In Favor of Translation: Researching Perspectival Growth in Organizational Leaders
– Clint Fuhs

A Meta-Model for Types: Patterns, Polarities, and Autopoiesis
– Linda Berens

Enacting an Integral Revolution: How Can We Have Truly Radical Conversations in a Time of Global Crisis?
– Terry Patton

Integral Diversity in Action: Implementing an Integral Diversity Program in a Workplace Environment
– Colin Green

Integral Evolutionary Recovery: Revisiting the Twelve Steps Through a Kosmocentric Lens
– Suzanne Shelly & Linda White

Exploring Inter-Being and Inter-Becoming as Ethos-Making
– Ian Wright

Enlightening Reading: Koan Study for Integral Scholar-Sages
– Michele Chase

The Conception of Integral Sports: An Application of Integral Theory and Practice in Athletics
– Sean Wilkinson, John Thompson, & Alex Takairis

New Theoretical Strategies for Integral Sustainability Praxis
– Darcy Riddell

Ethics and the New Education: Psychopharmacology, Psychometrics, and the Future of Human Capital
– Zachary Stein

On Social Holons, Ideologies of Interest, and the Kosmopolitan Call of Politics
– Michael Schumate

The Meaning of Planetary Civilization: Integral Rational Spirituality and the Semiotic Universe
– Tim Winton

Integral Sustainability: Correlating Action Logics with Sustainability
– Simon Dowsden & Barrett Brown

A Whole Delivery Measure of Comprehensive Social Service Provision
– Heather Larkin

Assumptions Versus Assertions: Separating Hypotheses from Truth in the Integral Community
– Suzanne Cook-Greuter

Integral Possibilism: A Tool for Critical Realism and Necessity for an Integral Community
– R. Elliott Ingersoll

Toward a Metaholistic Philosophy: Mysticism in the Philosophers of Bhusar, Panikkar, and Wilber
– John O'Neill

Integral Cinematic Analysis: Mapping the Multiple Dimensions of the Cinema
– Mark Allan Kaplan

Assumptions Versus Assertions: Separating Hypotheses from Truth in the Integral Community
– Simon Dowsden & Barrett Brown

Awareness-in-Action: A Critical Integralism for the Challenges of Our Time
– Daniel J. O’Connor

Critical Realist Integral Methodological Pluralism for Interdisciplinary Research in Agroecology
– Jack H. Buchanan & Douglas J. Reinemann
Journal of Integral Theory and Practice (JITP) is published quarterly by:

MetaIntegral Foundation
339 South Main Street
Sebastopol, CA 95472
United States of America

JITP is the official source for material related to Integral Theory and its application. The journal publishes peer-reviewed articles, case studies, integral research, critical dialogues, book reviews, and conference reports. JITP embraces a post-metaphysical and post-disciplinary perspective that is dedicated to articulating the ways ontology, epistemology, and methodology interact and co-arise across various scales of time and space. JITP is managed jointly by Integral Institute and MetaIntegral Foundation.

INTEGRAL INSTITUTE
www.integralinstitute.org
Integral Institute provides research and leadership for humanity’s most pressing problems. Through education and events that foster intentional, behavioral, cultural, and social self-awareness, the Institute aims to help leaders from all arenas to improve the human condition. Among the primary goals of the Institute is research of complex, global issues facing humanity in the 21st century. Climate change, evolutionary forms of capitalism, and cultural conflict in political, scientific, or religious domains are examples of problems to which the Institute hopes to bring new clarity.

META INTEGRAL FOUNDATION
www.metaintegral.org
MetaIntegral Foundation is a philanthropic and research organization devoted to creating a more ethical, sustainable, and psychologically mature humanity. The Foundation is engaged in three types of initiatives: 1) global initiatives that represent the leading edge of thinking on how humanity responds to complex, multidimensional problems; 2) academic initiatives that showcase how integral frameworks effectively communicate and coordinate across disciplinary boundaries; and 3) center initiatives, via eight application centers, that sponsor integral projects in a variety of disciplines.

© Integral Institute, 2013

No part of any article may be reproduced in any form without permission, except for the quotation of brief passages in criticism and discussion. The opinions expressed in articles, reviews, and other text material are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the opinion of the editors, editorial board, or publisher. The editors and publisher deny any responsibility or liability for statements and opinions expressed by the authors. Accuracy of reference data is the responsibility of authors.

ISSN: 1944-5083 (print)
ISSN: 1944-5091 (electronic)

Subscription Rates

2013 Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>United States $US</th>
<th>European Union $US</th>
<th>Rest of World $US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>180.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To subscribe, visit http://foundation.metaintegral.org/JITP or contact lynwoodlord@metaintegral.org

JITP is indexed by the American Psychological Association (PsycINFO), EBSCO (Humanities International Complete), Elsevier (Scopus), ProQuest (General Reference, Psychology, and Religion), and Ulrich’s.
EDITORIAL

v Editorial Introduction
   – Sean Esbjörn-Hargens

UPPER-LEFT QUADRANT

1 In Favor of Translation: Researching Perspectival Growth in Organizational Leaders
   – Clint Fuhs
19 A Meta-Model for Types: Patterns, Polarities, and Autopoiesis
   – Linda V. Berens

LOWER-LEFT QUADRANT

33 Enacting an Integral Revolution: How Can We Have Truly Radical Conversations in a Time of Global Crisis?
   – Terry Patten
56 Integral Diversity in Action: Implementing an Integral Diversity Program in a Workplace Environment
   – Lakia Green
66 Integral Evolutionary Recovery: Revisioning the Twelve Steps through a Kosmocentric Lens
   – Suzanne Shealy & Linda White
82 Exploring Inter-Being and Inter-Becoming as Ethos-Making: The Integrally Informed Pursuit of Professional Community Wellbeing
   – Ian Wight

UPPER-RIGHT QUADRANT

97 Enlightening Reading: Koan Study for Integral Scholar-Sages
   – Michele Chase
111 The Conception of Integral Sports: An Application of Integral Theory and Practice in Athletics
   – Sean Wilkinson, John Thompson, & Alex Tskairis

LOWER-RIGHT QUADRANT

126 New Theoretical Synergies for Integral Sustainability Praxis
   – Darcy Riddell
146 Ethics and The New Education: Psychopharmacology, Psychometrics, and The Future of Human Capital
   – Zachary Stein

OVERALL THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTION

163 On Social Holons, Ideologies of Interest, and the Kosmopolitan Call of Politics
   – Michael Schwartz
175  The Meaning of Planetary Civilization: Integral Rational Spirituality and the Semiotic Universe
  – Tim Winton

OVERALL RESEARCH CONTRIBUTION

197  Integral Sustainability: Correlating Action Logics with Sustainability to Provide Insight into the
     Dynamics of Change
  – Simon Divecha & Barrett Brown

211  A Whole Delivery Measure of Comprehensive Social Service Provision
  – Heather Larkin

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM OF INTEGRAL THEORY

227  Assumptions Versus Assertions: Separating Hypotheses from Truth in the Integral Community
  – Susanne R. Cook-Greuter

237  Integral Possibilism: A Tool for Critical Realism and Necessity for an Integral Community
  – R. Elliott Ingersoll

ENGAGEMENT WITH CRITICAL REALISM

245  Toward a MetaIntegral Philosophy: Mysticism in the Philosophies of Bhaskar, Panikkar, and Wilber
  – John O’Neill

ENGAGEMENT WITH COMPLEX THOUGHT

255  Integral Cinematic Analysis: Mapping the Multiple Dimensions of the Cinema and the Co-Evolution of
     Cinema, Consciousness, Culture, and Society
  – Mark Allan Kaplan

ALTERNATIVE TO INTEGRAL THEORY

277  Awareness-in-Action: A Critical Integralism for the Challenges of Our Time
  – Daniel J. O’Connor

POSTERS

317  Critical Realist Integral Methodological Pluralism for Interdisciplinary Research in Agroecology
  – Jack H. Buchanan & Douglas J. Reinemann
Integral Theory is a meta-framework that draws on the key insights of the world’s knowledge traditions. The awareness gained from drawing on all perspectives allows integral practitioners to bring new depth and clarity to every level of human endeavor—from unlocking individual potential to finding new approaches to global-scale problems.

Articles published in the Journal of Integral Theory and Practice (JITP) represent explorations in several modes of discourse: philosophical, theoretical, pragmatic, experiential, and critical. JITP is committed to the refinement, development, and expansion of Integral Theory.

Instructions for Authors

JITP follows American Psychological Association (APA) style guidelines. Visit http://foundation.metaintegral.org/JITP for full submission guidelines and a glossary of Integral Theory terminology. An abbreviated outline of the manuscript review process is listed below.

In light of the fact that both Spiral Dynamics and the Integral model sometimes use a color scheme to describe levels of development, we request that authors specify which color scheme they are using (e.g., orange altitude vs. orange vMeme). Altitude can be used to refer to any developmental line (e.g., orange cognition), while Spiral Dynamics, in the context of Integral Theory, specifically refers to levels of values development.

Review Process

Initial Review

Authors must submit articles to Lynwood Lord at lynwoodlord@metaintegral.org. In cases where authors do not adhere to JITP submission guidelines, manuscripts will be returned with a request that all components be provided. Theoretical changes, copy editing, and structural suggestions may be suggested at this stage.

Peer Review

The editorial team then assigns manuscripts to external reviewers. Information from submitted manuscripts may be systematically collected and analyzed as part of research to improve the quality of the editorial review process.

Authors are expected to revise their article in light of peer-review comments and provide a revised draft within one month. Changes should be made using the track changes feature in Microsoft Word, so our editorial team can quickly identify edits.

Theoretical Review

Once a draft with peer-review comments incorporated is received, a theory call will be scheduled with Ken Wilber, Editor-in-Chief. Wilber will offer constructive criticism and theoretical clarifications. This is a good opportunity to learn and refine your understanding of Integral Theory. The call will be recorded and a link to download the audio will be provided within a week.

Editorial Review

Accepted manuscripts are edited in accordance with JITP editorial style.

Author Review

Authors will be e-mailed a proof and will have one week to suggest changes.

Critical Presentations

Authors are encouraged to explore hypothetical and critical views in relationship to Integral Theory. When presenting hypothetical material (e.g., the possibility of a new line of development in one of the quadrants), authors should make it clear that a suggestive addition that is not currently part of Integral Theory is being offered, and then provide as much evidence, argumentation, and supportive material as possible to substantiate their position. When presenting critical material, authors must represent the components and claims of Integral Theory within an academically acceptable range of interpretation. JITP views the process of hypothetical and critical engagement as essential to the development of Integral Theory.
Welcome to our largest issue ever! Not since the journal was launched in 2006, when we published 20 articles in each of the first two issues (Vol. 1, Nos. 1 & 2), have we had so many amazing articles in one place. In 2013, we published two double issues: one covering Integral Business and this one, which contains some of the best presentations from the Integral Theory Conference (ITC). Each of these articles either won Best Paper or an Honorable Mention in one of 11 categories. Thus, these articles represent some of the most innovative work being done by scholar-practitioners from the integral community.

ITC 2013 was an exciting and, in some important ways, historic event. It was the third international Integral Theory Conference, the first one being held in 2008 and the second in 2010. We were not able to host the event in 2012 due to changes at John F. Kennedy University, where the event was held in its first two incarnations. Thus, with three years since the last conference and with a new location—the Marriott Waterfront Hotel in San Francisco—there was a lot of excitement going into the conference. Like the first two conferences, ITC 2013 sold out with 500 participants. The theme of the conference was “Connecting the Integral Kosmopolitan,” and Mark Forman, Jordan Luftig, and myself served as co-organizers.

In 2013, we envisioned expanding the integral universe to include a wider range of approaches than had hitherto been part of the discourse. We wanted to build on our previous efforts to honor the foundation created by Ken Wilber while at the same time expanding in new directions—in effect, shifting from a Wilber-centric approach to a Wilber-based one. Toward these ends we invited the chief architects of two other integral metatheories: Roy Bhaskar (Critical Realism) from London and Edgar Morin (Complex Thought) from Paris. Never before had these two integrative meta-giants been brought together, and both of them were relatively unknown to the integral community. Thus, ITC 2013 brought together three of the world’s most notable integral metatheories and exposed their communities of practice to each other. This was reflected in a number of the 100 presentations at the event that drew on two or three of these frameworks as well as in many of the articles in this issue.

Overall, the quality of papers at ITC 2013 was stronger across the board than in previous conferences. I take this as a sign that the conference is serving one of its aims—to help support the maturation of academic thought and professional application within the integral community. Thus, I am thrilled to present to you the 20 articles in this issue, which I feel collectively make a large contribution to the field. Given the amount of material in this issue I will provide just a brief introduction to each article. I encourage you to read as many of these articles as you can, as each one provides an incredible vista into integral consciousness and its applications. I have found all of these articles to contain many gems. Enjoy!

Upper-Left Quadrant
In this category we have two articles. The first is Clint Fuhs’ “In Favor of Translation: Researching Perspectival Growth in Organizational Leaders.” Fuhs builds on research he has been doing over the past few years by expanding on the notion of “perspective-taking,” which holds a central location within Integral Theory. Fuhs breaks down perspective-taking into its micro-elements, helping us to better understand what is involved in the process.

Next we have Linda Berens’ “A Meta-Model for Types: Patterns, Polarities, and Autopoiesis.” Berens shines a great deal of light on “the least articulated of the five elements of the AQAL model” (p. 19). She pres-
ments her own model of types, making links to the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) model, which is often neglected in integral discourse in favor of the Enneagram personality system. In addition, Berens explores type dynamics in the context of polarities and autopoiesis.

**Lower-Left Quadrant**

Terry Patten takes a unique approach to the “We space” in “Enacting an Integral Revolution: How Can We Have Truly Radical Conversations in a Time of Global Crisis?” In this article, Patten outlines what he calls an “integral trans-rhetorical praxis.” This article has many important implications for academic discourse and how we talk and listen to one another. For me, this feels especially relevant for supporting respectful discourse among scholar-practitioners associated with each of the three integral metatheories showcased during ITC 2013.

Lakia Green provides us with an applied case study in “Integral Diversity in Action: Implementing an Integral Diversity Program in a Workplace Environment.” Drawing on her actual experience in the application of an Integral Diversity Program, she illustrates the value, reward, and challenge of integral diversity within work environments. Having concrete examples of what worked and did not work like is invaluable for supporting all of us to be more effective in translating integral principles into integral praxis.

Adding to the field of Integral Recovery, Suzanne Shealy and Linda White build on their ongoing research in “Integral Evolutionary Recovery: Revisioning the 12 Steps through a Kosmocentric Lens.” They focus on the emphasis of ego transcendence found in Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and resituate it in the larger field of evolutionary spirituality. This reframe enables the spiritual orientation of AA to become meaningful to contemporary individuals who are not necessarily drawn to more traditional expressions of spirituality.

The last article in this category is Ian Wight’s “Exploring Inter-Being and Inter-Becoming as Ethos-Making: The Integrally Informed Pursuit of Professional Community Wellbeing.” Providing us with guidelines for “ethos-making,” Wight poetically gives us an inspired report from the field. Not only is Wight exploring a more integral approach to professionalism, but he is also exploring the intersubjective aspects of being a professional. This is a much-needed counterbalance to the individualistic orientation that is so common.

**Upper-Right Quadrant**

Michele Chase delights with her inviting “Enlightening Reading: Koan Study for Integral Scholar-Sages.” Building on her previous work examining integral academic praxis, she turns her attention to the practice of reading and writing. She invites us to consider the transformational power of authoring from a paradoxical place of Self/no Self. In the article she takes us on an inquiry into the intersection of scholarship and spirituality and allows us to see how academic writing can be liberating.

For six years, Sean Wilkinson, John Thompson, and Alex Tskairis have been involved in an exciting approach to working with young tennis players. In “The Conception of Integral Sports: An Application of Integral Theory and Practice in Athletics,” they present their latest reflections and experiences on how integral consciousness can serve young athletes and their parents both on and off the tennis court. This article inspires and instructs in ways that transcend both tennis and athletics and provide insight into how integral approaches can be enacted in multiple contexts.

**Lower-Right Quadrant**

Darcy Riddell covers much ground in her “New Theoretical Synergies for Integral Sustainability Praxis.” Not only does she raise some key criticisms of Integral Theory, but she also uses these critiques to help articulate
the beginnings of an integral social theory of transformation. Furthermore, she shows how the incorporation of three middle-range theories can serve to ameliorate some of the missing elements in current integral applications. Riddell’s epistemic reflexivity, combined with her robust metatheory-building approach, serve to guide us in how we might further develop Integral Theory and its applications in service of addressing sustainability challenges.

Next is Zachary Stein’s “Ethics and The New Education: Psychopharmacology, Psychometrics, and The Future of Human Capital.” Stein draws on both Integral Theory and Critical Realism to propose a “minimalist integral metatheory of education.” He explores the intersection of human capital theory and our educational systems and how this has resulted in significant levels of psychopharmacology use with student populations. Against this backdrop Stein articulates a vision of a new approach to education.

Overall Theoretical Contributions
In “On Social Holons, Ideologies of Interest, and the Kosmopolitan Call of Politics,” Michael Schwartz shines light on the notion of holons within Integral Theory. His primary focus is to begin to address the ways in which social holons have been undertheorized within integral discourse. In doing so he also exposes the “methodological individualism” that often goes unchecked within Integral Theory.

Following Schwartz’s valuable contribution we have Tim Winton’s “The Meaning of Planetary Civilization: Integral Rational Spirituality and the Semiotic Universe.” In this article, Tim outlines an approach to integral cosmology that is anchored in an integral semiotic realism. He champions the full development of modernity as a key to enacting a meaningful planetary civilization. Winton develops an approach to semiotic enactment that serves as the basis for a rational approach to spirituality. One of the most impressive features of this article is the coherent way Winton weaves together such a wide range of theories in service of a new meta-narrative that is emancipatory.

Overall Research Contributions
Simon Divecha and Barrett Brown share their recent research in “Integral Sustainability: Correlating Action Logics with Sustainability to Provide Insight into the Dynamics of Change.” Comparing two studies on the relationship between action logics and sustainability worldviews, they demonstrate the correlative nature between ones level of consciousness and how one talks about sustainability. Using concrete examples, they illustrate how sustainability content shows up differently at various action logics. Research such as this helps to operationalize the value of developmental psychology.

Heather Larkin continues to be one of the most important integral researchers in our community. In her most recent article, “A Whole Delivery Measure of Comprehensive Social Service Provision,” she builds on her prior work on adverse childhood experiences and presents some new models and measures for integral social work. One of the unique contributions of this article is how it looks at the issue of “service integration,” which has not been explored much in integral discourse. Integral scholars often discuss integration of knowledge, methods, perspectives, and dimensions, but rarely do they discuss how to integrate various forms of social service aimed at specific populations. Thus, Larkin’s work is important in that it not only expands what is being integrated, but she also provides actual research that is being used to develop new approaches to service integration.

Constructive Criticism of Integral Theory
In “Assumptions vs. Assertions: Separating Hypotheses from Truth in the Integral Community,” Susanne Cook-Greuter raises up a much-needed mirror for integral adherents. She challenges the ways in which
members of the integral community uncritically accept and promote a “more is better” vision of reality. She courageously cautions us to be more epistemically reflective and self-critical, and not to fall into various ego traps that promote integral greatness. She concludes her article with a powerful invitation to create a more curious and skeptical approach to integral studies.

Complementing Cook-Greuter’s article, Elliott Ingersoll provides a critical stance in his short but pointed “Integral Possibilism: A Tool for Critical Realism and Necessity for an Integral Community.” Inspired by Critical Realism, he introduces the notion of “Integral Possibilism,” which makes an important distinction between ontological and epistemological questions. Ingersoll’s article provides a valuable inquiry into what role critical thinking can and should play in integral discourse and applications.

**Engagement with Critical Realism**

In “Toward a MetaIntegral Philosophy: Mysticism in the Philosophies of Bhaskar, Panikkar, and Wilber,” John O’Neill engages in a comparative analysis and inquiry. He explores the trinitarian approach within these philosophies and outlines points of contact and difference. Given the importance that spirituality and mysticism plays in Integral Theory, this is a valuable article in that it sets the stage for a larger comparative project for future scholars.

**Engagement with Complex Thought**

Mark Allan Kaplan nicely draws and builds on Edgar Morin’s work in cinematic complexity in “Integral Cinematic Analysis: Mapping the Multiple Dimensions of the Cinema and the Co-Evolution of Cinema, Consciousness, Culture, and Society.” While Morin has written on many topics over the years, his work in cinema is considered by many to be groundbreaking. Kaplan explores Morin’s approach to cinema alongside three other approaches, and in so doing creates a rich integrative landscape for cinematic analysis.

**Alternative to Integral Theory**

Fasten your metatheory seatbelts for Daniel J. O’Connor’s “Awareness-in-Action: A Critical Integralism for the Challenges of Our Time.” O’Connor develops a robust meta-semiotic theory of primordial perspectives by drawing primarily on the work of Wilber and Jürgen Habermas. He explores the philosophical and practical implications of his approach and further builds a case against Wilber’s “tri/quad-conflated” approach to perspectives.

**Poster Summary**

Jack Buchanan’s “Critical Realist Integral Methodological Pluralism for Interdisciplinary Research in Agroecology” is an exciting example of the value of Critical Realism and Integral Theory in dialogue. In this extended summary of a poster he presented at ITC 2013, Buchanan develops a critique of Integral Theory’s approach to methodological pluralism. It is this kind of cross-fertilization that can help both metatheories think their distinctions anew.

Individually, any of the articles in this issue is a worthwhile contribution to Integral Theory and practice. Together, they signal a major addition to the depth and span of integral theorizing in action. I am often impressed with the range and scope of material that appears in the pages of this journal, as I believe such diversity is essential for the ongoing growth and maturation of Integral Theory. I want to thank the whole ITC team for creating the 2013 conference, and in effect creating the space for intellectual and pragmatic engagement that produced all of the content that is showcased in this issue.
The capacity to take the perspective of another individual underlies all forms of human interaction. It plays a central role in the developing social cognition of children as they navigate peer interactions (Selman, 1980), the formulation of moral judgments and action (Habermas, 1990; Kohlberg, 1969), the emergence of the self, who relies on it as a control mechanism to mediate communication (Mead, 1934), and the incidence of pro-social phenomena such as cooperation, altruism, and the inhibition of aggression (Batson, & Oleson, 1991; Eisenberg, & Fabes, 1990). As such, the term perspective-taking is richly polysemic, featuring diverse and sometimes conflicting usage patterns across a number of knowledge domains.

Perspective-taking has been variously conceived of as a trait, as a disposition, as a process, as an outcome, and as a developing capacity or skill. It has been explored in clinical and organizational settings, and in both children and adult populations. Its prevalence across a wide range of the literature, including communication theory (Flavell, 1968; Boland, & Tenkasi, 1995; Beatty, & Payne, 1984; Roberts, & Patterson, 1983), developmental psychology (Piaget, 1926; Feffer & Gourevitch, 1960; Flavel 1968; 1992; Miller et al.; 1970; Selman & Byrne, 1974; Selman 1980), information processing (Enright, 1976; Lapsley & Quintana, 1985; Oppenheimer, 1978), cognitive neuroscience (Ruby & Decety, 2001; Lamm et al., 2007; Ames et al., 2008), organizational development and leadership (Parker et al., 2008; Calvard, 2011; Litchfield & Gentry, 2010), discourse ethics (Habermas, 1990), theory of mind (Premack & Woodruff, 1978; Baron-Cohen et al., 2000; McHugh & Stewart, 2012), sociology (Coutu, 1951), education (Chandler et al., 1973; Ahammer & Murray, 1979; Marsh et al., 1980), and ethnography (Filmer, 1973)—underscores its importance as a multidimensional construct worthy of cross-disciplinary investigation. But as is so often the case, provincialism has seemed to prevail, leading virtually all organizational investigations over the past 15 years to neglect the rich history of constructive developmental approaches in favor of self-report surveys and approaches that construe...
perspective-taking as a flexible or dynamic trait insofar as they allow for influence by non-dispositional person variables (cf. Parker et al., 2008). Ample reference to the growth or development of perspective-taking capacity is present, but the singular citations of Jean Piaget or George Herbert Mead typify the extent to which a constructive developmental approach is employed. Perhaps this paucity of reliance on several decades of developmental investigation is due to the aforementioned provincialism, or to the inability of surveys, such as the oft relied upon Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis 1983), to measure developmental constructs, or perhaps it is due to the fact that the preponderance of past studies articulated levels of perspective-taking in children, leaving contemporary investigations with little more than historical footnotes upon which to ground their discussion of perspectival growth in organizational populations of adults.

This article is equally motivated by these possibilities and seeks to formulate a framework for researching the growth of perspectival function in organizational leaders and managers. Two areas of inquiry are of particular interest: 1) shifting the emphasis from developmental transformation to translative expansion, facilitating an investigation of the degree to which cognitive development enables within-level growth of perspectival skill; and 2) developing a unified taxonomy of adult perspectival function that allows for the tracking of changes in relevant translative variables.

Despite the existence of several perspective-taking models that include adolescent and adult stages (Byrne, 1973; Rose 1990; Elfers et al., 2008), I contend that the plurality of perspective-taking task demands required by both the day-to-day operations of organizations and dilemma-based developmental assessments are of a complexity that requires perspective-taking skills that first emerged in late childhood. As such, the investigation of perspective-taking in organizations should look instead for growth in translative dynamics—such as rate of perspective seeking versus taking, and perspectival accuracy and motivation—as compared to the complexity of perspective-taking acts themselves. Then, to the extent that it is considered, developmental complexity—whether cognitive, moral, or otherwise—can be investigated insofar as it enables or hinders translative growth. In short, I suggest we prioritize translation over transformation, a task that will require overcoming some deep-rooted assumptions about growth.

Growth-to-Goodness
Most developmentally informed discourse regarding perspective-taking has been encumbered by a peculiar feature of associated language games. The terms perspective-taking and development have been uncritically set in a circular relation such that transformation in perspective-taking capacity is seen as both the cause and product of development.

I suggest that such notions have resulted from an overreliance on metaphors to depict the process of developmental transformation. For example, “The subject of one level becomes the object of the subject at the next higher level” (Kegan, 1979; Wilber, 1980) has become a stand-in summary for more precise articulations of constructive developmental principles: development unfolds in invariant sequences of qualitatively distinct stages, which are themselves hierarchical integrations of increasingly differentiated structures (Piaget, 1954; Flavell, 1963; Kohlberg, 1969). Such metaphors are reminiscent of the subject/object relationships involved in perspective-taking, and, while they are functional descriptors for ontogenetic transformation, they fail to capture the microgenetic process of actually taking the perspective of another person.

With perspective-taking unintentionally wedded to ontogenetic transformation, we are lured into uncritically accepting developmental spectrums that posit an additional person-perspective with every new stage (fourth-person perspective at Wilber’s (2006) green altitude, fifth-person at teal altitude, sixth-person at turquoise altitude, etc.). Regardless of whether such associations are descriptively accurate—as far as I am aware, they have yet to be empirically verified—they are taken as prescriptively significant, curtailing the need for deeper inquiry and locking us into the “higher is better” trappings of the growth-to-goodness assumptions critiqued by Zachary Stein (2010).
Stein traces the notion that higher is better back to James Baldwin (1906), who saw evolution as a process of growth-to-goodness, a commitment subscribed to by virtually every 20th-century developmentalist. Although none of these theorists embrace these assumptions in a direct or unqualified way, their ideas have penetrated the zeitgeist, resulting in a belief that higher stages are inherently better and that the whole person transforms while attaining them.

The connection between these assumptions and the aforementioned issues with predominant notions of perspective-taking should be readily apparent. If development is characterized (or caused) by increased perspective-taking and higher stages are seen as better, then emphasis is placed on transformation, which has secured a place of greater normative value—even if it turned out, for example, that more good were to be derived from leaders learning to take less complex but more accurate perspectives. In light of these concerns, intentionally placing greater (or equal) emphasis on the possibility of translative expansion might very well yield preferable growth in perspective-taking capacities. To test this hypothesis, we first need to construct a framework for conceptualizing translative expansion.

**Terminological Clarity**

Before developing this taxonomy, we would be well served to get clear on our terminology. As stated before, the term *perspective-taking* features complex usage patterns. Over the past century, different terms have been used to refer to the same phenomena and the same term to different phenomena. Of particular interest here is differentiating perspective-taking, role-taking, and empathy.

**Historical Roots**

An early mention of perspective-taking, although not by name, can be found in Adam Smith’s (2010) *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, published in 1759, several centuries before Mead’s treatment of the topic. Smith described, but did not largely pursue, the idea that we use an imaginative process to overcome the inaccessibility of another’s feelings. He aptly noted that the only way to generate an idea of another’s feelings is to “...think about what we would feel if we were in his situation (p. 1).” He did not name this process, but appears to be speaking of perspectival functions similar to those referenced by William James (1890), who distinguished between Me, the known self or object, and I, the knowing self or subject, Charles Cooley (1902), whose looking glass self navigated changing social conditions by generating a notion of how society and others view us, Baldwin (1906), who debated the degree to which our self-image is relatively independent versus being reliant on our perceptions of how others view us, Theodor Lipps (1909), whose term *Einfühlung*, or “feeling into,” drives the empathetic response, and Martin Buber (1937), who construed the I-Thou relation as the direct, relational knowing of another’s perspective. While the roots of perspective-taking can be traced to these writers, the preponderance of 20th-century constructive developmental research drew its theoretical inspiration from Mead (1934) and its empirical inspiration from Piaget (1926; 1932; see also: Inhelder, & Piaget, 1958).

**Perspective-taking vs. Role-taking**

Mead (1934) is largely credited as being the progenitor of role-taking in its modern form. He understood the innately human capacity to take the role of other as both the source of a sense of self and the core of social intelligence. Mead construed the coordination between self as subject (what he called “the I”) and the self as object (what he called “the me”) as inherently social, leading many theorists to construe his role-taking as concerning social roles as compared to attitudes, which is what the term *role* meant for Mead. Walter Coutu (1951) traces the confusion across several decades of discourse within which he encountered ample confla-
tion between sociological concept of role-playing with the psychological concept of role-taking (see: Newcomb, 1950; Lindesmith & Strauss, 1949). In summary, role-taking, as typically employed, refers to a strictly mental, cognitive, or empathetic activity and not to overt psychological behavior. In this sense, perspective-taking and role-taking are different, but, as employed by Mead, role-taking and perspective-taking function as synonyms, a usage pattern demonstrated by most constructive developmentalists (Kohlberg, 1969; Seamen, 1975; Selman 1971; Enright & Lapsley, 1980).

**Perspective-taking vs. Empathy**

Empathy has a rich history of being confounded with both role-taking and aspects of role theory. Dymond’s (1948) concept of empathy is based on role theory and depends on the role-taking ability of a person. Speroff (1953) suggested that empathy involved both role-taking and role reversal. And Bucheimer (1963) argued that it involved both inferring and identifying with another’s role. Perhaps most impactful was Davis (1983), who, despite defining empathy as the reactions of one individual to the observed experiences of another, included a perspective-taking sub-scale in his measure of empathy.

As a result of these conflations, much of the research in this area has been devoted to resolving the conceptual distinctions between these concepts (Borke, 1971; Chandler, & Greenspan, 1972; Feshbach, & Roe, 1968; Flapan, 1968). The preferred resolution relies on the making of two distinctions. First is to differentiate affective role-taking, which refers to the ability to infer the feelings of others, and empathy, which is the ability to share the feelings of others, and second to differentiate role-taking in general, which is seen as more cognitive and distal, from empathy, which is strictly affective and proximate (Shantz, 1975; Stephan & Finlay, 1999; Parker & Axtell, 2001). In this sense, perspective-taking is viewed as a necessary but not sufficient condition for empathy, and empathy as a possible, but not guaranteed, outcome of perspective-taking.

**An Operational Definition of Perspective-taking**

When it comes to operationalizing a definition of perspective-taking, there is widespread agreement on two fronts. First, most theorists agree that a perspective is a person’s perceptual, conceptual, or affective orientation that includes such things as thoughts, ideas, attitudes, points of view (Selman, 1980; Flavell 1968; Fefzer & Gourevitch, 1960), angle of regard (Graumann, 1989), needs, connotations/associations, personality dimensions, cognitive patterns (Ross & Ward, 1996), background knowledge, beliefs, plans, goals, current interpretations of stimuli and events (Krauss & Fussell, 1988), visible information, operational codes, preferences, normative constraints, and self-images (Goffman, 1967; 1970).

Second, agreement exists around a general definition of perspective-taking, which is described in the following ways: “the capacity to understand the interaction process between self and other, through the other person’s eyes, as well as through one’s own” (Selman, 1980, p. 13); “a process in which the individual somehow cognizes...certain attributes of another person” (Flavell, 1968, p. 5); “how individuals coordinate and integrate their own understanding of a situation in relation to others” (Sokol, 2010, p. 186); and “the process of imagining the world from another’s vantage point or imagining oneself in another’s shoes” (Galinsky et al., 2005, p. 110). The definitions proposed by a few theorists (Parker et al., 2008; Calvard, 2010) include a requirement that the perspective taken be effective or accurate, but the general consensus seems to bracket accuracy, simply because inaccurate perspective-taking still constitutes perspective-taking.

When it comes to operationalizing a definition for research purposes, more specificity is needed. In the spirit of Flavell’s (1968) more precise articulation of perspective-taking as the ability and disposition to assess another’s role attributes and response capacities in a given situation and to use this understanding of the other person’s viewpoint in an instrumental way, I would like to propose the following operational definition of perspectival action:
The developing capacity of a subject to become aware of and consequently take or seek the perspective of a real or hypothesized individual or group with the intent to use the information about the object dimension enacted for some instrumental purpose.

This definition aims to integrate several aspects of the taxonomy proposed in the following section. As formulated, both transformative and transitive dimensions of perspectival action are captured, setting the ideal frame for balanced research that generate usable knowledge for practitioners.

Mapping Perspectival Action

An extensive review of the literature reveals very few attempts to describe the general flow or process of perspectival action (Parkere et al., 2008, Flavell, 1968) and no attempts to delineate the taxonomy of variables present in a specific perspectival act. Such representational devices aim to 1) integrate existing theorizing into a coherent framework that 2) scaffolds the creation of coding systems for dilemma or interview-based perspective assessments, in order to 3) guide research efforts toward more adequate articulations of transitive growth in adult perspectival function. In a simple sense, the flow of perspectival action (FPA) presented in Figure 1 is the result of a literature review guided by the inquiry: What variables, factors, or aspects of perspectival action undergo growth or change?

The next few sections of this article present the rationale for dividing the FPA into these five components. As we will see, the perspectival chain component, representing the core of a specific perspectival act, is further fleshed out into a taxonomy of interrelated elements called Act, Type/Subtype, and Object.

![Figure 1. Flow of perspectival action.](image)

**Awareness**

Awareness is logically prior to the other components in the flow detailed above. Without knowledge of the fact that self and other might have alternate perspectives on the same situation or event, the flow of perspectival action cannot progress (Flavell, 1968). Clearly, awareness (or lack thereof) is predicated by models that postulate several levels of increasingly complex perspectives (Kurdek, 1977; Selman 1975). By definition, if a level of perspective-taking has yet to emerge, there can be no awareness that perspectives of correlative complexity exist. But, that is only half the story. Even if awareness is possible, it does not mean that a particular perspective will enter awareness; that is, unless a perspective is salient to the subject, the flow will not begin. Organizational investigations on perspective-taking antecedents have suggested that mood, emotion,
social boundaries (Parker et al., 2008), flexible role orientation, an integrated understanding of the workplace, having previously held a person’s job (Parker & Axtell, 2001), and the outcome dependency present between subject and potential target (Neuberg & Fiske, 1987) impact the likelihood that a perspective will enter awareness.

**Motivation**

Awareness that a perspective exists does not necessitate that a perspectival act will be engaged. Also required is a need or motivation; something present in the situation must implicitly or explicitly constitute a signal to utilize one’s perspectival capacity. Flavell’s (1968) notion that the product of role-taking is used in an instrumental way underscores the motivation component, suggesting, as does Habermas (1990), that perspective-taking is a goal-directed activity.

Theorists broadly acknowledge the relevance of identifying the motivation underlying perspectival acts, but they address the topic in two different ways. The first seems tied to awareness in that it impacts the taking up of a perspectival act at the start of the chain. Ross and colleagues (1977) note that in instances where the subject already believes they know the perspective, motivation acts to impede the flow of perspectival action. Contrary to that, some factors, like positive affect (Parker et al., 2008) and the target holding a more senior position (Galinsky et al., 2006), have been shown to increase the motivation to engage.

The second manner in which motivation is addressed concerns perceived or desired outcomes, which is why motivation is represented as impacting the object component at the end of the perspectival chain. Parker and colleagues (2008) argue that perspective-taking is motivated by both self- and other-focused intentions, which may include a desire to evoke empathetic concern (Batson et al., 2007), to reduce stereotyping and prejudice (Batson et al., 2002), to genuinely understand the other (Caruso et al., 2005), to understand the environment (Steins & Wicklund, 1996), and to evaluate oneself (Batson, 2009). While these motivations are positive, self-interested motives are also possible but rarely discussed—imagine, for example, a manager who takes his subordinate’s perspectives with the implicit aim of shooting down their ideas. It is for this reason that motivation strikes me as such a crucial component when investigating translative growth in perspectival capacity.

**Perspectival Chain**

What I have termed the perspectival chain includes a taxonomy of acts, types, sub-types and objects. The metaphor of a chain is employed because all acts, regardless of variations in act, type, sub-type, or object, start with subject and end with an object dimension of a target. The taxonomy shown in Figure 2 depicts these variations, which were generated from a literature review that failed to uncover even a single effort directed toward a similar outcome. As such, some elements contained in the taxonomy are speculative.

The perspectival chain is initiated by a subject through the engagement of an act of perspective-taking or perspective-seeking, which involves a series of coordinated behaviors to actually seek out the perspective that could otherwise be inferred. Both aim to disclose a distinct dimension (a feeling, thought, behavior, etc.) of an object dimension of a target, but only the former has received extensive treatment in the literature. In fact, the bulk of research has focused on articulating levels of perspective-taking as they emerge in children. Drawing on the work of Piaget (1926, 1933), who viewed perspective-taking as playing a critical role in decentration and the decline of egocentrism, and Kohlberg (1969), whose levels or moral reasoning presuppose an increase in perspective-taking capacity, Robert Selman (1977, 1979) articulated five levels of perspective-taking—ranging from egocentric to second-order reciprocity—that have come to define most of the cognitive developmental work in this area (Enright & Lapsley, 1980; Gurucharri & Selman, 1982; Keller & Edelstein, 1991; Snarey et al., 1983). Selman’s stage model generally correlates with other perspective-taking models.
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(DeVries, 1970; Feffer, 1970; Kuhn, 1972; Flavell, 1968) and has even been extended to include, as of yet unverified, pre-reflexive and meta-reflexive stages (Elfers, Martin, & Sokol, 2008).

More recent contributions to adult developmental research have also positioned perspective-taking as a central theme (Armon, 1993; Gaudine & Thorne, 2001; Kegan & Lahey, 2002; Cook-Greuter, 2004), but they have the tendency to define levels in terms of different forms of perspective-taking, contributing, in part, to the prorogation of growth-to-goodness assumptions mentioned earlier.

Differentiation between seeking and taking has been explored by a few researchers (Dawson & Stein, 2011; Jarvela & Hakkinen, 2002; Simonneaux, 2007), but references are generally sparse. It is unlikely that perspective-seeking unfolds through stages, even though seeking acts can range in difficulty. Perhaps this accounts for why seeking has not been discussed, or, perhaps, as Parker and colleagues (2008) seem to suggest, it is because seeking behavior requires more cognitive effort and behavioral resources. Such speculations are compatible with the findings of Dawson and Stein (2011), who, in a study of the decision-making processes of 254 mostly middle and senior managers, saw greater instances of taking as compared to seeking, which was found to be more difficult. At the expense of increased task demands, perspective-seeking is likely to generate higher rates of perspectival accuracy—a point acknowledged by Flavell (1968) and which, in my estimation, justifies the inclusion of seeking in a taxonomy of acts.

Types/Subtypes

The type and subtype components of this taxonomy are the most speculative. Existing research construes types of perspective-taking based on the nature of the perspectival target (what this discussion calls object—conceptual, affective, spatial, etc.), leaving little investigation of the components that I argue are determined by subject preference, available information, and situation constraints. Shantz (1975) recognized three types of perspective-taking (differential, relational, and normative) directed at two types of others (real and hypothetical) when compiling a review of existing studies. My own thinking has produced similar results, so I have taken real (a boss, a spouse, my peers) and hypothetical (a good person, scientists, my ideal self) as types and differential and relational as subtypes. Then, in a slight adaptation to Shantz’s treatment, I have dropped normative—it has been identified as emerging at a particular stage (Selman, 1980), rather than being an option present at any stage—and I have modified the meanings of differential and relational to refer to single individuals and groups and relations between individuals and groups, respectively.
The act of perspective-seeking also distills into two types—active and passive. Active seeking concerns the direct pursuit of the targets whose perspective is being sought and is postulated to occur through at least two subtypes: inquiry or derived. Inquiry, as the name implies, concerns asking the target about their perspective, and derived seeks expressions made by the target relating to the object dimension being sought. An example of Active Inquiry would be asking your supervisor how they feel about senior management’s culture change initiative. Active Derived, however, would look toward a memo your supervisor wrote about their feelings. Passive seeking pursues the target indirectly by sourcing prior expressions made by the target that are unrelated to the object dimension being sought or by seeking other’s perspectives on the target. The former constitutes the construal subtype and the latter the refracted subtype. Depending on available information and situational constraints, passive seeking is likely to result in a decline in efficacy.

Object

Extensive work has been conducted regarding the object component of our taxonomy although it has been conducted as a search for types of perspective-taking (see Kurdek & Rodgon, 1975; Salatas & Flavell, 1976). Clearly, what is being referenced in this work are the dimensions that perspectives aim to elucidate: affective, conceptual, perceptual, and so on. I have relied on Wilber’s (1995, 1996) quadrant model to organize this component. The quadrants are derived from crossing two fundamental distinctions that can be made about reality: interior versus exterior and individual versus collective. This yields four dimensions, which adequately account for the perspective-taking objects identified by researchers: 1) the interior-individual, or dispositional (Corcoran & Mallinckrodt, 2000), conceptual (Shantz, 1975; Flavell, 1968; Selman, 1971; Miller et al., 1970), intentional (Shantz & Voydanoff, 1973; Irwin & Ambron, 1973; Kugelmass & Breznitz, 1968), cognitive (Kegan 1982, 1994; Labovivie-Vief, 2005), affective domain (Feshbach & Roe, 1968; Borke, 1971; Burns & Cavey, 1957); 2) the exterior-individual, or spatial (Flavell et al., 1981; Ackermann, 1996; Piaget & Inhelder, 1956), perceptual (Kurdek & Rodgon, 1975), behavioral domain (Sessa, 1996; Selman et al., 1986); 3) the interior-collective, or cultural, semantic domain (Calvard, 2010; Parker et al., 2001; Dawson & Stein, 2011); and 4) the exterior-collective, or social, systemic, syntactical domain (Williams et al., 2007; Parker & Axtell, 2001; Dawson & Stein, 2011).

If the perspectival chain begins with a perspective-taking or perspective-seeking subject, it ends with one or more of these four object dimensions as they arise in an individual or group. The process, however, is not as direct as it might seem. The feasibility of enacting an object dimension and the likelihood that it is enacted accurately depend on the information present to the perspective-taking subject. The penultimate component of the FPA concerns the selection of information that is relevant to one’s perspectival aims.

Information

In the context of perspectival action, information refers to aspects of the social environment that are selected as data to be utilized in an act of perspective-taking or -seeking. Information is typically discussed in regard to its impact on accuracy (see: Epley & Caruso, 2009; Myers & Hodges, 2009), but is relevant as a standalone component by virtue of the fact that information selection co-varies with development (Livesley & Bromley, 1973) and impacts a range of available taking or seeking types (and subtypes).

Shantz (1975) classifies information in two groups: information about a person and information about a situation. Person sources include: “surface” cues such as dress, facial expression, movement, voice quality, and verbal statements (Shantz, 1975); knowledge about the target (Parker et al., 2008; Marangoni et al., 1995); past experience with the target (Ickes et al., 1990), subject’s perceived self-similarity to target (Epley & Caruso, 2009); perceived in-group similarity and out-group stereotypes (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000); and other people’s perspectives regarding the target. Situation sources include information about context that
influence expectancies (Heider, 1958; Flapan, 1968), other’s responses to the target, subject’s experience in similar situations, and general knowledge of human behavior (Flavell, 1968).

Person and situation sources can be equally relied upon in the generation of accurate perspectives, but not all potentially relevant information can or will be considered. Barker and Wright (1955) reported that situation cues alone can be used to successfully understand other’s dispositions. Pevers and Secord (1973) discovered that prior to age 7, children rely upon appearances and physical possessions, but that by age 8, available information expands to include habits, dispositions, and traits. Barenboim (1981) found that exclusive reliance on behavioral information sources declined sharply by age 10. Even if development does not place limits on the information that can be accessed, task demands, attentional constraints, and egocentrism may prevent accessible information from being selected as relevant, impacting accuracy potentially more than most any other factor (Epley & Caruso, 2009).

Accuracy

Possessing the capability to take and seek perspectives and to select relevant information from a background field of meaning does not mean that people will use their perspectival skills when they should, or that these skills will generate reliable and accurate perspectives. Accuracy is perhaps the most important component in the FPA. What good is the ability to generate a sense of someone else’s emotions, thoughts or feeling, if that sense is not in general accord with their sense of the same? What good is our sense of a group’s shared value, if the majority of group members value something entirely different? In the simplest sense, accuracy refers to correspondence between a subject and object’s perspective of the same dimension (Ickes et al., 1990).

Accuracy was actively researched until Lee Cronbach (1955; Gage & Cronbach, 1955) leveled a devastating critique at the methods used to measure accuracy in empathy (Dymond, 1948) and person perception (Dubin & Dubin, 1965). Over the past few decades, however, the work of Seaman (1975), Cline and Richards (1960), and Ickes and colleagues (1990) has sparked a revival, fueled by methodological refinements and clarifications (also see: Meyers & Hodges, 2009). Accuracy has since been investigated in a number of different dyadic relationships—same-sex friends (Stinson & Ickes, 1992), married partners (Kilpatrick et al., 2002), client-therapist pairs (Barone et al., 2005)—and it has been correlated with popular empathy measures such as the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980). Results revealed that the Interpersonal Reactivity Index’s perspective-taking subscale was found to be significantly negatively correlated with accuracy (Ickes et al., 1990; Laurent & Hodges, 2002)—a finding not often acknowledged by those who employ this measure in organizational research.

Although most structuralists intentionally avoid issues surrounding accuracy (Flavell, 1968; Selman 1980), it has, not surprisingly, been of great interest to organizational psychologists, where accuracy matters far more than in clinical research settings. Epley and Caruso (2009) identify three barriers to taking accurate perspectives, which they suggest must be overcome if perspective-taking skills are to be capitalized on. The first barrier identified is a failure to activate perspective-taking in the first place. Experimental evidence indicates that people overly rely on their own perspective when a situation explicitly calls for taking another’s (Kreueger, 1998). In a study that required people to make a decision based on the perceived behavioral interaction of self and other, 72.5% of respondents took the other’s perspective when explicitly instructed to do so, but only 40% did when no instructions were given, suggesting that even when a situation offers a payoff for perspective-taking the default behavior of most is not to do so (Caruso et al., 2007).

The second barrier identified was miscalibrated adjustment or a failure to get over one’s own perspective when considering another’s. A study conducted by Van Boven and Loewenstein (2003) found that when asked to gauge the thirst of hikers who had gotten lost in the woods, people who reported themselves as thirsty attributed greater thirst to the hikers. Another study found that in addition to starting with egocentric perspectives, they were made more quickly and relied upon more strongly that non-egocentric perspectives
In summary, when people attempt to take the perspectives of others, the second barrier to accuracy is the residue of their own perspectives.

The third barrier identified was inaccurate adjustment or selecting information that is relevant to the perspective being taken. Studies have indicated that when people fail to use themselves as a guide for other’s perspectives they rely instead on stored information about the other person (Ames, 2004), which tends to be overly cynical about other’s intentions or motivations (Miller & Ratner, 1998), and a precursor to reactive egoism (Epley et al., 2006).

In addition to these three barriers, the task demands and a subject’s capacity have also been found to influence the likelihood of accurate perspectives. According to Parker and colleagues (2008), if a subject has greater inter- and intra-psychic resources at their disposal, they will be more likely to accurately and comprehensively take another’s perspective. Studies have demonstrated that a subject’s cognitive capacity (Lutwak & Hennessy, 1982), familiarity with the target (Marangoni et al., 1995), affective state (Galinsky & Ku, 2004), and interpersonal style (Mendoza, 1997) are linked with perspectival effectiveness. Also impacting potential accuracy is the complexity of the perspective-taking task itself (Gehlbach, 2004; see also: Wood, 1986), the prevailing work demands (Horton & Keysar, 1996; Totterdell & Holman, 2003), the accessibility of the perspective (Dougherty, 1992; Fletcher, 2007) and the type of perspectival object (Duan, 2000).

With such an extensive list of barriers and factors impacting the possibility for accuracy, one might wonder why we even attempt to take perspectives in the first place. Of course, in some instances it is the only option. But, in potentially many others, why not bypass the process all together? With accuracy defined as the correspondence of a subject and target’s perspective on the same object dimension, perspective-seeking provides the most reliable option. Increasing the rate of perspective-seeking over -taking (Dawson & Stein, 2011) might be the most viable option for positively impacting perspectival accuracy.

**Perspectival Growth in Managers and Leaders**

The paucity of studies investigating perspective-taking and -seeking in organizations from a constructive developmental perspective is the likely result of a number of factors. First is a sparsity of constructive-developmental studies concerning any aspect of organizational function. A notable exception is a range of leader development studies (see: McCauley et al., 2006; Strang & Kuhnert, 2009; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987) that primarily rely upon Kegan’s (1979) model. While this represents an important step, it does not constitute an in-depth investigation of perspectival action. Second, and likely most limiting, is the fact that current perspective-taking models and measures stop at early to middle adolescence, suggesting that managers and leaders would test at the highest stages, preventing an investigation of structural growth.

Without a developmental perspective to inform investigations of individual transformation, most perspective-taking studies at the organizational level focus instead on outcomes. Parker and colleagues (2008) provide a broad overview of these studies, which suggest that perspective-taking is responsible for a range of positive outcomes, including lower interpersonal aggression (Richardson et al., 1998), decreased stereotyping, and in-group favoritism (Galinsky & Moskowitz, 2000), higher communication satisfaction (Park & Raile, 2010), reduced attribution error (Regan & Totten, 1975; Storms, 1973), more effective interpersonal relating (Krauss & Fussell, 1991), and conflict reduction and improved negotiation (Bazerman, 1998). There is little debate as to the organizational value of such outcomes, but these studies leave us with two unaddressed issues. The first concerns the fact that many construe perspective-taking as a trait and assess it with self-report surveys. While perspective-taking reports might indeed correlate with the aforementioned outcomes, a survey response that states “the perspectives of others are very important” does not necessarily translate into actual perspective-taking. Second, and perhaps more importantly, if perspective-taking leads to positive outcomes, how can organizations increase the rate and efficacy of perspectival action? While this question could clearly be construed as a distinct research inquiry, my point is that these studies lack the ability to track
both horizontal and vertical growth. This is not a problem with the studies themselves, but more so with the methods they rely upon.

**Operationalizing Transformation and Translation**

The perspectival action flow and taxonomy proposed in this article can help address these concerns. By informing the creation of a coding scheme, my work seeks to balance an investigation of transformation and translation in the study of perspectival action in managers and leaders. The transformative component will utilize the Lectical Decision Making Assessment (LDMA) to investigate growth in cognitive complexity. The LDMA is an essay-based assessment that presents common ill-structured workplace dilemmas that focus on how people make decisions in a management context (Dawson & Stein, 2011). The LDMA is analyzed for developmental level using the Lectical Assessment System (LAS), a well-validated and reliable domain-general scoring system that measures a cognitive developmental construct against Fischer’s dynamic skill theory model (Fischer, 1980; Fischer & Bidell, 2006).

The translative component will focus on perspectival action and will utilize a qualitative coding scheme informed by the perspectival action flow and taxonomy presented here. Because LAS scores do not, for example, reveal the meaning of an argument, the form of perspective-taking, or the nature of self-understanding, concept coding is needed to investigate the content present in each assessment. Dawson’s developmental maieutic method (Dawson & Stein, 2008) will guide the process of uncovering conceptual development, temporarily suspended from the lectical level, and then recombining codes with level and phase through an inductive process of rational reconstruction to provide a rich and accurate picture of the empirical relation between concepts and complexity level.

The sample includes 565 civil supervisors, managers, and leaders from a major North American city. Test-takers completed four LDMAs and a 360 evaluation. The LDMAs were evenly spaced across a nine-month development program that included education interventions on perspective-taking and -seeking and the 360 was administered at the end of the nine-month period. The relationship between lectical level, perspective-taking and -seeking dynamics, and leadership 360 results provides a rich context for research inquiry—one which allows for the exploration of three areas: 1) the relationship between lectical level and perspectival dynamics, 2) the relationship between translative growth in perspectival function and transformative growth in lectical level, and 3) the perspectival dynamics of participants who have developed through a level transition, and, if possible, a tier transition. Taken together, these areas of inquiry constitute important original research that aims to overcome the methodological limitations of existing organizational studies on perspective-taking while bringing to bear a robust constructive developmental perspective that is balanced with an operationalized scheme for tracking translative growth. This study will inform future investigations regarding how best to intentionally develop the perspective-taking and -seeking capacities of organizational leaders while achieving sustained, positive organizational outcomes.

**Conclusion**

I began this article by noting that perspective-taking has complex and diverse usage patterns across many domains. There is little debate as to the critical role it plays in the emergence of social cognition, the process of effective communication, and the ability to generate mutual understanding with others. Yet, the idea is subject to disciplinary siloing, leading much of what is known about perspective-taking from one domain to not be robustly applied in another. Such is the case in organizational psychology and development, where perspective-taking has yet to receive a treatment informed by a robust constructive developmental perspective.

My aim has been to build a bridge from the constructive developmental domain to organizational applications, where leaders, managers, and the organizations that employ them stand to benefit from an increased
efficacy of perspective-taking and -seeking efforts. But first we had to reframe notions of growth, expanding them to include a more encompassing embrace of the affordances of translation. Specifically, this meant we had to overcome some unfortunate byproducts of our overindulgence in growth-to-goodness assumptions. Chief amongst them was the view that perspective-taking growth is both the cause and product of development, an issue that arises from the twisting of ontogenetic metaphors to describe microgenetic processes.

Once it was established that adult perspectival function potentially has as much to gain from a focus on translation as a child’s social understanding has from developing perspective-taking capacities, I moved to construct a model of the flow of perspectival action. An analysis of the existing literature yielded a model consisting of five components: awareness, perspectival chain (acts, types, subtypes, and objects), information, motivation, and accuracy. Each element of the model is rooted in the literature, but it remains untested. Will it scaffold the generation of a coding scheme robust enough to capture translative growth? Or is the model itself too cumbersome to be operationalized in a meaningful way? Is it constructed out of components that exhibit actual growth or are additional parameters and constructs required to adequately capture translative expansion? And, most importantly, if it guides my future work toward meaningful research outcomes, how might that research inform educational interventions and perspectival pedagogy? My ultimate aim is for this work to inform the on-the-ground practices of organizational development, because, in accord with Dawson & Stein (2011), my overarching interest is to generate usable knowledge at the interface of research and practice.
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ABSTRACT Types seems to be the least articulated of the five elements of the AQAL model, yet it holds keys for understanding vital autopoietic processes at play in individuals as well as in the collective. All approaches to types have the potential to do harm when used as fixed categories that determine behavior. Some approaches can foster increased well-being, self-awareness and perspective-taking. This article examines a meta-model as a guide to what makes a typology helpful in understanding ourselves and others as individuals, in our intersubjective relationship dynamics, in relation to the systems we operate in, and in relation to our observable behaviors and how our brain functions. It provides an overview of principles about types as holistic patterns with related polarities, examples of a robust typology, and guidelines for using typologies in ways that promote both horizontal and vertical development.
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Simply put, types are classification systems. In Integral Theory, types has a special place as one of the five elements of the Integral Map: “Types are the variety of consistent styles that arise in various domains and occur irrespective of developmental levels.” They are “….very stable and resilient patterns” (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009). Type patterns occur in all quadrants of the AQAL matrix, and there are a multitude of typologies. A typology is a systematic classification of types that centers around some basic principles. Some typologies are constructed categories made through factor analysis. Other typologies address shared characteristics that are organically present in nature, like coniferous or deciduous trees. Some typologies such as personality types are used to explain how we make meaning of the world, and can give us a language to describe our differing subjective perspectives. Others, such as governmental structures, seem to apply to our collective objective systems. Even so, these various type patterns are interrelated with each other as well as with other aspects of the Integral map. Some typologies can be used as a framework to describe aspects in each of the four quadrivial realities. In the end, using “types” as a construct is useful in that it helps us understand aspects of ourselves, others, our relationships, and the systems that constitute our life conditions.

Since human nature is so complex, no one typology can adequately describe behaviors, systems, relationships, and meaning making, hence there is no one “official” typology used in Integral Theory. To this point, no set of criteria seem to have been set forth for what makes one typology more useful than another and what makes a typology more consistent with an integral approach to working with living systems. This article is an attempt to set forth some essential qualities of a robust typology that can provide helpful information and practices for applications of Integral Theory. Examples from personality type will be used to demonstrate how having this meta-model can make “types” more useful in promoting vertical development as well as horizontal development, and inspire skillful means with communication, teamwork, leadership, organizational design, and other areas.
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A Polarity Approach to Types

One definition of *polarity* is “the state of having or expressing two directly opposite tendencies” (polarity, n.d.). In other words, this common definition leads to thinking that the opposite poles are indeed opposite rather than interdependent and positive or neutral, as identified by Barry Johnson (1996). The polarity construct is useful because it seems to be human nature to think in terms of opposites. Therefore, people tend to accept it as a way to describe types.

Inherent in our meaning making is the ascribing of value to desirable and undesirable aspects of experience, as we become socialized members of a human community. Our tendency to have preferences along with moral judgments creates the situation where we prefer one aspect of experience over its opposite. This privileging is a deeply rooted aspect of human meaning making. (Sharma & Cook-Greuter, 2010, p. 2)

Identifying these polarities can be quite useful in helping people disengage from their own perspectives and stop giving privilege to that perspective. The challenge is that the healthiest way to use polarities is to see them as both/and rather than either/or. However, in earlier stages of development, people tend to see them as either/or and see their own preference as better.

These pairs often get set up as competing with each other for “rightness” or “betterness.” All of us acquire and express pole-preferences (i.e., we begin to value one pole of a polarity over the other). Until we have matured beyond a certain stage, we cannot yet see the dynamic or interdependent relationship part and whole—that conceptually they define each other. (Sharma & Cook-Greuter, 2010, p. 9)

There is a tendency to speak of one side of any set of opposites as a type. For example, I have seen this happen over and over in more than 30 years of observing individuals relate to MBTI® results and psychological type models in terms of the identified dichotomies of extraversion versus introversion,1 sensing perceptions versus intuiting perceptions, thinking judgments versus feeling judgments, and a judging or a perceiving orientation to the external world (Myers, 1998). I have observed a tendency for many individuals to identify their own preference for one pole; for example, referring to themselves as “sensors,” and then making the assumption that they cannot engage the other side of the polarity. In this way, they may limit their access to intuitive perceptions and development can get thwarted, relationships damaged, and teamwork blocked by conflict. If, instead, the poles are presented as polarities to be managed, then a coach or facilitator can use this new awareness to facilitate development. However, since the MBTI instrument presents forced choices, and the language used is one of opposites, with the word “or” implying a “versus” aspect, the facilitator has to be conscious of managing the dance of opposites. Unfortunately, the focus is often on getting a “result,” especially in organizations where inadequate time is given for deeper exploration. In addition, looking at types in this way misses the autopoietic, self-organizing qualities identified with a more holistic and systemic approach.

A Pattern Approaches to Types

A type is often thought of as a classification according to a group of similar characteristics. Dictionary.com provides a simple definition: “a kind, class, or category, the constituents of which share similar characteristics.” However, there is another meaning to *type*: “the general form, plan, or design distinguishing a particular
group” (type, n.d.). This latter meaning provides utility for describing a meta-model of type as a pattern or configuration of interrelated characteristics, not a random cluster of characteristics. In the personality type example, there are those who describe holistic patterns that get at something more than the sum of the parts (Berens & Nardi, 1999). They focus on a full type such as ENFJ as a pattern or they use a temperament model that describes four holistic patterns that relate to the 16 types that the MBTI instrument is used to identify. Approaching type in this way could be thought of as seeing a type pattern as an organizing system in which an energy field self-organizes around an attractor of some kind. We could think of it as an unconscious operating system, with a core driver of the system and “talents” that maintain the system.

The advantages of this approach are that information is accessed that is not available in the polarity approach. These patterns are more organic and representative of something constant and therefore are very meaningful and memorable. The disadvantages include that they can be more complex to explain, challenging to detect with an instrument, and can be misused as static, deterministic descriptions.

### Holistic, Organic Models of Types

#### Recognizing Autopoietic Qualities of Living Systems

The concept of autopoiesis is significant in helping us understand what it means to be a living system. According to Umberto Maturana and Francisco Varela (1997), “…living beings are characterized in that, literally, they are continually self-producing. We indicate this process when we call the organization that defines them an autopoietic organization” (p. 43). Fritjof Capra (1996) clarifies autopoiesis as “self-making.” In other words, living systems are self-organizing in that they engage in maintaining themselves, transcending themselves, and renewing themselves.

Capra (1996) describes three key criteria for understanding a living system: pattern, structure, and processes. **Patterns** are configurations of how aspects or essential qualities are in relation to each other. They usually have a theme or central organizing principle. **Structure** is the physical embodiment of the pattern. **Processes** are the activities that help maintain the pattern. Thus, patterns “rule” the processes and the structure.

The pattern of organization of any system, living or nonliving, is the configuration of relationships among the systems’ components that determines the system’s essential characteristics. In other words, certain relationships must be present for something to be recognized as—say—a chair, a bicycle, or a tree. That configuration of relationships that give a system it essential characteristics is what we mean by its pattern of organization. (Capra, 1996, p. 158)

He goes on to point out that all three criteria are linked and do not stand independent of each other.

If we take an approach to types that embraces this systemic view of living systems, we would seek typologies that include all three aspects of living systems in the descriptions of the models. Such a typology would present us with the essential qualities of the patterns, processes that maintain the system, which could include polarities, as well as a relationship to structures.

The essential qualities of the patterns as related to personality would include:

1. A central attractor (i.e., “a set of states of a dynamic physical system toward which that system tends to evolve, regardless of the starting conditions of the system”) (attractor. n.d.). In other words, some quality that is a core or central driver
2. Some values and beliefs that are closely related to the core driver
3. Talents that get the core needs and drivers satisfied to further ensure self-maintaining
and provide a means for self-transcendence

4. Typical pattern-related behaviors that sustain or nourish the central attractor or core
5. Specific stressors that result when core needs and drivers are not satisfied

Processes that maintain the pattern would include:

1. Engaging the talents in support of the core driver
2. Various behaviors that support the core
3. Defensive behaviors that can be seen as self-maintaining “stress responses,” not illnesses

Dynamic polarities identify seemingly opposite kinds of processes. Each type pattern privileges one of the processes since that process would serve the pattern better. This is seen as having a preference for the process. The polarities also offer a means for the system to transcend itself as it opens up to the other poles and then integrates them. This approach identifies very meaningful and impactful polarities that might not otherwise be detected without the type model.

**Personality Type Examples**

Using an integrated set of typologies that I call Integrated Type or the Berens CORE Lenses, we can see how these criteria can be met in the area of personality type:

Personality type is a classification system or a way of viewing and understanding personality differences. It is not a grouping of unrelated traits, but rather a framework for detecting patterns that already exist and the processes related to those patterns. There are two aspects of classification systems to be considered: detection of the pattern (type identification and clarification) and the applications or use of the information as a tool to communicate, effect change, or promote growth. (Berens, 2003)

Detection is judged by the accuracy or goodness of fit and applications are judged on how useful a model is. The models briefly described here all have a long history of use with high construct validity as well as verification of fit with thousands of individuals and they have proven themselves useful in a variety of settings (Berens, n.d.; Robertson, n.d.).

This view encompasses both pattern and polarity approaches. The polarities are the processes and each model would include descriptions of the dynamic processes that maintain the patterns. The lenses of Integrated Type (aka models) used in the Berens CORE Approach are all related to the 16 personality patterns the MBTI instrument identifies. In the section below, each model is very briefly explained with examples of how the essential qualities of the meta-model are present. The models can be used together or introduced independently and integrated seamlessly. Each model is described in terms of the essential qualities of the patterns as well as the dynamics of the patterns, so both pattern and process are accounted for.

**Essential Motivator Model**

Essentials Motivators can be identified using the Temperament Theory outlined by David Keirsey and expanded on by myself (Keirsey & Bates, 1978; Berens, 2010). This model explains some reasons for behavior and sources of deep psychological stress (Berens, 2010). Essential Motivator patterns illuminate individuals’ core needs and values as well as the talents they are more drawn to use to get those needs met. Table 1 lists some essential characteristics of the four Essential Motivator patterns.

There are polarities between the Essential Motivator patterns that form the basis for dynamic move-
ment and adaptability. Each Motivator pattern requires different kinds of language, roles, and attention to maintain itself; therefore, people with different patterns have preferences for different sides of the polarity. While there is an innate preference for one pole of each polarity, we can choose to shift our behavior from one polarity to another as needed by context.

Abstract-Concrete Language Polarity
The language privileged in the Catalyst and Theorist patterns tends to be abstract, referring to concepts, abstract patterns, and symbols. The language privileged in the Stabilizer and Improviser patterns tends to be concrete, referring to the tangible and observable.

Affiliative-Pragmatic Roles Polarity
Those who embody the Catalyst and Stabilizer patterns tend to prefer affiliative roles of cooperation and interdependence. Those who embody the Theorist and Improviser patterns tend to prefer pragmatic roles where the focus is on the outcome and independence rather than getting permission. In this sense pragmatic roles are not about practicality, but about a utilitarian approach to doing what works regardless of norms or agreements. Affiliative roles involve some kind of explicit or implicit agreement or sanction before acting.

Structure-Motive Focus Polarity
The shared dynamic between the Theorist and Stabilizer patterns is that they both look for structure. Those with a Theorist pattern look for conceptual structure like frameworks, models, and configurations while those with a Stabilizer pattern look for more tangible structures like sequences and hierarchy. Those with Catalyst and Improviser patterns look for motives. The Catalyst focus is on deep meaning and purposeful motivations, whereas the Improviser focus is on the payoff or what is in it for the other person to behave a certain way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Improviser™</th>
<th>Stabilizer™</th>
<th>Theorist™</th>
<th>Catalyst™</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Needs</td>
<td>• Freedom to act on needs of the moment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Core Values</td>
<td>• Variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Skilled Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talent</td>
<td>• Tactics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressors</td>
<td>• Constraint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Boredom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Response</td>
<td>• Strikes back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Becomes reckless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Code</td>
<td><em>S</em>.P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>S</em>.J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>NT</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>NF</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The four essential motivator patterns (aka temperaments).
The Berens Interaction Styles Model

Similar to popular social styles models and DiSC, Berens Interaction Styles is based on observable behavioral patterns. The Interaction Styles framework helps individuals understand their natural energy patterns, what kinds of roles and situations are most energizing or de-energizing, and their approach to conflict. Table 2 lists the essential characteristics of the four Interaction Styles patterns (Berens, 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In-Charge™</th>
<th>Chart-the-Course™</th>
<th>Get-Things-Going™</th>
<th>Behind-the-Scenes™</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Drive</td>
<td>Urgent need to</td>
<td>Pressing need to</td>
<td>Urgent need to</td>
<td>Pressing need to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accomplish in a timely manner</td>
<td>anticipate and have points of reference</td>
<td>involve others and be involved</td>
<td>integrate and consider many sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim</td>
<td>Get an achievable result</td>
<td>Get a desired result</td>
<td>Get an embraced result</td>
<td>Get the best result possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Belief</td>
<td>It’s worth the risk to go ahead and act or decide.</td>
<td>It’s worth the effort and time to think ahead to reach the goal.</td>
<td>It’s worth the energy to involve everyone and get them to want to.</td>
<td>It’s worth the time to integrate and reconcile many inputs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Talents</td>
<td>Supervise</td>
<td>Devise a plan</td>
<td>Facilitate</td>
<td>Support others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobilize resources</td>
<td>Illuminate</td>
<td>Make preparations</td>
<td>Define specifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>Give guidance</td>
<td>Share insights</td>
<td>Clarify values and issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Execute actions</td>
<td>Monitor progress</td>
<td>Explore options</td>
<td>Produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>Focused</td>
<td>Engaging</td>
<td>Calmly Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Push against</td>
<td>Move away from</td>
<td>Move toward</td>
<td>Move with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressors</td>
<td>Feel out of control</td>
<td>Not knowing what is likely to happen</td>
<td>Not being a part of what is going on</td>
<td>Not enough input or credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing being accomplished</td>
<td>Don’t see progress</td>
<td>Feeling unlike or not accepted</td>
<td>Pressed to decide to quickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Response</td>
<td>Fight</td>
<td>Flight</td>
<td>Flurry</td>
<td>Freeze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Push against</td>
<td>Move away from</td>
<td>Move toward</td>
<td>Move with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Codes</td>
<td>ESTP, ESTJ, ENTJ, ENFJ</td>
<td>ISTP, ISTJ, INTJ, INFJ</td>
<td>ESFP, ESFJ, ENTP, ENFP</td>
<td>ISFP, ISFJ, INTP, INFP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. The four Berens Interaction Style patterns.

Interaction Style Dynamics

The drive of each Interaction Style is best supported by different kinds of communication, different roles, and a different focus. While there is an innate preference for one pole of each polarity, we can choose to shift our behavior from one polarity to the other.

Directing-Informing Communication Polarity

People with In-Charge and Chart-the-Course styles have a time and task focus; they want to get things done in a timely manner. Thus they prefer more directive communications and tend to be quite comfortable directing the actions of others, either verbally or non-verbally. Those with a Get-Things-Going or Behind-the-Scenes style tend to want others to be motivated to act. They tend to use informing communications to let others know what they are thinking or what actions are possible. They then tend to leave the choice to act up to the other person. This polarity can cause a lot of confusion and conflict since each communication style has appropriate uses and when inappropriately used, it can offend or frustrate.
META-MODEL FOR TYPES

Initiating-Responding Roles Polarity
Individuals with In-Charge and Get-Things-Going styles tend to take initiating roles in interactions. They tend to be quite comfortable making the first move in defining a new relationship and are likely to be the ones initiating a conversation. Those with the Chart-the-Course and Behind-the-Scenes styles tend to reflect a bit before initiating and therefore tend to take responding roles in interactions. Once a conversation is going, they can be quite talkative if it is an area of interest, but to make that first move they want more information first. This polarity is very similar to the Jungian extraversion-introversion dichotomy.

Outcome-Process Focus Polarity
Those with In-Charge and Behind-the-Scenes styles focus on the outcome or the product of an interaction. For In-Charge, it is about getting an achievable result and for Behind-the-Scenes it is about continuing to work toward the best result possible. Those with Chart-the-Course and Get-Things-Going styles focus more on the process. For Chart-the-Course, it is about having a process that leads to accomplishing the task and for Get-Things-Going it is about attending to an emerging, ongoing process.

Cognitive Dynamics Model
The Cognitive Dynamics model is based on Jungian theory from which the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator instrument was derived (Berens & Nardi, 2004). In actuality, the dichotomies identified by the MBTI instrument were somewhat artificial constructs designed to create an instrument to detect the types predicted by Carl Jung (Myers et al., 1998; Jung, 1921). Presenting them as either/or led people to think they could not access the other side of the dichotomy. The leading edge of type theory builds on insights gained from the work of Jungian analyst John Beebe (2001) about the archetypal roles of each process (aka “function in its attitude”) and Jung’s model of eight mental functions (Table 3).

The MBTI’s 16 type patterns each have a theme as well as a distinct pattern of cognitive process (aka functions in their attitudes) and development. Each of the processes is habitually engaged in qualitatively different ways in each personality pattern. Knowing an individual’s innate tendency to use these processes can help release energy, remove creative blocks, and generate more effective communication and decision-making. In this model the concept of an extraversion-introversion dichotomy shows up as a focus of our energies. This construct could be seen as a polarity in which we have an extraverted pole and an introverted pole and our energy moves inward and outward at different times with different activities. Table 4 provides succinct definitions of the eight Jungian functions, which are called Cognitive Processes in this model. This model gives us a way to understand how we cognitively process information. In simple terms, it tells us how we habitually think about things—what kind of information we tend to pay attention to (perception, in Jungian terms) and how we tend to evaluate that information (judgment, in Jungian terms).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraverted Sensation</th>
<th>Introverted Sensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extraverted Intuition</td>
<td>Introverted Intuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverted Thinking</td>
<td>Introverted Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverted Feeling</td>
<td>Introverted Feeling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. The eight cognitive processes or mental functions.
In this model, while we can have access to all the processes, we tend to give privilege to only some of them. Two show up in the four-letter type code, but in this model there are four primary processes that we tend to have conscious access to. Each of these processes plays a role in the overall dynamics of the type pattern. They are notated in sequence for convenience in Table 5. The first is the Leading Role (aka the dominant). It is the way we tend to be heroic, but we can also become domineering as we overuse this process. The second is a Supporting Role (aka the auxiliary), like a good parent there to help, but can be overdone (e.g., by being overprotective). The third is a Relief Role (aka the tertiary), which we also can engage, but its importance can be inflated. The fourth is a somewhat unconscious role, especially early in life. We often aspire to be good at certain kinds of activities, thus it is called the Aspirational Role (aka the inferior). We tend to be drawn to using this fourth process, yet are drained when we engage it too much. It can also easily pop up in a “shadow” kind of way that is outside our conscious awareness. The other four processes can be available to us when we need them. They are called shadow processes since they tend to be unconscious and we get caught up in more negative behaviors when we use these. While we can develop skill in any of the processes there is an energy cost for using the non-preferred processes over prolonged periods of time. Each of these patterns gives us a map to what is called type development as well as insights into the ways we can adjust our behavior according to the needs of a situation.

Table 4. The eight cognitive processes.
A Robust Typology?

Taken together, these models can provide a robust typology with many applications. Each model provides powerful information for understanding and working with individual differences. The themes and patterns seem to show up in all quadrants and can be used to describe environments of the Lower-Right quadrant, the objective, behavioral, and physical aspects of the Upper-Right quadrant, as well as the internal subjective meaning making of the Upper-Left quadrant and the interpersonal/cultural aspects of the Lower-Left quadrant. In other words, they can help us manage the complexity of what it means to be human. At the same time, there are some downsides. Two of the models are deceptively simple and easy to understand, yet when taken at their face value they can lead to labeling that can stifle growth. For this reason, practitioners are encouraged to learn the complexity and the nuances of all of the models so they can avoid the traps of oversimplification. These models are not easily captured with a simple questionnaire, but instead using them with a self-discovery process can increase the capacity for self-awareness and self-reflection. In addition, all personality instruments have a fair amount of measurement error since they are commonly used in a self-report fashion, and therefore access our beliefs about ourselves (Berens, n.d.; Murray, 2011).

Structure

The models presented above do not directly address the structure aspect that Capra identified as essential. However, there is some research that does point to brain structures. Dario Nardi (2011) gathered neuroscience information from University of California, Los Angeles, undergraduate students as part of a lab experience using EEG technology and neuromapping software. Nardi developed a menu of tasks that would tap different brain regions as well as the proposed activities associated with the eight cognitive processes. Spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalyst Temperament</th>
<th>Stabilizer Temperament</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foresee Developer</strong></td>
<td><strong>Harmonizer Clarifier</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chart-the-Course</td>
<td>Behind-the-Scenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFJ (Ni Fe Ti Se)</td>
<td>INFP (Fi Ne Si Te)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Envisioner Mentor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discoverer Advocate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Charge</td>
<td>Get-Things-Going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENFJ (Fe Ni Se Ti)</td>
<td>ENFP (Ne Fi Te Si)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planner Inspector</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementor Supervisor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chart-the-Course</td>
<td>In-Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTJ (Si Te Fi Ne)</td>
<td>ESTJ (Te Si Fi Ne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protector Supporter</strong></td>
<td><strong>Facilitator Caretaker</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behind-the-Scenes</td>
<td>Get-Things-Going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISFJ (Si Fe Ti Ne)</td>
<td>ESFJ (Fe Si Ne Ti)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.** The 16 dynamic patterns (with theme names grouped by Essential Motivator and then Interaction Style within each Essential Motivator pattern).
from 90 minutes to 3 hours with each subject in a social environment with other people interacting, he used a “situated research” paradigm that essentially tapped into all four quadrants. He discovered that there is no one single area of the brain that maps to each cognitive process; that each process was reflected in a unique typical pattern of brain activity; that there are similarities among people with the same best-fit type pattern; and there are unique activity patterns among people with the same pattern. So, at least for the Cognitive Dynamics model, the structure component seems to be accessible. Nardi is currently undertaking research with older subjects to see if he achieves the same findings and the trend seems to hold. Thus far, the patterns remain in place, yet there are differences that need to be teased out with the aid of type development theory (Nardi, personal communication, August 17, 2013).

**Nature, Nurture, or Both?**

For personality typologies at least, one must address the question of innateness. The question of nature versus nurture has been around for a long time. If we point to nature, then there is an implied deterministic aspect to type that is repulsive to many. If we say it is nurture, there is a likely false sense that we can be anything we want to be regardless of our natures. The evidence falls on both sides. The patterns described in this article have been observed for hundreds of years by great thinkers, so we know that there are repeating patterns. Nardi (2011) says that type “refers to a consistent pattern of activity, a stable and mutually reinforcing set of interrelated characteristics to which a person is drawn toward... In the mathematics of dynamic systems, a type is a ‘strange attractor’” (p. 11).

I like to think that we have a core self that is at the center of who we are and that most likely has been there from birth with some genetic foundation. We also have a contextual self that determines how we respond to different situations. Given that the contextual self may not be consistent with the core self, we adapt to both the internal pressure to behave, respond, make meaning, interact, and at the same time develop in certain ways in response to the pressures from the context or situation. And in this developed self we can have agency, which is an important aspect of who we are.

If we resist or ignore the core self, there is inevitably an energy cost. However, as conscious beings we do have some control over our responses, so the value of having a personality typology that mirrors nature can increase our self-awareness and take us out from being an unconscious “subject” into dealing with our life conditions in a more effective way. It can also help us learn to develop skill in taking perspectives.

**Development**

In Integral Theory, types are often referred to as horizontal development:

Finally, a word about “horizontal” typologies, such as Jungian types, the Enneagram, Myers-Briggs, and so forth. For the most part, these are not vertical levels, stages, or waves of development, but rather different types of orientations possible at each of the various levels... But it should be understood that these “horizontal” typologies are of a fundamentally different nature than the “vertical” levels—namely the latter are universal stages through which individuals pass in a normal course of development, whereas the former are types of personalities that may—or may not—be found at any of the stages. (Wilber, 2000, p. 53)

Stages are not types, yet the tendency is for people to refer to someone being at “orange altitude” or “a Diplomat.” The challenge is that our minds, especially in the Western world, seem to crave categorizing so we can better understand and navigate the complex world in which we live in. From an integral perspective, we
can be more helpful when we are careful with our language and understand the various type models as well as the development models, since some of these stages look very similar to different type patterns. A discussion of these lookalikes goes beyond the scope of this article, yet it has to be mentioned. Stages and types co-arise, and different personality types at different stages look different to the point that it seems like the type pattern does not exist. Yet if you know the essential qualities of a type pattern, you can begin to discern the pattern. Angelina Bennet has undertaken a description of how each of the 16 MBTI types look different based on their relation to each of Susanne Cook-Greuter’s ego development stages (Bennet, 2010). One of the challenges is that many of the type descriptions have been written based on the norm of conventional levels of development, so identifying the pattern can be difficult (Cook-Greuter, personal communication, January 2008). In addition, from a content analysis, it seems that some of the development descriptions may have been based on an overrepresentation of certain types in the samples. This is a fertile field for study, and I mention it here because we have to be careful that we do not conflate types with stages and treat stages as types.

Personality types are often seen as useful only for horizontal development. There is much value in having a framework for helping people understand themselves so they can reclaim aspects of themselves they have ignored or not developed. There are resources devoted to helping people develop and be more effective within their types. However, a type lens can help individuals develop vertically as well. The obvious first way is to discover the polarities, beliefs, and perspectives that are overly identified with. The next step is recognizing that there are other perspectives and that these have value. Eventually, one can increase their capacity for perspective-taking, which is a hallmark of vertical development. There are other type theorists and practitioners who have acquired a great deal of clinical data to support the notion that type development is vertical. Unfortunately, there is very little research published on the topic. Bennet’s work is a beginning framework for examining this premise. In my own experience with clients, type awareness does foster vertical development.

**Some Guiding Principles for Introducing Typology Models**

As stated in the beginning of this article, type models have the potential to do harm as well as good. So how do we use them for doing the most good and the least harm? Below is a list of principles to follow that are especially important with personality type models:

1. Hold models lightly: all models are only maps.
2. Establish a safe environment for exploring and sharing.
3. Present each of the type patterns in an equally positive light.
4. Make clear the difference between the innate constant core, the developed self, and the contextual self.
5. Know yourself using the models. Recognize how the models fit you and the ways in which they do not fit you.
6. Actively seek to discover and overcome your biases against different types.
7. Get adequate training in the nuances of the models so you do not stereotype and label.
8. Provide practices that increase self-awareness and perspective-taking.
9. Show how the model is relevant to the situations where it is being explored.

**Conclusion**

Type models can be very useful for a variety of applications. Mark Forman (2010) provides some wise advice for applications of personality type to any field that should be kept in mind:

From the point of view of Integral Psychotherapy, stylistic or typological differences
may be useful in understanding a client’s behavior, motivations, and point of view. At the same time, no style can in and of itself be said to be better than another. Types simply represent different flavors accents, and biases that we have when approaching life from a given quadrant perspective or stage of development. (p. 27)

Holistic, organic typologies are likely to be most useful. It is important to recognize that the most powerful typologies will have the following features: 1) the essential qualities of patterns, including the ‘strange attractor’ that is at the core of a pattern, 2) some processes that maintain the pattern, 3) the stressors and the pattern-specific form the stress takes when the core is not addressed, 4) some polarities that will yield ways to transcend the limits of the pattern, 5) some aspects of how the pattern is embodied in a structure, and 6) if possible, show how it is different at different stages. We have looked at how this meta-model can work with personality models. Yet to be explored is if it is useful for other kinds of typologies. Regardless, types are not deterministic and a good typology will show the way to be agile and adaptable as well as effective in whatever type is being examined.
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NOTES

1 Please note that the spelling of “extraversion” used in this article refers directly to the work of Carl Jung and how he defined the term. The more common spelling used in psychological literature is “extroversion,” which refers to a very broad set of sources such as the 5-Factor model and the work of Hans Eysenck and others. There is a significant distinction between Jung’s view of extraversion and that of other sources; the spelling difference helps maintain those distinctions. Both spellings are recognized by major dictionaries as acceptable.

2 Most of the section on personality type examples is excerpted from an updated revision of an article published in 2002 by the Australian Psychological Type Review. The revised article is currently available at: http://lindaberens.com/the-leading-edge-of-psychological-type/

3 Keirsey’s temperament theory describes four patterns or themes and therefore is different from the traditional trait-based theories of temperament, which often describe separate trait characteristics like irritability, calmness, and so on.

4 The phrases in these short descriptions are from Dario Nardi’s (2005) Eight Keys to Self-Leadership: From Awareness to Action.
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ENACTING AN INTEGRAL REVOLUTION

How Can We Have a Truly Radical Conversation in a Time of Global Crisis?

Terry Patten

ABSTRACT This article begins by setting forth the basic facts of our current world crisis and the injunction this crisis implicitly sets before each and all of us to change our lives and ways of relating to one another, explaining how this has inspired recent innovations in my dialogic praxis—an emergent form of ragged truth-telling and inquiry. It begins by defining “rhetoric” as the effective communication of a knowable message to others, and “trans-rhetorical praxis” as a form of inquiry that uses but also goes beyond rhetoric to get to the end of what is known and explore what is unknown to the participants in the dialogue. Doing this in passionate service of breaking through into effectively addressing our shared urgent challenges now is what I call here “integral trans-rhetorical praxis.” This approach to discourse intends to uplift rather than persuade. It is co-enacted by all participants (rather than enacted upon some by others) and crosses perspectival boundaries (I, We, It), even integrating types of discourse (parrhesiastic, prophetic, sagistic, technical), while raising “truth-listening” to co-equal status with “truth-telling.” This article describes how integral trans-rhetorical praxis has emerged, notes its philosophical and practical antecedents, clarifies the form and art of its practice, and identifies some features of the nature of its “community of the adequate.” Next, it discusses how integral trans-rhetorical praxis relates to various dialogue, intersubjective and “We-Space” practices. It then describes the highest experiments in integral trans-rhetorical praxis that have thus emerged, and speculates about what might potentially emerge from artful community engagement of this praxis. Finally, it calls on the reader to take the implications of this to heart directly.

KEY WORDS praxis; education; leadership; vision

For some years, I have engaged a deep contemplation of the moral, existential, and creative challenges and opportunities presented by our turbulent times: a historical and evolutionary moment in which a “perfect storm” of unprecedented global crises seems to be brewing. Seven billion of us Homo sapiens are on the planet, and many of us are newly aware of, but fumbling in our attempts to respond to, the enormously devastating and accelerating impacts we are having on the planet, its atmosphere and weather, its natural environments, and other species (many of which are going extinct at a rate not seen in 65 million years). Many credible scientists question whether the human species will be able to survive a planet whose carbon-enriched atmosphere promises to alter global climate and weather, melt polar icecaps, inundate our coasts, desertify vast regions, and worse. Meanwhile, our political, social, economic, financial, cultural, agricultural, and religious dynamics—as well as healthcare, education, media, and other institutions and infrastructure—are all in serious crisis simultaneously. A dramatic, positive, transformative, cultural, and evolutionary leap seems necessary if we are to avert catastrophic evolutionary regression into dystopian conditions—something analogous to the periods of rapid biological evolution visible in the fossil record and noted by Niles Eldridge, Steven Jay Gould, and others.
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The impossible questions posed by this crisis have been a key driver of my own inquiry, philosophical practice, and experiments in rhetorical and trans-rhetorical expression. After all, if I am not a passive observer (or “victim”) but ultimately a co-enactor of this global crisis (which is implicit in Integral Theory) then there must be unseen opportunities to participate creatively in the process through which human beings can awaken to how we are creating the global crisis and learn to navigate it in a healthy manner. An integral worldview makes it preposterous to defer responsibility for the world crisis to political, corporate, and celebrity “masters of the universe.” No integrally informed individual can legitimately live and operate as if impotent, without the opportunity to creatively engender a transformation of human culture. Where could the opportunity and responsibility for a turnaround lie, if not—at least to some tiny degree—with each of us, including you and me? If I take my responsibility seriously, then I must live with the question of how to enact it more effectively, finding leverage points for positive systemic changes. That inquiry will only keep evolving and deepening, and is vital and existential. Even though I am fundamentally optimistic, it is an engaged optimism, suffused with a sense of possibility and responsibility. The crisis presses upon me subjectively, and it presses upon us all collectively, whether we know it or not. It demands change. It is the single inquiry that brings coherence to a fragmented postmodern human world. As Peter Sloterdijk (2013) eloquently expressed it:

The only authority that is still in a position to say “You must change your life!” is the global crisis, which, as everyone has been noticing for some time, has begun to send out its apostles. Its authority is real because it is based on something unimaginable of which it is the harbinger: the global catastrophe. One need not be religiously musical to understand why the Great Catastrophe had to become the goddess of the century. As it possesses the aura of the monstrous, it bears the primary traits that were previously ascribed to the transcendent powers: it remains concealed, but makes itself known in signs; it is on the way, yet already authentically present in its portents; it reveals itself to individual intelligences in penetrating visions, yet also surpasses human understanding; it takes certain individuals into its service and makes prophets of them; its delegates turn to the people around them in its name, but are fended off as nuisances by most. On the whole, its fate is much like that of the God of monotheism when He entered the stage scarcely three thousand years ago: His mere message was already too great for the world, and only the few were prepared to begin a different life for His sake. In both cases, however, the refusal of the many increases the tension affecting the human collective. Since the global catastrophe began its partial unveiling, a new manifestation of the absolute imperative has come into the world, one that directs itself at everyone and nobody in the form of a sharp admonition: “Change your life! Otherwise its complete disclosure will demonstrate to you, sooner or later, what you failed to do during the time of portents!” (p. 444)

Accordingly, this has been the primary focus of my work for some time. Ten years ago, I was in the midst of researching and writing a deep analysis and contemplation of these issues, “The Terrible Truth and the Wonderful Secret: Answering the Call of Our Evolutionary Emergency” (Patten, 2004). Since then, I convened an online teleseminar series, Beyond Awakening: The Future of Spiritual Practice, in which I have conducted over 75 public conversations with leading intellectuals, spiritual teachers, and thought leaders, and asked the question: “Exactly how can higher consciousness enable the human species to rise to meet the unique challenges of our time?” I have also begun work with Marco Morelli on a new book (an evolution of The Terrible Truth) entitled The Integral Revolution: The Future of Consciousness, Culture, and Society in the Planetary Age. The first public expression of that effort was a blog post, Occupy Integral!, that called for
the integral movement to “really, really change the world” (Patten & Morelli, 2012). All these writings have been co-generated and informed by parallel “outer work” as an environmental and political activist (in various projects, including some of my own initiatives like “Integral in Iran” and “Integral Obama”). Additionally, I have given a series of public talks and seminars on this topic, some of which gave rise to the rhetorical (or rather trans-rhetorical) experiments that are the subject of this article.

In the process, I have again and again (often publicly) re-examined the assumptions in the preceding paragraphs, asking myself fundamental questions to open up my relationship to this enormous topic. For example, it is not unanimous that our time is unique. In public dialogues on my Beyond Awakening series, A.H. Almaas (2011) challenged the very idea that we are facing an unprecedented crisis, pointing out that humanity has always faced critical life-and-death challenges, unwilling to grant that overpopulation and the disruption of atmospheric balance represent challenges of a radically new magnitude. Roger Walsh (2011) and Byron Katie (2011) “turned the interview around,” asking me to look at my passion about this topic and whether my care might be based on unexamined assumptions, such as an inability to fully accept the prospect of evolutionary regression into dystopia or even human extinction, or perhaps an insistence on presuming that I, or we, can do anything at all about it, that these enormous processes may not be “my business” but rather “God’s business.” Ram Dass (2010) suggested that the only way to account for the world crisis is simply to “be love,” saying something parallel to the message of radical awakening expressed by Adyashanti (2010), Gangaji (2010), and other spiritual teachers. In many private and public conversations, I have deeply combined myself with integralist Jeff Salzman’s eloquent and spirited affirmations of faith in the power and positive directionality of cultural evolution (and similar expressions from others such as Ken Wilber, Michael Zimmerman, and Steve McIntosh).

I have been served by these challenges and moderating influences; through them, my understanding has been tempered and has become far more nuanced. My disposition has deepened, becoming simultaneously more joyful, free, and lighthearted on one hand, and more sober, serious, and committed on the other. Nevertheless, key facts remain. Even though I endeavor to bring epistemic humility to this discussion, and see clearly that reality exceeds and eludes all our modeling and languaging, the crisis that seems to loom (at least in my view, assessed and measured as realistically and empirically as possible) is overwhelmingly likely to be real, and demands to be taken very seriously.

It still seems to me that it is fundamentally different to face an existential threat to one’s tribe, nation, or race (which has happened throughout human history) than to face such a threat to a significant proportion of existing species, including our own, and even to the supportive conditions of our planet and biosphere. We still face a unique new opportunity and challenge to adapt tremendously sophisticated interconnected systems and meta-systems, which have never previously existed, to these crisis conditions. We can, and will, bring sophisticated, contemporary, scientifically informed foresight to our responses to these evolutionary crises and pressures. Doing such is an act of “conscious evolution,” which I have argued, elsewhere, represents a momentous “phase change” in human evolution. And even though I relate to our crises optimistically, as a “birth” rather than a “death” process, I regard optimism as a moral imperative rather than as a rational assessment and prediction.

Many scientists today are sounding the alarm, and their data asks us to contemplate a level of planetary devastation (to human-friendly conditions) that is so disorienting as to evoke reflexive denial and avoidance. Thus, it is my assessment that denial is a pervasive response (perhaps even healthy in some respects) that is nearly universally socially reinforced by our consensus to attend to “business as usual.” It is likewise my assessment that most “optimism” masks underlying denial. I have arrived at a radically positive orientation to awakening, activism, and cultural transformation. However, there is an important distinction between grounded, soberly realistic optimism and optimism that defends against a deeper existential confrontation with the disorienting dilemma of being alive in a time of global threats to human civilization and our bio-
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sphere, and I intuit that only the former is equal to the task before us.

In the face of that imminent enormity (even though it does not eclipse or diminish the innate joy and freedom granted by the even greater immanent and transcendental enormity) I am compelled to change my own life, certainly, and to risk making myself a nuisance attempting insight and action catalyzing a breakthrough enabling us to change our lives on every scale and in every arena where I sense real possibility. The times present us all with a series of impossible questions that we, and I, cannot ignore. Like a Zen koan, this mega- and meta-question must be lived as an ongoing inquiry with sincerity and authenticity and fierceness and surrender, and with no escape. This may yield insight and even acceptable partial “answers” at times, but its greatest power, here as in the monastery, is that it can exert a transformational pressure and pull upon our consciousness, behavior, and relations.

I must relate to this koan seriously, presuming that it can transform everything. And since I share this koan with everyone alive now, I must join with others who also recognize and pay attention to this same genjokoan (a koan presented by everyday life) because it can only begin to be answered individually; this global genjokoan presses us, each and all, toward a seemingly impossible level of collective and cooperative coherence and behavior change.

**The Limits of Rhetoric**

To participate in enacting an integral revolution, this article asserts that I, and we, must “pull out all the stops” in how we relate to this transformation of culture and talk about it—and life—with one another. It is not a problem we can simply “figure out” from a position of presumed objectivity. Contributions can be made in that mode, certainly. However, taking the position of dispassionate observer (although it is a necessary and valuable mode of consideration) rather than facilitating a clear and engaged form of seeing, often tends to engender an attitude of abstracted disconnected immunity. But this is an existential challenge, and it asks for a level of discourse that can shift not only our conceptions but our very ground, our whole way of being in the world. If we take our crisis seriously, the self-indulgence of “objective” immunity reveals itself as morally indefensible, because it abstracts the consideration, neutering its existential impact on us, and removing us from exactly what it primarily calls for—real participation. Relating to the world crisis in that fashion prevents it from shifting our ground and very way of being, which is the first step of any response sufficiently grounded to effectively address both the exterior and interior dynamics that must be addressed. This is a holistic dynamic, not one that can be fixed by employing new and better tools. It implicates and requires transformation of the tool-user. So the kind of discourse appropriate to the crisis must speak from and reach into the hearts, guts, feet, minds, and ground of each and every participant.

The koan we face will not be fulfilled until we co-enact communications and behaviors that adequately account for interior and exterior dynamics in individuals and groups, and in natural and human systems on local, regional, national, global, and personal scales in the midst of a rapidly-changing multidimensional and unprecedented global crisis. We are called to “wrap our heads” (and whole embodied beings) around quite a lot!

This article describes my attempt to do this. It has been by its nature challenging and disorienting: it is not an insignificant feat of complex thinking, but doubly difficult because it must be engaged in defiance of the “consensus trance” that tends to draw all people toward sleep and disconnection, and which patterns most people’s consciousness and many of our conversations (and all popular media and cultural communications) and thus tends to shape my consciousness (since I am, like everyone else, a social creature whose interior reality and behavior tend to be strongly influenced by how I, and the world, are seen by others). So, like any other practitioner, it has not been easy for me to continually generate the vigor, humor, verve, and penetrating clarity this inquiry requires.

Harder, by its very nature, is the fact that the integrated implications this feat of complex thinking must
be shared. And that presents an equally challenging task to everyone with whom one might hope to share it, each of whom is unique, and at a different moment in the process of authentically reckoning with the larger koans of our existential and cultural moment. That is why human beings have, for the most part, been unable to join together to address these challenges effectively, despite their extreme urgency and importance.

Since our crisis is demanding large-scale collective behavior changes, and since there are severe limits to what can be accomplished via top-down political processes on a public scale, and via abstract technocratic analysis and policy, part of what is called for is that human beings come to want to change, and to want to change together, coherently. Since we will undoubtedly be culturally, typologically, and developmentally diverse, and thus will understand the process in a range of different ways, there will need to be at least a critical mass of people co-operating coherently at a higher order of consciousness. That means many of us will need to become capable of a remarkable kind of enlightened intimacy, authenticity, vulnerability, and shared passion. That would be an existential breakthrough, individually and intersubjectively. Toward that end, even the smallest experiments toward a new level of enlightened commitment, openness, intimacy, and authenticity are worthwhile and perhaps significant. To the degree they succeed, they have the potential to transform individuals who will share them with others, such that this kind of experiment in praxis, as a meme, will tend to spread, joining with other related experiments to inform the collective interiors of this critical inflection point in the evolution of human culture.

Rhetoric & Trans-Rhetorical Communication

William Torbert famously identified four kinds of speech: framing, advocating, illustrating, and inquiring (Torbert, 2004, pp. 27-37). The first three of these, and sometimes the fourth, are rhetorical in nature. That is, they are kinds of speech that begins with the clear intention to communicate something as effectively (and perhaps persuasively) as possible. Most human communication is rhetorical. Some communications, even though rhetorical, are especially sophisticated and even noble. They are intended to uplift the listener and proceed with deep respect. This contrasts with conventionally rhetorical speech that intends merely to persuade the listener to the speaker’s point of view. Some are meta-communications, the teaching of distinctions, of pattern-languages, and of methodologies of communication and personal and social change. Although the word rhetoric today is most often used pejoratively to mean “language that is elaborate, pretentious, insincere, or intellectually vacuous,” in its classical sense, rhetoric is necessary and pervasive, and spans a spectrum of communications from among the most base to the most noble and high. Even so, and even though it is by far the most common kind of speech, not all speech is merely rhetorical. As I use the term here, rhetorical speech has the purpose of effectively communicating a defined message, directly or indirectly. Many conversational expressions are empathic and affiliative rather than rhetorical. Others express shared inquiry. More germane to this article, one must speak trans-rhetorically to investigate the unknown, especially to collaboratively engage in inquiry, particularly an open-ended inquiry that will deepen stage by stage to an unknown depth and height.

Integral Theory presents a powerful “theory of everything,” including the attempt at a comprehensive accounting for the key interior and exterior structures of our multi-dimensional reality, at least in outline form. One aspect of its genius is the rhetoric implicit in it. In the context of Ken Wilber’s remarkably large and detailed oeuvre, Integral Theory sets forth a very clear and memorable set of powerful distinctions, or memes, each of which reveals dimensional insights, and which, when combined, offer a psychoactive glimpse and a vocabulary for describing, mapping, and making sense of the otherwise bewildering plethora of perspectives that appear in an evolving panentheistic Kosmos of interiors and exteriors. This constitutes a rhetoric, whose power is demonstrated by the tens of thousands of educated intelligent people worldwide who use the vocabulary of AQAL (along with additional distinctions contributed by many other integral philosophers) to understand and describe the world, and the fact that it has been used at the highest levels of
private and government organizations worldwide. In this sense, rhetoric is a very good thing. As the eminent historian of philosophy Pierre Hadot (1995) succinctly put it, this has tremendous “persuasive force…. [and] psychological efficacy… which… enable the philosopher to orient himself in the world” (p. 216).

What I am calling “integral trans-rhetorical praxis” arises in the context of the powerful rhetorical foundation provided by Integral Theory. Integral Theory offers not only theory but also points to practice, and offers a set of orienting generalizations about that practice (embodied in Integral Life Practice, a book I co-authored with Wilber). This praxis arises in the context of an international community of practice that has been made possible by the power of the rhetoric of Integral Theory.³

That said, integral trans-rhetorical practice arises in the context of an effort to transcend the limits of what can be accomplished through even the most powerful rhetorical communication. The deepest ancient purpose of philosophy was, in the words of Socrates, “the cultivation of virtue.” His philosophy was “a way of life.” Pierre Hadot (1995), the eminent historian of philosophy, asserts that the greatest ancient and modern philosophy consists not primarily of abstract theories (although they certainly have a complementary function) but of “spiritual exercises” directed at transforming the philosopher’s worldview, personality, and very way of being. Socratic dialogue, seen thus, was the original quintessential philosophical practice. Hadot (1995) goes on to say,

There is a great deal more philosophy in spiritual exercises like Socrates’ dialogues than in the construction of a philosophical system. The task of dialogue consists essentially in pointing out the limits of language, and its inability to communicate moral and existential experience. Yet the dialogue itself, qua event and spiritual activity, already constitutes a moral and existential experience, for Socratic philosophy is not the solitary elaboration of a system, but the awakening of consciousness, and accession to a level of being which can only be reached in a person-to-person relationship. (p. 163)

This effort is accounted for and can even said to be implied by Integral Theory. To be a fully conscious and creative participant in a four-quadrant Kosmos, in which all interiors and exteriors are evolving, animated and propelled by inherently creative entelechy, or Eros, we must ourselves evolve progressively into more adequate structures and states of consciousness. And we must participate, too; the integral scholar is a co-creative, co-enactor of whatever is being studied—inseparable, rather than “objective” and immune. He or she must be a scholar-practitioner, not merely a scholar. The practice of the integral scholar, being integral, includes all of life: every dimension of life and every moment. It implies a global lifelong practice of personal self-transcendence and self-transformation.⁴

That transformation is not a solitary individual project; it’s one that can only be completely fulfilled by finding expression in all four quadrants. This implies (Lower Left) intersubjective development, a participation in the ongoing transformation of the quality of our relationships with others, our very way of relating, and ultimately of our subculture(s), culture and society. Ultimately, it even implies (Lower Right) the creative intention to extend evolution into the ongoing transformation of our social, economic, and political systems and infrastructure.⁵

This is a grand vision that offers a powerful theoretical rationale for a revolutionary transformation of consciousness, culture, and society. It is widely appreciated among integral scholar-practitioners that the theory offers important clarifying insights into the clashes of civilizations, culture wars, breakdowns of discourse, and political gridlock that seem to be creating an “inversion layer” preventing the rapid cultural transformation that is obviously so urgently needed. Integral philosophy has spawned, and continues to spawn, an international community of highly evolved and sophisticated practitioners and projects, including a signifi-
cant number of truly inspiring initiatives.

Even so, the rapid growth of the integral community that took place in the early 2000s has slowed in the 2010s. Meanwhile, our world crises and political and cultural deadlocks are only intensifying. I, like many other leaders of the international integral community, live with the frustrating awareness that we seem to be “playing a game of miles and yet are seeing progress only in inches and feet.”

A shadow of the power of the rhetoric of Integral Theory can be seen in the tendency of integral scholar-practitioners to express themselves in Wilber’s rhetorical mode—using Wilber’s vocabulary as the basis for insightfully noticing key abstract distinctions and setting forth orienting generalizations that clarify a big-picture “30,000 foot” view of the territory. Thus, the attention of some integral thinkers tends to zoom back to grasp “the big picture.” Integral Theory points to the challenging fact that this vital inquiry will not be understood and discussed in the same terms by everyone who must necessarily agree or at least cooperate in order to enact it. The inquiry itself was already profoundly disorienting and demanding. The job of translating it across so many “languages” complexifies it tremendously. The tremendous explanatory power of Integral Theory easily seems to provide an excuse to bypass the transformative existential confrontation in a flight to abstraction: “Aha! We have an amazingly comprehensive key to help with the needed translations! Let’s consider the messages that need to be fashioned and targeted!” The best-developed response of integral scholar-practitioners to the world crisis has been the technical and strategic designing of communications. In the process we have joined in the popular and predominant bypass of the foundational process—our ongoing deep authentic existential confrontation—and the transformational fire and efficacy of the koan is bypassed even by us. This exponential leap in the quality of our tools can distract us from the more immediate task, the existential transformation of the tool-user(s).

Let us not forget that Integral Theory asserts the value of all perspectives. The mouse-eye view sees and hears and sniffs out realities that cannot be perceived by the eagle. First-person and second-person expressions are no less valid than third-person. And large-scale abstractions, however valuable, are not the only or even the most powerful and necessary perceptual and communicative modality. No rhetorical communication, no matter how skillful or powerful, can convey what is unknown to the speaker. When one wants to explore the unknown or unknowable, mere rhetoric can’t help. True inquiry requires a different mode of discourse, what I call here a “trans-rhetorical praxis.” I call it “trans-rhetorical” because it has a purpose, like rhetoric, and it builds upon rhetorical foundations; that is, a conversation can begin with framing and illustration and even advocacy, but then in order to go further it must go beyond rhetorical expression into a profound inquiry.

**Experiments with Integral Trans-Rhetorical Practice**

Since the world crisis and the limits of rhetoric ask for a different kind of discourse, my public lectures began to shift gears. I felt called to be creative not just in terms of the content of my discourse but even in terms of its modality. So, it is in this context that my exploration of new forms of dialogue, dialectic, and rhetoric that what I am here calling “trans-rhetorical praxis” first emerged. The origins of this article and my articulation of integral trans-rhetorical praxis date to July 2012, when Terri O’Fallon suggested that I was embodying some innovations in my praxis of communication and encouraged me to identify them directly and make them available to others.

In the midst of teaching objective facts and ideas via third-person discourse, I found myself feeling compelled to shift gears, and to break the stream of the discourse to speak directly, passionately, and vulnerably to the audience. I was speaking in a confessional mode, in a daring and self-revealing fashion, disclosing my own feelings about the perspectives and facts I had been teaching and illustrating in third-person mode a few minutes before. This is something many speakers do, but I found myself pushing it further than I had ever seen it done before, disclosing not just the questions I am asking, and the deepening of my inquiry, but even my struggles and existential anguish, not as something I had already experienced and resolved, but il-
luminating the living inquiry alive in me, even narrating the voices inside me debating how to relate to those facts and feelings—not apologetically, but as an invitation to my listeners to join me in their own version of a similarly passionate inquiry. This had a dramatic effect on my audience or conversation partners, and even to our shared intersubjective field. Although I was not a performer in a play, the effect was almost like that of “breaking the fourth wall” and exposing us to each other in the room, each of us involved nakedly in our own version of the existential confrontation I was revealing and dramatizing. This simple shift broke through a certain detachment and immunity that had previously prevented the discourse from implicating us and catalyzing a living transformational confrontation. No amount of third-person discourse could have accomplished this breakthrough.

Before long, I saw that this breakthrough had opened up new intersubjective possibilities, so I took it another step. I began speaking directly, in second-person mode, to the nature of our shared experience in that potentized field. For example, I directly spoke to the awkwardness I sensed many of those in the room felt, and that I too felt, as we held various paradoxical tensions and injunctions and inquiries, and as we were becoming more existentially exposed to one another. I described how uncomfortable and alive it is to do that “in full view” of one another, and how intimate it could potentially enable us to be, and how it suggests a new kind of praxis and responsibility. I invited them to acknowledge their own experience, and on occasions some confessed similar perceptions, experiences, and feelings. This sometimes opened up a deep well in which powerful, apparently contradictory passions surge—including fierce protective love, deep grief and anguish, dark suicidal despair, fierce determination, ferocious rage, and a noble, sacrificial willingness to ride into battle with a sense of transcendent commitment and joyous abandon. I sometimes even pointed out that it is a practice for each of us to allow and participate in this level of discourse and intimacy with each other, and how different that was from the level of discourse, intimacy, and vulnerability to which we were accustomed, and how that implied a developmental trajectory with plenty of room for growth for all of us. So I invited people to notice an injunction of individual and intersubjective practice, helping us all to notice our inhibitions and the potential for deeper communication and radically greater intimacy.

Essentially, I looked people in the eye, and said something to the effect of, “Even if we can’t see how, we must presume that we can redeem the cliché and actually be the change that unlocks the stuck game in which we’re all co-creating this horrific global crisis. And there must be some way that we can shift right now that can more authentically enact that change; it’s right here in this room between us. We usually don’t believe this and almost always act as though that’s not true, but it is; logically it must be—do you see this too? If so, how can we show up more authentically right now?” By doing this I invited people into unknown potentially richly creative territory. It can help the dialogue transform into a daring, edgy living experiment, with the potential for generative creative novelty. It is certainly a risky move, and I have not always pulled it off successfully. But magic happened the first time I attempted it, and subsequent experiments have met with some level of success more often than not. When people have responded, this has profoundly deepened and further intensified the catalytic challenge and activation experienced by each participant and the subtle energetic shift in the intersubjective space of the group.

I described this kind of dialogue with some friends and colleagues, and invited them into it, and in a few of these one-on-one conversations we replicated the process and both of us entered into significantly more intimate and powerful high states of insight, intimacy, passion, and activation. (This was possible, of course, because these people were already deep practitioners, willing to relax defensive and compensatory patterns, and in touch with profound existential depth, high and low, and capable of taking sophisticated perspectives. Participants must be “adequate” in their development for any praxis to be possible.) For both my dialogue partners and for me, something remarkable occurred; a dramatic subtle energetic phenomenon manifested, which I will go on to describe and discuss in more detail below.
Dialogue, the “We-Space,” and Other Streams of Trans-rhetorical Praxis

I am hardly the first to engage trans-rhetorical experiments. Communicating wonder and inquiring into the unknown are among the most basic natural ways we speak to one another when rested intimately in our existential ground. Elements of inquiry and shared feeling (communicated trans-rhetorically) have permeated the history of spirituality, philosophy, and the practice of prayer. Emile Durkheim (1915) famously asserted that religion originally arose as a way for people to experience themselves as bigger and more alive in the intersubjective field of a group entering into higher states of consciousness. Open-ended inquiry is particularly evident in celebrated communities of “scenius” (Kelly 2008) such as the French philosophes, the early Romantics, the American transcendentalists, the salons of Paris, and the Algonquin roundtable. (Currently, trans-rhetorical “We-Space” explorations have become a popular focus of practice and excitement within the Integral community. In the following section I’ll offer a summary of those explorations and their roots.)

Ever since David Bohm’s first dialogue with Jiddu Krishnamurti in 1965, and especially since essays Bohm wrote in the 1970s began to circulate (and more so after the publication in 1991 of Dialogue: A Proposal by David Bohm, Donald Factor, and Peter Garrett) a field of dialogue study has emerged and developed rapidly. It interacted with the group facilitation practices that had emerged from encounter groups and group therapy practices dating back to the 1950s, and then with other communication practices and techniques. This field has a significant literature, leading practitioners, specialists, learnable methodologies and schools, communities of particular practice (e.g., World Café, Open Space Technology, Collective Intelligence, Dynamic Facilitation, Theory U, among many others) each with its own praxes—facilitation (or not), ground rules, numbers of participants, procedures, positive and negative injunctions and guidance. Some engage open-ended inquiry, like Bohmian dialogue, while others adapt the practices so groups can achieve agreements and results. This field is alive and evolving rapidly in many segments of contemporary culture.

It is quite significant that Bohm originally framed what he called “dialogue” as a way to address the very overarching problem that has driven my experimentation—the world crisis. He viewed war, systemic injustice and dysfunction, unsustainable practices and environmental degradation as expressions of incoherence and fragmentation at the level of thought. In a radical move that parallels that of the non-dual enlightenment traditions critiqued by his conversation partner, Jiddu Krishnamurti, Bohm even critiqued the presumption at the center of thought, that of a “central entity” or “self” and mechanisms to protect it, including judgments and opinions and fixed points of view. According to him, this fragmentation of thought prevented authentic shared meaning, and “shared meaning is really the cement that holds society together and you could say that the present society has very poor quality cement…a very incoherent set of meanings” (Bohm, 1996, p. ix). This tends to prevent human beings from really communicating with each other in a way that is adequate to our situation, which is inherently paradoxical. Instead, our fragmented thought tends to approach paradoxes as if they were problems and attempt to solve them. However, what is required is “sustained attention to the paradox itself” (Bohm, 1996 pp. xxiii-xxiv). For this, he proposed “dialogue” which requires an environment of free inquiry not directed at making any group decisions, in which participants suspend assumptions and opinions and judgments, and yet participate as honestly and transparently as possible, and attempt to respond to and build upon others’ contributions to the dialogue process. He saw dialogue as having a potential for “transforming culture and freeing it of destructive misinformation, so that creativity can be liberated.”

Thus, Bohm’s ends were transformational and even radical (and thus of special relevance to the thrust of this article), but his means have been so highly influential that they have almost overshadowed his ultimate purposes. His injunctions to suspend assumptions, opinions and judgments, to participate honestly and transparently, and to stay connected to others’ participation are the foundation practices that make possible the “higher intersubjectivity” and “We-Space” phenomena that are now becoming popular in the integral community (especially as elaborated by Scharmer and Varela, as cited and described most usefully by Olen Gunnlaugson in several key papers and presentations). In his two interviews with Otto Scharmer, Francisco
Varela summarized three “gestures for becoming aware”: 1) Suspension, 2) Redirection, and 3) Letting Go (and Letting Come). In Scharmer’s research, they are codified as a methodology. The individual is directed 1) to suspend thoughts, emotions, and judgments as they arise with the intention of seeing through the tendency to live from past associations and previous knowledge to enhance the ability to connect in the present with what is; 2) to continually redirect attention back into the present moment, paying attention “to the source rather than the object,” thus redirecting the place of listening from within oneself as a separate individual to subtly participating in co-enacting a group field; and 3) to let go of resistance and loosen the grip of the familiar self-sense, thus changing one’s quality of attention from “looking for” to “letting come” (Scharmer, 2000). More recently, Gunnlaugsson and Moze (2012) distilled what is perhaps the essence of this practice as “surrendering into witnessing.”

Those widespread and foundational practices have been complemented by another stream of practice injunctions directed toward evoking a “higher intersubjectivity” which dates to July 30, 2001. On that day, after a period of intense, demanding, dramatic, and highly controversial (Yenner, 2008) effort and practice, requiring that students “dig deep” with “humility, courage, and conviction…see through…delusions, abandon… defenses, accept the stark but true facts, and… embrace… greater freedom and responsibility” (Phipps 2001), a dramatic “intersubjective enlightenment” event was reported among a group of Andrew Cohen’s close students. This was described as a “collective, volcanic surge of spiritual illumination that carried with it, above all else, an overwhelming sense of evolutionary urgency.” While it could hardly have been called “enlightenment” in the traditional sense, it contained the “freedom, bliss, and release we normally associate with that term, and it lifted everyone who was present into a remarkable state of higher consciousness” (EnlightenNext, 2010). Participants reported that the very impulse of evolution became palpable and naturally began to speak through one, then another, then another person in this group of practitioners, all of whom co-created or co-channeled this higher intelligence. This event became an ongoing practice as Cohen and his community refined protocols and injunctions for communicating and replicating at least some of the important dimensions of this intersubjective awakening, and they have since taught and practiced them in a series of influential retreats. Cohen said he had been “single-pointedly” pursuing this evolutionary enlightenment for some time, having “lost interest in the spiritual experience of the individual alone outside of the context of a much larger endeavor—the evolution of consciousness and culture.”

This distinct and influential stream of practices directed toward evoking “higher intersubjectivity” has been taught and facilitated by many of Cohen’s students and former students, particularly widely in the United States by Craig Hamilton and Jeff Carreira, and in Germany by Tom Steininger, and also by others. This methodology has varied expressions, but most primarily involve participants relaxing and transcending their habitual identification with the point of view of their individual self and body-mind, and identifying instead with the awareness itself (“the ground of being”) and then, especially, the impulse of evolution itself. With all the members of a small group resting attention in the shared intersubjective field, identifying with the self-transcending priorities of that larger impulse, they allow that larger impulse to be present and to speak through them coherently and thus to arrive and express itself more fully in the world.

Neither David Bohm nor Andrew Cohen were fascinated by intersubjectivity in itself; for them both, it was a powerful instrument toward an overarching intention—effectively addressing the root causes of the world crisis (Bohm) or advancing the leading edge of the evolution of consciousness and culture (Cohen). The trans-rhetorical experiments described in this article were inspired by both motivations, seeing them as inextricably intertwined. However, as mentioned above, Bohm’s means have perhaps spawned something even more influential than his ends, and the integral community’s exploration of a “higher ‘We’” often takes place without any explicit reference to the urgency of the world crisis or the evolution of culture. In fact, higher states of intersubjectivity are cultivated and valued in themselves, as intrinsically self-validating, growth-producing, creative, fun and healthy. It is usually tacitly assumed or explicitly asserted that these
practices represent something culturally innovative, but with everyone’s attention returning again and again to the present moment, higher purposes are not the focus, but are instead allowed to be fulfilled as a natural byproduct of the inherently attractive deepening of intersubjective immediacy, emergence and depth.

“Intersubjectivity,” “culture,” “the domain of shared meaning,” and “the ‘We’” have long featured prominently in Integral Theory, as one of the “four quadrants” of human existence. Wilber has for years spoken often about the “miracle of ‘We’” and innovative facilitation of intersubjective processes, many of which have been informed by the dialogue field spawned by Bohm’s work, has been a vital dimensions of integral community events, most of which have been facilitated by psychologists, psychotherapists, and organizational consultants, ever since Integral Institute Seminars began in early 2004. This was powerfully catalyzed by Genpo Roshi’s “Big Mind” process (especially as facilitated by the talented Diane Musho Hamilton), which uses voice dialogue processes to evoke experiences of personal, transpersonal, and nondual states that have been shared and experienced as a powerful intersubjective field. After the “integral” and “evolutionary” communities interconnected more fully, starting in 2007 or 2008, “intersubjective” or “evolutionary enlightenment” began to influence and inform integral practices of intersubjectivity. In 2009, Olen Gunnlaugson’s efforts to distill inherent principles, and Stephan and Miriam Martineau’s Integral Community seminars, further advanced the state of community praxis. The integral community discovered that something very interesting happens when small groups of highly developed, integrally informed practitioners enter into sincere transparent contact with one another, returning attention again and again into the present moment, surrendering into witnessing, and intending to open to a higher intelligence or collective field that they presume to be “ours” (intersubjective) rather than “mine” (subjective).

By 2010, additional streams of intersubjective practice began to enrich the shared intersubjective experimentation in the integral community. One such stream, particularly effective in catalyzing interpersonal intimacy, has been brought by Decker Cunov, whose career began by teaching men how to understand and connect with women, but soon developed ingeniously skillful techniques for guiding dyads and small groups that he calls “intersubjective meditation” and “circling.” People are instructed to rest attention on their present moment experience of one another and to report it, offering an uncensored narration of their actual feeling experience of one another as it fluctuates and evolves in present time. These practices are very effective in bringing alive the unpredictable, dynamic, and erotic quality of the intersubjective field. Additionally, they provide challenging and growth-inducing reflection that has helped people “make subject object.” Especially since he and Robert MacNaughton began operating the Integral Center in Boulder, Colorado, at the beginning of 2012, their practices have proliferated into the culture of the integral community.

In 2010, I interviewed Thomas Hübl in my Beyond Awakening series, and in 2011 he began a series of influential teaching visits to the United States. He teaches another stream of intersubjective practices, “Transparent Communication,” that have significantly expanded and enriched these trans-rhetorical communication experiments. “Transparent Communication” begins with personal practices in which each individual learns to open his or her attention beyond the usual personal mental-emotional focus and to relax into the spontaneous flow of the emergence of the present moment, and trust and activate higher intuitive faculties that can access subtle and causal information fields. Although directed at developing personal capacities, most of the practices are done in dyads and triads. And as these intuitive capacities awaken, people learn to feel and read the subtle and causal patterns out of which their and others’ gross experience emerges. This can open up, shift, and deepen the quality of the intersubjective field of communication. Hübl instructs people to see below “symptoms” into the subtle or causal roots of personal shadow and other problems, and demonstrates what he is suggesting using his own considerable intuitive capacities. This opens up the subtle field of the group. He is interested in provoking what he often calls “a higher We,” by which he means a group “which is not just a collection of ‘I’s, but ‘a We without a Them.’”

Dustin DiPerna explored all these streams of practice and drew on them to shape the “We-practice
Groups” he began to co-lead with Christina Sophie and Bill McCart starting in January 2011 (and later expanded and elaborated with collaborators Julie Flaherty, Michael Stern, Sam Bernier and others). Based on his experiments, DiPerna has theorized “A ‘We’ Line of Development” in which “the self-reflective conscious awareness of the We” progresses through “conventional, personal, impersonal, interpersonal, transformational, awakened, evolutionary, and Kosmic” levels (DiPerna et al., 2013, pp. 209-212). Earlier this year, commenting on all this experimentation, and asking “What’s all the excitement about?”, Tom Murray wrote an important blog/essay entitled, “Meta-Sangha, Infra-Sangha: Or, Who is this ‘We’ Kimo Sabe?” in which he pointed out that discussions of “We-space” phenomena are often sloppy and imprecise, and he raised important questions and critiques, and offered a few helpful distinctions to bring rigor to the discussion. He pointed out that these “Higher We” practices and phenomena sometimes refer to 1) feelings, 2) shared meaning, 3) state experiences, 4) an emergent collective entity, and 5) collective action (Murray, 2013).

Even though I have been an active participant in many of these experiments in higher intersubjectivity, and I am sure elements of this “trans-rhetorical” praxis were indirectly informed by them, the original experiments described here began emerging in my lectures and in private discussions with individuals and small groups—that is, as an extension of explicitly rhetorical discourse. It seemed important to go beyond rhetorical expression in order to further a passionate shared inquiry into unknown territory. I had to expose my own existential confrontation and speak directly to others, inviting them into a deeper intimacy in the face of the profound disorienting paradoxes of our common situation. Because my focus was on catalyzing a personal and shared existential confrontation (with the world crisis/opportunity) not on deepening the quality of our intersubjective field, I did not consciously connect these experiments to these other streams of intersubjective praxis (which I was separately facilitating and experimenting with) until I began to engage the more careful and systematic thinking that has gone into the writing of this article in April 2013.

Although the “trans-rhetorical” experiments I am presenting here have most in common with Bohm’s dialogue and Cohen’s intersubjective enlightenment, they differ in important ways. Bohm saw the roots of the world crisis in the fragmented nature of human perception, thought, and communication. The dialogue he proposed was intended to cut the root of that confusion and to awaken people from fragmented thinking, and to liberate creativity thereby engendering social change. Although it has been widely influential, Bohm’s dialogue has not had its intended impacts on the crisis itself. And there are deeper problems. The critique of “spiritual bypassing” (Welwood, 1983, 2002; Wilber, 2000, 2009) makes it evident, however, that this radical (“cutting to the root”) approach, though necessary and most profound, is not adequate without tangible action in the conditional affairs of life. To address the world crisis we may do well to awaken at the level of consciousness, but we must also take awakened action, which means confronting and grappling with the complex conditional challenges of politics, religion, controversy, conflict, communication, culture, education, and so on. Many of my trans-rhetorical communications express a meta-perspective that transcends time and dilemma, but many others express intense urgency in time, taking most seriously (albeit happily and light-heartedly) the apparent dilemma of the world crisis as something that urgently demands effective pragmatic actions now. Awakening from limiting consciousness must express itself virtually simultaneously with taking enlightened, effective action. The key difference in Bohmian dialogue is the current historical moment, and therefore the character of the intention. We are not taking the first steps of a journey of investigation that can lead to a destination of clarity in the future that will enable us to penetrate errors of thinking that will eventually, sometime down the road, make possible a transformational act; instead, we are allowing and insisting that the future express itself through us now as understanding, clarity, and action. That passionate insistence animates the radical truth-telling, or parrhesia, which I will introduce below.

Andrew Cohen’s (2009, personal communication) experiments in intersubjective enlightenment were animated by an extreme sense of urgency, but they were not motivated by an appreciation for the need for a timely response to the unimaginable destructive potentials of the world crisis, but simply by the inherent posi-
tive urgency of the evolutionary impulse. And they were scripted significantly by Cohen’s teachings of impersonal and evolutionary enlightenment. Participants entered into the experiment on the basis of that context of shared understanding. This radically constrained the span of those who can participate, even though it liberated significant intensity and depth. This trans-rhetorical praxis is intended to be available to as wide a range of people as possible. Unavoidably, people must be adequate to the undertaking (which means they must possess sufficient degrees and levels of clarity, states and stages of personal development, sincerity, transparency, and light-in shadow). This represents an enormous constraint on how widely this can be practiced. Further constraining it to require participants to accept anything extraneous, such as a particular teaching or teacher, constrains adequacy so severely as to frustrate its very purpose. Nonetheless, these experiments most definitely share the spirit of “ecstatic urgency” he describes.

A Trans-Rhetorical Methodology
In my exploration of this trans-rhetorical praxis that followed my initial experiments, I found that the first levels of this phenomenon could reliably be replicated via a specific methodology.10

1. It begins with third-person descriptions of significant illuminating truths framing vital multidimensional unresolved existential challenges to all of the parties to the conversation, often relating to aspects of, but in no way limited to, the global crisis.
2. Then, it transitions into a passionate act of first-person ragged parrhesiastic truth-telling and self-disclosure about my own process of inquiring into those challenges. (This looks different each time because it must be done authentically, and thus freshly, in the moment.)
3. Once that has occurred, I engage in direct and disarming truth-speaking to my conversation partner(s), presuming second-person intimacy (as per sohbet and parrhesisia). I also engage in the practice of deep truth-listening, which is just as essential to this praxis as unbridled truth-speaking. The conversation deepens dramatically. (In a lecture format, deep truth-listening is implicit and perhaps can be backgrounded, but it is foreground and crucial in one-on-one or small group conversations.)
4. At this stage of the process, the method transforms into art, and a dialogic “dance” becomes possible, in which new insights or information or associations arrive from any of those three (first-, second-, or third-person) domains of experience, and cross-quadrant implications are available to be noticed and spoken, many of which require a deepening of our praxis of existential confrontation with reality. From this follows a consequent uplift of our individual consciousness as well as an intensification of our intersubjective contact with one another and thus a continual uplift of the quality of our intersubjective field. The first three steps make possible this intimate, passionate, “dance of intersecting perspectives,” but it is this fourth step that epitomizes the essence and character of the trans-rhetorical praxis I am describing here. Engaged over time, this praxis can deepen tremendously. There can be intersubjective triple-loop learning. After having learned to enter into this process, and to become a responsible “player” in this intersubjective playground, participants can experience themselves participating as a collective intelligence which is itself learning about how to more fully emerge through them, not only to advance into new clarity and presence but to evolve the very way it does so, advancing in its elegance, clarity, and grace.
5. In especially potent conversations (which I have only experienced so far in one-on-one conversations and in very intimate small groups) the intensity can build to
extreme levels. A positive-feedback loop (of intensity begetting more intensity) can build and feed on itself, cascading the illuminative intensity of the state experiences and subtle fields of all the parties involved. I postulate that this engenders a subtle field phenomenon that can function like an antenna or open nerve ending, opening into the larger noosphere and offering itself as a vehicle for the “strange attractor” of yet-unmanifested creative emergents to find their way into form through us.

This integral trans-rhetorical praxis is emergent, requiring much more exploration, experimentation, and refinement. This article is a prolegomenon to further work rather than the explication of a mature practice methodology. It emerged, however, through a specific, describable methodology of radical truth-telling and truth-listening. And certain features of its character are clear:

- Integral trans-rhetorical praxis has a higher transformational intent.
- It transcends classical rhetoric’s most narrowly defined purpose of persuasion or even education. Instead, it gently aims at mutual uplift and deepening.
- Communication ceases to be integral to the degree it is co-opted by secondary self-serving or other limiting agendas. It is integral to the degree that it functions in service of the advance into higher states and stages of consciousness, cooperation and enactment, and the cultivation of virtues and higher values (such as Goodness, Truth, and Beauty) in all parties to the discourse.
- Thus, although it can be initiated by a single participant (e.g., via a lecture) it ultimately strives toward a mutual praxis, which equally implicates all participants and the quality of their relations with one another—including the activity of listening as well as speaking. In mature expressions of this praxis, participants cease to compete for persuasive dominance but instead begin to function with more and more efficiency and grace as co-inquirers, sharing the intention of being of benefit—to the quality of the shared inquiry, to each other, to others, and to themselves.

The goal is to further a transpersonal evolutionary process, to offer up our nervous systems and individual and shared subtle energy fields so that they can be the vehicle for new intelligence and clarity to emerge through us. Such inquiry is open-ended; there are no limits to what it can open to. Thus, it can be grounded in direct experience (with no pathological grandiosity) but with an expansive aspiration to ultimately make oneself a vehicle for entirely new knowledge and understanding to enter into human consciousness. New insight has value in itself, whether it is new or not, simply because it is beautiful and true and good. But our fast-paced cultural evolutionary moment and world crisis (the need for dramatic evolutionary advance analogous to “punctuated equilibrium”) create a context in which it is not pathological but noble to aspire to co-creatively midwife new insight with transformational impact. Thus it is not necessarily delusional to intend to enact conversations that can not only make a difference, but even make the difference and enable us and others to do something radically new, and to actually address the world crisis proactively, positively and effectively. In fact, many such conversations are needed now.

Paradoxically, this practice asks to be engaged in a happy, grateful, lighthearted, and even playful spirit, notwithstanding the seriousness of the context and the enormity of the aspiration. It rests on an intuition of goodness, truth, and beauty, and the ineffable nondual ground of being (which is an unlimited resource of innate joy and creativity, and into which it always opens and deepens). Thus it is fierce and ecstatic and free, even while vulnerable and passionate and as it “lives with” and “inquires into” the deep paradoxes and questions it contemplates. Let’s look at two key traditional precedents that illuminate key elements of the disposition of this praxis.
The Soul of Trans-Rhetorical Practice: \textit{Sohbet} and \textit{Parrhesia}

The vulnerability of this kind of discourse has an intimate and sacred quality, suggesting the Sufi spiritual practice of “sohbet,” or ecstatic conversation, famously exemplified by Rumi’s mystical intimate conversation with Shams Tabriz, which Rumi described as the highest spiritual exercise, even higher than prayer and meditation (Barks, 2005, p. xxv). This is mystical discourse, or the direct meeting of sincere souls, hearts, and minds. This occurs in the context of mystical communion. In that sacred encounter, the truth can and must be told directly and radically, without any attempt at rhetorical persuasion. The boundaries of self, other, and the Divine begin to dissolve. In this kind of speaking and listening there is only a deep meeting and loving inquiry. There can be no distortion of the communicative field by strategic agendas. This includes not only selfish and provincial motives but also idealistic and utopian ones. To practice this one has to be able to:

access the primary, pre-reflective meanings, arising from within…deployed by the innermost substance of consciousness within the Heart, and, with the proper positioning of awareness, receptivity, and the environment of safety, they can be linked to speech…[which] requires great self-presence, inner listening, and discrimination between primary and secondary thoughts.\textsuperscript{11} (Louchakova, n.d)

This Sufi practice, suffused with the spirit of Hindu \textit{satsang} and \textit{brahmodya} and yet directed at deep sharing, epitomizes the praxis of sacred intersubjectivity.\textsuperscript{12} A true trans-rhetorical praxis must be informed by the practice of inner and sacred sensitivity and depth (like the Quaker practice of listening for “the still small voice”) poetically invoked and taught by mystics of most traditions.

But such sacred speech also freely crosses over into addressing the urgency of the world crisis directly, where its spontaneity and vulnerability expresses itself as unedited creative courage, suggesting \textit{parrhesia} (from the Greek παρρησία, usually translated “free speech” or “speaking everything” and yet connoting something more like “unbridled, ragged fierce truth-telling”) which has been advocated as a remedy to the corruption of discourse by philosophers from Plato to Plutarch to Foucault. According to Foucault (1983, Lecture 1), a \textit{parrhesiast} is:

someone who says everything he has in mind: he does not hide anything, but opens his heart and mind completely to other people through his discourse…Whereas rhetoric provides the speaker with technical devices to help him prevail upon the minds of his audience (regardless of the rhetorician’s own opinion concerning what he says), in \textit{parrhesia}, the \textit{parrhesiastes} acts on other people’s mind by showing them as directly as possible what he actually believes.

He goes on to say:

If there is a kind of “proof” of the sincerity of the \textit{parrhesiastes}, it is his courage. The fact that a speaker says something dangerous—different from what the majority believes—is a strong indication that he is a \textit{parrhesiastes}…\textit{Parrhesia} is a form of criticism, either towards another or towards oneself, but always in a situation where the speaker or confessor is in a position of inferiority with respect to the interlocutor….This is why an ancient Greek would not say that a teacher or father who criticizes a child uses \textit{parrhesia}. But when a philosopher criticizes a tyrant, when a citizen criticizes the majority, when a pupil criticizes his or her teacher, then such speakers may be using \textit{parrhesia}. (Foucault, 1983, Lecture 1)
Foucault (1983, Lecture 5) also quotes Socrates’ practice of *parrhesia* as described by Nicias in Plato’s *Laches (On Courage)*:

> whoever … has any talk with him face to face, is bound to be drawn round and round by him … and cannot stop until he is led into giving an account of himself, of the manner in which he now spends his days, and of the kind of life he has lived hitherto…. Socrates will never let him go until he has thoroughly and properly put all his ways to the test.

Socrates was not Nicias’ inferior, but he took great risks for the sake of bold truth telling, as the conclusion of his life story demonstrates. The exercise of *parrhesia* was regarded as essential to good rule, whether in a democracy or a monarchy, to prevent the abuse of power. It also regarded as an essential practice by the Epicureans, Stoics, and Cynics, one that had an essential function not only in the life of the community but in small groups and in intimate relationships. This was not a green light for irresponsible blather; *parrhesia* was a discipline.

> …the *parrhesiast* reveals to the listener the listener’s own truth, the listener’s *ethos*, by speaking in such a way that the listener is thrown back on himself. In other words, the *parrhesiast* does not tell the other who he is objectively. Rather, the manner of speaking in *parrhesia* provokes the listener, brings the listener into a new relationship with himself. (McGushin, 2006, p. 10)

The transformational art and praxis of radical truth-telling (as well as truth-listening) is at the core of an integral trans-rhetorical praxis. For Foucault, as for Socrates, *parrhesia* was in service of the “care of the soul (or ‘self’).” Plato focused on cultivating the virtue necessary to rule, to responsibly participate in Athenian democracy. For Foucault, the focus was on the purpose of cultivating authenticity and truly creative agency in a postmodern world in which the subject has become an inauthentic fiction without legitimacy. Both tasks have relevance to us today in the context of trans-rhetorical praxis, since we must recover our authenticity if we are to gain the capacity to speak with each other in a way that enables us to function effectively, in this time of crisis, as communities of responsible planetary citizens.

**The Existential “Design Specs” for Trans-Rhetorical Praxis**

Transcending rhetorical communication is valuable if it makes something new possible—a deeper level of existential encounter and a more effective intersubjective inquiry. The inquiry is radical and existential, not merely a verbal-conceptual question. To the extent that it can be put into words, it goes something like:

> What does it take to become the kind of human being who *can* break through the stuck patterns of human life at this time to engender a rapid, minimally destructive, transformation of human culture, society, and behavior? How can we wake up (whether from ego, fear, confusion, spiritual bypassing, or other limiting frames of mind) so that we can be rightly related to the question? How can our ways of being (both with ourselves and with each other) begin to shift right here and right now? What does that mean for us personally? And what is that for us in relation to one another? What new kinds of cooperation are called for? What is it we can do to fulfill this bewildering responsibility to “change our life” and participate creatively in evolving human culture in this time of global crisis? What does that imply *right here*
and right now? How can we take this very conversation to a level of awakened illumination and intense insight such that we begin to co-enact an existentially authentic creatively innovative response to the world crisis?

This is an impossibly large question and demand. I call it “impossible” because it demands we answer it with both urgency and real rigor, which seem mutually exclusive. (After all, if we’re committed to rigor and efficacy, even our very best immediate answers will only be provisional.) Still, only by treating them seriously and urgently can we engage them in a spirit that will empower our responses to be sufficiently essential to evolve into real adequacy and rigor. Thus, the authenticity of the inquiry requires that it be framed urgently. Engaged with seriousness, it points us to a “true north” that helps us transcend the more limited preoccupations that will otherwise tend to distract us.

Thus, there are many things we can do to help lay foundations for the cultural transformation our crisis implicitly is calling for. Inspired by this vision, my work is a series of such initiatives. My primary work as of this writing is teaching integral spiritual practice to groups and individuals, something that confers many benefits, among which is cultivating in them foundations for adequacy to engage authentically in this kind of trans-rhetorical experiment. Even so, the inquiry that responds to the existential koan of our time is not merely a knowable skill or developmental capacity that can be taught or coached. It rests on existential seriousness, and the capacity to be profoundly self-responsible and vulnerable, and also to dare, vision, risk, and extend into the unknown. So I teach a process that leads to a glorious sanity capable of the level of sincerity, practice, openness, intimacy and authenticity required to participate in this ongoing inquiry, which by its nature must be ongoing, open-ended and paradoxical.

Many praxes also cultivate capacities that help build adequacy for participation in a higher level of intersubjective discourse, for co-creating a profound emerging Sangha through which the “next Buddha” may come into being. Other kinds of spiritual, intellectual, physical, energetic, psychological, and integral practice, as well as many of the “We-Space” modalities discussed earlier, can help build such a foundation of basic self-responsibility. It is important to note this last reference to “We-Space” practices. Even seen through the lens applied here, there is tremendous value in the many other less-intense practices and initiatives that directly or indirectly help people build the capacity to co-inquire more powerfully. Thus, there is tremendous value in the many intersubjective practices described above that do not themselves directly address the world crisis or cultural evolution. Like Integral Life Practice, they build adequacy, and further evolution.

Among the components of adequacy for authentic integral trans-rhetorical praxis are: stage development in the self-related lines to “exit orange altitude,” “exit green altitude,” “teal altitude,” or, for higher expressions of the praxis, “turquoise” or “indigo” altitude, in state-stage growth, the relaxation of strict fixation of attention in the gross “waking state” levels of mind and emotion, a basic inner witnessing capacity, an ability to focus and direct attention and thus to stably rest it on others and the intersubjective field, some insight into shadow dynamics and ongoing sincere non-defensive inquiry into ongoing shadow dynamics, a basic capacity to endure discomfort and delay gratification, the integrity and courage necessary to transcend “looking good” in order to “make subject object” transparently, sufficient existential depth to be capable of remaining self-responsibly grounded while facing the world crisis and taking it seriously, and enough emotional intelligence, health, and compassion for self and others to be able to hold high levels of cognitive and emotional dissonance while remaining present with others in a fundamentally non-problematic manner as a mostly friendly benevolent presence.

Conclusion
Not all experiments with trans-rhetorical conversations are equivalent. In most of my experiments in lecture situations, I have simply described the situation objectively, disclosed the character and content of my own
existential confrontation vividly, transmitted it energetically, and invited my listeners into their own existential confrontation and into intimacy with me as a fellow inquirer (Steps 1-3 of the process).

In my deepest private trans-rhetorical conversations, my conversation partners have entered deeply into the discourse, sharing their darkness and light, depth and freedom. A dialogic “dance” has emerged. Personal sharing has sparked empathic resonance that has provoked insights about the nature of the obstacles to a coherent human response to the crisis. This has in turn sparked connections to ideas about engineering social change and sticky memes which have then provoked personal examination, and back and forth, co-creatively uplifting the level of awareness, presence, clarity, care and engagement. The “dance” between perspectives has then begun to feed on its own momentum and is beginning to become more and more coherent (Step 4 of the process).

On rare occasions this dance between perspectives has even fed upon itself. It is as though the intensity of intuitive freedom, deep existential confrontation, intimacy, and truth-telling has evoked a higher intelligence that began to learn how to replicate and intensify itself. Some intersubjective triple-loop learning took place. It was as if the “higher we” that had come into being began to “get a feel” for how to get better and better at being “OurSelf”—more and more free, intelligent, passionate, and connected to information depth, intimacy, creativity, and ecstatic urgency (Step 5 of the process). When this has been most powerful and flowing, there have been occasions when I and my conversation partners have experienced a powerful energetic phenomenon. In these “electric” occasions, it has seemed certain to us (albeit entirely subjectively) that the power of our clarity, depth, authenticity, intimacy, and connection was not just illuminating us but attracting others, who would join and strengthen the field which would then in turn attract still others. It has seemed self-evidently obvious that the field will only intensify and act as a nerve-ending in the “global brain,” an antenna for the “strange attractors” of higher order coherence, new noetic emergents around which higher-order cultural change can re-organize itself.

In these conversations, the intersubjective field is connected with all its most powerful forms of expression. We have access to every kind of speech, and yet they are integrated into something new. The conversation can cross back and forth between rhetorical and non-rhetorical speech. Third-person expressions provoke second-person intimacy, evoking deeper first-person existential and spiritual depth, enlivening a dance among insight and illumination in all these quadrivia that builds into something larger and more beautiful. Foucault identified four kinds of speakers: parrhesiasts, prophets, sages, and technical speakers (McGushin, 2007, pp. 9-11). In this trans-rhetorical praxis, parrhesiastic truth-telling naturally flows into intuitively illuminated prophetic speech, supported by objective insights expressed in technical (rhetorical) speech, and transitioning into sagacious speech in which the beneficial upwelling of consciousness itself offers the benefits of its radical, penetrating clarity (Robert Richards, personal communication, May 2, 2013). What results breaks through its own forms of discourse with a potent immediacy that can not only pierce the veil, but also magnetize others in a coherent field.

If the world crisis is indeed telling us “You must change your life,” it is certainly also asking us to change how we relate with each other. If human systems are stuck in patterns that seem to be binding us into a collective sleep-walk into catastrophe, any awake consciousness and voice must call out urgently, “Wake up!”, not unlike the penetrating scream of a parent preventing a sleepy child from wandering into the path of an oncoming truck. Reasonable men and women might respond, “Yes, we too see what you see, but screaming is bad form, and besides, it won’t do any good if you don’t know exactly what to do.” “Screaming” here is a metaphor for summoning not merely a voice but a radical level of seriousness, passion, intensity, clarity, intelligence, freedom, humor, and energy; not as individuals, but together. It is a metaphor for coming fully alive and bright, connected, and engaged together. If the next Buddha is to be a Sangha, we will need to be able to come together in a way that conduct a higher order of energy and awareness. That is not an abstract problem we can figure out. It is no longer sufficient to “work on it” as though no urgency impinged upon us. It is something to which we are obligated now, something we can and must begin to do whenever and wher-
ever our awareness is liberated from the delusions created by the fragmented consciousness, the “consensus trance” David Bohm so wanted, through dialogue, to penetrate.

This article itself is paradoxical—a performative contradiction. By this time, the alert reader has perhaps begun to smile, noticing that this piece of writing presents itself as an academic paper, but its animating raison d’être and subject is communication that breaks through the very conventions it is observing as it makes its case! This piece of inherently rhetorical writing advocates for communication that crosses beyond rhetoric, joining with my reader/listener and uplifting us all. This article would betray what it advocates if it were to end here, only as a tidy academic communication.

Can you sense the nature of the times in which we are living? Do you appreciate the passionate intensity appropriate to it? Do you see me doing my best to open up to that intensity, and how it drives the experiments I describe here? Is something similar alive also in you? Then let the experience of reading this article inspire and embolden you. Don’t hide out in safe familiar territory. When there is an opportunity to make real contact with others, please take inspiration from this example and “color outside the lines.” Engage in par-rhesia. Use all ordinary forms of expression to express something that now attempts to transcend “business as usual.” Can you do so animated by and in contact with the formless source of joy, intelligence, love, and creativity that is the nature of every moment’s experience? Can you actually make your philosophy your way of life, a spiritual exercise, a living experiment in authenticity and virtue, even in the face of probable futility and overarching absurdity? It seems to me that we must seriously attempt to, especially since it is only thereby that we will learn how.

Life wants to keep living. Evolution wants to keep evolving. We Am the very process of evolution, as it is appearing right here and right now. We Am the raw materials out of which the Sangha that would be the Buddha will have to assemble itself. What do we need to do and be, individually and together, to catalyze that emergent? How can we speak to each other? How can we engage together in a way that brings forth something genuinely new, alive, illumined, grounded, powerful, and adequate to this moment of crisis? Our very way of living must answer this question. It is urgent. Our answers today will inevitably be provisional, and will need to evolve over time, certainly. But our current answers are clearly inadequate. Right now, we need to attempt to enact much better answers to this question than we have been able to do up until now.

Can we stand in this urgency together in a way that allows it to transform us? Can we thereby be a magnet, pulling through the noosphere, resonating into the unmanifest field out of which the future emerges, calling for the emergence of the new possibilities our continued evolution seems to depend upon? Can we relate to one another in a way that does the work of opening and surrendering into a way of being that by its nature becomes better and better answers to the koan of our time?

Numbness, apathy, distraction, and quiescent resignation are no longer acceptable. So do you dare to make the attempt? Remember, you will (at least partially) fail. (But any failure will only be temporary. It will also be success.) After all, there is no escape from this, no alternative path. Yes, it is true, utter absurdity is the context. Existential disorientation in this time is unavoidable. So trying to avoid this call, or attempting to save face and “look good” under these conditions would be insane, and even morally indefensible. May you and I and we dare to “lose face” and engage one another passionately in ragged truth-telling and truth-listening, stretching beyond the known into the clear light of morning, the limpid, pregnant field of blessedly unlimited potential where life and consciousness have always evolved and emerged. We have no other home.

NOTES

1 Please see Patten & Hubbard’s (2010), The Integral Implications of Conscious for more information.
2 Classically, rhetoric has meant “the art or study of using language effectively and persuasively” which is the sense in
which rhetoric is examined here (The American Heritage Dictionary, n.d.).

3 Here, “integral praxis” is used to mean a methodology for accomplishing anything that is undertaken with the intention that both the methodology and the tool-user will be subject to ongoing cycles of reflection through which they will undergo change and transformation.

4 Please see Integral Life Practice (Wilber et al., 2008) for more information.

5 Please see Patten and Morelli’s (2012) Occupy Integral for more information.

6 The fourth wall is the imaginary “wall” at the front of the stage in a traditional three-walled box set in a proscenium theatre, through which the audience sees the action in the world of the play. The idea of the fourth wall was made explicit by philosopher and critic Denis Diderot and spread in 19th-century theatre with the advent of theatrical realism, which extended the idea to the imaginary boundary between any fictional work and its audience. Speaking directly to or otherwise acknowledging the audience through the camera in a film or television program, or through this imaginary wall in a play, is referred to as “breaking the fourth wall” and is considered a technique of meta-fiction, as it penetrates the boundaries normally set up by works of fiction.

7 For the sake of brevity, this summary generalizes shamelessly, offering imperfect generalizations that I think will be helpful to the reader but which fail to make explicit or even blur many important distinctions and which do not point to or explore significant and relevant related issues.

8 Full disclosure: I have been a creative co-participant and/or facilitator in most of the intersubjective explorations described in this paragraph.

9 I have been deeply involved with many of these experiments, and even as I write this I am co-teaching a year-long program with Thomas Hübl, entitled “Birthing a New We.”

10 On the surface, this may seem like nothing new. Doesn’t it simply recapitulate the language in the Call for Papers received by the presenters at the Integral Theory Conference to “strike a balance between third-person didactical, second-person dialogical, and first-person experiential components?” Yes and no. Because it’s a non-strategic practice of passionate parrhesia, integral trans-rhetorical praxis doesn’t design the communication intending to “strike a [rhetorical] balance”; each of these perspectival communications must press into a daring inquiry that may make use of useful conventions but whose intent must be to transcend and transform all conventions.

11 Please see Louchakova’s The Experience of Sohbet (http://www.ias.org/spf/sohbet.html) at the International Association of Sufism website for more information.

12 Satsang literally translates as “the company of truth” and refers to the sacred meetings between an enlightened Master and his disciples and especially to the quality of loving illumination suffusing them. In ancient Vedic India, brahmodya was a competition or “dharma combat” in which the intention was to express absolute truth more and more powerfully, and which ended when an utterance left all participants in profound silence (Armstrong, 2006, p. 258).
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INTEGRAL DIVERSITY IN ACTION
Implementing an Integral Diversity Program in a Workplace Environment
Lakia Green

ABSTRACT It is often a challenge to translate academic theory into actions that have real-world impact. As the Integral Theory community focuses more on the topic of diversity, it is essential to identify the most effective methods to create interventions that apply to multiple environments. This article focuses on the process of moving from theory to practical application. In the fall of 2012, the staff at the Professional Development Program for SUNY Albany tested the effectiveness of a two-day diversity intensive based on Integral Theory. This article describes the challenges of the implementation, as well as the success of implementing a diversity intensive in a workplace environment. Discussion will also include how activities for the implementation were designed by using an the AQAL model as a map, lens, and methodology.
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I’m going to ask you for your participation. Specifically, I’m going to ask you to write, so gather whatever materials you require. Return here when you are ready.

You are going to make a list. Start each item on your list by writing “I identify as...”. You will then complete the phrase however you choose. Go at whatever pace you like, but continue to create your list for at least one minute.

Now, take a moment to review your list.

I’m going to ask you to continue your list in the same manner. This time, dig deeper. What are the ways in which you identify yourself? Write for another minute.

Review your list again. Which item on your list most defines you? Make a choice. Take a moment to write why you chose this item.

Which item on your list surprises you? Why is it surprising? Take a moment to write about this item.

Review what you wrote. As a result of completing this activity, did you bring any new discoveries about yourself into consciousness?

The activity above embodies the essence of an Integral Diversity Program (IDP). Ultimately, an IDP is about capturing a moment of change—understanding the instant when a possible future becomes a new reality. It seeks to understand not only how change occurs, but what conditions best foster it. At the same time, an IDP aims to acknowledge a diverse range of experiences by strengthening our competency for perspective-taking and embracing difference. At its core, an IDP is a way to create a diversity practice in service of transformational change. It seeks to understand how content, method, and feedback intertwine to inform practice. It also attempts to distill the primary elements that create openings for transformation regardless of scope, scale, audience, or focus. This article will focus on the results of moving from theory to action by exploring the development and implementation of an IDP training in a workplace environment.

Correspondence: Lakia Green, One Spark Consulting, 206 Jefferson Street, 2nd Floor, Albany, NY 12210-1606. E-mail: lgreen@onesparkconsulting.com.
History of Theoretical Work

Designing a workplace-based IDP was the next step in attempting to move years of integral diversity research from theory to practice. Previously, my work attempted to identify the elements of an IDP that were essential to its effectiveness (Green 2012). The first element, Ken Wilber’s conception of karma and creativity, is perhaps the most important. Wilber sees karma as the inheritance of the past, often referred to as the “kosmic habit,” while creativity is defined as future possibilities of manifestation. What is crucial to understanding the power of this concept is recognizing how the constant dance between karma and creativity can promote change and development across the Integral map. He explains that kosmic habits can be disrupted when a “legitimization crisis” occurs and there is “a breakdown in the adequacy of a particular mode of translating and making sense of the world—that is, a breakdown in the adequacy of a particular worldview and its capacity to command allegiance” (Wilber, 2003). When new ways of being disrupt kosmic habits, “the old worldviews and theories are thrown into a crisis that can only be resolved by a progressive increase in depth to keep pace with the increase in depth of the new paradigm or techno-productive base” (Wilber, 2003). The idea in designing an IDP was to create an environment in which karma and creativity can interact in such a way to promote transformational change.

Second, a successful IDP recognizes that comprehending how an individual, group, or system structures reality is essential to bringing about change to those constructs. This concept is particularly vital in a diversity context. For example, it is important to acknowledge a social concept such as gender, because utilizing such constructs allows us to self-identify and connect with others; our communal acknowledgement of the concept becomes a shared reality. At the same time, it is just as vital to understand that gender is not reality, but simply a creation used to build a worldview. We must work within the paradox of “construct as reality” in order to better reimagine the way we interact with ourselves, each other, and our environment.

Third, an IDP must acknowledge the importance of both horizontal and vertical approaches to development. In doing so, we must include an examination of what Wilber describes as agency and communion. An effective IDP would not only promote vertical growth and competence, but also deepen our connections across any given level of development. Finally, it is essential that an IDP utilize the AQAL model as a map, a lens, and a methodology. In order to create the fullest range of understanding, we must be able to “look at,” “look as,” and “look with” (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2012). Designing an IDP that takes all three aspects into account allows the practice of perspective-taking and perspective-making, increasing our ability to expand our worldview. These four crucial elements must be incorporated into the design, implementation, and assessment of an IDP, and served as the theoretical basis for my workplace diversity program.

Selecting the Implementation Format

The creation of an IDP can be applied in a variety of ways, from completing practice activities (such as the one presented at the beginning of this article) to building a certification program in integral diversity competency. When creating this IDP, a few factors influenced the decision to offer training in a workplace environment. As a part of my previous research, I had created a personal diversity practice. Now, I was interested in creating a program for a professional environment that focused on personal growth and development while also addressing cultural and organizational contexts. The starting point would be offering an in-person training designed to lay the groundwork for an IDP.

Choosing my personal workplace also provided additional benefits. The Professional Development Program (PDP), Rockefeller College, University at Albany, is an organization dedicated to providing continuing professional development for public employees and volunteers. In 2007, PDP implemented a strategic initiative specifically devoted to promoting diversity in the organization. Offering diversity training at PDP would allow me to work with an organization dedicated to diversity, while building upon the efforts of the
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strategic initiative. Furthermore, because PDP itself is an organization that offers training and adult learning opportunities, I had a unique chance to provide an IDP to those who have expertise in curriculum development and application.

In July 2012, I proposed implementing a workplace IDP. Working closely with senior staff, we agreed that a two-day training would be offered to PDP employees. On May 13, 2013, and May 20, 2013, the Personal Diversity Development Program (PDDP) training was offered. Ten participants attended the May 13th session, while nine participants attended the May 20th session (one participant was absent the second day of the training due to illness). Participants were asked to complete an online assessment prior to and after completing the training. In addition, participants were asked to complete “Personal Practice Activities” in the time period between the two sessions. These activities were designed to encourage participants to think about crafting their own diversity practice.

Understanding the Personal Diversity Development Program

The directive was simple: “Dig deeper.”

I had done some variation of an “Identity Circle” activity in trainings dozens of times. In the past, the activity was always a success, and I had even witnessed transformational moments as a result. Yet, this time I was nervous. It was not unusual for a group to begin this activity by naming the most superficial aspects of their identities; in fact, it was expected. My job was to facilitate the experience in such a way that participants fully engaged themselves in the process. Yet, a part of me feared this group would be uncomfortable with the interactive nature of the exercise, and as a result would fail to make the connections necessary to create a meaningful learning experience. After all, such a personal and intimate activity was an unusual addition to a staff development training at PDP. This exercise served as a building block for other content; if the participants rejected this activity, the remainder of the training would reveal additional challenges.

The activity itself was straightforward. First, participants were asked to stand in a circle. Then, participants were instructed to take a step into the circle, one at a time, and complete the statement “I identify as...”. This was done on a completely voluntary basis; any participant could choose to step into the circle to make a statement. Once a statement was made, if the other participants felt they shared the same identity as the speaker, they were asked to also step into the circle. At that point, everyone is asked to look around and silently acknowledge who is inside the circle and who is not. Once everyone has made their acknowledgement, the participants step back into the circle, and the opportunity is open for the next person to make an identity statement.

To my surprise, when I asked the group to dig deeper, they did. The next participant to speak shared an intimate part of her identity with her coworkers, and those who identified with her joined her in the circle. The old way of engaging with ourselves and each other had changed, and everyone knew it. The shift was discernible. It was the moment when personal awareness of one’s own past encounters new possibilities. Brought about by communal coalescence, a moment of change presented itself into group consciousness.

Several such moments of transformation occurred during the two-day PDDP training, and this paper aims to present insights about them. If the four elements discussed earlier represent “why” these moments occurred, then what allows us to better understand the “how?” Although the implementation of the PDDP provided an extensive amount of useful knowledge and data, the goal of this article is to focus on exploring the three basic components of any IDP: curriculum development, implementation, and assessment.

I. Curriculum Development: Structure Informing Function

I decided the basic framework of the training would consist of four modules mirroring the four quadrants...
of Integral Theory. Participants would explore the dominant diversity concepts within each of these frames; this structure allowed participants an opportunity to interact with the entire Integral map. Layered on top of this basic framework would be the four elements previously identified as essential to the design any effective diversity program: karma and creativity, construct as reality, a balance of horizontal and developmental approaches, and the quadrants as map, lens, and methodology. Part of the focus was to pinpoint how these elements could be useful in developing an IDP regardless of scope, scale, audience, or focus.

Relying on these four elements, I created some basic rules to guide the curriculum development. First, the curriculum needed to create “change moments” where karma opens to creativity. In other words, it was important to build the curriculum in such a way that activities designed to question worldviews were followed by opportunities for exploring new ways of being. Second, it was essential to create a training that concentrated on personal growth, but also provided ways of strengthening human connection through horizontal development. This necessitated giving consideration to which activities were done on an individual basis, in partners, in small groups, or with the whole group. Third, focus was on providing participants with “shared constructs of reality” to promote communication and mutual understanding. The goal was to provide a common language for key diversity and Integral Theory terms, while also honoring different worldviews. This involved creating a framework for engagement that specifically guided feedback and discussions. Finally, the curriculum development had to be based upon the quadrants as method, lens, and methodology. This meant the structure of the training required a variety of activities from diverse disciplines which allowed participants to “look at,” “look as,” and “look with.” Thus, through experiential learning, participants had to be afforded opportunities to objectively examine their current worldview, take multiple perspectives, and discover new ways of being while utilizing shared constructs of reality to deepen communal understanding.

The “Identity Circle” activity described earlier exemplifies how these four elements were used in curriculum development. For example, asking participants to state how they self-identify allowed each individual to bring their personal karma into consciousness, while input from others in the group provided new ways of collectively identifying and being. In addition, asking participants to physically step inside the circle provided an opportunity to discover shared constructs of identity with other members of the group; horizontal development was deepened even further by encouraging participants to take a moment to acknowledge these circles of identity in a nonverbal manner. Participants were asked to take on multiple perspectives by recognizing the identities they acknowledged, as well as those they did not. Finally, by choosing to structure the activity so that self-identity was explored within a group context, participants were allowed to explore their first-person perceptions of their self-identity, while simultaneously discovering and acknowledging the collective identities contained within the group.

The four elements can also be seen in the construction of each lesson. For example, in Lesson 4: Systems and Diversity, participants are first shown a short video on discrimination against atheists. The news story discusses a family who was forced to move after they protested their public school’s practice of devoting classroom time to Bible study and prayer. A discussion of the themes in the video allowed participants to bring their own karmic inheritance of systematic discrimination into consciousness. Then, participants were asked to play a variation of the “Monopoly” board game, an exercise originally created by Richard Harvey, in which each player was given different rules and resources (Plouse, 2011). This activity was designed to give each participant a first-person experience of what happens when access to resources are limited, while demonstrating how systemic inequalities become self-perpetuating. After discussion and the introduction of some basic systems theory concepts, the participants were provided with a sample model that gave them a lens to explore the relationships within their own workplace. The 1950s family model created a shared construct of reality that allowed participants to discover how the parts and wholes of their own organization interact. Finally, participants were able to deepen this insight by using the model to identify the various groups and subsystems influencing the organization, expanding shared understanding of workplace dynamics and offer-
ing new ways of being.

To complete the curriculum design, I decided to add an introductory module to familiarize participants with basic integral and diversity concepts, creating a common language to facilitate discussion. I also chose to conclude the training with a module discussing the development of each participant’s own personal diversity practice. In addition, participants were asked to complete “Personal Practice Activities” between training sessions, expanding self-practice beyond the confines of the training environment. The curriculum design provided opportunities for participation in both individual and group activities, time for discovery and reflection, and ways to engage the mind, body, and spirit.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the designed curriculum, I created a brief, five-question assessment based upon Robert Kegan’s Theory of Transformational Learning. Heavily influenced by the work of Jack Mezirow, Kegan shifted the focus of his work to understanding how people move from one developmental stage to the next. Building upon Mezirow’s work, Kegan further defines the distinction between informational learning and transformational learning: Informational learning focuses on “what we know,” while transformational learning examines “how we know.” Kegan uses an interesting analogy to distinguish between the two types of learning. Imagine a container filled with liquid. If information is represented by the liquid, and our “way of knowing” is represented by the container, then Kegan would assert that adding to or changing the composition of the liquid would represent informational learning. However, when transformational learning occurs, the shape of the container itself changes, and “what we know” is held through a different frame of reference, or form. Although transformational learning can occur in a variety of ways, Kegan’s focus has been on moving self-perception from subject to object.

The aspect of Kegan’s work that was most influential in the creation of a curriculum assessment tool was his discussion of how a transformational learning environment is created. Such an environment must: provide collaborative activities, role-play, simulation, and experiential learning; create a safe space for engaging in dialogue; encourage seeing things from a different perspective; include journal writing and other self-reflection activities; and allow the questioning of underlying assumptions, beliefs, and values (Traylor, 2010). Kegan’s requirements speak to the very nature of designing learning, and as assessment tools, complement the goals of an IDP.

In order to assess how well the PDDP created an environment for transformational learning, participants were asked to rate the training’s ability to meet the five requirements on a five-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. All participants rated the training’s ability to meet these requirements at either strongly agree (SA) or agree (A). Ninety percent of the respondents strongly agreed that the training provided collaborative activities, role-play, simulation, and experiential learning (90% SA/10% A). Participants also agreed the training allowed them to engage in dialogue in a safe environment (80% SA/20% A), see things from a different perspective (70% SA/30% A), and participate in journal writing and other self-reflection activities (70% SA/30% A). Respondents rated the training’s ability to question their underlying assumptions, beliefs, and values slightly lower (50% SA/50% A). With a focus on using the four elements to inform the curriculum structure, the PDDP demonstrated its ability to create a transformational learning environment.

2. Implementation: Investigating the Change Moment

Whereas curriculum development focuses on the form of the training, implementation focuses on the “change moment” itself, the instant when momentum moves away from karma and toward creativity. In other words, how effective were change moments during the training at creating a positive shift in personal or collective development? Furthermore, can the change moment itself be articulated, measured, or examined?

For the purposes of the PDDP, focus was primarily placed on personal development. Again, I chose to rely heavily upon Kegan’s work in this arena, since it resonated most closely with the creation of an IDP.
Kegan’s solution for assessing personal development is the subject-object interview (SOI). The SOI is an interview technique where the interviewee is given a series of prompts, followed by a series of dialogic questions asked by the interviewer. The technique is not designed to explore the contents of the interviewee’s responses; rather, focus is on understanding the “why” behind their thinking. Using the SOI as an assessment tool allows a greater understanding of how the interviewee makes meaning and how much they perceive themselves as “subject” versus “object”. Although the SOI has been shown to be highly effective in assessing levels of personal development, the assessment itself does not meet the IDP criteria of being able to scale in order to accommodate various diversity programs. The interview and scoring can take up to 2½ hours, and an optional debrief may add an additional hour of time to the assessment process. In certain implementations of an IDP, the tool would prove impractical.

Susanne Cook-Greuter provides a more accessible approach, building upon Kegan’s work in adult development and her own work with Loevinger’s Washington University Sentence Completion Test (WUSCT, also known as the SCT). Cook-Greuter’s own SCTi-MAP (also known as the MAP or LDP) requires participants to complete 36 sentence stems. The assessment can be completed on paper or online, and can take up to 40 minutes to finish. The test is then scored by a certified or trained assessor (Cook-Greuter, 2003). Although this evaluation method is a bit more accessible for implementations faced with time constraints, the expense of completing the assessment for multiple participants or large groups would likely prove cost-prohibitive.

An examination of these two methods exposes some key issues facing the implementation of an IDP. As stated previously, the goal of an IDP is to enable any person, group, or organization to design an effective diversity practice regardless of scope, scale, audience, or focus. Even in my own implementation of the PDDP, it would have been impractical to implement the SOI, adding at least 60 hours of additional time devoted solely to this assessment. Likewise, implementing the SCTi-MAP would have been cost-prohibitive and would have required waiting up to four weeks to receive the assessment results. Though several assessments geared towards measuring adult development exist, the number of reliable and valid assessments that can be used in any IDP appears somewhat limited.

One method that shows some promise addressing this need is Eleanor Drago-Severson’s (2004) approach to evaluating adult development. Drago-Severson employed multiple assessment tools to measure the level of development for adult basic education/English for speakers of other languages (ABE/ESOL) learners. The researchers point out that prior studies employing Kegan’s constructive-developmental theory primarily focused on white, well-educated middle-class Americans whose primary language was English (Drago-Severson, 2004). The team sought strategies to adapt measures that better accommodated ABE/ESOL learners, acknowledging that these learners may exhibit different ways of making meaning. The researchers employed several qualitative and quantitative measures, including three assessments specifically designed to determine each participant’s developmental orientation: the SOI, Loevinger’s version of the SCT, and problem-solving vignettes the researchers designed themselves. With slight modifications of the SOI due to logistical constraints, the researchers found they were able to compare the SOI scores with the scores from the vignettes to assess levels of adult development.

While the researchers sought to also use Loevinger’s SCT, they ultimately dropped the measurement from their study. They found that spontaneously being able to respond to a sentence stem proved difficult for many ABE/ESOL learners. The researchers also found that the test relied on English language proficiency and was embedded with cultural assumptions. For example, in the female version of the SCT, respondents had difficulty with completing the “A wife should,” “I feel sorry,” and “A man feels good when” sentence stems because of differences in cultural understanding.

The developmental vignettes created by the researchers required participants to solve a hypothetical problem; the purpose was to ask probing questions during an interview to assess each individual’s way of knowing, sense of role competence, and their relationship with their own construction of reality. Vignette
results were evaluated using the same measures used to evaluate the SOIs, and the researchers found that the vignette results correlated with those of the SOIs. Overall, the researchers concluded that the developmental measures they used (the SOI, vignettes, and other qualitative measures) could be used reliably with adults from diverse cultural backgrounds, and the use of these tools allowed researchers to measure developmental change over time (Draco-Severson, 2004).

I chose to modify Drago-Severson’s version of the role-related vignettes to test a new way of assessing personal levels of development based on Kegan’s work. I elected to forgo the interview process in favor of implementing the vignette in writing. In this format, participants read the scenario and then wrote their responses to eight prompting questions. The language of the scenario was also modified to be gender neutral, alleviating the need to administer separate tests for men and women.

Using the modified vignette yielded some interesting results; these outcomes were supported by other data collected during the PDDP, such as detailed personal profiles and diversity-specific assessments. Participants were asked to complete the vignettes prior to and after participating in the PDDP. Then, each response was coded according to Kegan’s levels of development, taking into consideration whether the response was a) solidly at the current level, b) at the current level with awareness of the next level, or c) at the current level with awareness of the previous level. Emphasis was placed on examining any indications of developmental level changes as a result of the training. All respondents were shown to be between third-order (Socialized Mind) and fourth-order (Self-Authoring Mind). Of the eight participants whose results were analyzed, two participants demonstrated movement toward the previous level of development (at an average of -9.4%), two participants showed no movement toward the previous or next level, and four demonstrated movement toward the next level of development (at an average of 18.2%). These results indicate that those who demonstrated movement toward their current level of development were more likely to engage with diversity at that level, while those who demonstrated movement toward the next level were more likely to engage with diversity at that higher level of development. What is interesting about these results was that for some participants, participating in the PDDP allowed them to engage in new ways of being at the next level of development. More fascinating, however, were those participants who showed movement toward their previous level of development. On the surface, their movement away from the current or next level of development might be seen as regressive. However, when examined in conjunction with the other collected data, it appears that these participants also discovered new ways of being (within their current level of development), indicating deepening horizontal engagement versus vertical growth.

The use of the vignette assessment opens up possibilities for future investigation. Participant responses to the vignette, though often brief, provided rich data for evaluation. Second, although the SOI was not used as a comparative measure for this project, other data collected during the study seems to indicate the vignette assessment accurately measured the general developmental orientation of each participant. Finally, the vignette assessment also seems to allow for the measurement of both horizontal and vertical developmental changes.

3. Assessment: Impact on Ways of Being

Assessment allows us to concentrate on the efficacy of the PDDP implementation itself. In order to examine the overall effectiveness of the training, I used Donald Kirkpatrick’s model of training assessment. Kirkpatrick (1994) takes a different approach to assessment from Kegan’s transformational learning, focusing specifically on evaluating training programs. Including the Kirkpatrick model as a part of the assessment process was essential to measuring the effectiveness of the PDDP, since PDP uses this model to evaluate all of its internal and external trainings.

Kirkpatrick posits that there are four levels of training evaluation. The first level gauges participant reaction (i.e., what the student thought or felt about the training). It is essential to recognize that unlike other
For this project, focus was on Level I and Level II evaluations. To evaluate Level I participant reaction, I used the same measuring tool that PDP uses for all its training evaluations, the Participant Reaction Survey. The Participant Reaction Survey measures several aspects of the training, including participant perceptions of the trainer, materials, and whether the training objectives were met. Participants were asked to rate 10 questions on a five-point Likert Scale ranging from very high to very low. Overall responses were positive, with all participants rating 9 of the 10 questions either very high or high. The top scores were for the trainer’s subject knowledge, organization, and preparation, which 100% of the respondents rated very high. Participants also stated that the training objectives were achieved and the training helped them to improve their knowledge, skills, and abilities. Ninety percent of the participants rated the overall event at very high.

In terms of Level II evaluation, which focused on the group’s ability to understand and apply key integral and diversity concepts, participants demonstrated knowledge gain as a result of the participating in the training. Six multiple-choice, knowledge-based questions were asked in the pre- and post-assessments. Participants showed a knowledge gain in 5 of the 6 questions, with one question demonstrating no change. Knowledge gain among participants averaged 32%.

It should be noted that although not measured, several anecdotal indicators of Level III and Level IV changes also occurred. Several staff members reported hearing participants express how much they liked the training and how useful they felt the training was. This was supported by many of the open-ended responses collected as part of the post-assessment, where many participants suggested offering the training to all staff members. Some participants demonstrated continuing awareness of diversity by sending me news articles related to the issues we discussed during the training. Other participants even reported sharing the results of the training with their families or encouraging others to try some of the activities done in the training. As a result of the enthusiasm of the participants, as well as their ability to articulate the usefulness of the training to their coworkers, senior staff decided to offer subsequent implementations of the PDDP, as well as feature an article about the PDDP in their community newsletter.

New Ways of Being for the Personal Diversity Development Program
This project opened up numerous possibilities for the continuing development of the PDDP. First, there is the immediate work of preparing another implementation of the program at PDP. Focusing on the feedback from the Participant Reaction Survey and the curriculum development assessment, I will be refining this training for its next offering. Second, curriculum development is an area of expertise and a passion of mine, so I would also like to look at advanced levels of program and training implementation. Layering more complex lenses over the four elements, such as Tim Winton’s conception of Pattern Dynamics, offers new possibilities for structuring change moments and learning experiences. There are also possibilities for cultivating the creation of developmental assessment tools that span across scope, scale, audience, or focus. For me, it would be
particularly interesting to build upon the vignette assessments to create a tool that validly and reliably measures both horizontal and vertical development. Finally, there are larger questions that we as a community of integral learners must answer. Where does the study of integral diversity go from here, and what is our level of diversity competency within our own community?

Take a moment to retrieve your list. Thinking about all you have read, review your list one more time. Has karma and creativity presented you with new ways of thinking about your identity? What constructs of reality are you currently operating under? Who else shares elements of your identity? Did your list open up new perspectives to you?

Take one minute to reflect on any new information or experiences that have come to the forefront of your awareness.

Now, put your list away. Once you are done, take a moment to clear your mind. For the next hour, go about your day, but open your awareness to the complex and diverse environment around you.

After that hour, our time is done, and the choice is yours. Should you choose to continue, this will be when your own personal diversity practice begins.
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INTEGRAL EVOLUTIONARY RECOVERY
Revisioning the Twelve Steps through a Kosmocentric Lens
Suzanne E. Shealy and Linda A. White

ABSTRACT This article traces the roots of evolutionary spirituality through the Program and Fellowship of Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), mining AA’s wisdom while translating it through an AQAL integral and evolutionary lens. With sobriety as the first priority (Upper-Right quadrant), 12 Steps promote recovery and ego-transcendence for the individual (Upper-Left quadrant), 12 Traditions support the integrity of the collective We space (Lower-Left quadrant) for the recovery group, and 12 Concepts provide a world service structure and container for evolutionary culture (Lower-Right quadrant). AA’s “servant-led” gift economy exemplifies organizational sustainability and unity of purpose amid exponential growth. In facing the challenges and crises of the 21st century, how might the example of AA’s program and fellowship that leads the hopeless alcoholic out of despair, inform the enactment of integral/evolutionary perspectives to transform individuals and the culture and structures of the larger world?
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The application of Integral Theory to the area of addiction recovery began with the quiet efforts of solo practitioners to apply recovery, psychotherapy, and Integral Life Practices to assist their clients (White, 2002).1 The first formal model of an integral recovery program (Dupuy & Morelli, 2007; Dupuy & Gorman, 2010) was introduced in 2007, and presentation of other integrally informed approaches followed (Shealy, 2009b; du Plessis, 2010; & Calleja, 2011). The recent application of Integral Methodological Pluralism to the problem of addiction (du Plessis, 2012a) and preliminary identification of addiction recovery stages (du Plessis, 2012b) marks a maturation of the field. This article examines commonalities and contrasts between the grassroots program and fellowship of Alcoholics Anonymous (AA) and newer evolutionary spiritual teachings and practices, exploring the potential for extending the recovery path into transpersonal or post-personal levels, catalyzing individual and collective awakening, and laying groundwork for a model of Integral Evolutionary Recovery.

Mining the Kosmocentric Roots of Alcoholics Anonymous
A Kosmocentric evolutionary perspective recognizes both the timeless ever-present ground of being and the deep-time dimension of human becoming (Cohen, 2011, p. 39). Focus is on care for the evolution of human consciousness for the sake of the whole (Hamilton, 2009d). Individual and collective practices that promote self-transcendence are designed to awaken participants to embodied creative emergence as part of a “new We” (Hamilton, 2004; Gunnlaugson & Moze, 2012; Hubl, 2013; Cohen, 2011). Kosmocentric evolutionary spirituality can be viewed as an emergent at the leading edge of consciousness, a path of embodiment and practice, as well as an updated mythology for a post-postmodern world. The roots of Kosmocentric
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evolutionary spirituality have been traced through a variety of sources that include Pierre Teilard de Chardin

The grassroots movement of AA was started in 1935 in Akron, Ohio, and ultimately spread throughout the
world, offering a program of recovery and a support community for those with a desire to stop drinking. AA’s
program and fellowship provided a template for numerous other “12-Step” groups and broadly impacted
culture as the recovery movement moved into the mainstream (Travis, 2009, p. 4). In 1951, AA was awarded
the American Public Health Association’s prestigious Lasker Award, with these prophetic words:

Historians may one day recognize Alcoholics Anonymous to have been a great
venture in social pioneering which forged a new instrument for social action; a new
therapy based on the kinship of common suffering; one having a vast potential for
the myriad other ills of mankind. (Alcoholics Anonymous, 2001, p. 571)

The development and proliferation of AA groups can be viewed as an emergent at the leading edge of
the modern early worldcentric consciousness of the first half of the 20th century. AA historian Ernest Kurtz
(1979, p. 171) points out that AA developed with recognition of limitations in the modern, rational culture of
that time: “…the very identity of modernity in modernity’s own terms, revealed itself as inherently addictive:
the striving always harder for ever more that always satisfied ever less.” This has been described in the
“rooms” of AA as “the addiction to more.”

As a college-educated Wall Street securities investigator, AA co-founder Bill Wilson was situated
at the heart of the modern, rational Western world of the early 20th century. It was thus no accident that
he helped birth a “spiritual, but not religious” program that has served as a nexus for the emergence of a
modern spirituality that transcends the bounds of traditional religion.2 From an AQAL integral perspective,
we can observe that Wilson’s reflections addressed to “We Agnostics” offer a beautiful critique of the modern
“shadow” of rational-scientific materialism and neglect of interior experience:

…we were grateful that reason had brought us so far, but somehow, we couldn’t
quite step ashore. Perhaps we had been leaning too heavily on reason that last mile,
and we did not like to lose our support. …We’d been faithful abjectly to the God of
reason. We found too we’d been worshippers. …Had we not variously worshipped
people, sentiment, things, money, and ourselves? And then, with a better motive, had
we not worshipfully beheld the sunset, the sea, or a flower? Who of us had not loved
something or somebody? How much did these feelings, these loves, these worships
have to do with pure reason? Little or nothing, we saw at last. Were these things not
the tissue out of which our lives were constructed? It was impossible to say we had
no capacity for faith, love, or worship. …Imagine life without faith! Were nothing
left but pure reason, it wouldn’t be life. (Alcoholics Anonymous, 2001, p. 54)

The spiritual and psychological roots of AA include, most directly, the non-denominational Christian Oxford
Group and, indirectly, the insight of Carl Jung, who considered the potentially life-transforming power of a
spiritual conversion experience to be the only possible option for an otherwise hopeless alcoholic (Kurtz,
1979, p. 21). Wilson’s evolutionary journey began with an awakening experience while detoxing in a hospital.
He recounts:

I immediately knew that I was a free man; and with this astonishing experience
came a feeling of wonderful certainty that a great number of alcoholics might one
day enjoy the priceless gift which had been bestowed upon me. (AA Grapevine, July 1953)

Wilson subsequently derived comfort and inspiration from the work of William James, who described a “variety” of awakenings that transformed individuals, enabling them to “do, feel, and believe what had hitherto been impossible to them” (Wilson, 1953, p. 197). He was struck by James’ observation that many were “hopeless people who in some controlling area of their lives…had met absolute defeat” (Wilson, 1953, p. 198).3

Alcoholics Anonymous developed in communication with the medical profession, which contributed an understanding of the “disease” of alcoholism that could be communicated to alcoholics in sharing the message of recovery. New York physician William Silkworth, “the little doctor who loved drunks,” contributed a description of alcoholism as involving a physical allergy, a mental obsession, and a behavioral compulsion (Kurtz, 1979, p. 15). AA maintained a pragmatic focus on the “alcoholic” rather than the becoming engaged in speculation related to the more abstract concept of alcoholism (Kurtz, 1979, p. 59). Specifically, AA sought to assist alcoholics in arresting the disease (through abstinence) and dealing with the “spiritual malady,” the core of which was identified as egocentricity or self-centeredness. Similarly in the area of religion and spirituality, AA’s focus on “God as I understand Him” pragmatically avoided conflict with existing religious institutions, and Wilson enjoyed a close relationship with Catholic Father Dowling who related the 12 Steps to the spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola (Kurtz, 1979, p. 98).

The roots of AA were also strongly interpersonal. The AA fellowship began and grew from conversations between alcoholics, the most famous of these being the “founding” 1935 conversation between Wilson and “Dr. Bob” Smith in Akron, Ohio (Kurtz, 1979, p. 33). A psychology of the interpersonal transmission of the recovery message came to light as early alcoholics considered ways to more effectively share the AA message. They observed that identification with the story of another alcoholic opened the door to transmission of the possibility of sobriety (physical recovery), sanity (mental recovery), and ultimately serenity (spiritual recovery) for the suffering alcoholic (White, 2002). The alcoholic’s telling of his personal recovery story was couched in a simple “language of the heart” (Kurtz, 1979, p. 193) and aimed to establish a bridge of empathy that would pave the way for a sharing of the hopeful message of recovery.4 In the following section, details of AA’s 12-Step program of recovery will be elucidated and related to the path of self-transcendence in newer evolutionary programs.

Twelve Steps for Recovery and Ego Transcendence

The path of transformation for the individual is laid out in the 12 Steps, which are the most well-known of the AA principles (Alcoholics Anonymous, 2001, p. 59). Ultimately, the 12 Steps call for a reorientation of one’s life (Shealy, 2009), a shift from egocentricity and isolation to a life of surrender, humility, and loving service (Travis, 2009, p. 101). While this emphasis in AA is designed to address the denial and hubris of a narcissistically-inflated ego, the identification of self-centeredness as a key aspect of the spiritual “malady” of the alcoholic can easily be generalized to the human condition of suffering based in attachment to and absorption in the needs and wishes of the separate egoic self. Harry Tiebout (1961), a psychiatrist and contemporary of AA’s founders, identified a four-fold transformation process in his alcoholic patients, akin to spiritual conversion. “Hitting bottom,” humility, surrender, and ego-reduction appeared to catalyze a fundamental change in the alcoholic, enabling him or her to arrest the symptom of drinking and to begin cultivating a “surrendered sense of self, rooted in personal humility and love” (Travis, 2009, p. 63).

In AA, recognizing one’s powerlessness over alcohol, a psychological “deflation at depth” (Kurtz, 1979, p. 21), along with the acceptance of abstinence initiates the recovery journey at Step One. Steps Two and Three invite the addict to enter a path of ego surrender to a power greater than oneself: “Some of us tried
to hold on to our old ideas, and the result was nil until we let go absolutely” (Alcoholics Anonymous, 2001, p. 58). Step Three can also represent a commitment to working the rest of the steps, which facilitates a gradual or “educational” variety of spiritual awakening, aided by honesty, open-mindedness and willingness.

Step Four involves taking inventory of conditioned patterns and strategies for survival (White, 2011), with particular emphasis on resentments, fears, and sexual misconduct. Understanding of these aspects of one’s conditioned self may be further revealed as the resulting inventory is shared with another in Step Five. Bringing secrets to light can help to heal associated shame and guilt, opening space for a sense of “healing tranquility” (Alcoholics Anonymous, 2002, p. 62). Steps Six and Seven have been described as the “second surrender,” an opportunity to commit to the broader and deeper work of personal transformation (White, 2002). Step Six involves considering one’s willingness to let go of identification with the egoic patterns and survival strategies that were identified in Step Four. Step Seven invites surrender and emphasizes a maturing appreciation of the virtue of humility (Alcoholics Anonymous, 2002, p. 74).

In Step Eight, the alcoholic lists ways that he or she has harmed others in active addiction, with an emphasis on unresolved relationship conflicts that continue to serve as a source of turmoil. This sets the stage for the making of amends in Step Nine, which may help to restore relationships and ease the burden of guilt over past actions. Finally, Step Ten calls for ongoing inventory that helps to prevent the storing of new resentments and regrets, keeping the relational field clear. The final steps involve continuing to deepen spiritual awakening and “conscious contact” through prayer and meditation in Step Eleven; and transmitting the message in Step Twelve through the embodiment of one’s awakening, as well as through specific engagement in outreach to alcoholics who remain ensnarled in the disease. In the next section, we will examine evolutionary parallels to the 12-Step recovery path.

**Evolutionary Parallels on the Path of Ego Transcendence**

Through our engagement as students, we, the authors, became aware of striking similarities between the year-long Evolutionary Life Transformation Program (ELTP) taught by Craig Hamilton (Shealy et al., 2012) and aspects of AA's program and fellowship of recovery. We are now also able to identify some key differences. Table 1 contains a summary of the parallels observed. Regarding commonalities, both programs offer a path of self-transcendence that is enacted through surrender to a power greater than one’s limited, conditioned, and egoic self. Each encourages identification, witnessing, willingness, and choice to let go of conditioned patterns that distort perceptions, complicate relationships, and obscure clear seeing and embodiment of the freedom and fullness of our human potential. Both value making amends to “clear away the residue” of past interactions (Hamilton, 2009c) and keep the individual and collective fields clear. Finally, both support a path of collective engagement and service.

Regarding containers for practice, AA meetings provide a support structure for ongoing support, study, and sharing of the message of recovery. An AA member also may find a “sponsor,” a person in recovery with more experience who can help them progress through their working of the 12 Steps. The evolutionary programs in which we have been involved encourage participation in a weekly practice circle or triad group. Some individuals also find “evolutionary partners” to offer additional support and accountability.

Some subtle nuances and contrasts can also be identified. These will be described and examined through the eyes of an Integral Recovery and psychotherapy perspective.

**Gradual versus Direct Paths of Transformation in Recovery**

While AA and newer evolutionary programs both offer a path of self-transcendence, AA’s program and fellowship offers room for a range of levels of understanding and engagement in the transformative work of recovery, as well as a gradual path of transformation through the working of the 12 Steps. In contrast,
evolutionary programs offer explicit cognitive orienting maps and transmission of a more direct path for awakening to spiritually charged state experiences of both the spacious Ground of Being and the “Becoming” energy of the evolutionary self (Shealy et al., 2012); what Thomas Hübl describes as the “competency of ‘stillness’ and ‘movement’” (Dierkes, 2012). Some of these programs introduce post-personal group dialogue practices such as “Awakening through Conversation” (Hamilton, 2009b), collective “presencing” (Scharmer, 2009, p. 39), “Circling” (Cunov, 2013), and “Surrendering into Witnessing” (Gunnaugsen & Moze, 2012) that invite self-transcendent states of awareness, while others emphasize illuminating aspects of shadow through transparent communication (Hübl, 2011). Despite differences, most if not all, recognize the importance of a daily meditation practice. In general, there is an emphasis on transcending of one’s personal story in favor of awakening and opening to emergent wisdom or collective intelligence.

While the more direct path of evolutionary life transformation has served as a life-changing source of inspiration for hundreds, if not thousands of individuals, from an Integral Psychotherapy perspective we observe that the emphasis on rapid transcendence of ego in certain evolutionary programs has the potential to be psychologically de-stabilizing to individuals who lack sufficient self-structure development and preparedness for post-personal practices. Additionally, some participants, particularly those who have a trauma history and/or post-traumatic stress (PTSD), may experience the triggering of what Mark Forman (2010, loc 1792) refers to as an “encapsulated identity,” resulting in acute exacerbation of emotional distress and inner turmoil. While we are not aware of any serious adverse effects of general participation in evolutionary programs, we are aware of individuals who have perceived a need to withdraw from their program due to emotional and psychological de-stabilization. This leads us to conclude that some participants might derive greater benefit from a path that is more gradual and supportive in nature, as might be developed with and guided by an integral psychotherapist or a stable and caring sponsor.⁷

This may be particularly true for individuals in early addiction recovery, and the value of the structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcoholics Anonymous</th>
<th>Evolutionary Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surrender to a power greater than self</td>
<td>Surrender to the evolutionary impulse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty, open-mindedness, willingness</td>
<td>Open mind, heart, will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth-step Inventory</td>
<td>Identifying faces of ego and limiting beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making amends</td>
<td>A life of constant resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscious contact</td>
<td>Daily meditation practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for the suffering alcoholic</td>
<td>Care for the evolution of the whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA Group or meeting</td>
<td>Evolutionary practice circles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>Evolutionary practice partners or triads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymity</td>
<td>Post-personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group conscience</td>
<td>Awakening through conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Traditions</td>
<td>Principles of evolutionary culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Parallels between Alcoholics Anonymous and evolutionary groups.*

This may be particularly true for individuals in early addiction recovery, and the value of the structure
and support in AA and other 12-Step recovery groups for these individuals has been emphasized by Integral Recovery professional Guy du Plessis (2012). He observes that 12-Step groups can provide “predictable and consistent holding environments and can become a transitional object” that is helpful for development of a more mature sense of self, more inner resources, and internalization of new healthy object relations (du Plessis, 2012, p. 134). He additionally asserts that “the right social and cultural affiliation is one of the most important curative aspects of the recovery process” (p. 138). AA can be viewed as offering support at a range of levels of self-development, from offering healthy conventional-level structure, to promoting psychological and interpersonal development, and enabling gradual growth toward post-personal self-transcendence.

**Evolution of Self and Story**

In contrast to the emphasis on cultivating post-personal modes of engagement in evolutionary programs, in AA the speaker’s “personal” story becomes a vehicle for transmitting the message of recovery, thus serving the larger self-transcending purpose of helping another alcoholic. Additionally, Travis (2011, p. 63) points out that, in AA, personal particularities tend to be de-emphasized in the interest of what she described as “‘alcoholic equalitarianism,’ a compassionate worldview that emphasizes the essential similarity and imperfection of all humans”; a recognition that one is “not God” (Kurtz, 1979, p. 3). This supports the cultivation of a group culture that is rooted in humility and love. Within evolutionary groups, there tends to be an elevating impact on the group when an individual “transmits” insights, openings, and more stable embodiment of growth on the evolutionary path of awakening (Shealy et al., 2012). Participants are encouraged to let their transformative light shine, to serve as an inspiration and example of what is possible. At the same time, participants are cautioned that “there’s no point in trying to be where you are not,” and great value in showing up authentically (Hamilton, 2009c).

From an Integral Psychology perspective, a developmental process (in both AA and evolutionary programs) may be observed involving movement from embeddedness in one’s story (or the proximate self) to experience of the more objective distal self in which aspects of one’s story are transcended and included, and ultimately to alignment with one’s antecedent self, an experience of spiritual awakening that enables sharing “from” emergent wisdom (White, 2011). Movement from proximate to distal self may be facilitated by AA’s inventory process and identification of cognitive distortions, limiting beliefs, and other forms of “stinking thinking.” This requires a willingness to step back and look at one’s experience and patterns; to make subject object (Ingersoll & Zeitler, 2010, p. 70).

Post-personal (state) experience of the antecedent or evolutionary self is invited and supported by collective dialogue practices as well as through practice of principles of evolutionary culture (Hamilton, 2009b), such as “Beginner’s mind,” ““Speaking from the deepest, most authentic parts of the self,”” and “Deeper listening.” Finally, identification, embodied experience, and integration of shadow aspects is facilitated by the small-group practice of transparent communication (Hübl, 2011). Engagement in all of these forms of practice should minimize the chance of “blind spots” and may have a synergistic effect in catalyzing transformation and growth.

**Self-Transcending Perspectives, Purpose, and Experiences**

Just as the primary purpose of AA is to help the suffering alcoholic, in evolutionary programs the path of awakening and individual transformation is engaged “for the sake of the whole” (Cohen, 2011, p. 159). Participants in evolutionary programs may practice taking on one or more “enlightened” perspectives drawn from the major wisdom traditions, such as the perspective of the interdependence of all beings, of a caring God, of the evolutionary impulse, or of the view from one’s deathbed (Hamilton, 2009a). “Getting out of self” and practicing a larger perspective may ultimately open the heart, dissolve the illusion of separation,
Emphasis on spiritual surrender and service can offer a beneficial corrective to postmodern individualistic narcissism, and AA's modeling of the explicit cultivation of humility may serve as an example to those of us exuberant integralists and evolutionaries who may be susceptible to our own subtle forms of ego-inflation and hubris.

In exploring the higher potentials for a spiritual development conveyor belt (Wilber, 2006, p. 192) in AA, we observe that engagement of the path of conscious contact in Step Eleven invites the possibility of a mystical opening to the ground of being and the promptings of Spirit, creativity, and emergence: the evolutionary self. Glimmers of the evolutionary can be seen in the late psychiatrist David Hawkins’ account of the spiritual experience that led to his sobriety:

The mind and all sense of a personal self disappeared...It had been replaced by an infinite, all-encompassing awareness which was radiant, complete, total, silent, and still as the promised essence of All That Is...My body and its actions were controlled solely by the infinite will of the Presence. (Scott, 2012, p. 94)

Influenced by AA co-founder Bill Wilson, Hawkins went on to integrate the wisdom and structure of AA into a community-based center for mental health recovery that addressed physical (UR), emotional (UL), and spiritual (UL) concerns, as well as the relationship between patient and family (LL) (Scott, 2012, p. 123). In further reflecting on his transformative experiences, he wrote:

You become a channel of God and radiate out unconditional love. You give all that you are infinitely capable of giving, you just be that for the world. You are an antenna of radiance. (Scott, 2012, p. 229)

The Fellowship of AA and Evolutionary Group Practices

The group meetings that comprise AA's “Fellowship” can be found in virtually any community in the United States, and worldwide membership is estimated to be around 2 million (Travis, 2009, p. 3). It has been said that all that is needed to start an AA meeting is “a resentment and a coffee pot” (Travis, 2009, p. 5), and the only requirement for membership is a desire to stop drinking. While the primary content of a meeting varies, depending on whether it is a “speaker” meeting, an open discussion, or a Step or literature study group, it is common for members when speaking to introduce themselves by first name and by identifying as an alcoholic. While some might criticize this as reifying a negative identity, this may serve to remind an alcoholic “where I came from,” help make subject object, and over time, gradually reduce the sense of shame related to the stigma of alcoholism (Robertson, 1988, p. 124). AA members report that the language spoken in meetings is “plain and everyday,” and “there is a kind of ‘keeping down’ with the Joneses attitude” (Robertson, 1988, p. 124). AA gatherings today often include acknowledgement and celebration of members’ time in sobriety, and offer a warm welcome to the newcomer who is said to be “the most important person in the room.” Regarding her entry into an AA group, an anonymous member recalls, “I saw love and something there that I wanted” (Robertson, 1988, p. 121). Another member recounts her recovery journey by sharing,

You are accepted for who you are, not what you do; the group reinforces you in many, many ways simply for remaining sober; and finally, you are in a position to help others. (Robertson, 1988, p. 127)

Regarding the flavor of practice group meetings, we can observe that in some evolutionary programs, there is an intention for the quality of discourse to be elevated, to reach toward the creative, evolving edge
of what is possible in human culture (Carriera, 2013; Hamilton, 2013). Participants learn to suspend attention to the discursive mind and listen for the deeper chords in what is shared, in order to access “a deep flow of meaning and essential emergence” (Scharmer, 2009, loc 6267). In an attempt to describe his experience of the quality of this type of interaction, Scharmer (2009) writes: “…voices get softer, the conversation slows …a sense of enhanced warmness seems to radiate from the interpersonal space” (loc 6267). Baek and Beeth (2012) convey a sense of this quality of post-personal knowing and being when they write:

…collective entities are not made up of a specific, finite group of individuals who stay together continuously. Their DNA lies in the theme of inquiry: their metabolism is the individual and collective practices that enable men and women to join the collective inquiry…our bodies and minds as sense organs of the whole, and our lineages, biographies, and knowledge as resources, filters, and facets of diversity through which the future is bubbling up in the middle, called forth by the shared focus and consciously-held intent. (p. 38)

Alternatively, in his guide for practice groups, Thomas Hübl (2011, p. 8) writes that “Transparence means radical truth and honesty regarding all of the movements that show up within us in every moment.” In this context, the full range of human experience is welcomed, though not taken on as personal identity.

**Twelve Traditions for AA Group Unity**

As AA grew and proliferated, the 12 Traditions (Alcoholics Anonymous, 2001, p. 562) were created to offer guidance to newly forming groups. The 12 traditions support the ego-transcending work of the 12 Steps and balance individual and group autonomy with AA’s primary purpose of helping the alcoholic who still suffers. Tradition One speaks to the overarching value of AA unity and the interdependence of AA members. Regarding this tradition, Travis (2009, p. 92) observed that AA has institutionalized a “gift economy.” *Transmission of the gift of sobriety* is the heart of AA’s gift economy, as captured in the slogan, “We have to give it away to keep it.” Recognition of interdependence in maintaining the fellowship serves as a check on individual particularities and preferences that might hinder this primary purpose. Similarly within evolutionary programs and practice groups, care arises from recognition that “we live inside of each other.” A commitment to “awakening as a first priority” (Hübl & Patten, 2013) for the sake of the whole points to purpose that expands beyond any limited and individualistic aspirations for achievement, satisfaction or “self-improvement.”

Tradition Two holds each group responsible to its collectively discerned conscience, with consideration of the impact of its decisions on the whole of AA. While “group conscience” related to any given issue might be sought through a vote, Travis (2009, p. 96) observed there is an assumption that the group conscience reflects divine will and that “decision making should seek out (the wisdom of) divine presence rather than simply allowing the majority to rule.” AA’s 12 Steps and 12 Traditions (Alcoholics Anonymous, 2002, p. 137) offer an example of honest dialogue and reflection of the evolutionary principles of a commitment to engage, speaking authentically from depth, and deeper listening. At its best, group conscience has been envisioned by evolutionaries in recovery as a living entity—an emergent unity consciousness that transcends and includes the “many and varied” members who are present (White, 2011).

From an integral perspective, the traditions of group conscience and “principles over personalities” promote a developmental move from egocentric individualism to ethnocentric or sociocentric selves-in-relation, as individual needs are subordinated to those of the group to carry out the primary purpose of AA. Subordination to something larger than one’s self parallels the evolutionary principle of care for the whole. Willingness to extend oneself for the sake of the spiritual growth of another is an expression of love (Peck, 1978, p. 85) that may bring a sense of deep fulfillment (Shealy, 2009a).
Alcoholics Anonymous’ tradition of anonymity is intended to protect the individual from ego-inflation or hubris and the organization from potential misrepresentation. The post-personal sharing that is invited by the principles of evolutionary culture and associated dialogue practices may represent a higher resonance of the principle of anonymity in the sense that participants consciously seek, open, or surrender to transcend embeddedness in an isolated individual self-sense. The practice of “Awakening through Conversation” (Hamilton, 2009b) explicitly seeks to invoke post-personal discourse through the suspension of personal agendas. As mentioned earlier, the practice of transparent communication (Hübl, 2013) invites radical presence and openness. As such, the practice opens the door for a full range of experience and expression, from coaxing repressed, minimally-developed shadow material to light, to opening to “pure, creative thought” and nondual awareness (Hübl, 2009, p. 57). An evolutionary perspective has informed the development of a variety of collective dialogue processes that enable the experience of spiritually charged state experiences (Cohen, 2011; Hamilton, 2004; Gunnlaugsen & Moze, 2012; Shealy et al., 2012). Scharmer (2009, pp. 39-41) explains that an open mind (fresh eyes), an open heart (empathy), and an open will (authentic purpose) are gateways of connection to Source, enabling self-transcendent creativity and co-creation.

Structurally, the 12 Traditions emphasize the importance of AA being fully self-supporting, which is intended to protect the Fellowship from undue influence. It is recommended that leadership be rotated and it is noted that “leaders are but trusted (and experienced) servants (of the whole)” (Alcoholics Anonymous, 1976, p. 564). Finally, the Traditions call on the group to maintain focus on its primary purpose and to avoid engagement with “outside issues.” This has enabled AA to avoid becoming embroiled in controversy and deviating from its mission. Larger cultural and structural aspects of AA are contained in the 12 Concepts, which will be our next area of exploration.

**Twelve Concepts for World Service**

The 12 Concepts (Alcoholics Anonymous, 2001, p. 574) delineate the model of the AA Conference structure. AA has been described as an “upside-down” organization because; in the upside-down triangle, AA groups are at the top, and the trustees are on the bottom. The sides of the triangle represent the three legacies of Recovery (the 12 Steps), Unity (the 12 Traditions), and Service (the 12 Concepts). In the AA logo, the triangle is enclosed within a circle that represents the program being held in love.

In terms of its governance, AA can be described as a representative democracy that is free from the influence of outside economic “special” interests. A system of representation provides regional organization and delegates to the General Service Conference, which carries out functions of the organization as a whole and provides a container and vehicle for expression for the group conscience of the collective. AA supports group autonomy within the bounds of its Traditions and is centralized only to the extent that is necessary. While speaking of economics and AA’s freedom from undue influence, it can also be noted that AA offers widely available support, all maintained by the voluntary donations of members.

Travis (2011, pp. 92-93) explains that the founders of AA’s spiritual program and fellowship sought to counter the distractions and excesses of modern culture. One might say that they envisioned an organization that was in the (modern/egoic) world but not of the (modern/egoic) world. Taken together, the 36 AA principles (the 12 Steps, 12 Traditions and 12 Concepts) support the creation of a stable container for the transformative work of recovery and transmission of the AA message across space and time. The following section considers the relevance of AA and evolutionary principles and practices for the greater collective.

**Evolving the Larger We**

Alcoholics and individuals with a history of trauma and fragile self-structures may have a vulnerability that makes recovery crucial for their functioning, even for their very survival. As such, they may be particularly
attuned to the life-or-death aspect of recovery. It can be argued that humans (and many other life forms) are in a similarly vulnerable and precarious position in the face of global climate change, widening economic inequality, and accompanying social unrest. The presence of institutionalized forms of greed (Loy, 2003, p. 99) and associated denial or dissociation may lead to dire consequences as we collectively perpetuate the enactment of social and economic structures that, at best, are not aligned with the needs of the whole and, at worst, may be leading to the destruction of human life as we know it. If we wait until we “hit bottom” as a civilization before we act, it may be too late.

So how do we wake up? Perhaps like the alcoholic “breaking through denial,” we may be able to achieve “saving identification” if we can look honestly and open to the suffering that is occurring in the context of a growth-oriented economic system and associated materialistic culture and consumptive lifestyles. Peter Merry (2012) asserts that willingness to feel the pain of our current collective situation is crucial to marshaling movement toward change and the possibility of recovery:

As humanity now we must create the space and conditions for us to name and face the pain of our knowing about what is happening. Drop deep into the despair, frustration, fear, and anger. Let it rage in us and between us. As we do so, our beings will come to settle into a creative tension between what we have accepted is true now and our knowing that it can be different. ...The sooner we let it in, the more graceful the transition will be, and the quicker we will find ourselves doing what we are really here to do.

So, what might such a recovery look like? If we take guidance from AA’s model, it will require willingness to let go, to surrender to a higher source of wisdom and to continually align with the greater purpose of care for the evolution of the whole. Practice of suspending current beliefs may help us to transcend our embeddedness in conditioned perceptual frames, opening space for a wider range of possibilities to emerge in consciousness. Like AA, new cultural entities may co-creatively develop and thrive alongside and amidst existing social and economic structures; embracing the whole, while leaning in to the evolving edge. It additionally seems possible that the collective forms taken might have a greater fluidity and flexibility built into them, informed by integral understanding and an intuition of increasing levels of complexity.13 Rotation of leadership might occur flexibly in response to the capacities that are needed, allowing the emergence of natural hierarchy or holarchy (Spangler, 2008). At the same time, recognition of shadow and human limitation can raise caution around issues of power, idealization of individuals, and authoritarian structures.

As in AA, change is likely to come from the coordinated efforts of networked groups and individuals who have the capacity to unite around the purpose of evolving our culture and systems. One can hear the ring of AA wisdom as Otto Scharmer (2009) writes: “Performing with humility or a selfless self seems to be a precondition for the collective field to advance to a higher level” (loc 1363). Contemporary change processes will be able to benefit from global communication technologies that enable complex networking and rapid sharing of information, as well as potential for wide inclusivity (Tapscott, 2013). Additionally, group dialogue and transparent communication tools are now available to help individuals and groups connect with greater purpose, enabling creative engagement and effective action.

Many experiments are underway at this time. In addition to the model of AA’s gift economy, we can observe projects related to climate change and the local food movement, such as Transition Towns (Hopkins, 2008), Slow Money (Tasch, 2008, Hewitt, 2013), and alternative methods of economic exchange, such as time-banking (Cahn, 2011) and complementary currencies (Lietaer & Dunne, 2013). Still others working within existing economic systems and structures advocate a model of “conscious capitalism” (Schwerin, 1998). While these initiatives have their value, it would seem that more global cultural and structural change
will also be needed. Evolutionary visionary Otto Scharmer (2009, p. 352) asserts that “we need to go to the next evolutionary stage of the global economy,” which he describes as “ecosystem-driven: seeing and acting from the emerging whole.” He suggests that:

Instead of treating the symptoms, a systemic response must focus on creating innovations in infrastructures that will allow the system to evolve….What is necessary now is a subtle shift of social fields that will allow multiple networked individuals and communities to function as collective agents of an emerging whole and to innovate and prototype our way into the future.

These words offer inspiration and encouragement for further practice on the evolutionary path, as well as further learning and participation in efforts to support human evolution toward a more caring, skillful, and sustainable future. In a similar, more poetic vein, Peter Merry (2013) writes:

...if we have a kind of shared language around integral, there’s a shared consciousness and intention….It’s like different cells, different imaginal cells in the body of the caterpillar popping up. And at some point, they’ll be mature enough; they’ll start connecting and interacting and that’s when the body of the caterpillar dissolves and the butterfly emerges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERIOR</th>
<th>EXTERIOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIVIDUAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>COLLECTIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Steps for personal recovery</td>
<td>12 Concepts: Decentralized World Service structure, rotating “servant” leadership, enabling care for the whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awakening as first priority (for the sake of the whole)</td>
<td>Holarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncovering and disembedding from the guises of Ego and ineffective survival strategies</td>
<td>Gift Economy and other economic alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying, reframing and ultimately transcending limiting beliefs</td>
<td>Global communication technology and networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Work, trauma healing, and psychotherapy as needed</td>
<td>Integral education systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer and/or meditation</td>
<td>Ecosystem “presence” for innovation in governing, market and cultural infrastructures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(12) Traditions: Higher purpose and Group Conscience supporting the integrity of the we-space</th>
<th>12 Steps for personal recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice groups and post-personal collective dialogue practices</td>
<td>Abstinence: Sobriety as first priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent Communication triads</td>
<td>Healthy diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolutionary partnerships</td>
<td>Regular exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery Fellowship</td>
<td>Adequate rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission</td>
<td>Daily meditation practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Four quadrants of Integral Evolutionary Recovery.
Integral Evolutionary Recovery

In this final section, we will attempt to synthesize the learning from our exploration of AA and evolutionary spirituality, to begin to lay groundwork for a model of Integral Evolutionary Recovery (IE Recovery). Figure 1 identifies potential components in the four quadrants of the AQAL model. Building on AA’s contribution of the 12 Steps as an UL developmental pathway, the 12 Traditions as LL cultural guidelines, the 12 Concepts as a LR organizational blueprint, and Abstinence/Sobriety as an essential UR practice, we offer the following summary.

Integral Evolutionary Recovery acknowledges and provides tools for addressing addictive and destructive patterns within the individual and in collective culture, structures, and systems. It offers an expanded kosmocentric mythology for a post-postmodern world, as well as a path of shadow integration and ego-transcendence to further the evolution of the whole. IE Recovery incorporates post-personal group dialogue, embodied awareness, and transparent communication practices as a complement to individual spiritual practice and recovery-supportive health behaviors. In doing so, it will be attentive to issues of self-structure development and offer appropriate support and trauma-informed care when and where it is needed.

Integral Evolutionary Recovery will be infused by the love that arises in the space between us and movement in ever-widening circles toward universal care. A quality of humility is sourced in recognition that we as individuals are but one brief manifestation within the ever-unfolding evolution of the cosmos. In “letting go of the known, and opening to the needs of the whole,” IE Recovery is willing to suspend attachment to existing structures, enabling the vision of alternatives and co-creative transformations that will better serve the primary purpose of ever-greater manifestation of the Good, the True, and the Beautiful, for the sake of the whole.

Acknowledgments

While this material is the result of work that was partially supported with resources and use of facilities at the James A. Haley Veterans’ Hospital, the opinions and observations expressed in this article are the authors’ alone and should in no way be viewed as representing those of the Veterans Administration or the James A. Haley Veterans’ Hospital.

NOTES

1 Co-author Linda White began living an integral recovery practice in 1986. She found it natural to marry the recovery and wellness aspects of her academic studies and her personal practice, such as exercise, meditation, limbic regulation, fellowship, and therapy, to her work with her clients. She began writing “Integral Recovery & Psychotherapy” in 2002 after she immigrated to New Zealand and experienced an absence of applied spirituality and recovery awareness among the community of therapy professionals. She subsequently presented material from her growing compendium of knowledge and experience at the Kawai Street Mental Health Clinic in 2004 and also shared her work with her Integral Psychotherapy mentor, Willow Pearson, and others in her supervision group in Australia and New Zealand. This early foundation continues to evolve within her current practice of Evolutionary Recovery & Psychotherapy, LLC.

2 Upon returning to my Catholic faith, I attended confession for the first time in over 20 years. Having practiced the AA program for almost three decades—the only “sin” I felt I needed to confess in the eyes of the Catholic Church was not attending weekly Sunday mass. When I told the priest that I attended a Sunday AA meeting rather than church, the priest’s response was, “As far as I am concerned, AA is the religion that the West has given to the World.”

3 More recently, psychologists William Miller and Janet C’dé Baca (2001) studied the dramatic life-change experiences of 55 different individuals. They observed that what they call “quantum change” is a “vivid, surprising, and enduring personal transformation” (p. 4).

4 In co-founder Bob Smith’s recounting of his initial transformative conversation with Bill Wilson, he italicized these
words, “...he was the first living human being with whom I had ever talked who knew what he was talking about in regard to alcoholism from actual experience. In other words, he talked my language” (Robertson, 1988, p. 35). While Bob Smith had a lower profile in AA history, the surgeon has been described as the “steady hand that held the cord of Bill Wilson’s high-flying, erratic kite,” and it is reported that he treated nearly 5,000 alcoholics at no cost (Robertson, p. 37). He strongly encouraged Wilson to “keep it simple,” and in a rare public speech he said that the 12 Steps, “when simmered down to the last, resolve themselves into the words ‘love’ and ‘service’” (Robertson, 1988, p. 37).

Popular recovery speaker Sandy Beach (Step Stories, CD 5) describes the process of inventory as an opportunity for alcoholics to identify and eliminate the cognitive distortions that are the root of their problems. He notes the crucial importance of feedback from others in identifying “faulty slides” in the “projector” of the mind through the sharing of one’s inventory (Step 5). A clear resemblance to integral shadow work and mindfulness-based cognitive therapy is evident here. He points to the fruit of spiritual awakening that becomes possible through the clearing of obscurations in the conditioned mind (Sandy Beach, Step Stories CD 11):

Everything screwed up? Absolute discord. And then we work on that; harmony comes out. This is what’s inside already. This isn’t anything we learn. It’s there! This is the true nature of our spiritual selves. So we’re not learning how to be loving. We are! It’s just been blocked by this stuff we’d been creating up there. Where there’s error, we bring truth. Truth comes intuitively. It suddenly is revealed. We didn’t figure it out. We didn’t study it. We didn’t do anything. We just got error washed and washed-and what was left was truth coming out… That’s the wonderful gift that we’re getting here is the awareness of what’s already inside if we do this work…. We will intuitively know how to handle things. We will bring an awareness and a knowledge to the situation that we didn’t have before, and we’re gonna contribute to more to every situation than we did in the past. And none of it’s gonna happen by learning anything. It’s all gonna happen by erasing what we know. Isn’t that ironic!

6 Information regarding evolutionary spirituality is primarily based on the authors’ experience as participants in programs facilitated by Craig Hamilton and Thomas Hübl. Additionally, exposure to the work of Andrew Cohen was gained through reading and listening to recorded materials. In communicating our observations, we recognize that our perceptions are impacted by our experience as individuals and as mental health and addiction recovery professionals.

7 We can acknowledge the value of concurrent treatment of substance use disorders and PTSD (Foster & Kelly, 2012) and the potential value of mindfulness and acceptance-based approaches. It also appears that group affiliation and social support aid limbic regulation, reduce isolation, and offer the opportunity for corrective emotional experiences.

8 The Integral Recovery Program developed by John Dupuy employs an Integral Life Practice model and emphasizes recovery in all four quadrants (Dupuy & Morelli, 2007). While the program does not explicitly include the 12 Steps or engagement with AA or Narcotics Anonymous meetings, a case example presented by Dupuy (2010) suggests that treatment is offered within a community that offers a high level and quality of support to individuals for the time that they are there (Dupuy & Gorman, 2010). The Integral Recovery program also includes work with the client’s family and assignments on resentments and regrets that bear similarity to AA “Step” work. During the 2010 Integral Theory Conference panel on Integral Recovery, Dupuy described himself as “on the side [of AA], but not far from it” (ITC, 2010).

9 In their own ways, participants in both AA and evolutionary programs are supported in letting go of “already knowing” and cultivating openness to the inner promptings of emergent wisdom. While it would appear that evolutionary programs offer more specific practices to cultivate this type of knowing, AA study groups or individuals in recovery may encounter a wide range of books and other materials that support engagement in transformative spiritual practices.

10 Thomas Hübl’s (2011) small-group practice of “transparent communication” utilizes feedback to facilitate an individual’s awareness of un-integrated shadow aspects thus promoting growth within relevant lines of development. While some evolutionary teachers, such as Andrew Cohen and Craig Hamilton, place much less emphasis on this type of work, all of these teachers agree on the value of feedback and therapeutic work occurring in the context of an overarching commitment to awakening (Cohen, 2013).

11 There are some caveats to consider. One is that by no means are all or even many AA participants at post-personal levels
of spiritual development. Nonetheless, a good case can be made for the presence of a spiritual conveyor belt within AA. Because AA developed during a modern period of history, its perspective included more traditional forms of spiritual understanding, while making room for a wider range of experiences. Over time, an increasingly pluralistic focus is evident within the choice of stories in the AA big book in response to an increasingly diverse population of the alcoholics who sought their support. Currently there are popular AA speakers who are able to present an understanding of the work of the 12 Steps in a manner that could be understood by traditional theistic participants, while also incorporating glimmers of a mystical understanding of nonduality and a path of enlightenment:

Praying only for knowledge of His will for us and the power to carry that out…If we go back to The Varieties of Religious Experience, the author of that book said, “the greatest contribution that has ever been made to the human race (is) awakened people.” (Sandy Beach, Step Stories CD 11)

The language of the heart is love moving to fulfill itself. It is the releasing of pain and the story in the face of truth and love, knowing that truth and love contain their own fulfillment. “When AA doesn’t work, it’s because of a lack of love. The deep mystery within each one of us (which is love) is key” (Anonymous, 2010).

12 If anything, what we need to be doing on the planet right now is rapid prototyping experimentation because that’s what will load the field with new insight, new ways of thinking… it won’t be any one of those initiatives that discovered the secret but it’ll be the process of experimentation that will have loaded the field with something, which at some point reaches a tipping point and downloads.

So… [let’s] allow each to be what it is, to be its own experiment… Encourage sharing of what is being learned, but don’t try to standardize them and don’t try to force a connection between them until that emerges of its own accord from the system, which requires some patience. But I think actually the value is in the diversity of experiments. …if we have a kind of shared language around integral, there’s a shared consciousness and intention…It’s like different cells, different imaginal cells in the body of the caterpillar popping up. And at some point, they’ll be mature enough; they’ll start connecting and interacting and that’s when the body of the caterpillar dissolves and the butterfly emerges.

14 This theme is fleshed out in Otto Scharmer and Katrin Kaufer’s (2013) book Leading from the Emerging Future: From Ego-System to Eco-System Economies.
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EXPLORING INTER-BEING AND INTER-BECOMING AS ETHOS-MAKING

The Integrally Informed Pursuit of Professional Community Well-being

Ian Wight

ABSTRACT This article explores an application of Integral Theory in the context of professional community well-being, with a focus on ethos-making, and with an interest in the interface between “integral” and “professional.” Ethos is discussed in relation to ethics, in the wider context of an integrally informed approach to inter-professional education. Ethos is positioned beyond praxis, en route to poiesis, with all three represented as the “makings”—or unique integrations—of professionals. The learning from a highly experiential ethos-making workshop is examined, including the main outcome—a representation of agency in communion. Ethos, in integral terms, is speculated to represent a place for inter-beings, for well-becoming. The learning edges relate to: the integration implicit in ethos; the critical “audience” aspect; the associated collective intention and communal enaction; and the generative potential—ethos beyond praxis en route to poiesis, the latter being viewed creatively, in integral place-making terms—as possibly the ultimate venue for transformative integral practice.

KEY WORDS agency; ethics; ethos; professional education; praxis

The interface between “integral” and “professional” is an interesting place to explore both ideas; insights may be generated, about the essence of each—and of their associated integrations and makings. Where both are in play—integralists identifying as professionals, professionals identifying as integralists—a novel inter-world may be anticipated, peopled by inter-beings. When an evolutionary perspective is also activated these inter-beings become “inter-becomings”—agents in communion, enacting their professing, willing ever-more-whole outcomes, through cascading integrations of their own makings. When such uncommonly enlightened agents commune, there is the further prospect of new possibilities, new potentials—out there, in the beyond, to come, in time—meta-integralists and meta-professionals.

The main context in play here is the inter-personal, and the inter-professional—more than simply personal, more than singularly professional. It is “We space” that is being privileged, with professional communing in mind, with an integral perspective. The “We space” is perceived as a professional development place—for professionals, and their professions; an inter-world hosting the integrally informed pursuit of professional community well-being. It engages the realm of integral ethics in practice (Wilber et al., 2008), but more so it engages integral ethical practice—as ethos enacted.

Ethos is positioned as one, potentially central, “making” (situated between praxis and poiesis) of integrally informed professionals—a making that is also an integration, the embodiment of an integral professional—or perhaps, more accurately, an integral inter-professional. The operative territory appears to be that of inter-beings, operating with an acute sense of their “inter-becoming-ness”—evolving, collectively. What might this look like, outcomes-wise, on the ground, in practice? This article reports on a recent experiment.
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in (inter-professional) ethos-making, in professional community settings, as part of a larger project called Evolving Professionalism Beyond the Status Quo: Contemplating the Education of the Agents of the Next Enlightenment.

The larger work focuses on considerations of professional-self-design, viewing “the making/s of professionals” in terms of three main “products” — integrations (integrally) that are also makings (professionally): praxis (personal), ethos (interpersonal), and poeisis (transpersonal, or “trans-professional”) (Wight, 2012b). Earlier work on praxis, and praxis-making, has been reported elsewhere (Friesen & Wight, 2009). The intent here is to report on more recent work in the realm of ethos, and ethos-making, for an integral audience—especially for those interested in one particular inter-world, between integral and professional. The larger project was initially conceived as an inquiry into “integral professionalism,” but this representation did not seem to gain traction with either integral or non-integral audiences. While it might be anticipated that “modern” professionals would have problems with “integral” perspectives, it is not so obvious why the integral community might be comparatively disinterested in professionalism perspectives. Perhaps this offering can also inform such an inquiry. Ethos could be the bridge—an integration that serves integrals and evolving professionals—ranging beyond mere conventional (non-integral) ethics, and beyond mere professional codes of ethical practice.

Within an integral framing ethos spans the interobjective and the intersubjective, acknowledging the realm of codified ethics especially associated with modern professionalism (LR), but ultimately aiming for a transcending, co-created, ongoingly enacted, collective ethics (LL). More broadly, ethos may also be represented as an effort to mesh the personal, the professional, and the spiritual, in what seems to involve an expanded sense of integral ethical practice; intention (UL) and acting out this intention (UR) are also in play. When an evolutionary form of enlightenment and spirituality is added to the mix of operative perspectives, it might be suggested that such ethos-making—and ethos-enacting—manifests as an integration of inter-being and inter-becoming. Could this be the terrain of integral professionalism, or at least the venue for an evolved professionalism, beyond the status quo?

The outcome of a recent inter-professional ethos-making initiative is featured, with these expansive perspectives in mind. Agency in Communion emerged from the inter-professional communing of a diverse group of professionals, in the context of an advanced professional development offering, delivered as a highly experiential workshop. It targeted seasoned professional practitioners, from a range of built environment professions, and thus represents a more direct inquiry into the realms of “inter-professionalism,” where some of the current thinking around inter-being and inter-becoming began to take shape.

The underlying themes in all the ethos-making to date involve a combination of place-making (places for the development of professionals) and well-being (venues for professional community-building, privileging well-being on multiple levels). Both place-making and well-being are being conceived from an integral perspective, embracing multiple quadrants and levels. For example, place-making involves a collectively embodied integration of physicality, functionality, conviviality, and spirituality (Wight, 2005b; 2011a). At its best it represents an integration—transcending while including—individual sense-making and collective meaning-making, emerging as a form of trans-personal poiesis. Well-being also engages several levels of consideration, mantra-like, for example: Doing well by my Self; Being well Together; For the Well-being of All; In Our Well-becoming. It stretches well beyond happiness, for example, but engages meaning, and mystery, in an ultimately loving embrace (Vernon, 2008; Wight, 2012a). Both—place-making and well-being—share a whole-making impulse, and the associated evolutionary dynamic; the underlying “evolving” is a synonym for “ever-more-whole”—the core intention in any emergent ethos.
The 2013 Integral Theory Conference called for participants to connect as Integral Kosmopolitans—a highly charged, and challenging, invitation to say the least! Modern (modernity-rooted) professionals, for example, have problems reconciling the personal and the professional—an integration too far for many to comfortably entertain. They have also resisted the cosmopolitan perspective—a pluralism too perplexing and too postmodern. The combination of an explicitly integral and Kosmopolitan perspective probably lies beyond their known world. This triggers some underlying questions for this article. Would such a conference have any application at all for such individuals? What might help to make the connection? Could it have something to do with ethos-making, and helping folks become more whole—wherever they now find themselves?

The context for the initial presentation was also an Integral Theory conference, albeit with a decided interest in application, in such contexts as community well-being (specified, in our case, as professional community well-being). With the earlier broader context in mind, this article may therefore be regarded as a work-in-progress around an interest in how Integral Theory might best inform (integral) professional education, and thus contribute to the flourishing evolution of what it might mean to be a postconventional (or post-postconventional) professional. The integral perspective represents a perceived framework for “evolving professionalism beyond the status quo,” featuring generative integrations of the best of (i.e., the dignities rather than disasters of) premodern, modern, and postmodern professionalism. A specifically Kosmopolitan and Kosmocentric representation of the integral perspective may be even more generative, potentially in terms of an eventual integral meta-professionalism.

The practical concern therefore revolves around how such theoretical perspectives might be best introduced to those parts of the academy responsible for the education of professionals, or to the arenas of professional institutes responsible for the continuing education of professionals. It will be suggested that university programs need to graduate students with not only a degree, but also with a praxis, an ethos, and a propensity for poiesis. This will entail an embrace of new professing horizons, such as the inter-weaving of single-, double-, and triple-loop learning associated with developmental action inquiry (Torbert, 2004), or the presencing and co-presencing associated with U Theory (Senge et al., 2004; Scharmer, 2007), or the mesh-working associated with applied Spiral Dynamics (Hamilton, 2008; Merry, 2009).

Professional institutes need to position themselves in support of such extension and expansion, facilitating opportunities for tune-ups (attunements) and explorations of inter-professional collaboration (excursions that are also incursions). But mostly there first needs to be some differentiation (and then integration) of ethics and ethos, and then more in-depth consideration of the implications of ethos in an Integral Theory application context.

From Ethics to Ethos

The author’s ethos-making experiences referenced so far have emerged in the context of graduate professional education and continuing professional development, with the teaching and learning of professional ethics in mind. It seemed too easy, and too narrow, to focus simply on a reading and discussion of ethical practice as “codified” by a particular profession; larger questions emerged, demanding consideration—in this case, by someone with over a decade’s exposure to Integral Theory and its application in professional practice. The questioning took an integral turn: Can ethics be taught, or are they better experienced? Do they merit an individual, personal treatment, or do they demand a collective, interpersonal approach? What is an educator to do? Is there a comprehensive, balanced strategy that covers all the bases, that leaves nothing out?

It seemed that ethics have an essential educational quality to them; they are, literally, drawn out of the interiors—of those who come to consciously self-realize them—to guide their exterior actions. And this self-realization may potentially be viewed as a byproduct of a larger, wider social process of inter-personal relating—a communal endeavor, ideally with fellow professionals, where discrete ethics morph into a higher, transcending while including, ethos. By these premises, the realm of ethics—extended into the realm of...
ethos—anchors what might be rendered as potential extraordinary experiential education, in service of a comparatively unique form of collective self-realization, an ethos that is enacted (naturally, unthinkingly, always) as a form of meshing of the personal, the professional, and the spiritual (the latter defined broadly, as a key dimension of a whole, undivided, self). The underlying interest in this particular article may perhaps best be referenced as a meshing of the personal, the professional, and the integral.

The initial ethos-making workshop initiative—*Quiet Resolve*—emerged in the context of how to best address ethics in a capstone “professional planning practice” graduate course. The course has recently featured two major assignments—one focused on “praxis-making” (Friesen & Wight, 2009) and the other on “relationship-building” (Wight, 2005a); the first very personal, the second very inter-personal. The graduate students and some of the practitioners contributing to *Quiet Resolve* had the benefit of this foregrounding in praxis-making and relationship-building, as well as a common concern with the realm of planning professionalism. This made for a comparatively rich, layered, and grounded set of ethos-draft elements (as reported in Wight 2011b; 2011c). This work helped to establish (inter-personal) ethos-making as a natural progression beyond (personal) praxis-making.

Ethos-making features extraordinary inter-relating, the quality of which is very much helped by some grounding in praxis work. In contrast to praxis-making, ethos-making was more clearly perceived as developing a form of professional agency in inter-professional communion, of ethical inquiry in collective action, to paraphrase Leonie Sandercock (1998). In retrospect, it felt like a highly experiential post-conventional response to the current challenge of professional ethics education. Why might this have been the case? What might be some rationale?

Based on the overall course experience to date—now over almost two decades—professional planning ethics has been distinctly challenging to teach in a conventional manner, in a way that is meaningful on an ongoing basis, beyond situational contexts. While particular content, and contexts—and their associated scenarios, are obviously important, ethics has a quality that seems to position it as more than just another “subject” to be objectively taught. Helped by an increasing exposure to an integral perspective, there has been an emerging sense that ethics education needs to be approached, at least in equal part, as not simply something to be acted out on occasion, but as something to be enacted from within, always. Most fundamentally, it seems to entail a visceral experiencing on the part of the individual, and considerable “inner” work (self-inquiry), coupled with an equally in-depth intersubjective exploration with fellow professionals, in the realms of ethos. This is what was attempted, building on the *Quiet Resolve* foundations, in the second ethos-making initiative—through its particular focus on inter-professionalism, and the associated inter-facing.

**Agency in Communion**

*Quiet Resolve* (March 2011) thus inspired *Agency in Communion*, an effort to experiment with ethos-making in the arena of *inter*-professionalism. The associated workshop (May 2011), *From Ethics to Ethos, Inter-Professionally*, targeted a mix of around 18 built environment professionals (architects, engineers, planners, designers)—all practitioners in Winnipeg, Canada. They responded (self-selected) to a “professional development workshop offering” circulated to the memberships of the provincial professional institutes:

> In this experiential workshop you will engage in an inquiry—around ethics and ethos—exploring, with fellow professionals, where your professionalism is grounded and how it is evolving—or might evolve, and what we might share in common—in the form of an ethos... we will explore the space between our individual professions, and our role there as an “inter-professional”, operating beyond our normal solo/silo professional confines. This will also involve considering what it means to bring our whole selves to this work, effectively meshing the personal, the profes-
ional and the spiritual… it is expected that participants will have some enthusiasm for exploring inter-professional terrain in novel ways.

Participants were prepared in advance for some reflection on their experiences, in part through a variety of exercises (small-group sentence completion circles, personal journaling, facilitated dialogues, and plenary circle processes) addressing:

…the “pillars” of your professionalism, the “bridging” challenges (especially as regards inter-professional relationships), and “over-arching” ethical imperatives. The work we do together will be framed as “ethos-making”, beyond codified ethics (although we will look over our shoulders at our respective “official” professional codes of ethics, or statements of values). More than mere dutiful referencing of these codes, the workshop will effectively involve attempting to mesh our personal, professional and spiritual selves—aiming for an ethos that we enact, always, as a matter of course.

Reference was made to the intention to “workshop” some recent proposals by Parker Palmer (2007), on “re-educating the new professional,” translating his ideas into their own professional contexts: “Part of Palmer’s message involves rejoining ‘soul and role’; it also involves ‘prospecting a new professionalism.’ Are you up for this kind of action inquiry?” Participants were expressly primed to come to the workshop as potential “co-creators” and “as emerging inter-professionals.”

The culminating phase of the workshop involved a plenary sharing circle, organized into two rounds of offerings by participants. The “circling” was informed by their earlier workshop exercises and was guided by some specific lines of questioning—to provide some potential structure as well as inspiration:

- What is calling me? What is my calling? What am I being called to profess?
- What do I want to make of myself, personally and professionally?
- What does the world want of me… want to use me for?
- What is my unique gift or gifts… that I cannot not give?
- How do I plan to be of service in the world, to the world?

The first round of offerings focused on “I statements”—personal, individual reportage, for all to hear. The second round featured more considered statements, informed by some deep listening into what had gone before, with each person reaching for what they felt merited expression in terms of “We statements” that encompassed not only their personal perspective, but also—and especially—their sensed inter-personal perspective, from the professional communing they had just experienced. These formed the basis for what is currently identified as Agency in Communion, drafted as an initial offering by the workshop facilitator, based on the participants’ own offerings—as expressed throughout the workshop (outcomes from some earlier exercises were documented and disseminated), but especially in terms of the final/second plenary round “We statements.”

What follows therefore represents elements of a potential ethos—that all might be prepared to subscribe to—as an outcome of the workshop. It incorporates content delivered in and generated by the workshop; it could certainly benefit by further work by the participants—but this has proved a challenge; the participants were clearly very busy people, who found it difficult to provide timely in-depth feedback, though not for the lack of interest, nor desire. The ethos-draft elements are therefore mainly products of their specific time and place; they may or may not be living on in the hearts and minds of participants. But the signs are that the
sentiments expressed are quietly embraced, if not loudly proclaimed, by many participants—some of whom at least continue to seemingly cherish the workshop experience. They are offered here as emerging \textit{inter-professional} ethos elements, for consideration by others with an inter-professional disposition.\textsuperscript{5}

The first set of outcomes reflects an attempt to identify the main themes in play, in tension, for most, at the workshop—the tussle between the “professional” and the “personal”:

We are \textbf{professionals}, in development,  
from solo to synchro, generating synergy,  
inter-professing together, integrated and integrating,  
in service, to our wider worlds, beyond us,  
transcending while including, all we hold dear

We are \textbf{personals}, in relationship,  
whole beings, making meaning,  
discerning truth and goodness and beauty,  
agents of wholeness,  
enacting our truth, exuding goodness, privileging beauty  
in a loving embrace

The second set of outcomes, an effort to synthesize the various “We statement” offerings, is organized in response to the question-prompt options provided to the participants (as a follow-up to their “I statements”) in the second round of the closing circle:

\textit{Calling}: We are called to co-create places that matter, wells of well-being, filled full to over-flowing… with communing, with spirit, by enacting from within. This is our gift to give together, to be of service, in the evolution of ever-extending wholeness.

\textit{Making}: We are makers—sense-makers, meaning-makers, place-makers. We also make our selves, personally and professionally. Our makings are more than a relationship of theory and practice; our values and beliefs anchor our makings. What we make of ourselves personally is our praxis—reflecting our deepest accountability. What we make of ourselves collectively is our ethos—reflecting our greatest aspirations for our inter-being, our being together.

\textit{Communing}: We are in communion—agents in communion, agents of communion, agents by our communion. Our pro-vocation is collaboration; we are agent-collaboraters. Our professional “home-base” underpins a higher inter-professional “bridge-place”; where we privilege connection, as beams and struts—beaming light into dark recesses, bolstering shaky framings; where we privilege conversation, to unearth common intentions and to respectfully pursue uncommon contentions; furnishing claims that are ethically warranted, providing guarantees that are backed by this ethos. Pillars of community, mirroring the pillars of our bridging inter-professionalism, we seek to function as a keystone in the over-arching imperative.

\textit{Gifting}: We have gifts that we cannot not give—novel perspectives, leading-edge capacities, special sensibilities; generative power allied with generative love. We apply science; we deploy technology; we value art, and craft; we represent humanity. Ours is the gift of integration, as integrated individuals, embodying and ensouling
integratedness, making sense of differentiation, and counter-balancing tendencies to reduction and fragmentation. We are not attached to specific outcomes; we do not crave attention. We seek to be a contribution, to be true to our intention, to leave the world more whole than we first found it.

Serving: We seek to be of service to a greater whole, beyond us in time and space. We are sources of hope, organizers of the hope in others, and in ourselves. We make an object, rather than a subject, of our service—in reference to worthy others, beyond client and employer. As privileged inter-professionals, we acknowledge not only our great debt to the past that has got us here, but especially our crucial obligations to future generations, to other species, and to the ecosystem that services us. We serve the here, now—so that those who come after us, have “a here and now” worth having.

Evolving: We are developing, evolving; we are not done growing. Ranging beyond our foundational professional home-base (effectively, our “first language” context), this inter-professional terrain is becoming more familiar—a second-home of sorts, where we are more than a tourist, where we are becoming multi-lingual, where we can grow and develop beyond our egoic selves. Our ego is now complexifying to incorporate our “eco”; our practice is evolving into our praxis; our ethics are evolving into our ethos. We anticipate ongoing evolution, such as in our propensity to make even more magnificent poetry together, representing a poiesis — to complement our praxis and ethos.

Wholing: We bring our whole selves to our work—body, mind, soul and spirit. We are in alignment: self and service; soul and role; spirit and purpose; profession and inter-profession. We are finely attuned with the living system we inhabit. We are not simply human doings, we are human beings—and spiritual beings at our core. We have the capacity to inspire, to enact—an inside-out movement, potentially transformative: from “me” to “I”; from “I” to “We”; from “We” to “All-of-Us.”

The final set of outcomes emerged as a coda of sorts, and as an expression of what may be regarded as the de facto commissioning (“co-mission-ing”) of self-conscious inter-professionals—manifestations of Agency in Communion.

Well-beings,
making meaning-filled places together,
with discernment;
inter-beings, inter-facing, inter-professing

We are all inter-professionals in the now
Ethical Agents in Ethical Communion

Extending Ethos-Making: Be-Comings

What might become (“be-come”) by a shift from ethics to ethos? Ethos appears best considered to be prior to ethics: it is more the whole, while ethics is more the parts. Ethos is also viewed as something that is made, collectively—forged in the ongoing moment, in the now, in the heat of dialogic practice. It is perhaps best regarded as not so much a case of “taking action”—an impersonal subject operating on an impersonal ob-
PROJECT—but more of a “making together”—a collective enaction. It is very personal and relational at the same time. This can be strange, almost “foreign,” territory for modern professionals—even for those with a design sensibility who may be more comfortable with complex integrative syntheses. In fact, this may be an arena for an emerging “we-design”, not simply the sum total of individual professional-self-designs, but the territory of a collective professional-we-design. And this in turn may be opening up some new meta-professional territory, transcending while including premodern, modern, and postmodern professionalism.

As indicated earlier, the experiential ethos-making work is part of a larger current concern with “evolving professionalism beyond the status quo” (initially conceived as integral professionalism). This in turn is part of a deeper “contemplation of the education of the agents of the next enlightenment.” The motivating questions include: How can we better negotiate the institutional landscapes in which we live and work? How can we better position our professional practice to provide a lasting legacy based on ethical inquiry and action? How might our professionalism evolve beyond the status quo? The broad line of response being investigated focuses on “the making/s of professionals”—a triad of praxis, ethos, and poiesis (Wight, 2012b). The focus here has been on the ethos piece; the associated “becoming” is anticipated to be located in relation to poiesis.

Donning our professional “hats”—whatever that may be (formal or informal, explicit or implicit, integral or otherwise), what might constitute our professional ethos? What might “we” become in terms of professional ethos? Based on the work and ideas discussed here, it is suggested that this is very much for us to make, with our audience in mind. The audience aspect is crucial for realizing an authentic ethos—beyond employer, beyond client. The “making” clearly requires the evolution of ethics into the realm of ethos, and associated inhabiting of higher and wider perspectives—seeing with new eyes.

Comparatively speaking, ethics may be conceived as more “out there,” at an institutional distance from us, ostensibly objective, ultimately a set of third-person “its.” By contrast, ethos may be conceived as more “in here,” constitutive of our core, subjective (perhaps more accurately intersubjective), a manifestation of the combination “I + We” (first- and second-person perspectives), real, lived—always being made and remade, as ethics evolve. Ethos has been defined as “the distinctive character, fundamental values and spirit of engaged members (of a profession),” drawing on the Greek term for “accustomed place” or “starting point.” “Ethos,” then, in an important sense, seems to represent the origin of “ethics.”

Delving deeper into its Greek roots, it is possible to place ethos in interesting territory. For example, it does not focus on individualism, but the expression of society’s values through the individual… expressing inherently communal roots. In its highest form, ethos comprises a mesh of: phronesis (practical skills and wisdom); arete (virtue, goodness); and eunoia (good will towards “the audience”). As rhetoric, ethos does not belong to the speaker, but the audience—it entails a higher level of common meaning-making, quite distinct from logos and pathos (Reynolds, 1993). One particularly appealing rendering situates ethos as “a habitual (ethical) gathering place” (Halloran, 1982) that inspires the sense of ethos as a unique “bundling” of personal, professional, and planetary ethics, constantly enacted, always “on show.”

In terms of the larger agenda—evolving professionalism beyond the status quo—an ethos-making perspective informs critical collective inquiry, and provides a generative setting for addressing core questions about our professing in common. Are we essentially agents of (the established) order, or (reforming) agents of (transformative) change? What is the critical nature of our agency? Is it a form of sole/solo agency, or is it agency in communion (with fellow professionals)?

By way of some response to these lines of questioning, ethos-making is here conceived in novel ways, that may presage very different future manifestations of professional practice. For example, it involves “telling a We story to the future.” It is a community project (not for sole agents, or solo efforts); it is about agency in communion. As storytelling it is a moral tale—beyond codes and ordinances and standard practices/protocols. As a “making” endeavor it is a “we-design” project, in a “we-zone,” where we try to see with Marcel
Proust’s multi-perspectival “new eyes.” Ethos-making is about “big-picture,” “big-caring” perspectives (i.e., telling stories to the future, calling into being a higher level of practice, a deeper sense of professing).

Ethos: A Place for Inter-Beings, for Well-Becoming?

If we are up for a shift in focus, from ethics to ethos, or at least for a greater privileging—or prioritizing—of ethos over ethics, we may wish to consider a more fundamental repositioning in ourselves, possibly in ways where an integral perspective could be very instructive. Ideally, individuals need to be helped to see beyond themselves, to see themselves in a new “way of being,” in a novel community of practitioners; an individual professional needs to be able to also see themselves simultaneously as an inter-professional. More expansively, intentional ethos-makers would comfortably comport themselves as “inter-beings”—quintessential “we-place” citizens—leaning into their “inter-becoming.” Does this begin to better fill out the terrain between integral and professional? Is some explicit integral professionalism in order?

Beyond the sphere of mere ethics, we seek to encourage greater consideration of a potentially more encompassing notion, namely, ethos—minimally, a special bundling of ethics, but integrally, a model for ongoing ethical practice. While ethics may be applied in practice, on occasion, ethos is made out of praxis, the praxis of a professional communion of ethical agents, in an ongoing sense. Professional education, including integral professional education, needs to complement the teaching around ethics with the learning experience in ethos-making. Ethos is a place for inter-beings, to make higher-level meaning of what they profess, how they profess, and why they profess; it is a communal making, of well-being by design.

Ethos-making may represent extraordinary educational practice in unduly secular times. It not only entails a meshing of the personal and the professional, but it very much adds “the spiritual” to the mix (SandercocK et al., 2006; Wight, 2009). In a sense it may be viewed as bringing professionals “home,” to the origins of professionalism, in professing a form of faith, aligned with a commitment to a higher flourishing. But it is also drawing the notion of professing forward, certainly beyond the confines of modern professionalism, to a higher integration of what it means to be a professional, of what makes a professional. Praxis represents a personal integration; ethos represents a collective integration. Conceivably, there is a further meta-professional integration (a poiesis perhaps) to be realized when praxis-based ethos-makers commune on a higher plane—beyond their professional confines. For now, it is probably enough for professional education to more assiduously foster personal praxis-making en route to inter-personal ethos-making.

An experiential workshop process merits consideration in supporting such an endeavor. This presentation has attempted to convey some supportive rationale, a congenial interpretation of ethos vis-à-vis ethics, and a process by which interested individuals might begin to make a collective ethos, in a relatively short period of time (a potential outline for adaptation is presented in Appendix A). Examples of emerging ethos-draftings indicate the insights that might be generated, to support a higher level of professing by those who wish to better manifest their identity as professionals. As such ethos statements become more common it is possible that a wider “we-dentity” might emerge, with ethos-making serving as a venue to practice “we-design”: a place for inter-beings, for well-becoming.

Integral Theory and Professional Community Well-being

This article has explored the application of Integral Theory in the context of professional community well-being, with a focus on ethos-making, and with an interest in the interface between “integral” and “professional.” What has been learned?

An ethos (vis-à-vis ethics) perspective has proved enlightening in several respects that may merit further consideration by the integral community. The learning edges relate to: the integration implicit in ethos; the critical “audience” aspect; the associated collective intention and communal enaction; and the generative
potential—ethos as en route to poiesis—possibly the ultimate venue for integral practice. Some observations on the qualities that characterize this process:

- It appears that integral ethics may be further developed by a more explicit regard for ethos, and for the associated ethos-making. Ethos represents a congenial locus for integration, engaging all four quadrants, while constituting a critical central level of development in the realm of integral ethical practice (between praxis and poiesis). It invokes a sweet spot in the overlap beyond codes, implicating certain behavior or enaction, while also going “inside”—individually and collectively.

- The classical Greek rendition of ethos underlines the critical audience aspect; the orientation widens and heightens—beyond clients or employers, to reference something greater… perhaps Kosmocentric in effect. The significance of such an audience might be grasped in Marcel Proust’s observation: “The only real voyage of discovery consists not in seeking new landscapes, but in having new eyes; in seeing the universe through the eyes of another, one hundred others—in seeing the hundred universes that each of them sees.”

- There is a distinct quality of intention associated with ethos: “We are all in It together; We all embody It together.”. Ethos entails collective intention, communally enacted. The intention is always “on”; it is intrinsic. It makes ethics seem more individualized, more occasional, more optional. It might also be suggested that more than intention is involved—rather, it is the intention in intervention—a form of action with vision—vision-logic at work.

- With ethos in play there is immediately enhanced generative potential. There is momentum at work, a dynamic—heading beyond personal praxis, en route to something grander: poiesis. There is something more to aim for—poetry in action, on a grand scale. New territory looms enticingly; the interface between integral and apithological—a future mission if ever there was one.

While the ethos-making discussed here has been in terms of a meshing of the personal, the professional, and the spiritual, the latter has been approached with an integral sensibility; the workshop design attempts to be at least integrally-informed. “Integral” should be credited with providing the “oomph,” the oxygen, to power the ethos-making—and especially for facilitating the engagement of “the spiritual” (however participants might have defined this). “Integral” has also provided an “operating system” of sorts for the workshop facilitator; its most advanced expression probably lies in the ethos-draft elements presented here, Agency in Communion, and in the earlier Quiet Resolve. Ideally, “integral” would more directly inform, if not drive, future professional education, so that such “in-sighting” might become second nature.

By way of an extended “for example,” my own professional “home-base” is planning, sometimes narrowly defined in physical or statutory terms, but also amenable to a much broader and more integrative exposition (Wight, 2012a). Planning professionals conceiving their planning more broadly, while undertaking such ethos-making as discussed here, will potentially begin to author new forms of planning, in effect “telling we-stories to the future” (Aberley, 2000). The new planning in prospect may only be glimpsed at the present time, and much of it may be more in the realms of personal wish-filled thinking. However, a few pointers may be offered to indicate how and where such “post-conventional” planning might manifest—pointers that may have generic application in professional circles.

Much of the underlying extraordinary inquiry associated with praxis-making and ethos-making (and future trans-professional “makings” in the realm of poiesis) seems to be captured well by the notion of “in-
“Interweaving” found in particular action inquiry contexts (Chandler & Torbert, 2003; Torbert et al., 2004). The “interweaving” relates to a combination of single-, double-, and triple-loop learning, spanning first-, second-, and third-person action research. This can be linked to another emerging social technology—presencing (Senge et al., 2004)—that planning (and other professions) will want to take on board sooner than later, especially planning in the public domain, acknowledging different ways of knowing and informing collective action. The ethos-making process engages elements of the associated U-Theory (Scharmer, 2007). Presencing also lays much of the necessary groundwork for another emerging social technology—meshworking (Hamilton, 2008; Merry, 2009), which supports the extraordinary collaboration necessitated by many current challenges.

“Interweaving” takes “knowing thyself” into potentially transformative territory, serving especially well those on a praxis-seeking path. “Presencing” (and co-presencing) can help us—collectivities in particular, ethos-makers in general—literally get to the heart and soul of our work together; at its best, it is a form of spirit-in-action. “Meshworking” is a stretch, a necessary stretch informed by the latest brain science; it is much more than networking, but includes interweaving in the pursuit of a highly practical “overstanding” of any given complex context. It is the projected venue/technology for realizing acts of poiesis, the compounding product of those with a praxis and an ethos, and a sense of much more besides. Could these be elements of an agenda for integral inter-professional education?

**Conclusion**

What might all this mean for those calling a particular profession “home,” wondering about their motivating ultimate concern, that is worthy of their attention, because it embraces their underlying and overlying intention? I can only offer a personal response, forged in the heat of all the ethos-making workshop work, which has served to power me, ground me, inspire me.

My planning has become very much centered on the notions of place-making and well-being, each viewed through an integral lens. *Place-making* (Schneekloth & Shibley, 1995; Wight 2005b) involves the integration of physicality and functionality (the exterior referents) along with community/conviviality and spirituality (the interior referents). *Well-being* includes but transcends happiness; it reaches into the realms of meaning, and mystery, and the mystical (Vernon, 2008). Both have a stake in whole-making (Wight, 2012a); both help stake out the ethos I ascribe to, hopefully with others such as the workshop participants, co-authors all. Place-making and well-being delineate a field of resonance, individually and collectively—and, not surprisingly, find manifestation in the fragments of ethos-drafting presented above.

The planning I am now calling home, and that I am calling on others to consider calling home, is planning as place-making, as well-being by design. This feels like the essence of a new ethos in the making, an ethos driven by a larger defining dream. Drawing on earlier work (Wight, 2009), and paraphrasing Martin Luther King:

I have a dream,
of a profession of servant-leaders,
as a community of well-beings,
striving for the well-being of all,
in well-loved places:
whole beings in whole places,
tending not just to inanimate matter,
but to all that matters—
in body, mind, soul, and spirit.
Appendix A

Outline of Experiential Workshop

The experiential workshops underlying the ethos-making may be outlined as follows, for adaptation by others. The ideal workshop setting would feature opportunities for interested individuals to reflect on their own experiences—on aspects of their personal praxis (sense-making)—with a view to then exploring their common ground and any emerging ethos (meaning-making), as the stage for some dreaming about what might become: for example, what might come out of the combined efforts of “integral Kosmopolitans”—folks with a praxis and an ethos, and an intention to pursue poetry on an epic scale (placemaking as poeisis-in-action).

This would include opportunities for: some personal inquiry (guided questioning); some sharing (initially in dyads, and then in quads) of common sensings—around the “architecture” of their professionalism (pillars, bridgings, over-archings); and some “circling” to surface meaning-filled “I” statements, followed by some hunches-fueled “We statements.”

The initial personal inquiry might feature an offering of some potentially layered questions, allowing individuals to focus on where they can most comfortably “place” themselves, to prospect key planks of their praxis (their sensed integration of their own personal “doing, thinking and believing”). The question-prompts—for some silent reflection and simple journaling, according to “taste”—might include:

- What is calling me? What is my calling? What am I being called to profess?
- What do I want to make of myself, personally and professionally?
- What does the world want of me… want to use me for?
- What is my unique gift or gifts… that I cannot not give?
- How do I plan to be of service in the world, to the world?

The joint inter-personal inquiries—in dyads and then in pairs of dyads—might explore common elements that seem to be emerging from the initial individual work, looking for foundational framings with a more integral “architecture” in mind. What intersubjective understanding is emerging—from the pillars, bridges and arches—that might form pieces of a more integral “over-standing”? Potential elements of this over-standing might be suggested in terms of possible “pairings that matter”—inner dimension + outer expression: self + service; soul + role; and spirit + purpose.

The closing circles would attempt to give voice to any emerging over-standing, initially in the form of “I statements”—accompanied by deep listening, and then in the form of spontaneous volunteered “We statements,” attempting to be representative of the circle as a whole, as well-beings and well-becomings. The We statements may then be collated into a draft collective ethos statement that all might consider calling their own—individually and collectively.

Full presentation details on workshop process and activities are available upon request: Ian.Wight@UManitoba.CA
NOTES

1 An earlier ethos-making initiative—*Quiet Resolve*—reflected the outcome of some communing of a mix of graduate planning students and local professional planning practitioners, in the context of a graduate course in professional practice (delivered as a de facto professional self-design studio). This particular foundational experience has been documented at length in other presentations (Wight, 2011b, 2011c). It represents the most fully articulated ethos-statement offering to date, reflecting a high-level of participant involvement in the authoring, and a well-developed relationship between the participants—students and practitioners—and the facilitator, all of whom closely identified with the common ground of planning professionalism.

2 A smaller, less formal July 2011 ethos-making inquiry, in Fremantle, Western Australia, focused on “meta-professionalism.” The outcome—*Yearning/Yarning: Embracing Yesterday’s Tomorrows*—is still a work-in-progress. It is anticipated that it will become the subject of a future presentation.

3 This “mantra” emerged as form of personal “ethos” during a 2010 academic leave experience, when reflecting on the significance of some in-depth consideration of well-being, in association with a long-standing interest in place-making. The praxis-ethos-poiesis “triad” also emerged on the same occasion, reported in greater detail in Wight (2012b).

4 The first encounter with “integral” was in 1998 (Wilber’s *A Brief History of Everything*). Initial explorations were in the context of place, place-making, and planning (and Integral Ecology) (Wight, 2005). The integrally informed journaling that came to anchor the Professional Practice course first emerged around 2007 (Friesen & Wight, 2008). This centered initially on individual-oriented praxis, and praxis-making, but came to incorporate what was initially formulated as “shared praxis”—referencing the class as a whole. This was the embryo for the more recent ethos, and ethos-making, explorations. The associated experiential workshop context was strongly influenced by the experiential education focus of a course of studies in 2008/2009 at the Centre for Human Ecology, then based at Strathclyde University, Glasgow, Scotland. The interest in well-being emerged at this time, and was cemented by a 2010 leave based in the Centre for Confidence and Well-being—also in Glasgow, Scotland. The 2011 ethos-making explorations rest on these foundations.

5 The workshop participants should be credited with originating, through their voicing, much of the raw material that has been crafted/drafted into the current version of the ethos-statement, *Agency in Communion*. Eleven pages of follow-up documentation were shared with the participants, including notes on: the pillars, bridges and arches emanating from the initial small-group sentence-completion circles; reflections on the five Parker Palmer proposals relating to “educating the new professional”; the ethos-pieces (ethos-drafting): i) Beginning with ME (the “I-statements,” and ii); From Me to We (the “We statements”); and the closing circle one-word expressions of sensed “being inter-professional” building blocks. Simple content analyses of each were presented in the form of “wordles” (word clouds).

The workshop participants comprised a mix of members of the built environment professions practicing in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada: A. Al-Neamy, R. Friesen, R. Gibson, J. Granger, M. Gregoire, D. Haines, G. Koropatnick, M. Larson, D. Marsh, N. Maruca, L. McCormick, M. McPhail, R. Mitchell, M. Samuda, S. Schipper, and R. Suzuki. The draft ethos-statement was compiled and integrated by the Workshop Facilitator (Ian Wight), Associate Professor, City Planning, University of Manitoba, based on observations generated by the workshop participants, including closing “We statements” transcribed by Christina Maes, a graduate student from City Planning, University of Manitoba.

Several participants offered follow-up commentary that has been reflected in this presentation. These included comments such as the following extracts: “I thoroughly enjoyed the experience”; “Thank you for the offering and the workshop. I certainly hope you do more of these and I would very much like to be included… your offering resonates—and if highlighting is required highlight all of it”; “It was a great workshop… it feels timely to be addressing these issues now—personally and collectively…” and “It was really a ‘deep’ experience for me… much more than I was expecting.” Such comments may or may not be representative of the group as a whole—as one person alluded, there was probably considerable “not knowing” what to make of it all. Cautions are probably in order, to avoid unwarr-
ranted projection, or too much guessing—especially of the optimistic variety. One participant did offer some in-depth, seemingly well-processed reflections that convey a good deal about what they made of the workshop experience:

This workshop was very timely for me, in particular...a very strong outcome is that though I may work and live in various institutions...I can maintain unity in my person and that I have the power to persist in wholeness and integrity.

There is power in openness and I sensed that those present were surprisingly willing, sometimes cautiously, to change our posture towards one another to trust each other with our passions and uncertainties. We seemed to recognize that we cannot profess with integrity if we guard and protect our “expertise” and that we really are not whole without the collaboration and inter-professing of the others. We also seemed to recognize that our gifts and calling are not necessarily defined by the particular roles and institutions we work in.

I was very surprised by the depth of the workshop and the personal nature of the reflections. I wouldn’t change any of it now that I’ve been through it... a safe and trusting environment to mine ourselves as we did. I was very surprised that this particular group responded as we did. I was more surprised at how, in the short 25 to 30 minutes of personal reflection, I was able to articulate a source of angst and tension in my own soul.

This seemed to be a first for many people in that group who are generally used to workshops being taught and less so requiring the introspection, the listening to our selves, in order to discover the means to inter-profess... I felt that this was a beginning and hope that we can continue this conversation towards transforming our institutions to serve us rather than confine us. Please don’t change the delivery. Perhaps more time would help.
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Koan Study for Integral Scholar-Sages
Michele Chase

ABSTRACT Cryptic, poetic, paradoxical, hard-to-pin-down sacred texts make conceptual engagement (using Eye of Mind) difficult; you see the paradoxes in reading about “spirituality”—“translations” of ineffable realizations into language forms that cannot hold them. However, “form as emptiness and emptiness as form” suggests that enlightening is in performing, not in texts—neither in form nor in “meaning,” but what you are doing (“right now”). Could the Eye of Contemplation read scholarly writing—or any form—as “doing without a doer”? This article partly explains and partly performs reading of integral material in which language-ing is realizing (like meditating, “drinking tea from an empty cup”).

KEY WORDS literature; linguistics; hermeneutics; koan; scholarship

Authentic transformation is not a matter of belief but of the death of the believer; not a matter of translating the world but of transforming the world; not a matter of finding solace but of finding infinity on the other side of death. The self is not made content; the self is made toast...Transformative spirituality, authentic spirituality, is therefore revolutionary. It does not legitimate the world, it breaks the world; it does not console the world, it shatters it. And it does not render the self content, it renders it undone.

— Ken Wilber (2000b, p. 27)

As Suzuki Roshi tells his students, the second half of the paradoxical “form as emptiness and emptiness as form” suggests that whatever we’re doing at present—for instance, reading—is enlightenment itself. So, why can’t we read the work of integral scholars (including this) so as to practice “doing without a doer,” “drinking tea from an empty cup”—practicing language-ing as realizing? Rather than puzzling out what this could mean and how to approach it, we might try reading as a dynamic inquiry into what we’re already doing in our habits of language and communication, an inquiry Susanne Cook-Greuter (2000) indicates is part of developing a “unitive” form of consciousness, a gateway to permanent transpersonal realization (p. 14).

In our writing and our reading we can become aware of koan-like (and ever so creative!) junctures that come alive in using language, which creates secondhand experience, and “seeing through” it, or language-ing as direct experiencing. Familiar paradoxes related to “nonduality,” in what we think of as “awareness without object,” arise to be grappled with, not in concept but as questions of doing (at the moment, reading). Koan study usually proceeds by students receiving already formed and explicit paradoxes, with “to realize” meaning to “solve” them, an act of reconciliation, finding a mysterious space that unites incommensurable assumptions. Here I’m not suggesting (re)solving given koans but seeing (through paradoxes), realizing in the
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very process of (per)forming them, in our doings (for instance, in reading). This is enlightening—though not exactly self-shattering: more like no longer being able to find a solid platform or orienting space from which/within which to take perspectives.

What follows is unconventionally marked up discourse on language and spirituality—philosophically naive—not staking any claim but questioning in the doing what might happen in juxtaposing scholarship and sage-ing in one “practice.” Together with (the usual) processing of what’s said please, allow the quotation marks (for “so-called”), capitalization (to mark reification), parentheses (suggesting “underlying assumptions,” interjecting author comment, and sometimes delivering a jolt), quirky word choices and allusions (what?), double meanings (both/and), and trickily suggesting rather than stating to keep you awake. You’ll discover that subject/object dualities may not actually be inherent in the form and nature of language but arise in how we read language as container-form, as representing meaning, and in not being awake to what’s behind particular usages. This inquiry for integral scholar-sages gradually transforms written language from input that guides us in our quest to “make” “sense” (within interpretive frameworks) to occasions for catching OurSelves in the act of koan-ing: for instance, seeking to “undo Self” and yet madly expressing it in that very goal, a paradoxical act of self-assertion very similar to our uses of language for communicating, especially as part of scholarly inquiry.

**Koans in Performing Translation, Transformation, and Transmission**

There’s an almost exact parallel between conventional understanding of communication—“entities” transmitting messages via the medium of language—and how we (scholars) sometimes think, write, and read about spirituality and spiritual practice. Paradoxes and conundrums in a quest for “authentic spirituality” might therefore be approached obliquely (and with less conceptual baggage) through considering transmission—for instance, what’s been called the conduit metaphor (Reddy, 1979) with its implications related to Self (as entity) that so shape our teaching and our practice as integral scholar-sages. Wilber (2000a) distinguishes between spirituality that promotes translation, reinforcing a sense of discrete Self, separate from World, and transformation that causes a layer/level of the self-sense to shatter (pp. 25-28). In the same way, it might be claimed that some forms of writing promote translation and others promote translation.

Investigating and experimenting with how we understand, write, and read about spirituality and other integral topics makes apparent how conventional scholarly habits of expression and information processing could be said to reinforce (rather than to undo) “Self.” They actually reinforce a modern—rather than a postmodern—mindset, with “perspective” enacted as “positions” that (implicitly bounded) entity-selves take on the world, made textually available for confirmation or refutation by other scholars. Built into conventional written academic form is an assumption that Self and World are separate, with EveryThing (including concepts) amenable to inspection and analysis. Even our integral (and postmodern) attempts to account for multiple perspectives by describing OurSelves in terms of quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types, acknowledging that who we are determines how and what we see (our interpretation), doesn’t change the fact that we’re still enacting a subject/object duality in our analyses, terms and definitions, classifications, reasoning, and arguments. And also in our citation practices: knowledge is owned, collected—and always dated.

Scholarly writing is thought to be direct transmission from writer to reader. An act of translation, it’s intended to inform, and by aiming to make sense of the world, by being separate from and about, by pointing out and pronouncing upon, it promotes conceptualization. The reader’s task is to extract the meaning-message, performing a translation that results in secondhand rather than direct experience. And in fact our experience of life is often derived from “reading” the world (and not just texts) this way. However, “radical spiritual transformation” might require a different “reading” that we might think of as divining (paradox)—seeing through “reading in.”
Although it’s actually what we’re doing that makes something “translation,” we often assume that the form (as conduit) constrains how we can act (read), and that’s why we sometimes yearn for a “new kind of statement” (Gebser, 1985, p. 308) and for new and improved spiritual practices. If we’re interested in promoting “radical spiritual transformation” we may not use scholarly writing because we assume it’s not a pedagogically effective medium, though it may promote development of cognitive capacities and an integral perspective (conceived a certain way). Our scholarly writing and reading practices reinforce the habit of translating, and translating EveryThing (choosing what fits within a circle of attention, focusing by separating out, resolving any dissonances) is an engine of ongoing self-generation. Didactic writers intend to be clear and cogent—to reduce (painful) pressures of doubt, fear of the unknown, and messy chaos (theirs and their readers’), to satisfy the thirst to know—and readers try to get what writers are saying, joining in creation of a coherent idea-world (a larger circle) to interact within. We usually assume that the meaning-messages realized by and in such genres can only be dualistic, and not only that, we’d never reduce satori to something we could put into words (to name and talk about it) or hope to extract such a “thing” from words either.

This isn’t to denigrate the scholarly enterprise! A developmental orientation suggests a continuing place for philosophical explication on spiritual matters. In *One Taste*, Wilber (2000b) explains that before offering authentic spiritual transformation teachers must provide helpful translations (p. 26). For example, in a Core Integral call with advanced students, a student asks Wilber this question: “Could you describe how you use Vision-Logic, Illumined Mind, Intuitive Mind, Overmind, and Supermind in your day to day life—what does the experience of each look and feel like? And what did the move to each higher cognitive structure involve—how did you make the moves?” Wilber answered that he “uses” the “minds” and experiences the modes of knowing characteristic of each, which he “translates into” writing that can be understood by those at Vision-Logic, home base for most members of his audience.

Wilber met his student’s question as a request to transmit information and explanation about his knowledge-making process. By giving it in those terms, in that form and forum—by smoothing away dissonances inherent in telling about what cannot be told, by describing his experience of “the Higher Minds” as states he’s not in now, rather than as stages on a developmental ladder that mostly goes up—he helps solidify his students’ ability to take an “Integral Perspective,” which is fantastic in itself and, he says, necessary for “going further.” Integral Theory is thought to be a congruent (non-paradoxical) cognitive tool from the perspective of viewers “at” a range of stages, as mapped on the Wilber-Combs Lattice, gross (self) line (see Wilber, 2006, pp. 88-92).

Though we get that hearing talks and reading texts about spirituality probably isn’t transformative, we still enjoy spending time in the rarefied atmosphere created by talking about it. Thinking over claims and arguments by scholar-sages present and past, knowing the history of ideas, and understanding theories and principles gives us confidence, inspires us, and even explains why we need to have a practice such as meditation, which we believe our reading and studying can’t substitute for because of the difference between (a self) realizing That (which is secondhand experience, translation) and (direct experience:) so-called “selfless” realizing (Wilber’s One Taste, or “Doing without a Doer”). We know that studying the teachings, the finger pointing out the moon, in itself can’t transform—and especially not studying written teachings, which are “just words,” lifeless for being about an ineffable that can’t be named, explained, or languaged at all without distorting and limiting.

Wilber’s answer to his student implies that direct (ineffable and “formless”) experiencing probably has to be “translated” into form in order to share it: composed into word-messages tailored to meet the consciousness capacities of listeners and readers. We can think of this as a writer’s creation myth, and we tend to think of this translating-composing as a “stepping down” process—what is more “formed” has to be smaller/lessor because no (bounded) form can fully realize (“hold”) the limitlessness inherent in formlessness. We believe that language (being a container-form) is inadequate as a vessel or as a channel for
directly transmitting authentic spirituality—just as we sometimes consider material form to be smaller, lessor, stepped-down spirit. We nevertheless resign ourselves to the necessity of using language—perhaps the same (consoling) conceptual move as seeing “the world” and our bodies not necessarily as “spirit” but as “Spirit” (a distinction Wilber [2000c, p. 8] uses to distinguish “transcendent” and “immanent” versions of the concept) when what we may need is SPIRIT (a third way of formatting a word that Esbjörn-Hargens [2009, p. 25] introduces in talking about “nature”—with all caps suggesting all possible dimensions).

However, at some point we may find unbearable that seeming chasm between realizing a “NonDual” One Taste (as direct experiencing, “suchness”—Being without “self-consciousness”—Doing without a Doer) during meditation and realizing in (and through) the rest of our (stepped down, smaller circle) lives, for instance, in writing, reading, and scholarly inquiry, which seem to be only possible from self-orientation. It seems we’re trapped in duality in order to operate our lives and organisms effectively. And yet sometimes we question the reahness of the gap—and wonder what’s the point of producing and consuming all those words about SPIRIT; what’s the point of living our lives as secondhand experiencing, like reading about orgasm rather than experiencing it? Also, how can we judge the realization of those who would teach and philosophize, given the impossibility of fully expressing SPIRIT in language or through any form? With pain we face the koan-like dilemma of being stuck enacting dualism everywhere in our lives—surely this only reinforces what we’re longing to escape!

So many of us are hungering for authentic spirituality—for the kickstart of a more radical transformation, for something more than conceptual engagement with Integral Theory, for more than translating the world. We yearn for realization at the desk and realization on the meditation cushion to be Not Two, for stable waking and everyday “selfless” (i.e., NonGross) states of direct experiencing (though we can’t quite imagine it, other than experiencing as some kind of “Witness” self). Might this (permanent higher states access) be possible at “higher stages,” and if so, can we get there through integral scholarship and practice? Developmental theorists (e.g., Kegan, 1982) suggest that at some point in any structure-stage the coherence of a worldview starts to become more difficult to maintain, leading to breakdown and to eventual emergence of a person at a higher stage. Integral Theory is brilliantly congruent, and becoming ever more so as more and more of us add our work and as Wilber adds (further translations?) to the canon. What dissonance might or even could arise out of this integrative quest, stir the waters, break us down, and lead us onward—and how? As Roy (2006) wonders, how can we get from AQAL to A-perspectival? With Gebser she suggests that we’ll need to experiment with a “new kind of statement” (p. 28).

However, maybe what’s really needed is a new way of stating (or state-ing), a Tao that can’t be written or read as secondhand experience. We’ve sort of agreed that scholar-sages who translate the bright, vague, paradoxical, swirling, buzzing, blooming confusion of everything (i.e., NonGross state experiencing) into cognitive structures that make sense (by defining everything as Every Thing) can only facilitate translation (i.e., making sense, or secondhand experience) in readers and listeners. That we integral scholar-sages continue to translate, to explain “SPIRIT” in conceptual terms (creating “teachings”) could even be said to work against NonDual realization, just as this painting of Hotei, the laughing Buddha, demonstrates: his big round figure, front and center, is an engaging moon it’s difficult for viewers to get beyond, as are our detailed maps (and charismatic teachers) that offer consolation for students, a home-like resting place very difficult to abandon for wandering in the wilderness. But we’ve also agreed that never mind, because translation is necessary and useful—and yet, wouldn’t it be wonderful if the term scholar-sage weren’t an oxymoron?

Transformative teaching, writing, and reading may require subverting the hunger to make sense, to be consistent and congruent, to grasp and hold onto ideas as though they’re pearls of wisdom, maps, or building blocks to be held in and transmitted via form containers, because transmitting and receiving concepts—explaining about SPIRIT—strengthens rather than undoes Self (as secondhand experience), in both transmitter and receiver. This may be a reason that sacred texts such as the Tao Te Ching tell us that
those who know don’t speak and those who speak don’t know (verse 56). We’re not being cautioned about speaking, but about explaining—defining, classifying, relating, assigning qualities—even ineffability or formlessness—which almost always results in paradoxes and impossibilities (requiring further explanation and ever more complex idea structures to make sense). Theoretically, verbally, philosophically, or rationally describing “enlightenment” would be Wilber’s “words without injunctions” (2001, p. 82). We’re being cautioned about the perils of trying to translate direct experiencing into form (by remembering, reflecting—matching experience with form by reading meaning into it) that is then read as secondhand experience by others who extract the meaning. “Mind” isn’t something we have but something we do: “translating” direct experiencing—changing “experiencing” into “experience” by talking about it, using reflective self-consciousness—is “Mind-ing.” And so is reading that assembles meaning based on textual clues, “reading in.”

There might be stages in how we attempt to integrate scholarship and spiritual practice, for instance, we might move from writing and reading EveryThing as “either/or” to finding places of “both/and.” A sophisticated version might involve reasoning through paradoxes. And yet Wilber (2001) has cautioned us not to confuse mandalic or paradoxical reasoning—Mind explaining SPIRIT (“mind-ing”)—with SPIRIT, spirit-ing (my term), though he also says that some paradoxes can so shock and challenge as to open seekers up to contemplative insight because the mind just shuts up (pp. 156-162). Maybe there’s a difference between paradoxes resulting from (SomeOne) explaining or arguing, matching idea to form, trying to be clear—but encountering the limits of reasoning—and those that result from not explaining, not matching idea to form, not trying to be clear, but just writing, as direct experiencing, not translating—inevitably creating paradoxes and almost accidentally triggering direct experiencing in readers? As though the first is transmitting as “giving” (consolation) while the second is either not transmitting in the conventional sense or “transmitting” as “taking away” ability to read as secondhand experience (Mind-ing)?

Could we reform integral writing on spirituality so as to undo (“take away”) Self, perhaps by developing a form that would be “scholarly” (?) and yet could not be written and read as (entity-)Self-consciousness? Is it possible to provide self-shattering challenge in the context of scholarly inquiry, using language? With a New Academic Integral Form (NAIF), might (not necessarily “fully realized”) scholar-sages be able to access and express “Higher Minds”—not translating—transcending and but including Vision-Logic and “lower” stages on the cognitive line—transform themselves and promote transformation—possibly even “making individual and collective expressions of the transpersonal relevant to the mainstream,” as Esbjörn-Hargens (2012) hopes academic work on integral spirituality and religious studies might do (p. v)?

Koan: What is the Form of Selfless Transmission?

While believing that (something let’s call) “Satori” can’t be transmitted via conventional academic writing, many of us do believe that some rare teachers can “transmit” SomeThing (a very subtle energy?) that touches off an awakening we also call “enlightenment”—through a look or a touch, through visual art or music, and even through words—but probably through utterances cryptic, poetic, or shocking-crazy that subvert and bypass concept-forming. For instance, koans and haiku, which force direct experiencing in readers—a self-shattering inability to process as SomeOne understanding That.

Brokering a functional marriage of poetry and scholarly writing seems pretty daunting, so I used to just hope we could evolve some not too radical “academic” textual forms that would provoke (“spiritual”) realization, that would launch us into space beyond the conceptual by undoing self, that would facilitate transformation to higher stages. A “transcend and include” move, so we’d get to keep “the Mind” that thinks like a scholar, but also give voice to “Higher Minds.” Even if enlightened teachers who can “transmit” in some marvelous manner are extremely rare, I hoped that if the right forms were developed the guru and the pandit could speak a common language—a guru’s teachings could be both undistorted and clear, and a
meditating pandit could avoid smoothing away paradoxes (“translating”) when writing or talking with other scholars and students about OneTaste. With more apt forms, even if we weren’t lucky enough to encounter a fully realized teacher, perhaps we integral seeker-writers and seeker-readers could transcend self, leaping that wide and mysterious chasm between Self and NoSelf—transforming.

I kept experimenting: Could any form of academic writing promote a leap of faith from a Gross, dualistic orientation and life experience—into some state of NotSelf (as all non-Gross states could be said to be)? Could any Form “hold” insights from Higher Minds, allow expression of the Eye of Contemplation (a term Wilber [2001, pp. 2-6] borrows from St. Bonaventure)? I wondered if we could integrate scholarly inquiry with spiritual practice through textual forms that are “academic,” but also “indirectly transmit,” hoping that thereby transformation is sparked. If we tinkered with the form, maybe transformations in writers and readers would happen naturally, similar to the way our experience is said to be transformed when we enter different state-realms, wearing different body-forms (e.g., a “Subtle Body”)?

What might that New Academic Integral Form (NAIF) look like? I tried to work out a scholarly form true to principles long-ago Chinese Chan (Zen) Buddhist scholar-sages thought of as “communication from mind to mind” in a “special transmission” very different from the ordinary in that no information is actually conveyed. It’s not about anything; that is to say, its meaning is not in its subject (e.g., two monks and a temple bell) but in the forced direct experiencing. Reading about is secondary to (or replaced by) reading as. In that sense, it could be called “indirect transmission” and should be able to bring about transformation, I hoped.


- Through strangeness (in comparison with conventional language)
- Through negation and contradiction
- Through paradox and irony (extravagant and irregular words)
- Through tautology and repetition;
- Through storytelling and confrontational speech;
- Through writing “otherwise” (indirectly, in the margins, obliquely);
- Through using “goblet words” (living language, rich with connotation—words that mean many things at the same time and thus, are slippery)

I experimented with ways we might get some of these features into academic inquiry by tweaking the conventional form, for instance, through different ways of citing other work, perhaps using hyperlinks and allusions so as to keep the expansive, “livingness” of inquiry, and encouraging readers to “project”—to knowingly read in what authors may not have intended; through structuring texts to subvert chaining of statement claims, processed only rationally, based on distinction-making; through changes in how we define, name, and title, somehow embedding the messiness, contradiction, and emergent nature of words in use by collectives. I considered how we might make room for multiple possibilities (including struggle, messiness, and clash) and the ever-evolving, ever-emerging Right Now. I’ve thought of my experiments as a continuation of my efforts to play with how we might “enact Integral” (Chase, 2010; In press) so that the talk and the walk would be congruent.

I could imagine that reformulating academic writing so as to transmit indirectly might obviate the problem of language’s inability to contain and express the ineffable, as well as promote transformation because with the NAIF it would be up to readers to struggle for direct experiencing, reading as Suchness, or Doing without a Doer, being in the present movement. This suggests a state of reading similar to “flow” (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990) sometimes experienced in practicing sports, art, or qigong, a more Asian-like oneness of Body and Mind wherein meditation and activity are the same (Yasuo, 1987, p. 24). The genre might evolve from a medium in which ideas are reviewed, explored, discussed, argued, explained, critiqued (in a process
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of community knowledge-building)—where what texts are about and making/extracting points is the focus, and Self and World are separate—to occasions for (Selfless) realizing (by writers and readers). What we’d write within the integral community, not as a collection of selves but as voicing some localized collective, ongoing, evolutionary emergence, might still be “about Integral” or “about” our academic disciplines, just as the characters in parables written by teachers in monasteries are often dressed in saffron robes, and desert teachers might speak of fig trees and mustard seeds. However, our inquiry would no longer begin or culminate in Subject discoursing about subject to Subject because we’d no longer be making such distinctions. We’d be writing as integral-ing, but not “representing,” “enacting,” or “embodying” (or even “practicing”) “it”—instead, realizing integral in the act—doing rather than talking about it. Roy (2010) puts it like this:

The view you are coming from is none of the above—everything that can be seen, thought, felt, imagined, or conceived, in singles or multiples, wholes or parts, interiors or exteriors, subject, objects, the real and the surreal—are other than this view. This view is that which is like the subtle push of wind at your back; what is there below, behind, beneath everything else. It is aperspectival, because it itself is contentless, and therefore context transcendent. (p. 15)

The “subjects” (whatever is at hand) would become occasions, not “content,” with our texts being taken as the injunctions that words surely are, but now as invitations to koan “study,” in the crux of Being/NonBeing rather than as input for making sense, for gaining Knowledge. We’d come to see (even as we’re doing it) that talking/writing about SomeThing (such as SPIRIT) invites reading as secondhand experience; a clue is in the word “about,” which implies a Self-consciousness separate from that about which it’s talking. At the same time, we could imagine reading and writing as One Taste-ing, about whatever—language-ing as direct experience-ing rather than having direct experience and using language to talk about it to others. If there were an integral and academic form of writing that could promote transformation, it might allow us to bridge the gap between philosophical statement-making and sacred writing. We’d no longer see the latter as transmissions (translations) from a mystical Mind (like the Holy Spirit descending in tongues of flame, bestowing commandments, channeled sacred teachings, healings, or attunements), or as signposts for ascending (developmental) stairways to heaven.

And yet. Notice the thrust of this search for a form of academic writing that could promote transformation in readers. In considering textual form (as in teaching) we usually pay more attention to the writing (“transmission”) end—how forms best match writers’ intentions and/or developmental levels—than to the reading end. Writers find forms through which to realize their intentions, and the right forms allow readers to experience what writers intended, albeit interpreted through their developmental levels. Even the possibility of “transformation” (defined as “undoing Self) is somehow built into texts by (the selves of) writers (or not). This implies that we readers are at the mercy of writers and teachers, dependent upon their realizations and the forms through which they convey them. We’re still focusing on the guru-self and the power of his pointing finger when we should be mooning.

Whether or not we encounter realized teachers or “new forms of statement,” better is learning to read AnyForm as always already ever-present One Tasting, not by trying to receive some message (from Another Mind or Another State), reading meaning into form, enacting duality, but by struggling (in action) within the question of acting as direct experiencing. Being and NonBeing at the same time (which must always read as paradox-ing). We don’t need different Forms but different ways of reading, and struggling within a clash between reading as extracting meaning from form and reading as direct experiencing is radically transformative in exactly the same way that working on koans is. As in study of established koans there are mistaken assumptions to face, ordeals one must pass on the way to mastery. We can’t escape the conundrum
of “translation” as long as we believe realization can be expressed via (matching, representing, enacting in) form. To proceed we must see through lingering conceptual separations between Consciousness and Form that keep us looking for the best forms through which to express OurSelves.

More Koans in Transmission: Medium, Form, Message, and Content

Can you imagine NonDuality, not as a developmental attainment (of Self), but as “NotDualing,” a radical “way” (Tao) of performing (let’s say writing and reading), always available to anyone at any stage (as states are said to be)—not “transformative” of self, in that there’s no seeker involved, NoBody changing or attaining—no message transmitted through any form? Not a transformation of person but of practice from “practice of” to “practicing as”—“direct experiencing,” Suchness (i.e., “NonGross states”)? Perhaps we can approach by looking away, by grappling with some beliefs about use of language (or Any Form) (by Consciousness) as a vehicle or Medium for transmission (whether direct or indirect) of meaning, content, information—Message. It’s part of a package of assumptions that are also behind paradoxical claims of having and using “Higher Minds” or the “Eye of Contemplation” as media through which to know or experience.

“Having” and “using” always indicate a self doing something, but we hope that Self becomes “empty” as we get “higher,” right? While the refrain, “I have a body but I’m not my body; I have a mind, but I’m not my mind” may be useful for dis-identifying with Body and Mind, thinking this way is a liability for “undoing self” because Self is built in as the haver and user (and of course, as the transformer). Recognizing this conundrum, we might posit temporary NonGross state access or higher stages of development in which NonGross selves use minds/eyes (Subtle or Casual bodies) that are perhaps less “dense,” less ego-driven, more tinged with spirit, interacting within different state-realms that maybe have different contents or rules. We’d assume the (tourist) Self could “come back” “into” the Gross Realm and report, using conventional forms, forgetting that we also believe that self, perspective/knowledge, and world of acting within are inextricable. Remaining YourSelf but “going back and forth” between states isn’t actually possible (in the way we often imagine) because consciousness and form arise together and make no sense except in terms of one another. It’s tricky to define “consciousness” states, if we must, by “what is seen in them” (see O’Fallon [2010] in a section called “Iterating Tier Patterns: Finer Distinctions in States.”)

I find it more fruitful to think of states as different ways of reading (for instance, “Mind-ing” and “Spirit-ing”) and not different Realms because the “realm” metaphor can be (mis)understood as Consciousness traveling into and perceiving Form—Subject/Object duality. “In” “NonGross states,” there couldn’t be some stable self (Consciousness) who sees (reads) Forms and uses Forms to “express” “itself,” though reading and writing might happen. Written texts (or Any Forms seen) are nothing more than footprints; the (reading) eye of the beholder sees the movement of trees (or the pointing of the finger) but never the wind. The idea that a Consciousness (“in” or “at” any state or stage) could use a Form (to represent something unformed, such as an idea) is a GrossSelf reading of things (Mind-ing). This plays out in the conduit metaphor (transmission) and in our thinking about language. Besides implying selves (e.g., writers and readers) doing something (sending/receiving), transmission implies a Message (a product of Consciousness) passed between, via some kind of Medium (Form) such as language.

Marshall McLuhan famously said that “the medium is the message,” and this has been (mis)interpreted to mean that the Medium, as channel (and sometimes as form or structure), and the Message, as content, are one. Thinking of how two things could be One implies seeing them as Not One. We make the same distinction with many pairs, including Consciousness and Form. It’s useful to pay attention to our habits of allocating—for instance, This a “medium” kind of thing, and That a “message” kind of thing—and what follows from this distinction. We usually understand “medium” to mean “carrier,” “conduit,” or “vehicle” for transmitting signals from one place to another, and “message” to mean the “contents” or “passenger”—the signal. This medium and message distinction often informs our thinking about translation from one language to another:
it’s assumed that a particular quality of meaning remains in good translations, even though the carrier medium changes.

We think via this conduit metaphor (with its cousin, the metaphor of containment—i.e. EveryThing an entity-Being) in all sorts of ways that have little to do with communication but everything to do with Consciousness (as “message”) and Form (as “medium”):

- Our notions about embodiment (consciousness carried by and inhabiting bodily form)
- Channeling (one personality/soul expressed through another who is the “medium”)
- Subtle energy, healing, and qigong (qi flowing through meridians, being “sent,” “channeled,” etc., ideas about entrainment and vibration—as with communication, so much is based on “signal” analogies)
- Many ideas about healing, including systems that match parts of the body with emotions stored there, emotional charges that can be released by bodywork techniques, etc. (emotion/consciousness carried by parts of the body)
- Telepathy (one person’s thoughts carried through the medium of ether and picked up by another)
- Ideas about intention and affirmations (wishes sent out into a universal medium that carries and manifests them)
- Ritual (beliefs given expression in acts or movements)
- Our sense of “nature” as a medium in which we live, that supports and contains us
- Metaphors of development (distinction between “inside” essence and “outside” structure, implying something contained and that the container has a conceptual shape/form)
- Development in levels (the message of this stage becomes the medium of the next)
- States of consciousness (as medium), (pre-given) realms that we (as message) enter into and interact from within, lenses (almost like a mechanism) that we see by
- Enacting integral and any brand of “walking the talk” (philosophy given expression in form and actions)

We apply these transmission and container metaphors also in distinguishing between teachings (medium) and truth they point to (message), as well as in thinking about practice, application (of teaching/theory/principles), and using various kinds of methods or techniques as media of inquiry. In most cases, the truth, the realness, the heart or essence, is thought to be in the message (Consciousness), while what we think of as medium (Form) is instrumental, and supports, contains, represents, or expresses that essence.

To “translate” is literally to “carry across,” and (reflective) self-consciousness is the bridge and container used for translation-transmission. Even though we do believe in “bodmindspirit,” and that Consciousness (UL) and Form (UR), and “internal” (consciousness “essence”) and “external” (consciousness structure or state) are inextricable, and thus, develop together, in other contexts (and in the way we talk about them) we imply that they can be distinguished. So, changing the Medium (form or structure) doesn’t necessarily change the Message (self)—just as a soul might inhabit a different body this time around—only transmutation of Message (heart, soul, identity, essence) could be considered “transformation.” The inside part, the consciousness, the self—the content—drives the process. Integral scholar-sages, we therefore believe we’ve got two different practices: the “transformative” one we do on our meditation cushion (that changes the “message,” our self “contents,” and with them our self-structures) and the “translative” one we do at our desk and “in the world” (that refines the “medium”: the form/structure of how we think and express
ourselves so as to be consistent with who we are, with our integral perspective).

Operating from this body of assumptions we might not see the form (e.g., of writing) as the driver of experience but our consciousness-content (“who we are”), which uses Form for expression or reads (meaning) into (and out of) Form. We’d probably assume that formalized genres of writing, such as academic writing, are neutral, fairly good conduits for expression by those at a range of levels of consciousness. We’d also assume that since language, as Form, is (merely) a medium of “self-expression,” then it must be limited as a vehicle for transformation involving breakdown of Self. And examining language for evidence of development to stages in which “permanent state change” has occurred (or so-called “third tier” as Wilber talks about in a guru and pandit dialogue in EnlightenNext)—to state-stages of NotSelf or to any NonGross state—would be tricky (paradoxical). It’s only GrossSelf who can “use” language (who can “translate”), whether for expression or as a diagnostic tool.

Reading As Seeing Through Koans

Gebser predicted that integral consciousness would have the capacity to make new kinds of statements, by engaging new types of thinking that would go beyond perspectival thinking into the realm of the A-perspectival. According to Gebser, the hallmarks of this new consciousness would include, in addition to transparency and integrity, dynamics of the whole, space and time freedom, and spirituality. So the question is, “How do We Get from AQAL to A-perspectival” (Roy, 2010)—from the ability to contextualize perspectives across the boundaries that delimitate them, to a realm of unbounded wholeness?

If NonGross (by definition!) doesn’t use language or any form—can’t “express” or assert (entity as distinction-making) Self—what is the guru-teacher doing and how shall we read what he says and writes? Why would someone who’s “become the moon” of direct experiencing nevertheless point out the moon as though trying to tell us something? We know he can’t be saying “(Hey You), look at That,” and can’t be using “pedagogical technique” to explain how to get from Here to There, which would assume all kinds of dualities. So, we shouldn’t read “teachings” into the gesture or explain it. Likewise, we’ll have to read “indirect transmission,” descriptions of “thoughts without a thinker,” “emptiness,” “suchness,” and other words about the experience or actions of “NotSelf”—and even the very idea of “NonDuality”—not as definable, arguable conceptual forms but as unresolvable koans. “Unresolvable,” meaning paradoxes, dualities, and incommensurable assumptions are not “figured out” or “taken in” through integrating them into tidy schemas, within one big (entity-container) circle of Wholeness, so that they can live in harmony with one another. Sides are not taken either—neither emptiness (NonBeing) or form (Being). Sure, the guru is pointing, but not “pointing out” any big round moon of realized Wholeness, though he might be laughing at the tendency to see wholeness as a (containing) circle of Oneness. And he’s not even suggesting that “Self should be undone.” He’s doing what he’s doing—koan-ing (divining)—“unification of dualities” not as “integrating” but as “seeing through” paradox (in all the ways this can be read), and perhaps appearing cryptic or chaotic—the way dreams appear to the so-called waking consciousness.

We might transform not OurSelves but our reading—learning to read (everything) as seeing through paradox. Thinking of authentic transformation as requiring Self-obliteration (how?!) increases our difficulty and suffering, not because we don’t want to “give up” Self but because we can’t. We (who?) can’t possibly “transcend” Self (let alone “include” it) without paradox. But maybe we can perform the koan of Self without self-expression (i.e., not reading as SomeOne who unknowingly acts from an oriented and circumscribed center in arcs and arrows of “self-transmission,” “reading in” our interpretations of the World). Instead of trying to give up distinctions and dualities, maybe we can “see through” them the way the guru is doing in pointing out the moon (and laughing).

Will we have to give up all those lovely sensations and images of being “centered,” of going “deeper,” of being connected, of circles of inclusion? Abandon a strong sense of “spirit,” enveloping our lives (because
sensing Self as a circle of being, enveloped in a larger circle of being is no longer comforting; it just feels wrong)? Is it true that “we” can’t “be aware of” “SPIRIT” in any way at all, can’t believe in “it”? Can we no longer engage in (self) transformational practices and enjoy participation in communities involving them—because we can’t resolve the koans embedded in the notion of self-transformation, can no longer stand dualistic explanations? And from what solid places can we possibly engage in “scholarship”? What would be the point?

Entering into the nondual floor is another huge leap. . . .The transition into this floor begins to take place when one develops the capacity to construct distinctions and patterns that can span gross, subtle, and causal floors, in addition to common effortless eruptions coming out of the formless ether in the illumined mind. After holding this space for time, one suddenly feels a shock—a stab, an internal tsunami, a tumble, a dive, a rolling downhill, an agonizing tearing and ripping of the fabric of mind. It is another Maya once again, a crashing clarity caused by seeing the causal ego and by the discovery of the illusion of the distinction-making, perspective-taking causal mind itself—the mind that all along has constructed this gross, subtle, and causal self. This causal Maya that hypnotizes us once again tumbles us in its playful hurricane, the washing machine scrubbing the mind, which is drenched in gross, subtle, and causal distinctions into a Dark Night of the Causal Self. There are glimpses of the operation of this mind that has led for so long, completely unaware that it is not leading at all. Rather, it has been incessantly discriminating amongst its own constructs, regardless of how ethereal they are, and is not able to see itself constructing gross, subtle, and causal floors. . . .What is this “that” that is watching this mind-self? This is a wondering that seizes one’s gaze as one fitfully surrenders mind to the nondual Divine that begins to transcend the kingdom of the mind that makes distinctions. (O’Fallon, 2010, pp. 23-23)

Surrendering to the koan in NonDuality is to actually intensify the ability to read unsolvable paradoxes in our questions and assumptions about transformation as “dropping self,” in our use of language as self-expression. Inquiry for integral scholar-sages might be reading and writing as a koan-like (often uncomfortably dissonant) Self/NotSelf, “realizing” (in doing not in form) the paradoxes inherent in trying to be oriented, “centered” (as entities, seeing that, taking an integral perspective, expressing ourselves), trying to experience solidity and some sense of self-boundaries as an integrated locus of action. We try to make sense, but can’t (without violence) because reflective, secondhand experiencing always results in contradictions, dissonance, dualities. We’re not centered entity-selves with multiple aspects that we can examine or express individually or in a harmonious chord, without unwitting paradox. Nor can get to NonDuality using paradox as a technique.

So we don’t try to escape by arguing or explaining, giving explanations of minds and eyes and immaterial bodies. Self-expression is “undone” in identifying our acts of koan creating—not by seeing them (“out there” and “afterwards”) but by making and finding them in the doing—in realizing that many spirit and consciousness-related elements in Integral Theory invite the “ah ha” of realizing dissonance rather than sense. In so doing, we may find that standing within the tension of paradox and ambiguity “is the most alive place to be: freer and more juicy than any certainty” (Cook-Greuter, 2010, p. 312). We don’t particularly try to avoid creating or enacting koans of self-expression in writing and reading; we see through them. The integral scholar-sage just wonders (but not “about”), in writing, reading, and living. As Roy (2010) has suggested, Integral Theory is “tricky,” a liberation theory, and yet we can so easily forget that the maps are not meant to represent just another, larger and more inclusive, perspective but are injunctions for escaping the prison
of perspective (p. 2)—i.e., “pointing out instructions,” but not to be read “straight” or “taken literally” by looking at what is pointed to so much as seeing through (the gesture of) pointing. Have you considered the fundamental paradox of Integral Theory: trying to integrate by mapping every separate part? Seeing such paradoxes we wonder, inquiring the way we’d work on a koan: okay, without paradox I can’t integrate everything by accounting for all the parts, can’t perform any gesture that separates me out of everything, that makes me an entity analyzing and explaining, having a secondhand experience. Hmmm. How is reading this paper as “direct experience-ing” the same as the sound of one hand clapping?

We inquire through writing or reading (or any act), performing self-expression, seeing through the paradoxes and letting the dissonance spark creativity; we play around with possibilities—if not self-expression, what else is there to do? How can “transcending and including” be performed: what are we assuming? We ask rather than answer. We explore through doing; NoOne is thinking about it. In languaging (more like “art-ing” than “philosophizing”) we can keep the inquiry concrete and visible: we can highlight self-expression (as I’ve been doing here), which is almost always entity-based, perspectival (oriented, located in space, literally and/or metaphorically), and “directional” (of time). “Inquiry” as koan-like “direct experiencing” rather than as “inquiring about” allows us to treat self-expression not an “object of inquiry” that an entity-Self can witness; instead, it’s performing as “seeing through”—perhaps Gebser’s “transparency.”

“Seeing through” as an image seems richer, less abstractly conceptual (and less spatial) than the notion of “transcend and include,” and more applicable to how we think of states. We can “see through” metaphorically, as in penetrating foggy conceptual illusion or deception, and also literally, as in seeing through a clear pane of window glass that’s there and yet isn’t itself seen and isn’t the mechanism of (SomeOne) seeing (as an eye is). Juxtaposing these two connotations, and others that can be read in, such as to “see through” an undertaking until completion, implies a “transparency” not as whatever the definitions have in common—figured out by unifying, integrating, or reducing to some common essence—and not as adding up multiple variations of meaning. Instead, there’s an “integral-ing,” a multiplying of connotations, in which the sum is greater and more unexpected than the sum of the parts considered one by one—and only “grasped” in writing or reading the term, fully and emply. Everything becomes oxymoron, though as with puns and double entendres, it’s no fun if you have to explain, and often you can’t.

Any act could be an occasion for One Tasting, for seeing through paradox-ing—but practicing in writing and reading academic texts can be especially profound. We don’t need to find new forms to use (though they may find us) but to work out through the doing of it how we’re thinking though writing or reading as self-expression, allowing alternatives to emerge in the dissonance of acting as entity-Self and as No Such Thing-ing. The practice for integral scholar-sages is staying within the whirlwind of the challenging and apt koan of “form in emptiness and emptiness in form,” which may lead to severe loss of orientation. “Self is undone” by not being satisfied with reading to make a resting place of sense, to make coherent, to grasp, hold on, contain—the corollary of written self-expression (by bounded “stable” entities). If you can stand the discomfort of this inquiry, you’ll discover that “reading” doesn’t need to be followed by “about,” any more than “realization” needs to be followed by “that” or “practice” followed by “of.” The two sides of the Spirit/spirit dualism (and many other ideas) turn out to be conceptual hoaxes partly arising from assumptions inherent in conduit and container metaphors through which we think. Playing with language (by which metaphorical thinking becomes obvious) uncovers the terrible gravity of these metaphors—the “unbearable lightness of being”—which makes possible self-expression and also perspective, certain concepts about time, and ideas about how things relate. A new, enriched reading becomes possible, something other than the act of a self interacting through the medium of language or extracting information from what we see (in broader terms). A dualistic sense of separation is healed—not by bringing things together but by realizing that they need not and can not be harmonized—in fact, a concern with Such Things is unnecessary. We read as divining, seeing through the paradoxes in seeing through Self.
As the opening quote from Wilber implies, we may be seeing experiments in teaching and scholarly writing, not as colluding with students and readers (individual and collective) in a game of Self trying to undo Self, but as laughing at the paradoxes in transformation. In owning and playing with our koan-ing we merge two aspects of the verb “to realize”: to know completely and to bring to life. The crux where scholarship and sage-ing meet is “realizing”—the (Being as) Doing and the Knowing (as direct experiencing).

*inauzumi satoranu hito no tattosa yo* [Matsuo Basho]

How admirable!
to see lightning and not think
life is fleeting.
[trans: Robert Hass]

how admirable—
a man seeing lightning
and not satori
[trans: Jane Hirschfield]
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THE CONCEPTION OF INTEGRAL SPORTS
An Application of Integral Theory and Practice to Athletics
Sean Wilkinson, John Thompson, and Alex Tsakiris

ABSTRACT Sport is a vital part of culture and an enduring symbol of human excellence. Therefore, it is believed sports are a great avenue to explore and promote integral awareness. This article aims to show an application of Integral Theory to a real-time project over six years. Integral enactment theory will be used to explore all dimensions of the “who,” the “how,” and the “what.” Using ego development theory, the team concept is explored as representing the “who.” Integral injunctions are then explored for the “how,” and followed by an analysis of sport, the “what,” as a multiple object. It is hoped that the vision of Integral Sports envisioned in this article can be an example of embodying and enacting integral applications in the world.
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Six years ago it was the vision of our team to apply Integral Theory and practice in sports. Prior to this there had been a considerable time period of bringing a pluralistic and post-structural philosophical understanding into the practice of sports. This had been a significant leap in complexity and skillful means from a mainstream rational (orange altitude) worldview dominant in the sports world. Equally, the difficult reality of the limitations of this pluralistic (green altitude) worldview was experienced firsthand. The jump to second tier was a hard, lonely, physically confounding and emotionally surprising journey. It was also an inspiration, a deep calling, a pure wonder of experiences and something that was never looked back from. On this integral path there was much learning about the desire for recognition of what was being attempted, for guidance and support through the many dark nights and how to express the depths of what was being felt and experienced. After being unable to find a ready-made place in the integral community to train or work using our huge passion for integral practice, it was painfully realized there was a necessity to stand on our own feet and go it alone from the grassroots in the sports community in the United Kingdom.

The goal was more than to bring integral awareness into the arena of sport; it was also about understanding the embodiment of these deeper principles. In addition, having come from a critical philosophical background, it was about really testing the applicability and power of this most ambitious metatheory. What was to be found was an incredible internal process, interpersonal sharing, and a sense that the outside universe was a good mirror to our level of development and personal edges. It has been turbulent, rich, and an exponential learning that has created a successful tennis academy, a pioneering project in parent coaching, becoming teachers in an exciting interpersonal spiritual practice and finally a team connection that has ultimately been the most important home of practice. The next stage is to continue and stretch our embodiment as integral practitioners and attempt to enact the work onto a bigger scale, a challenge that seemingly resonates through the integral community.
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Therefore, this article aims to demonstrate how Integral Theory and practice is the next stage in sports evolution through our personal journey of enacting Integral Sports. Using integral enactment theory, it will be demonstrated how a team enacted a deeper, more comprehensive perspective of sports. This approach has been taken to draw a picture of a real-life example of the enactment of integral principles. How was the team influenced, what was the impact to those that were served by the work, and what does this say for the potential for sports in the future? It is hoped that our integral experience can be a stimulus to give and gain support from others and an opportunity to critically assess ourselves and integral awareness in the world.

Integral Enactment Theory

Considering that teams are foremost practitioners, the intention has been to recount our research using as full a range of Integral Theory as possible. For this article, the most compelling formulation was integral enactment theory (IET), or post-metaphysical Integral Pluralism. This is based on Sean Esbjörn-Hargens’ (2010) triadic framework of the Who, the How, and the What—the “who” being epistemological pluralism, the “how” being methodological pluralism, and the “what” being ontological pluralism. To enact is fundamental to an integral perspective and highlights the co-constitutive relationship of subject-object relations. An integral worldview acknowledges both the singular and relativistic possibilities of the perceived object but transcends and includes both in a higher integration conceptualized as a multiple object. Enactment acknowledges the connection between the perceiver and the perceived and how this is formed through injunctions of a method used to perceive. This goes further to recognize the fundamental role of method that links epistemology to ontology. It is this process that illustrates our attempt to enact an integral world, not a straightforward representation but a triadic structure that can be called Integral Pluralism (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2010).

Consequently, the “who” was the team, the “how” was Integral Theory and practice, and the “what” was sport. This highlights how the team is fundamental to this presentation, as it acknowledges the depth of complexity of the subjectivity/perceiver that enacted the reality. From here, a consideration of integral injunctions as they were applied is essential. Lastly, sport will be explored not as a simple phenomenon, but more as a complex and multiple “third-person (inter) objective phenomenon” (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2010, p. 144). In summary, this endeavor can be characterized as multiple perspectives that involve multiple techniques and injunctions to enact a multiple object that are entwined with and diverge from one another in multiple ways to generate the object under the signifier (sport). More simply, this makes our team, Integral Theory, and sport all “more than one and less than many” and all within a co-constituting relationship with each other at the same time (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2010, p. 148).

The Who: The Team

To begin this journey, the team’s characteristics, strengths, and limitations will be outlined using ego development theory to give theoretical perspective and understanding. Susanne Cook-Greuter (2002) developed the Leadership Development Framework (LDF) to map human experience in the Upper-Left quadrant. Many themes of the Strategist outlined in the LDF resonate strongly with the team. It is common with the Strategist to understand the reality of complex systems inwardly as individuals, of methods, and the world. A further quality from LDF analysis is the profound emphasis of relationship for growth and the value of others to see blind spots and act as mirrors to the point of experiencing non-possessive love. This links to a big desire “to become the best one can be” and support others in their growth. Further, at this stage, coaching, therapy, and support from others is not experienced as a way to deal with pathology per se but an opportunity for growth. The challenges at this stage can be a fear of not fulfilling one’s potential or living up to valued universal principles. With this there can be a difficulty with the normal work and life constraints that can feel stultifying (Cook-Greuter, 2002, p. 25).
This analysis of the Strategist resonates strongly within the team. In particular, owning inner experience and integrating this has been crucial and has led to committed work with specialists in interior development. Dedication to this kind of development has been a key strength of the team and many retreats were undertaken for this purpose. Sharing with each other has been one of the most satisfying parts of the project and a sense of non-possessive love has grown and opened in peak experiences together. Also evident was a need to be composed and to demonstrate maturity and this contributed to the team image of sometimes being aloof and distant, which has been a limitation in connection to important stakeholders. This points to an outstanding feature within the team; the significant challenge each member has endured in terms of not gaining recognition from others for their full complexity and the need for higher levels of connection. On the one hand, this has been rich in revealing and compelling the team to face shadow and the developmental needs required to truly meet people where they are in the work environment. On the other hand, this problem of recognition can align with a kind of development complacency or even arrogance. It can be dangerous to be armed with a map of people’s different worldviews and how they stack up with each other and oneself. This is a problem that has reduced by owning some of its hubris but is still an issue that requires attention. However, it may have been a bigger problem letting the team’s message be muted by the fear of being deemed arrogant in the face of overwhelming evidence of development.

The desire to be “the best” was strongly evident in the team and showed up in a deep commitment to bring integral principles to the “normal” world. It has also been questioned and has led to the revealing of much vulnerability. For example, feeling into the strong need for depth of connection with one team member shone light on a fear of not being of value without offering something “special” for others. This led to a regression, characterized by freezing and withdrawal, into a childlike experience of being alone and fearful of lacking inherent worth in the adult world around him. All the members of the team have experienced the pain of feeling unable to fulfill personal potential characteristics of this stage. This was especially pronounced in the early phase when the work received limited acknowledgment from the governing body despite excellent results. This was compounded because the team had a good level of establishment in the sports world prior to engagement with the Integral framework. The team possesses four Master’s degrees, a Ph.D. in Sports Science, an elite playing background, and experience with coaching athletes at the highest national level. Despite these qualifications, there was little interest in the project from the outside other than the level of performance of the players.

While the Strategist analysis resonates deeply with some of our strengths and limitations, the next stage of Magician is also enlightening. The Magician is a big leap in development, where the individual starts to deeply understand egocentricity and its constraints to further growth and development. This means expressing the underlying unity of the Kosmos starts to come online as a concern (Cook-Greuter, 2002, pp. 27-28). This stage seemed to appear in peak moments, in important junctures, and after retreats during the past three years. The experience of the subtlety of ego has been a prominent discovery during these times. Inversely, there has been much exulting in breakthroughs and owning separation fears during illuminating states and this is something that is starting to be seen as a stumbling block in development. It makes a lot of sense that this is a cover for a fear of impermanence and death and this territory has shown up in deep practice, dreams, and moments of difficulty. The team has a continued exploration and mistrust of overly theoretical communication and a lot of our practice is around a more direct moment-to-moment sharing of experience.

The practice of Circling has been paramount in bringing more Magician consciousness to the team and the ability to attune to others has been the richest sign of this, alongside a desire to be more in the present. This has brought an awareness of the problematic of the Strategist motivation of trying to change others and themselves. In Circling, the idea that everything is perfect as it is (transcending and including the desire to change things) is a key element of facilitating a group and holding the potential projections coming from a place of “being the best one can be.” It also involves moment-to-moment awareness in relationship with each
other following principles of authenticity, openness to vulnerability, presence, and acceptance of “what is.” This is an intense practice that has been an inspiration in bringing state experiences from subtle, causal, and to glimpses of nondual realization. Also, this practice helped shadow to be experienced as a direct gate to openings into unique self in the moment. This is the embodiment of the work pioneered by Marc Gafni (2012) and has led to a significant strengthening of the sense of “team” through recognizing personally and in each other, unique gifts and the developing of a trust built on this radical openness. The work to feel into and transcend and include vulnerability/authentic needs have given the team a profound knowledge of development, in particular, having a strong practice around building awareness around the link between physical illness, emotional unconsciousness, and spiritual emergence. One member suffered quite serious chronic fatigue for over three years and another had serious neck pain for a year and both have been meaningfully overcome through integral practices. Thus, Circling is like a self-development cross-training that has been a pillar in the development of the team and our work in sport.

The team is at the point of creating two novel organizations, and although Magician consciousness does not feel securely in place as a collective stage, this is where it appears the project is heading. Another key aspect is a sense of having to do much less and that everything that needs to be done will flow through us. This has come through a far greater sense of trust in our experience and the universe as a whole. In the latest phase for the team there has been less need for outside approval, coinciding with receiving a lot more recognition and a growing sense of being connected to each other, the integral community, the wider world, and our spiritual truth.

The What: Sport

Before detailing our work, it is important to establish what sport looks like as a multiple object. Through ontological pluralism the complexity of sport becomes clearer. It is a highly contested debate in sports science what the exact definition of sport is from an Upper-Right perspective (Bertman, 2007). A basic definition suggests it is a physical activity that involves competition. However, as one looks at this objective view it becomes evident why this is a contested notion. When does an activity become physical? When is something deemed competitive or non-competitive? Should it even rely on a notion of it being competitive (Bertman, 2007)? This is not a debate for this article, but enough to show the multiplicity at the root of understanding of sport as an object. This is all before beginning to imagine how the same phenomenon looks from different anthropological perspectives as a practice, through a molecular or quantum perspective, or spiritual state experience.

Sport is much more than the base activity and is enveloped in all four quadrants. This is where the Kosmic address of the perceiver has a fundamental effect. For example, sport can mean something different at each level of development, or even within the same level depending on where attention is placed. An example of this in the Lower Right; a global entertainment enterprise (orange altitude), a place to demonstrate biotechnological excellence (orange altitude), a tradition to teach values and etiquette (amber altitude), an activity to build equality and inclusion (green altitude), a way of establishing social prestige (red, orange altitudes), or a symbol of local, national, or even global identity (magenta to green altitudes). In the Lower-Right quadrant the system can be seen in a new light with vision-logic. Morin’s (2008) conception is a good example that encapsulates the complexity that can be experienced in the sports world. He states “a self-organising systems detaches itself from the environment and distinguishes itself but also links itself evermore to the environment by increasing its openness and the exchange that accompanies all progress of complexity” (p. 62). This makes sport a self-eco-organizing system, which is a useful conception that has parallels to the interconnectedness encapsulated in the IET.

In the Lower-Left quadrant, sport can be a way of expressing kinship (magenta altitude), dominance (red altitude), establishing of moral standards (amber altitude), demonstration of excellence (orange altitude),
and an openness to difference (green altitude). It is also an opportunity to meet the needs of all levels and potential healthy translation (teal altitude) and fertile soil for deep connection and growth of individuals, relationships, and culture in the presence of each moment (turquoise altitude). In the Upper Left a way to show allegiance to mythic gods (magenta altitude), express internal power (red altitude), develop faith (amber altitude), build self-esteem (orange altitude), and connect to a care that goes beyond competition (green altitude). Integral once again would look to acknowledge and embody each of these levels within oneself (teal altitude). Ginny Whitelaw (2012), in her article on Zen, leadership, and Olympians, is a good example of second/third tier understanding:

Samadhi is not a state we can will ourselves into; the “I” that would will it is, itself, dissolved. It is a place that the stillness of meditation naturally opens us to. And from that state, insight arises that we translate into thought: a vision of what wants to happen through us.

Our vision is that sport includes all of these ways of enacting and is more than the sum of the parts. It commonly invokes experiences of collective unitary consciousness and the highest in masculine and feminine embodiment. It is also a unique opportunity to experience presence and love in a symbolic hero’s quest.

**The How: Integral Injunctions**

This article does not include a detailed description of the precepts of Integral Theory, but rather points out the main injunctions that were used in the project. These include: A) An underpinning belief that humanity is in a process of evolution that proceeds in stages of unfolding of transcending and of including what came before. Therefore, in the team and work with others understanding and honoring each level was a big challenge and took a difficult and humbling learning curve. B) All levels have to be negotiated and connected by respecting and translation within their own language. C) Perspectives in the world all hold a truth, but are also partial in important ways and this can be understood through the spheres of reality represented by I, We, It, and Its. These fundamental spheres are encapsulated in the conceptual framework of the four quadrants. D) Different traditions and cultures have emphasized different aspects of the quadrants and therefore developed the practices required to build awareness in this realm. This leads to the importance of an integration of practices or Integral Life Practice and includes an understanding of multiple lines of intelligence and personality types. E) Finally and importantly, that spirituality and state experience is vital to human development and attaining higher stages. Moreover, shadow is a phenomenon of growth that cannot be bypassed and is vitally important in a serious Integral Life Practice (Wilber, 2000, 2006).

**Results**

The project started in a relatively new tennis club (four years old) that had been set up at great expense to “create a champion.” The club had failed so far to make any success from its coaching program, which was compounded by the county (local area) the club was situated in also being historically unsuccessful in tennis. This made it a challenge but also gave the team a freedom and full control of the training program. The goal was to develop players as individuals in preparation for life through tennis, not just for the obvious individual and social benefits, but as a way to create greater levels of excellence. Therefore, it was intended to produce exceptional results with players that would stand out in the litmus test for success in elite sports. It was also an aim to do this within a healthy business model that was often rare within elite level academies that could rely on high levels of funding from governing bodies.

The coaching of the players was the first priority of the project. Fundamental practices were introduced
within the tennis coaching to develop player’s emotional intelligence, to introduce awareness and relaxation
techniques (calling it meditation risked skepticism) and concepts of acceptance, intentionality, and conscious
responsibility. However, to meet the sports world where it was, and indeed to be humbled by its wisdom in
many cases, the training required strong boundaries with players. This was one of the most important areas
that pushed the team beyond pluralistic to more Strategist action as it was seen just how much leadership and
a strong coaching presence could impact the players, rather than just relying on empowering them. It became
apparent the work was preparing the players for a world where results have a serious importance and where
strong boundaries from adults are the norm. This required powerful life skills and had developmental impor-
tance to the children and the team, and was a move that the team felt some initial resistance to.

In the coaching of players the team used a rubric (see Appendix A) to great effect to help highlight dif-
ferent developmental levels of effort, skill, emotional awareness, and communication during training (Drum-
mond & Berland, 2010). Communication with the players was always a priority and the rubric facilitated the
processing of projections and vulnerabilities when they arose. The “Attitude of a Champion” was created as
a model for players in order to encourage higher-order life skills. Thus self-awareness, acceptance with de-
termination, taking responsibility and teamwork were fundamentally built into the training in an engaged and
conscious way with the athletes. Sport provided ample opportunities to bring these concepts to life with the
players each day. They also received scores that indicated the level they had reached based on these develop-
ment capabilities after every session and would be given tasks to develop these skills further off court (e.g.,
maintaining eye contact, giving feedback to others, planning extra training themselves, journaling on their
emotions).

It was imperative to meet the different values of the players within the center. This included storytelling
a magical world onto the tennis court to the youngest players (magenta altitude), challenging and skillfully
making space for egoistic expression when it was emerging in players (red altitude), holding strict but still
skillful boundaries (amber with green altitude) and making sure of having the latest in coaching scientific
knowledge and skill (orange altitude) as well as making the training session dynamic and high intensity. It
was also vital to be able to communicate with this awareness to all the stakeholders, to the accounts manager
of the club, to the executive, to parents, and to the governing body that select players for national teams and
give substantial funding to successful programs. In addition, there was also a sensing into the center as a liv-
ing organism, feeling what was wanting to emerge and finding where attention was required. The approach
was adopted of walking into and facing the tensions within the system as they arose.

Facing these different values while not losing the team’s authentic voice was a real trial and required
much inner work. For instance, for one coach holding boundaries and maintaining intensity under the pres-
sure from parents and governing bodies was hard, because on one level they were largely objectifying the
athletes. However, it also reflected some parts in his embodiment around expressing power, not having expe-
rienced this type of support as a child and the emotional effects of this. It also revolved around questioning
whether tennis coaching was meeting his gifts and highest truths while at the same time monitoring this as
a potential escape from the direct test of the work. For another team member, connecting to the imagination
of the magenta-altitude world caused contraction and linked to a past feeling of “not being creative” through
school and a fundamental question around the level of his own spirituality. For another team member, meet-
ing the values of others came quite easily but when it came to taking a stand for his own values there was a
strong anxiety. This was tackled through a long reintegration of his red-altitude values and masculinity in part
through engagement in martial arts and further involvement in competitive sport.

As the performance of players was the fundamental measure of the team’s success, significant invest-
ment of energy was needed in best supporting this—from adeptly encouraging players and parents from their
own deeper values to commit to higher intensity training schedules, to investing in cutting-edge fitness train-
ing, to a detailed talent-identification process to select players for training squads. The results of the process
were impressive. There were 7 players making the top national ranks in Britain, 12 making regional, and over 40 in the county within 3 years. This was a significant achievement for one program, especially within a club and county that had a very poor track record of producing high-achieving tennis players. Most of this success came from working with younger players, but there were substantial improvements to the program for older junior players who have increased in motivation, focus, rankings, and levels of engagement. The program was profitable, which allowed a researcher to be employed to create academic papers showcasing our work. From the interior perspective the “Attitude of a Champion” and rubric had a big impact on players in cognitive, emotional, and interpersonal development.

Of course, it was not all success. At one level the governing body is still distant, although much better than in the beginning. The team’s successes have been acknowledged, but the reasons behind the successes have not been credited or understood by the governing body. In fact, the governing body once presented the success of the club but from the stance of their systems that had been employed in the area. This has been the hardest challenge faced over the years as a team and at times has been incredibly discouraging and painful, even though it was understood that integral principles are going to appear invisible to many people. Part of the reason for this lack of recognition comes down to gaps in the team’s documentation and points to some of the team’s struggles in the Lower-Right quadrant. In terms of mapping consciousness and complexity there is a high degree of capability. However, organization, administration, and even basic tidiness (equipment, office, etc.) have caused problems. Integral Coaching Canada was crucial in showing a Left-Hand quadrant bias and owning that some of the recognition troubles have stemmed from this imbalance (Hunt, 2009). Linked to this was the anxiety that the team had in communicating what it was they were doing due to how they may be perceived, which again prevented a comprehensive expression of the work appearing in the Lower-Right quadrant.

The ambivalent relationship with the governing body also stems partly from the team’s lack of involvement and general enthusiasm toward the structures and practices of the governing body. When faced with the choice between attending a workshop on “tennis tactics” and attending a cutting-edge integral workshop the latter was more appealing. This made the team appear aloof at times to the governing body who always wanted commitment toward their workshops, which typically consisted of Right-Hand quadrant orange and green altitude–based content. Although the team did attend and follow the rules of the system, and did not want a rebellious tag, there was still an attitude of doing the minimum considering the emotional difficulties of engaging with this flatland approach. While the team acknowledged cognitively how important it was to embrace and honor the healthiest aspects of orange and green altitude–oriented coaching, it was a real struggle to embody this. Part of the reason behind this seems to stem from our fullest expression being about bringing integral principles into the world and supporting the development of others and not just revolving around tennis performance alone, which is more typically the single focus in other big national tennis centers. This taps into a view from Barrett Brown (2011), “Don’t do anything someone else can do,” which is about honoring what the team is good at and letting go to others things that are not directly in line with these gifts.

Fortunately, the most exciting integral aspect of our tennis project has now been so successful that the team has been able to reduce attention on the specific tennis coaching and the academy as a whole in order to start to develop Integral Sports to a wider audience. This came down to the creation of a project for coaching parents of athletes (www.parentsinsports.com). In recent years, the issue of parents of athletes in sport has been widely covered in sports science literature and has become a growing concern of governing bodies in how to support parents of athletes (Matos et al., 2012). It has become clear in research and from experience in the field that parents have a major impact on the excellence and overall healthy development of their children. However, at present parents are frequently marginalized within the culture and can become objectified as more a nuisance than a positive source for the athletes. There is plenty of will to support and educate parents and a sense that this is important, but in general across sport little more is done than the occasional leaflet or
presentation, which have tended to have little influence.

The vision of our parents’ project was to coach parents of athletes using the Integral Coaching Canada (ICC) methodology on how they could better support their children in sport (Hunt, 2009). Over the years the team has had considerable experience building deep rapport with parents and having a significant influence on them. ICC gave extra structure, inspiration, and legitimacy to approach parents with a formalized, individualized parental support opportunity. This meant parents had the potential to gain the wide-ranging benefits of Integral Coaching through their initial motivation to want to “better support their child.” This was a genuine motivation and gave an impetus for parents to engage in self-development and coaching when in nearly all cases this would be very unlikely otherwise. It is believed a project of this nature required integral awareness to see the problem and have the knowledge and experience of interior development to do what was needed to make a real impact. Although it is acknowledged this model can be replicated by a more behavioral or positive psychology approach, and with some positive effects, it would still be a flatland approach and less significant in encapsulating a full ranging developmental intervention.

The results of this project have been initially exciting. From the preliminary five parents who volunteered for the coaching, the center has now had 25 paying clients go through the program. Twenty completed the six sessions, the others postponed or stopped after one to three sessions. There have been no negative reports or criticisms from any of the clients to date. Of the twenty that completed the program, five continued past the six weeks to deepen the coaching. This included continued coaching and even psychotherapy, Circling, and couples therapy. Significantly, there have been some dramatic attitudinal improvements in the children of these parents, which led them to train and compete at a far higher level. This is an important “hook” for governing bodies and professional clubs whose primary focus is often excellence. In addition, the program has created wider improvements in the relationships within families and the development of the parents as individuals. A number of the parents report that the coaching has been the best thing they have ever done and has had far-reaching positive influences in their life.

Parents in Sports is now in the early stages of going to a national scale to offer sporting parents comprehensive resources, coaching, and workshops across sports. The resource section will attempt to cater for the health of the whole spiral by covering the absolute basics and then stepladder up to greater complexity and depth with the potential to move on to webinars, workshops, and one-on-one coaching. A major government sports company has now partnered with the team as they believe this program will be attractive for numerous sporting governing bodies. This was a breakthrough moment, as after all the years of working in isolation the project’s potential and dream was finally recognized by people highly established and influential in the world of sport. The team has also received backing from some key sports psychology academics who are supporting and engaging in further research of our projects. If the project is successful it will be a way of impacting the sports culture at large with integral developmental ideas and practice.

Another project being developed is integralsports.org, which has been set up as a showpiece for the development of integral awareness in sports. This future site will be a showcase of the parents’ project, how to run a sports club/academy with tennis as a model, coaching education, academic work, life skills through sport, and also Integral Coaching interventions with athletes. A further side project, but one that is indirectly fueling development in working with people, is the practice of Circling. For this the team has founded a company called Circling Europe (www.circlingeurope.com) that has successfully run workshops in Europe.

**Discussion**

The aim of this article has been to show the potential of integral consciousness in sports. Rather than a general application of the theory to an understanding of sport, this is a report from a sustained application of the theory and its practice in the field. Through the use of IET and Integral Pluralism, a review of the work has been recounted. This approach suggests that the relationship between theory, practice, and its impact in the
world is a complex enacting process between the Who, the How, and the What. Understanding the “who” meant looking at the team’s collective Kosmic address in their enactment of Integral Sports. This process has been insightful and impactful in demonstrating the pluralism at the heart of epistemology. With this ability to look behind the perceiver, a new dimension opens to understanding the project that is not possible when the perceiver is an objective viewer or a relativistic elusive subject. Cook-Greuter (2002) and Brown’s work (2011) have brought a deeper appreciation of adult development and its application in work. Both these sources gave a big impetus in connecting even more to the spiritual foundation that is the work.

The IET approach, along with the development of this article, has been a catalyst to further refine the call for the team to open into consciousness and its guidance in the work environment. It has brought a broader sense of the false separation that becomes present when dividing what can be called the spiritual from the work dimensions. The team has in the past painfully felt in two worlds and, incidentally, become subject to the considerable social and professional expectations in work, especially with the results on the court being continually under scrutiny. However, in more recent experience and vision, the team emerges as consciousness becoming aware of itself as the felt sense that binds everything moment by moment. From setting a boundary with a parent on acceptable communication, to intuition on a new story to motivate a young child, to holding a space of presence for a team member feeling lost in uncertainty—it is all coming through consciousness. This manifests in sport embracing all that is and the two evolving movements of Eros and Agape; from the creative drive to grow when driving a player to the next frontier, to the deep existential despair that pervades and engulfs when suffering a big loss or the work is uncertain, and the exponential love available as one awakens and surrenders as each moment. As these realizations have become more stable, so has the team’s motivation, confidence and efficiency in bringing integral principles into the world. At the same time noticing subtle ego whispering in the background, the need to be “developed” and as one who understands the deepest truths in the universe. This is a complex, socially embedded self-ego subject that can have a grand vision of itself as part of the world.

There are some limitations to our approach, the most prominent being the difficulty of self-assessment. It is not easy to sufficiently be able to take the view from the outside in getting as accurate a picture of the team as possible to make this study relevant. To date, no member has been officially tested or trained to take the LDF test, although for this paper the literature was read in-depth and has been rigorously discussed and applied in the writing process. This relates to another issue around whether this model can really capture the full complexity of the world of our being in the project. This includes the constraint of self-assessment, but also whether a map of ego development can be sufficient to convey what has happened epistemologically throughout the six years of implementation. Furthermore, the perceiver or voice in this case report is still once removed and subject to the multiple object of the paper. For example, a central drive is to promote the team within the integral community. This motivation can be a strong bias when writing about what has been achieved and the viewpoint of a self-assessment. Integral Theory has been a huge influence in the work and in the team’s lives and, therefore, this investment can lead to a mutual appreciation based more on common experience than sober critical analysis.

Work from Cook-Greuter, Torbert, and Joiner (Pfaffenberger et al., 2011) are all positive signs in showing that development does correlate with effectiveness, which supports this project, although at this time the sports world does not have many visible examples of this. The big sports iconic leaders, from Sepp Blater, Alex Ferguson, Jacques Rogge, Phil Jackson, Nick Bollettieri, Lionel Messi, and so on, are not talking about integral awareness and are having the kind of influence the integral community surely would like to have.

When connecting with the Integral model as a methodology, there is one simple question. What was the impact of following these injunctions? In brief, these were A) transcend and include, B) translation of each level, C) truth is partial and related to the quadrants, D) practices emerge from different perspective that can be integrated into an Integral Life Practice, and E) the importance of spirituality. The first injunction had a big
impact on the team as individuals and in understanding and relating with others. It gave a viewpoint of sport and the community the team was embedded in that made sense of the conflicting values and the attributes of each. It was more than understanding as it opened the team to the awe of each perspective. This also demonstrated where the team was contracted and not able to take perspective and gave the impetus to practice and integrate with each level. This became easier through the six years and became increasingly nuanced.

Interacting with the integral community itself is its own challenge. At integral events there were experiences of deep connection, being seen and inspiration for the team to continue the work. There was also confusion around what can really be achieved by the community and the potential threat of spiritual bypassing the hard work and truths to produce something in the world (Masters, 2010). Sometimes there was disillusionment with the grand statement of “being at the leading edge of evolution” when it seemed many in the community, including ourselves, were a long way from making a powerful impact in the world. At the same time, there was the fact that we were being continually inspired by senior figures in the community and at the workshops we attended.

The second injunction states that each level requires its own translation and understanding. This was a great practice in connection and humility. Within the team it showed that the path was not a simple cognitive exercise and this was learned the hard way. Shadow work stands out and how hard it was in the outset to regress and open into interior parts that were mistranslating. Working with a wide variety of people also checked the desire to make everyone move toward integral. It became clear that this was a dishonoring of the evolutionary truth of this injunction. To date, many people in the club do not know anything about integral philosophy. For those that showed interest and aptitude it was shared, but otherwise this injunction as it was understood led largely to working under the radar.

The injunction of truth being partial was powerful in navigating the greater perspectives of the work, sport, and the world. It gave a narrative to what was happening in sport and how that has come to be. This enabled a deeper motivation to drive the project forward. Conventional values of excellence and employment were not sustainable for the individuals in the team and this perspective helped forge a vision and greater reasons to bring integral presence into sport. For example, how all the great methods of knowledge link to historical epochs and have evolved to capture one or two quadrants and how it makes sense in this time that a higher integration is being called for. This went hand in hand with the Integral Life Practice developed over the six years. At the beginning the team had a good understanding of coaching, therapy, spirituality, and philosophy. Through this journey it feels like this knowing has been surpassed exponentially and practice more precise and opening. Without the map of development this would not have been possible.

Lastly, the most important injunction was that of the integration of spirituality. This had the largest influence on the team and the project. Making sense of the profound mystery of existence in each moment and letting go to what is beyond our grasp has been a wonder. It has also been painful and confusing to tackle this depth of being and becoming. This is where the integral community has been the most inspiring and where the team is most grateful. Therefore, in summary, the evidence suggests that using Integral Theory as a method to enhance sporting excellence has many positives and it has brought a more accurate way of seeing and how to respond effectively. It also generated awareness and intuitions of a higher ethical attentiveness to “what is.”

From the work of the project there are many clear signs of the benefits of an IET approach to sports. Seeing sport as a multiple object ontologically has given much scope to understand and make powerful interventions. From the results of the project the litmus test of conventional authorities of the sport was creating good tennis performers. In this realm, the results were exceptional. However, the other litmus test is organization, attending trainings, and administering players’ experience. On this front the project did not do as well, partly because of a lack of attention and motivation and partly because there was ambivalence toward conventional approaches of supporting player development in sports. Taking responsibility on the part of the team would suggest an area for growth and development is evolving the right kind of structure to support the
integral vision into the world. Using vision-logic and moment-to-moment awareness is not a capability that is easy to explain to others and can create distrust even when the results are good. However, on the other side the results of the project demonstrate how effective integral awareness is for producing better results than conventional methods with more streamlined and direct connection with players. Integral awareness also enabled a deeper influence on the community and those within the culture. It is unique for a training program to have the depth of intention to work with players’ emotions/shadow, cognitive perspective-taking, and moral, empowerment, and interpersonal skills. Although other approaches are doing good work in these areas it is most often without a serious interior Upper-Left practice (Matos et al., 2012). This awareness can only be developed through the injunctions of doing the work on one’s self. This is always the first question for those claiming to do psychological work in sports: the amount of psychological and spiritual practice they have personally undertaken.

Within this project the area in which integral awareness shows its most power is in the parent project. It was not the aim at the beginning of the project to innovate in working with parents. However, this emerged as the most important area needing attention and skillful means and the seeds are now sown for a large-scale intervention in sport. The psychoactive influence of IET it is again a positive outcome of this article and has had a powerful impact on the team in understanding the story of the project and what it has meant. It has been co-constitutive in a way that the article has also written us and added depth and nuance to our experience.

**Conclusion**

At the outset of this article it was our intention to share the experience of bringing integral awareness to life through sports. On the whole this purpose has reached a level of realization that it is believed makes the work a true integral project. It is hoped this can serve as an example of how an application can look and the many ups and downs along the way. It is also hoped that it will stimulate a response to aid and support the future of the project. During this journey the team has faced serious doubt from those around us, limited reassurance and guidance, and continual internal conflicts and uncertainty to endeavor toward this vision. Looking back, we do not regret one moment and believe in this way of being more than ever.

From the work detailed in this article, Integral Sport can start to be envisioned. Using IET makes it possible to understand the great depth and complexity happening in a local project like our own, as well as the global situation as a whole. In this view development is no longer a survival of the fittest, but an intricate understanding of the unfolding levels in consciousness, the ability to speak to and hear the differing world-views and the ground from which it all arises. Importantly, it is a way of seeing what needs translating to bring health to an individual, collective and/or system, and an inspiration to transform to new levels of complexity. The project shows that the integral mission is not about converting everyone to one great perspective, but leading in a way that embraces people where they are and taking full responsibility for our own experience, expression and growth along the way.

The signature of our work has been the parents’ project. Although still at a vulnerable stage in its emergence, it demonstrates a way of supporting social structures without explicitly positing the theoretical orientation that inspires it. In this way Integral Theory becomes a source of love that makes a real difference to parents and children, and is bringing developmental practice into people’s lives that would otherwise not have contact with it. It is our aim to bring this to the larger culture of sport to show there is a higher integration possible that can make sport a creative arena of the development for human growth.
Appendix A

Integral Tennis Training Moods

1. I’m doing my best easily and I enjoy it
   • I’m able to keep a high level of training intensity even if I lose points, make mistakes, or the coach isn’t watching
   • I inspire others to train at a higher level
   • I feel bad sometimes but I know this helps me learn more about myself

2. I’m trying my best nearly all the time
   • I have good focus on my goals even in points
   • It’s not always easy but I make sure my effort is always there
   • When I’m feeling down I can recognize it and start to work hard again

3. I want to do well but am finding it difficult
   • I can work well if the coach continually reminds me
   • I sometimes don’t like learning new technique and tactics
   • Often if I lose some points or make mistakes I stop trying

4. I’ve completely lost focus
   • If I make a few mistakes I’ll give up on my goals
   • When I lose I often make excuses and get at my team mates
   • I mess around a lot and forget why I’m at tennis

5. I think I’m rubbish and I don’t care
   • Losing, missing shots, or struggling with technique means I’m rubbish
   • I’ll never get better
   • I feel like giving up
The core team are the three authors. The team has had important support along the way, principally by Nuno Matos.

Some of the major changes included: increased empathy and a desire to help people, beginning vision-logic, interest and beginning in understanding a developing interior awareness, interest and skill in understanding others interiors and coaching them there, a drive to really empower the players we worked with, and a deconstruction of the main streams of coaching knowledge within sport and the power relations common between coach and athlete.

As a team tasting sophisticated, exuberant, and often arrogant post-structural deconstruction; at the same time there was a belief and reliance on empowerment of those being served leaving us unaware of important hierarchies and developmental naïveté to our own motivations and insecurities. At the same time this was a vibrant period where a close kinship was formed and ideas about the transformation of self and others and theory into practice was strongly developed. Overall, the seeds were planted for what was to come. Furthermore, vigorously challenging the rational world to “wise up” meant significantly underestimating the power of its grounded expertise. Finally, and most significantly, psychotherapy, embodiment, and spirituality had been mistakenly/subconsciously underestimated in a conceptual relativistic phantos.


From the World Spirituality annual retreat, Integral Theory Conference 2010, Circling (Decker Cunov), integral practice groups (Gary Hawke), Unique Self Retreat (Marc Gafni), Tantra, to Integral Coaching Canada in addition to one-on-one coaching and psychotherapy. This was supplemented by Vipassana meditation, subtle and casual body meditation, lucid dreaming, and our own personally developed daily meditation practice.

This is accompanied by an understanding of the limitations of rational thought and the attempt to make more and more detailed maps as a partial defense against knowing the impermanence of the embodied self. The more one is conscious and proud of one’s psychic powers and ego transcending quest the more clearly ones ego is enthroned. They connect to their work independently and courageously in full realization of their basic despair and aloneness and this when not integrated can lead to depression. They are very attuned to others and have great skill in understanding others complexity and thus able to adjust to the unique individual, creating a presence for the other to find their own meaning, empathetically listening, challenging ideas at the right moment, helping reframe, telling new stories, and gaining courage to experiment with the boundaries of their current way of meaning making. Importantly, Magicians reject the subtle need for self-affirmation of previous stage. With this can be intolerant of the often enthusiastic need of the Strategist to help others become the best that they can be. This desire to be different or transformed as a misperception of the ego seeing itself as the center in a solid world that can be understood, a perspective that can limit the capacity to be in the moment. Interestingly, the Magician tends to build their own novel organizations or work alone doing what they perceive to be their best contribution to humanity. They feel successful when an organization itself becomes transformative and self-organizing and they are thus dispensable (Cook-Greuter, 2010).

It must be mentioned that the team cannot so simply be rounded up to one specific stage. There are many variations in line development and commitment to practice. However, the analysis was structured as a collective due to limited word count for the individual journeys of the team to be specified.

A big inspiration with the work on psychologically induced pain syndrome (PIPS) that, although from green altitude, could be translated as a key practice. Feeling into our physical pains and allowing the emotional content of the symptoms to open up was a powerful healer; it also required the intention to acknowledge the physical pain was actually an unconscious emotional or spiritual emergence. This meant after medical consultation showing no serious problems, the courage to stop treating the ailments like illnesses and any rituals that had built up around these beliefs and face the symptoms head on. This is an awareness that is clearly not being seen in the medical world but also from our experience is also evident in the integral world.

Magenta (altitude) was required working with the younger children and a part of our collective psyche holding repressions and need for shadow work. Red was linked a lot to our expression and asserting our boundaries with key
stakeholders as well as honoring our emotions and desires. *Amber* was reintegrating structure and traditional values with the children after the boundary breaking of the green days. *Orange* was acknowledging and developing our own specific tennis and coaching abilities and making money from our work. *Green* was maintaining our connection to the individual’s unique journey and need for autonomy.

There was a long battle with trying to get published in a sports science journal documenting the project. This was partly due to the difficulty of articulating the complex nature of the work being done and partly due to the research going against the grain of mainstream publishing standards for sports science. Later, we published the full complexity of the project in the *Journal of Integral Theory and Practice* (Matos et al., 2012).

The typical issues worked with parents have ranged from developing boundaries, feeling more connection to the athlete and wanting to be a better leader to individual to topics like developing masculinity in relationships, finding meaning, being able to connect emotionally, dealing with deep sexual and emotional abuse and the desire to embark on a spiritual journey. Importantly, the athletes of the parents all showed improved attitudes to training, and behavioral and emotional development. There were also marked differences in relationships between athletes and parents that also affected extended family.
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ABSTRACT In order to avoid overshoot of critical planetary boundaries, collective and purposeful social transformation is needed on a scale unprecedented in human history. In Part 1, this article describes and critiques applications of Integral Theory to sustainability and social change, highlighting overstated claims about the role interior development plays in effecting social change. Integral Theory is also missing lenses necessary for understanding the pathways to social transformation, including multi-domain concepts, micro-meso-macro scales, process lenses to illuminate cross-quadrant dynamics, and depictions of the embeddedness of actors and the strategies they pursue. Wilber’s outline of an integral social theory of transformation is then presented as a resource to more effectively analyze social change processes. In Part 2, the sociological concepts of agency, structure, and institutions are introduced as important building blocks in any theory of social transformation. Next, three middle-range theories of transformative change are reviewed for their contributions in understanding multi-level and dynamic processes of change, along with the strategies actors can pursue to aid systems transformation. Future directions for research and practice are then identified.
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H umanity is currently in a state of “overshoot.” The cumulative level of our activities is depleting natural capital, degrading ecosystems, and causing unprecedented changes to key planetary cycles—a situation that is judged with high degrees of consensus as a threat to the future of societies around the globe (Galaz et al., 2012; Metz, 2007; Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005). In a world projected to have nine billion people by 2050, the ecological and social consequences of ecological degradation are increasingly borne by people in the global south and by the world’s poor. Such overshoot forecloses options for development, threatens basic human dignity and rights, and renders the pursuit of self-actualization more difficult now, and for future generations. The concept of sustainable development (and later sustainability) arose in response to the interwoven challenges of social inequity and environmental degradation, with the goal of meeting humanity’s current needs for social and economic development, while aiming for inter-generational equity, which requires that the earth’s basic functions be sustained over time (WCED, 1986). Achieving this goal is proving to be highly problematic and paradoxical. The notion of sustainable development creates a vicious cycle when linked to increased consumption, where consumption leads to investment and technological progress, driving growth, which drives consumption, which drives ecological degradation (Jackson, 2009). To avoid catastrophic overshoots of planetary boundaries, humans will need to make radical reductions of energy and material throughput, and transform systems of production and consumption from local to global scales (Galaz et al., 2012). To accomplish this will also involve profound reconceptualizations of the purposes of human
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organization. In short, collective and purposeful social-cultural-political-technological system transformation is needed on a scale unprecedented in human history.

Yet, this terrain is complex and highly contested, and the pathways for such widespread change are uncertain. What does seem obvious is that large-scale transformative social change will require new epistemologies and ways of generating and sharing knowledge. Transdisciplinary “post-normal” fields have emerged which link subjective/qualitative and objective/quantitative aspects of scientific inquiry (Funtowicz & Ravetz, 1993; Gibbons, 1994). Definitions of such transdisciplinarity coalesce around three major aspects (Hirsch-Hadorn et al., 2006; Klein et al., 2001): 1) orientation towards life-world problems; 2) multi or interdisciplinarity; and 3) participation of stakeholders or affected people in research. Many transdisciplinarians shy away from efforts to bridge divergent disciplinary ontologies, and instead use middle-range theories to conceptualize and analyze their research.

Metatheory development represents another response to the need for new knowledge generation, providing large-scale theories that integrate multiple paradigms and lenses, taking diverse theories as their data source (Colomy, 1991; Edwards, 2010; Gioa & Pitre, 1990). Integral Theory is one such metatheory, with many inter-related fields oriented towards solving societal and ecological problems, including sustainability, international development and ecology. Integral researchers, theorists, and practitioners are guided by the integral ontology and epistemology that situates multiple bodies of knowledge in an over-arching framework (Wilber, 1996). Through this integrative stance, integral theorists and practitioners are advancing solutions to the challenges posed by the interwoven ecological and social crises of the early 21st century.

This article is divided into two parts. In Part 1, I examine some of the ways integral theorists have approached the challenges of social change and sustainability, highlighting key contributions and theoretical gaps, and drawing out elements from Integral Theory which form a latent Integral Theory of social transformation. In Part 2, I draw from other fields in order to expand the repertoire of theoretical lenses and concepts available to integral theorists of sustainability and social change. I introduce the integrative sociological concepts of institutions, structure, and agency, which I believe are necessary to include within an Integral approach to social change. I then highlight three integrative, evolutionary theories of change—resilience theory, social innovation, and socio-technical transitions theory. These literatures contribute to understanding the processes, pathways and mechanisms of change in linked social-ecological systems, in socially innovative initiatives, and in established socio-technical regimes. They can be used to understand complex problem-domains, and to guide strategies for purposeful systems intervention and transformative change efforts. I conclude by offering suggestions for expanding the Integral research and theory development in the arena of large-scale social change.

My motivation in writing this article is to encourage the uptake of Integral Theory in the fields of sustainability and social change. The article emerges from my own academic experience, where I became aware of the absence of the applied research, conceptual distinctions and bridging discourse within Integral Theory which I perceive as necessary to engage with more mainstream (yet innovative) approaches to system-wide transformation. I also intend this article to act as a clarion call to integral practitioners to match their passions for self-development and metatheory with an equal commitment to enacting large-scale social change.

Part One: Integral Theory, Sustainability, and Social Change

Theoretical Contributions and Critiques of Integral Applications

Interior development (UL)...is the crucial ingredient in moving humankind toward different kinds of (and more eco-friendly) attitudes, practices, beliefs, institutions, politics, and economics.

– Sean Eshjörn-Hargens (as quoted in Brown, 2006b, p. 413)
Integral Theory, also known as the AQAL model, describes the fundamental dynamics of evolutionary systems as they “tetra-arise” in four quadrants. The quadrants represent basic, irreducible perspectives available for generating valid knowledge: subjective/psychological (Upper-Left, UL), intersubjective/cultural (Lower-Left, LL), objective/behavioral (Upper-Right, UR), and interobjective/systemic (Lower-Right, LR) (Wilber, 1996, 2000a; 2003a; 2003b, 2006). Central to the theory is integration of constructive-developmental psychology, which maps the evolution of human consciousness through stages of development (Wilber, 2000b). The theory has been further refined with the introduction of Integral Methodological Pluralism (IMP), which outlines eight co-emergent perspectives (zones) available to researchers and the categories of methods available for disclosing these different aspects of reality (Wilber, 2006). Integral Theory’s meta-framework for organizing and integrating disparate domains of knowledge has been applied in many fields including sustainability (e.g., Brown, 2006a; 2006b; 2010; Edwards, 2010) and ecology (Esbjörn-Hargens and Zimmerman, 2009; Esbjörn-Hargens, 2010). In this article, I draw on the works of Wilber and these sub-fields as illustrative of the Integral orientation towards sustainability and social change. However, the challenges and opportunities I highlight have implications for Integral Theory in general, and specifically for Integral sub-fields dealing with social or organizational change including leadership and management, politics, health care, and international development.

Despite the need for transdisciplinary approaches to tackle ecological and sustainable development challenges, Integral Theory and research has largely been overlooked within existing sustainability discourses. This may be due to Wilber’s books being published in non-academic venues, his embrace of spirituality, his polemics against the capture of academia by post-modern “flatland” ontologies, or his unwillingness to engage critics according to the accepted terms of academic debate. A more pragmatic reason may be that applications of the Integral model may not be relevant to problem-focused practitioners, because they do not directly address the dynamics or concepts central to many transdisciplinary sustainability discourses. Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Theory Application</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Critique of Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The need for AQAL/IMP to solve social-sustainability problems “...the more of reality we acknowledge and include, the more sustainable our solutions will become, precisely because a project will respond more effectively to the complexity of that reality.” (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009, p. 12).</td>
<td>Calls for AQAL/IMP and assertions that other approaches are partial; meta-categorizations of bodies of theory &amp; gap analysis; more knowledge and domains of inquiry yields better solutions (Brown, 2006a; 2006b; Esbjörn-Hargens and Zimmerman, 2009)</td>
<td>Little evidence showing impacts of IMP on social change outcomes (Saiter, 2009); AQAL missing key lenses (Edwards, 2010); IMP unwieldy and costly; AQAL/IMP categorizing limits integrative theory development; portrays lack of knowledge as main obstacle to achieving sustainability – backgrounds politics, path-dependency &amp; power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Leaders with later stage consciousness have more social impact; “...[I]t takes a relatively small number of such leaders who can work with the complexity of Integral Pluralism to have a large-scale effect worldwide.” (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009, p. 39).</td>
<td>Leadership orientation, assertions and research on unique contributions and capacities of late-stage Integral practitioners linked to solving social-sustainability problems (Brown, 2011; Esbjörn-Hargens, 2010; Rooke &amp; Torbert, 1998).</td>
<td>Privileges interior development as main driver of change; unsubstantiated claims regarding impact of late-stage individuals outside top-down management settings; advances heroic model of leadership; ignores cross-sector, collaborative and shared leadership contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Emphasis on individual and collective stage development: “We cannot reign in industry if we cannot reach mutual understanding and mutual agreement based on a world-centric moral perspective concerning the global commons. And we reach that world-centric moral perspective through a difficult and laborious process of interior growth and transcendence.” (Wilber, 1996, p. 311).</td>
<td>Interior growth via stage development is necessary for solving sustainability crisis; social change requires internal growth. Stage development holarchy used to characterize different perspectives and tailor communication strategies. (Brown, 2006b; 2008; Brown &amp; Beck, 2009; Brown &amp; Riedy, 2006).</td>
<td>Over-emphasis on developmental holarchy (Edwards, 2010); lack of robust research to support developmental frame beyond UL applications; subjective development rarely linked to dynamics in other quadrants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Applications of Integral Theory and critiques.
shows common theoretical applications of Integral Theory to sustainability and ecological topics, with their point of focus, and critiques of each application, which I argue limit theoretical resonance within other transdisciplinary communities, and may hobble efforts in the integral community to create positive social impact.

While the integral treatments of topics cited above make valuable theoretical contributions, I argue they are far from comprehensive in their depiction of the change processes necessary to enact more sustainable and just societies, and in many cases they lack rigorous evidence to support their claims. The first application aims to categorize various theories or sub-disciplines in a particular field within the four quadrants, and sometimes also by the altitude or developmental perspective from which the theory emerged. This tendency towards prescriptive AQAL categorization (Edwards, 2010) may actually background many important lenses or concepts contributed by the theories being categorized. Just because a theory, method or discipline is named on an Integral map does not mean Integral Theory subsumes or includes the wisdom therein. Integral theorists wishing to engage in cross-disciplinary dialogue about societal change processes should be aware of the risk of sticking the Integral flag into territory as if its current inhabitants are somehow “lesser.” Such neo-colonial epistemological impulses will be met with legitimate resistance in the rich, contested, and evolving disciplines dealing with the complexity of societal change.

More practically, categorization efforts offer little guidance about which concepts are most useful, how they interact, and how to apply multiple theoretical perspectives in order to observe, better understand, or catalyze change processes in a given problem-domain. It is exactly this kind of guidance many transdisciplinary approaches are oriented toward. AQAL categorizations can also implicitly suggest lack of knowledge is a primary obstacle to social change or sustainability, overlooking the role of power, vested interests, sunk costs, political expediency, corruption, lack of effective governance, profit-motive, institutional path-dependency, habit, and other significant inhibitors of change. The reformulation of AQAL into IMP or Integral Research encourages more practical and contextualized application of Integral Theory, but it may seem cumbersome to researchers, and still does not provide integrative cross-quadrant concepts depicting the dynamics of tetra-enacted change. Even if widely adopted, it is also unlikely that integral research methods, in and of themselves, would be sufficient to bring about significant political and social change, despite Wilber’s confidence in the transformative power of IMP (2003a; 2006a).

The second and third examples of Integral Theory application in Table 1 portray interior development as the key driver of social transformation—a claim neither supported by AQAL theory (e.g. Wilber, 2003a) nor substantiated by research (Saiter, 2009). Claims that only small numbers of late-stage leaders are required to make worldwide impact on issues such as climate change (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2010, p. 39) should be (and are) greeted with extreme mistrust, in the absence of either supporting research, or clear propositions about how this might occur. If interior stage development was more consistently presented in the context of tetra-arising constraints and enabling conditions, instead of as “the crucial ingredient” for transformation (Brown, 2006b), more scholars of the dynamics of change might take note of Integral Theory’s important contributions. In the absence of such context, asserting the importance of subjective stage-based development valorizes the individual’s role in societal change. This echoes heroic models that have been de-emphasized by both constructivist and complexity-oriented theories of leadership, in favor of concepts such as institutional entrepreneurship, embedded and distributed agency, and actor-network approaches (DiMaggio, 1988; Garud & Karnoe, 2005; Garud et al., 2005; Latour, 2005; Lichtenstein & Plowman, 2009; Maguire et al., 2004; Olsson et al., 2006; Riddell et al., 2011; Westley & Antadze, 2010). These concepts describe the agency of individuals in emergent, relational, political, multi-scaled and cross-sector problem-contexts, where there is little formal or top-down managerial control. The constructive-developmental emphasis of integral theorists rarely takes into account these embedded and collaborative leadership contexts, undermining the credibility of Integral claims and hampering potential synergies with other academic discourses.
Conceptual Gaps, and What Falls Between

While offering an integrative meta-framework, Integral Theory still lacks concepts and lenses capable of illuminating the dynamics of change and development in messy real-world contexts, where dividing things into their constituent quadrants and levels can obscure understanding of how transformations in society come about. Integral treatments sometimes read like AQAL “paint-by-numbers”, dividing dynamic issues into quadrant-, zone- and stage-analyses. Based on my research into other integrative theories, Integral Theory lacks concepts for analyzing social change processes in at least four areas: 1) multi-domain concepts to more effectively describe interacting LR socio-political structures, organizations, sectors and systems; 2) multi-level concepts dealing with micro-meso-macro temporal, spatial and organizational scales; 3) process-lenses that depict the dynamic interactions between the phenomena disclosed by the quadrants; and 4) descriptions of the strategies and pathways by which individuals and groups can enact large-scale social transformation.

Multi-Domain Concepts To Describe Social, Economic and Political Systems

Phenomena manifesting in the LR quadrant of social and ecological systems are woefully under-specified within Integral Theory. The LR interobjective quadrant is sometimes simplified as containing “systems,” its research methodology being “systems theory.” It in fact refers to the enormously complex interacting domains of ecologies, societies, economies, technology, governance and legal structures, and the aggregates of the behavior and multiplicity of social membership across public and private domains, from the smallest group level, through all forms of organization, to nation-states, up to the global level, throughout the evolving arc of history. The theoretical and methodological resources dealing with this quadrant alone likely dwarf the knowledge created in all other quadrants. Yet, in many Integral treatments, when the LR quadrant is engaged, it has not been to synthesize the key lenses and approaches from different disciplines or sub-domains—it has been to critique them for not including the other quadrants. Astoundingly, there are not even any accepted conceptual categories within Integral Theory for organizing these diverse collective-systemic domains of the right hand. Common domains of social organization such as the market, the state, knowledge institutions, different industrial sectors, and civil society are essential for theorizing about sustainability and change processes. Yet these have not been developed for the LR quadrant based on existing research and theoretical resources in the way, for example, psychological lines, states and types have been for the UL quadrant. In a sustainability context, the interactions between these different domains of society (and at different governance and geographical scales) are also very important to conceptualize, illustrating the need for better process lenses and multi-level spatial and organizational scales in Integral Theory’s conceptual repertoire.

Multi-Level Concepts: Beyond Individual and Collective

Because the AQAL model is presented through the polarity of the individual-collective, it has been critiqued for flattening the ecological holarchy lens so that important micro-meso-macro relationships between holons are obscured (Eddy, 2006; Edwards, 2010). The problem-domains that require analysis in social change applications deal with exactly these missing gradations between the individual and the collective. For example, Integral Theory does not contain the scale-based categories to analyze how civil society organizations working at local and regional scales, and with national and global networks, can mobilize emerging consumer values and encourage new regulations in various jurisdictions, and changes in particular company, in a given industrial sector, where the industry may be based in one country and is a member of a globally regulated industry. The kinds of governance, regulatory, organizational and geographical interactions portrayed above are an essential component of other transdisciplinary theories linking ecological systems change and socio-cultural transformation. Yet, the AQAL model does not have multi-level concepts capable of addressing these interactions across scales of time, space, culture, human organization, and function.

Sean Esbjörn-Hargens and Michael Zimmerman (2009) clarify the difference between multi-level eco-
logical holarchies (increasing spatial-temporal levels of membership in a social holon), and developmental holarchies (consciousness/enfolding subjective depth of individual or organization), yet they do not describe interactions between these holarchies. Spatial-ecological holarchies and developmental holarchies are actually co-enacted (because human consciousness exists in human beings, who are always playing membership roles in different organizations over time and space - and all social holarchies are enlivened by developmental holarchies of perspective. To effectively theorize social processes and the consciousness enlivening them, these holarchies and their dynamics must be conceptually re-integrated. Wilber’s work on social holons and nexus-agency is important here (2003b), and can inform further theory development. Mark Edwards (2010) also proposes that theorizing transformation towards sustainability must include governance holarchies, which refer to relational systems of authority, power, and governance.

Cross-Quadrant Process Lenses
Cross-cutting concepts for understanding processes or dynamics by which socio-cultural phenomena are sustained or change can become elusive when quadrants are dealt with separately. The main process addressed in Integral Theory is that of evolutionary tetra-arising development. Yet, descriptions often privilege the process of evolving consciousness, via psychological or cultural stage development, de-emphasizing other processes of phasal change, or cross-quadrant dynamics. This division can sometimes be in aid of conceptual clarity, but as in the case of the separation of ecological and developmental holarchies, the lack of reintegration causes important questions about how processes arising in different quadrants interact seem to languish, unasked among Integral theorists. Integral Theory could provide enormous insights into social change processes, by looking at the dynamic pathways by which changes occur in hearts and minds, behaviour, cultural values and social structures. Yet, further theory development is needed in order to provide concepts capable of illuminating such cross-quadrant change dynamics.

The division of collective domains into LL and LR quadrants also leads to definitions of social concepts that differ from common usage in many academic disciplines. For example, when non-integral scholars refer to “social” or “political” systems and “institutions,” these by definition involve subjective and objective dimensions (e.g., values, norms, collective behavior and governance structures), despite the convention of mapping them on the LR of the Integral map. Undoubtedly, many approaches would benefit from greater inclusion of psycho-spiritual, developmental, and interpretive-constructivist lenses, but my point is that there are important approaches to sustainability and social change worth incorporating, and their contributions may be misrepresented when only assessed through the AQAL lens.

Strategies of Actors and Organizations
Integral Theory places subjective (UL) and intersubjective (LL) dimensions of reality on equal footing with objective-material (UR/LR) dimensions, while emphasizing the constructed and perspectival nature of enacted reality as it “tetra-arises” in four quadrants. In attempting to redress materialist or postmodern obfuscations of the role of consciousness in evolution, integral theorists can over-emphasize the role of UL development, leading to interior stage development being portrayed as socially transformative in and of itself, dis-embedded from socio-cultural (LL) or systemic (LR) dynamics. If integral practitioners want to offer their insights into problem-focused arenas, they must pursue research to assess whether and how leaders with later stage levels of development positively impact specific problem domains. For example, does this occur through their influence on discourse, which then influences institutions and policies? Can individuals at later stages better engage and mobilize diverse citizenry? If so, how does this occur? Does their impact depend on where they are situated in various power and authority structures? What roles do they play in institutionalizing new social and governance forms? In other words, what role do individuals actually play in the collective
processes involved in large-scale societal change?

Finally, according to Edwards’ work in the field of sustainability and organizations, other lenses absent from Integral Theory but present in middle-range theories of sustainability include social mediation, learning, system dynamics, alignment, stakeholder, de-centering, and evolutionary process (2010). The middle-range theories in Part 2 provide examples of the four conceptual areas described above, as well as some of the lenses Edwards notes. In the broader fields of sustainability and social change, a comprehensive metatheoretical analysis similar to what Edwards (2010) undertook for organizations would presumably reveal more lenses important to addressing the linked political-economic-cultural-ecological domains implicated by sustainability concerns. My efforts below aim to contribute to such work.

*Toward an Integral Social Theory of Transformation*

Despite the challenges identified above, the canon of Integral Theory offers rich resources and accounts of tetra-arising societal change processes. In *Integral Spirituality* and the online excerpts from a forthcoming book, Wilber (2006a; 2003a; 2003b; 2004) develops significant lines of sight into the process for enacting more emancipatory and complex worldviews and social structures, suggesting the contours of an integral social theory. He emphasizes that the techno-economic base of society exerts inordinate influence on the average levels of cultural and individual consciousness, going so far as to assert, “It does appear…that the mode of techno-economic production is the single strongest determinant for the average level of consciousness in a society” (Wilber, 2004, p. 129). This influence is due to the “staggering weight of the social system” and the physical persistence of artifacts and their modes, which outlive individuals and form a fabric of socio-cultural cohesion and reproduction that enmeshes behavior and awareness (Wilber, 2004, p. 127).

Because social-technical innovation cycles happen faster than cultural cycles, they therefore offer a more rapid means for introducing and concretizing new social practices into society than do efforts at widespread cultural change (Wilber, 2003a). In Excerpt A, Wilber (2003a, pp. 33-66) depicts an AQAL theory of societal transformation that involves first an individual inventor (in response to tetra-arising conditions) who develops a new social practice or technology from a worldview of greater consciousness or depth (UL) and then communicates this novelty (verbally and cognitively) to others (UR). Eventually a small group of individuals understands the idea and wants to bring it forth as a cultural micro-pattern (LL) and then as part of the socioeconomic base (LR). Wilber asserts new social practices or technologies can be taken up quickly because they do not require users to share the complexity of consciousness or perspective of the inventor. The widespread adoption of new inventions (i.e., innovation) can then create disruptive evolutionary forces.

Wilber (2003a) makes a distinction between the emergence of macro-practices of the techno-economic base, and micro-practices historically initiated and enacted by groups of elite. Using the rise of modernity as the example, Wilber further describes how these elites participated in and advanced the modern worldview that valued freedom, liberty and equality, through engaging in micro-practices of open rational debate about self-governance in small groups. This led to the development of a new social contract, as articulated by figures such as Rousseau, Locke, and Jefferson, which was adopted into the governance structure via revolution (macro-patterns in the LL and LR). Wilber (2003a) goes on to describe how macro-patterns of societal change are driven by selection pressures from each quadrant, and how mismatches of depth and complexity across quadrants create evolutionary tensions. These tensions may highlight pathologies in the dominant system, and can catalyze crises of legitimacy for governing holons, which are resolved either by translation or transformation. Translative revolutions (or reforms) from the same depth and complexity reframe the existing organizing pattern at the same level. Transformational revolutions are driven by emergent social-scientific practices that embody greater depth and complexity, which have been brought forth into novel institutional forms and governance arrangements. These institutional forms help to stabilize deeper consciousness, more authentic cultural inclusion, and greater systems complexity.
To summarize, Wilber (2003a) emphasizes that 1) the techno-economic base is the single largest influence on individual and socio-cultural depth; 2) for evolution to continue, those possessing emerging deeper waves of consciousness must enact new social practices and these must be adopted into the techno-economic base; 3) once taken up, innovations can co-adapt with individual and cultural awareness and have the potential to support and further inculcate interior development (or drive tetra-emergence to a new level via the resolution of evolutionary tensions); and 4) new legitimate social-political forms based on mutual understanding between people with diverse perspectives are necessary to institutionalize such transformations. Such new institutions embody a deeper, more complex “cultural wave” into more authentic cultural norms and governance rules.

Although Wilber’s outline of a social theory of transformation offers a useful starting point, it understandably simplifies how new social practices are taken into the techno-economic base and eventually embedded in culture and institutions. Contrary to Wilber’s portrayal of rapid uptake of novel technology, the process of innovation can be long and arduous—especially when it extends beyond the technological, to the more disruptive political-cultural forms capable of unleashing profound solutions to deep-rooted social problems. Obstacles to such large-scale social innovation include power inequities and path-dependency in existing systems, the reinforcing pressures of institutional and worldview lock-in, and the need for opportunities to align in political, economic and cultural domains as well as in the agendas of influential actors. The rules and forms in the techno-economic base are resistant to change, and socio-political structures and cultural values in late industrial societies are increasingly diverse and gridlocked. As the spectrum of values and opinion widens and deepens, mutual agreement towards sustainability and other social goals is increasingly difficult to reach.

Given these current life conditions, it is unlikely that generative new social practices and technologies will simply meet with large-scale adoption. Rather, those concerned with transformations toward sustainability must identify strategic leverage points to advance more emancipatory and sustainable values, institutions and practices. Wilber’s outline of the enactment of revolutionary new paradigms suggests several key strategies for transformation in socio-cultural systems. These are 1) the creation of novel forms and innovative practice that are positively disruptive to the dominant techno-economic base, institutions and cultures; 2) speeding the diffusion and uptake of these disruptive innovations; 3) cultural preparation (interpreting evolutionary tensions) to fuel demand for innovative forms and values alignment; and 4) strategic mobilization of evolutionary tensions to enact more emancipatory and sustainable institutions and governance forms.

This latent integral social theory of transformation can be refined to generate knowledge about the institutionalization of more emancipatory, authentic and sustainable human systems. It also offers a corrective to the emphasis in Integral literature on mapping other theories, championing formal IMP research as the most impactful way to intervene in systems, or making exaggerated claims about the relationship of individual development to societal change. Instead, it points integral practitioners towards the power of the techno-economic base in determining the average societal level of consciousness, the importance of enacting new social practices/paradigms, and the need to test and spread new political and institutional forms as consciousness develops. It also illustrates the need for integral researchers to expand on Wilber’s latent social theory and link with other promising approaches (see Part 2) to develop concepts and test propositions. This research agenda would focus on unpacking the nature of cross-quadrant selection pressures and how mismatches of depth and complexity drive evolution. Research could also explore how individuals and groups operating from emergent waves of consciousness enact and spread new social practices, how they work in different cultural contexts to exacerbate evolutionary tensions and capitalize on opportunities for transformation, and how they mobilize people with diverse worldviews to develop, gain legitimacy for, and institutionalize new forms of governance and human social organization. I turn now to several theories of systemic and societal transformation and the agency involved therein, to identify missing lenses and concepts, address theoretical gaps, and build on the leverage points discussed above.
Part Two: Synthesizing Concepts from Theories of Transformative Change

The fundamental task of metatheorising is not to be able to categorise theories within some pre-existing overarching framework but to ensure that the unique contributions of middle-range theories are accommodated within the metatheory.

— Mark Edwards (2010, p. 208)

In the second half of this article I define and clarify key sociological concepts including institutions, structure and agency, which are building blocks in many middle-range theories of social change. Next, I introduce three middle-range theories: resilience, social innovation, and socio-technical transitions theory. These are each concerned with generating and scaling up innovation in order to transform linked social, cultural and ecological systems, and utilize multi-level and multi-domain concepts to illuminate the dynamics and processes of systemic change as well as the strategies actors can pursue to enact such change. I conclude with recommendations for further research and conceptual development.

Integrative Concepts of Institutions, Structure and Agency

A key obstacle to the maturation of Integral Theory—both in advancing more mainstream academic uptake and increasing its positive social impact—is that common sociological concepts are either under-theorized, or are defined differently within Integral Theory. This makes translation difficult, and may stymie interdisciplinary collaboration. While it is beyond the scope of this article to fully introduce these sociological concepts and their related, evolving bodies of literature, I will briefly describe them here, and invite readers to engage further.

The role of individual agency and social structure in the reproduction and change of social realities represents one of the central debates in the history of sociological theory (DiMaggio, 1988). Those on the functionalist side of the debate emphasize the role of structure in limiting individual freedoms and reproducing stable social realities. Those on the interpretive side of the debate emphasize the self-authoring and co-constituting role of individuals in society. In his constructivist approach, Anthony Giddens’ (1984) “structuration theory” defines structures as societal rules and resources that are sustained and recreated through agents’ routines (practical consciousness) and reflexivity (discursive consciousness), and “the structural properties of social systems are both medium and outcome of the practices they recursively organize” (p. 25). This recursive relationship between agency and structure has been called the paradox of embedded agency (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998), which refers to the degree to which individuals can transcend their context to create new structures and institutions. Bandura (2001, 2006) defines agency as intentional action to influence one’s functioning, life circumstances or environment. In this socio-cognitive approach, humans are understood as both producers and products of their life circumstances, in mutual evolution with systems and structures. Emirbayer and Mische (1998) emphasize the importance of collective agency in responding to the structural and emergent demands of real-time problem contexts.

Regarding structures, Wilber notes, “whatever else a ‘structure’ might be, the least objectionable way to define it is simply as a probability space. Technically, then, for Integral metatheory, structuralism means an exterior description in third person ‘it’-terms of the probability of finding a particular ‘I’ or ‘thou/we’ behavior in a particular spacetime milieu of the AQAL matrix” (2004, p. 24). Despite this, more common integral usage of the term structure focuses on structures of consciousness, found in the UL and LL. Agency is also defined somewhat differently within Integral Theory than in common sociological and academic usage, with Wilber’s agency-communion polarity framing agency as the continually self-transcending drive of Eros, and communion as its opposite—the relational, embedded impulse of Agape (Wilber, 2000a).

The notion of institution is used widely in disciplines of economics, sociology, political science, global
governance, organizational management, and beyond (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Scott, 1995). Institutions refer to culturally embedded understandings that explain and justify social arrangements and behaviors (Gard et al., 2007), or rules, norms and beliefs that describe reality for an organization, explaining what can be acted upon and what cannot (Hoffman, 1999). Scott (1995) describes the three pillars of institutions: the regulative, which guides action through coercion and threat of formal sanction; the normative, which guides action through cultural norms of acceptability, morality and ethics; and the cognitive, which guides action through the very categories and frames by which actors know and interpret their world. Integral usage of the term institutions tends to focus on its objective aspect, and institutions are commonly mapped on the LR quadrant. Yet, the definitions above point to subjective, intersubjective and objective dimensions embodied within the concept of institutions.

Neo-institutional theorists (e.g., Powell & DiMaggio, 1995) emphasize discursive and constructionist approaches to look at symbolic boundaries of institutions, and how political and social movement struggles shape meaning, mobilize resources, and confer new legitimacy (Granovetter & McGuire, 1988; Garud & Kornoc, 2001; Lounsbury et al., 2003). Institutional field is a dynamic frame that enables analysis of arenas of actors in sectors such as government, trade associations, non-profits, firms, and economic institutions (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Scott, 1995). These actors are engaged with struggles to frame and reframe institutional meanings, operating from both congruent and divergent purposes, perspectives and values, who wield different amounts of power, and coalesce around the same issue (Hoffman, 1999). The concept of an institutional entrepreneur has also emerged to recognize the role individuals play embedding innovation into social structures (beyond notions of business or social entrepreneurship). Institutional entrepreneurs are “actors who have an interest in particular institutional arrangements and who leverage resources to create new institutions or to transform existing ones” (Maguire et al., 2004, p. 657). This includes creating new meaning-systems to tie disparate institutions together.

For Integral Theory to engage cogently with existing social theory, differences in definition and conceptual application should be bridged or clarified. The growing body of innovative social theory and research that uses the concepts of agency, structure and institutions must also find a home in Integral theories of change. Dynamic theoretical lenses such as institutional fields and institutional entrepreneurship could also be brought into fruitful dialogue with Integral Theory in order to advance theories of socio-cultural transformation. Beyond this, Integral Theory has many potential contributions to make to theories of structure and agency, for example, by bringing additional psychological perspectives to structuration theory and theories of agency, and by articulating the role of self-transcending (or developmental) agency both in individuals, and for collectively enacted agency.

Three Theories of Transformative Change

The transformation-oriented middle-range theories profiled below are concerned with the dynamics, mechanisms, pathways and agency involved in societal transformations, as well understanding how actors are both constrained and enabled by various contexts. I have chosen here to focus on three theories: resilience, which looks primarily at adaptive governance in linked social-ecological systems (Gunderson & Holling, 2002), social innovation theory, which partially builds on resilience insights to illuminate the complex process of introducing innovation in order to transform social systems (Westley & Andtaze, 2010), and socio-technical transitions theory, which analyzes how regimes of production can be transitioned toward sustainability using evolutionary and constructivist lenses (Geels, 2010; Grin et al., 2010; Kemp & Rotmans, 2004).

They contain both multi-level and multi-domain constructs to address human organizational, spatial and temporal scales. However, these theories are not theories of everything. Resilience theorist Buzz Holling asserts, “If a theory explains everything, it explains nothing” (2002, p. 20). Resilience theory is instead referred to as a heuristic, a meta-model and a boundary object enabling inter-disciplinary collaboration (Brand
Resilience Theory

Originating with the work of C.S. “Buzz” Holling (1973, 1995), resilience theory recasts static conceptions of ecosystems toward a dynamic view, interweaving insights from evolutionary biology and ecosystem sciences, non-linear and complex adaptive systems theories, adaptive resource and environmental management, history, economics and social sciences (Holling, 1995; Gunderson & Holling, 2002). Resilience is defined as the capacity of a system to absorb disturbance and reorganize while undergoing change, so as to still retain essentially the same function, structure and feedbacks, and therefore identity (Folke et al., 2010). Resilience theory focuses on “managing” linked social-ecological system, and emphasizes the role of dynamic feedback effects and system behavior that emerges from these processes as they interact across spatial-ecological scales, scales of human organization, and between different domains (Gunderson & Holling 2002, Walker et al. 2004). Co-emergent dynamics are described between cultural, political, social, economic, ecological and technological domains at scales from the individual to the global in resilience-based analysis (Holling & Gunderson, 2002; Berkes et al., 2003; Walker et al., 2006). Managing for resilience aims to reduce the vulnerability of a social-ecological system to collapse, rapid changes in productivity, or ecosystem services. There has been recent theoretical focus on maladaptive resilience and the importance of transformability as a companion concept to resilience (Folke et al., 2010).

Two macro-structures described by resilience theory are a shifting, *non-linear stability landscape*, which describes the totality of the possible states of a social-ecological system (Folke et al., 2010), and a *panarchy*, the structure in which systems are linked in nested sets of adaptive cycles across time and space, within which system characteristics change and persist (Gunderson & Holling, 2002). The adaptive cycle is the primary process model within resilience theory, and refers to a continuous cycle of both incremental and transformative change in four phases (Holling & Gunderson, 2002, Folke et al., 2010): the foreloop process is of stable and incremental change, from the exploitation phase (r) where resources are freely available and resilience is high, enabling emergence and rapid growth. Over time, the system locks up human and physical resources, entering the conservation phase (K)—a mature system which resists change. Eventually, systems become brittle and face the collapse of structures or processes in the release phase (Ω)—a “creative destruction” that is influenced by unpredictable changes happening at larger or smaller spatial-organizational-temporal scales. This begins a trajectory of turbulent change—the backloop—where reorganization, invention, or transformation to another system identity is possible. During release, connections between existing systems parts are dissolved, dominant forms of organization are disrupted, and novelty or innovation may emerge. Cross-scale influences from other levels of human organization or ecosystems are strongly felt and may shape the emerging identity of a system (Walker & Salt, 2006). In the reorganization phase (α) that follows, a process of exploration and renewal occurs, enabling growth and recombination that may be adaptive or transformative (Walker et al., 2004).

Walker and colleagues (2004) define transformation in social-ecological systems as a change in the nature of the stability landscape, introducing new defining state variables and losing others. System changes are influenced by only a small number of key human and natural variables (Walker & Salt, 2006). A threshold is a level of a controlling, often slowly changing variable in which change occurs in a critical feedback, causing the system to self-organize along a different trajectory (i.e., to transform). Transformation means an irreversible change in both ecosystem characteristics and the social systems that depend on them, and can be
positive or negative.

Navigating transformation necessitates people to undergo deeper (double-loop) learning, which is supported by the engagement of multiple stakeholders embodying different perspectives in the system (Gunderson & Holling, 2002). Transformative capacity depends on a system group or person’s ability to draw on scales transcending their own (Gunderson & Holling, 2002). Because of this, human agency plays a key role, as human consciousness can traverse many spatial, temporal and organizational scales of systems. Reflexivity and consciousness allow humans to change the institutional rules that guide self-organizing social patterns (Westley et al., 2002). When actors understand adaptive cycles and scales of a panarchy, points where the system can accept positive change can be identified and used as leverage points to increase resilience, sustainability or systems transformation (Holling, 2000, Olsson et al., 2009, Westley and Antadze, 2010). More radical innovations or transformative systems changes can be introduced during back-loop phases when new combinations of ideas, products or processes can disrupt institutions (Biggs et al., 2010; Walker et al. 2004; Westley & Antadze, 2010). From a resilience perspective, important strategies include paying attention to processes and cycles happening in various domains for openings conducive to transformation, looking for critical thresholds or variables that may be crossed, and attuning to cascading interactions between scales and domains.

Social Innovation Theory

The growing field of social innovation is concerned with public sector, private sector, civil society and philanthropic efforts to solve complex, deep-rooted social problems—most notably in North America and Europe (Mulgan et al., 2007; BEPA, 2011). Social innovation is a pragmatic, practice-oriented, transdisciplinary concept: “social innovation transcends sectors, levels of analysis, and methods to discover the processes—the strategies, tactics, and theories of change—that produce lasting impact” (Phills et al., 2008, p. 37). Definitions of social innovation sometimes include a normative goal: “a novel solution to a social problem that is more effective, efficient, sustainable, or just than existing solutions and for which the value created accrues primarily to society as a whole rather than private individuals” (Phills et al., 2008, p. 38). According to Pol and Ville (2009), an innovation is termed a social innovation if the new idea has the potential to improve either the quality or the quantity of life. Drawing many of the core concepts of resilience theory, Westley and Antadze (2010, p. 2) define social innovation as “a complex process of introducing new products, processes or programs that profoundly change the basic routines, resource and authority flows, or beliefs of the social system in which the innovation occurs. Such successful social innovations have durability and broad impact.” The field of social innovation includes but transcends efforts to develop social enterprises and social entrepreneurship more generally, as it encompasses efforts in all sectors to generate transformations in policy, governance and institutions in service of societal needs. In this framing, social entrepreneurship operates at the individual and interpersonal levels, with social enterprise inhabiting organizational levels, and social innovation bridging inter-organizational and institutional scales to create system-wide impacts (Westall, 2007).

The concept of an institutional entrepreneur (DiMaggio, 1998) has been adopted into social innovation theory in order to conceptualize how actors can engage in systems to bring about change. Institutional entrepreneurs have the ability to work within complex institutional contexts to navigate opportunities, frame solutions through new discourse, create political coalitions, and connect innovative practices to windows of opportunity by being attuned to cross-scale interactions (Battilana et al., 2009; Dacin et al., 2002; Dorado, 2005; Westley & Antadze, 2010). The agency involved in social innovation can be distributed, with appropriate roles being played by different people at different times, and with a critical role played by networks to enable actors to span scales and leverage system-change opportunities. One emerging social innovation practice is that of convening “changelabs,” “design labs,” or “social innovation labs.” Labs provide a physical, cultural and intellectual space designed to facilitate cooperation and the co-creation of meaningful and
innovative solutions to complex problems. Conveners of lab processes gather together experts, potential users, and other stakeholders to develop broad and sophisticated systems awareness, to create and test social prototypes, and to scale up successful innovations.

**Socio-technical Transitions Theory**

Socio-technical transitions theory (STT) originates in Europe, and is focused on understanding trajectories of socio-economic development and practical interventions to re-orient systems towards sustainable pathways. It includes various strands, including transition management (Rotmans et al., 2001, Loorbach & Rotmans, 2006), system innovation (Elzen et al., 2004, Markand & Truffer, 2008), and the multi-level perspective (MLP) (Schot, 1998; Rip & Kemp, 1998; Geels, 2005). Socio-technical transitions draws on science and technology studies/innovation studies, evolutionary economics, complex adaptive systems, integrated assessment, neo-institutional theory, historical analysis, globalization studies, reflexive modernization, social construction of technology, and Giddens’ (1984) structuration theory (Grin et. al, 2010).

*Transitions* refer to transformation processes in which society or a complex subsystem of society changes in a fundamental way over an extended period (more than one generation) (Kemp & Rotmans, 2004, p. 138). Socio-technical *regimes* are defined as reinforcing clusters of elements in different domains including technology, regulations, user practices, markets, cultural meanings, infrastructure, and supply networks. Technology has been the focal point for organizing transition efforts, within co-evolving institutional/ regime contexts (Geels, 2010). A key assumption of STT is that systems are path-dependent, meaning they are often highly resistant to change due to the institutionalized force of habits, sunk costs, existing governance arrangements, economic incentives, economies of scale and other forces. The transitions approach connects to larger sustainability discourses by addressing how to break technological and social “lock-in” of existing regimes, and speed the uptake of sustainable innovations into society.

According to the theory, socio-technical systems transform through dynamic processes of emergence, self-organization, and co-evolutionary adaptation. Co-evolution involves irreversible patterns of change caused by interactions between economic, cultural, technological and institutional subsystems (Grin et al., 2010). Natural science conceptions of evolution are augmented with social adaptation mechanisms including variation in beliefs and visions of intentional actors, novelty generation through bricolage (assembling existing elements in new ways); selection through enabling or constraining political and cultural requirements; negotiation; and retention via interpretation, contestation and codification or institutionalization (Geels & Schot, 2010).

The multi-level perspective (MLP) frames transition processes as interactions between innovative micro-practices (niche experiments), meso-level structures (a given socio-technical regime, framed through a social constructivist lens), and long-term, macro-level exogenous trends that influence the regime (socio-technical landscape) (Geels, 2002, 2005; Rip & Kemp, 1998; Schot, 1998). The MLP is a holarchy showing functional and temporal levels of increasing structuration—macro-processes are slower (and more structured), meso-processes are faster (and less structured), and niche-processes are fastest (least structured). Niches generate agency, new norms and practices, and radical innovations while being influenced by incumbent regimes (Rotmans et al., 2001; Geels, 2005). The landscape provides the broader macro-structural context for niche—regime interactions, and includes social values, policy beliefs, worldviews, political coalitions, the built environment, prices and costs, trade patterns and ecological influences (Kemp & Rotmans, 2004). Landscape processes, political or otherwise, bear down on regimes through interpretation by actors (Geels & Schot, 2007), generating stress and creating opportunities—acting as a stability landscape that provides “gradients for action” (Rip & Kemp, 1998; Geels, 2004). The MLP depicts different transition trajectories resulting from interactions between levels. These pathways highlight different leverage points to tip systems towards sustainability.
Niches are key to nurturing radical innovation (Rip & Kemp, 1998). They derive their power through collective enactment of social groups and technology users, who learn together, attract newcomers, and develop demonstration projects (Rip, 2006; Geels & Schot, 2010). Strategic Niche Management (Kemp et al., 1998) focuses on creating protected technological niches to nurture the co-evolution of technology, user practices and regulatory structures. Geels and Schot (2010) synthesize key processes for successful niche development, which include: 1) articulation of expectations and visions to direct learning, attract attention and legitimate niche protection; 2) building social networks for constituency and resources, both broad/diverse and deep; and 3) multi-dimensional learning processes which emphasize second-order learning about various system domains. In addition to creating protected niches, strategic actors must take advantage of windows of opportunity (Geels & Schot, 2010) and can co-determine what landscape tendencies are mobilized, neglected, or circumvented (Grin et al., 2010; Rotmans & Loorbach, 2009).

The relationship between structure and agency is central to socio-technical transitions theory, and theorists draw on Giddens (1984), Bourdieu (1990), Latour (2005) and Luhman (1995) (e.g., Geels & Schot, 2007; Grin et al., 2010). The interdependent relationship between systems, institutions and agency creates a “duality of structure” which implies that structural change requires reflection-in-action, where actors critically scrutinize and reformulate their conduct in light of intended and unintended consequences (Giddens’ reflexive monitoring) (Grin et al., 2010). Sustainability transitions co-emerge via “circular causality” as processes in multiple dimensions and at different levels link up with each other and create mutually reinforcing dynamics (Geels, 2011, Grin et al., 2010). Working from a transition governance perspective, Grin and colleagues (2010) propose that actors can advance “constructive interference” between levels, to orchestrate the process of mutual reinforcement toward sustainable development. This orchestration requires a “distributed competence for strategic agency” in order to connect and mobilize these alignments, which is characterized by an extension of actors’ agency by viewing issues from a meta-perspective to see immediate opportunities and limitations, as well as wider patterns in space and time. John Grin et al. (2010) describe three aspects of the strategic agency involved in orchestrating mutually reinforcing transformations towards sustainable development. These are 1) envisioning and advancing novel niche practices; 2) opening up new institutional structures in relation to regime and landscape constraints or opportunities; and 3) sustaining connection between novel practices and new institutional structures to create a cycle of mutually reinforcing change.

Points of Intersection and Further Theory Development

We cannot expect to understand the Kosmos through partial perspectives and singular methodologies; we must have a multi-faceted, kaleidoscopic view.


The theories and fields of practice described above can enrich Integral Theory’s approach towards large-scale transformative social change. These middle-range theories utilize and build on the important sociological concepts of institutions, structure and agency, and apply these to the challenges of sustainability and societal innovation. They draw on complexity and evolutionary theories to illuminate systems-change dynamics—at the same time including the subjective and intersubjective dimensions of such transformation (to varying degrees and levels of sophistication). These three theories rely on an array of multi-level heuristics largely absent from current Integral applications, which are capable of highlighting cross-domain and cross-scale influences, phases and pathways of change, and the role of strategic, purposeful action in generating social and institutional change. Using these heuristics, theorists develop and research propositions about the dynamics of social transformation, as well as new tools and practices to guide systems interventions. Table 2 summarizes the key insights from each theory, proposing potential linkages with Integral Research and areas for further development.
Based on the analysis presented in this article, an agenda for enriching Integral Theory’s ability to address issues of large-scale social change therefore includes 1) working to substantiate claims about the impact of subjective development on social change, and to embed UL development in tetra-emerging contexts and processes; 2) incorporating missing lenses for analyzing multi-level, multi-domain, cross-quadrant process dynamics, and actor strategies for cultivating systems transformation; 3) building on Wilber’s latent social theory of transformation to better conceptualize the evolutionary pathways of change; and 4) re-orienting Integral discourse to include more “bottom-up” research approaches and engagement with existing middle-range theories of social change and sustainability.

In addition to the potential research linkages highlighted in Table 2, integral research and development opportunities that may emerge from this orientation toward social transformation include: 1) enriching theory and research to describe how later-stage individuals innovate and institutionalize more comprehensive paradigms into complex socio-cultural domains, and researching their effectiveness compared to individuals at other stages; 2) developing theoretical clarity and concepts to describe interactions between developmental, ecological, and governance holarchies; 3) importing distinctions from other fields to categorize LR and LL domains in language that is transferrable across disciplines, including cross-quadrant sociological concepts of agency, structure and institutions; 4) engaging with literature on agency to contribute developmental insights based on a “self-transcending subject”; and 5) developing more dynamic and empirically rigorous concepts and propositions about the interactions between individual agency and the nexus-agency of social holons—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Key Insights and Integral Research Linkages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Critical role of dynamic cross-scale influences and cascading multi-domain interactions in system transformation; importance of variables and thresholds at different speeds and levels of organization; strategic agency is sensitive to phasal change and windows of opportunity for introducing innovation; testing and iteration of ecological governance models and new institutional forms for managing linked social-ecological systems; role of second-order learning in transformation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral research linkages:</td>
<td>Contribute understanding of role of different cultural norms and values as variables that can shift “stability landscape” and how this has occurred to transform systems; incorporate cross-scale interactions and phasal systems change lens into Integral Theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Innovation</td>
<td>Theory and practical research on public, private sector, civil society and philanthropic collaborations; innovative systems change; lessons on scaling up change using markets forces, financial instruments, social media; living examples of public policy innovation to reframe stuck systems; institutional entrepreneur concept and embedded agency perspective to analyze strategies pursued by actors and groups; importance of role-based and situational leadership for navigating institutional change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral research linkages:</td>
<td>Draw on practices of institutional entrepreneurs to develop concepts of embedded agency and apply analysis in concert with stage-based assessments. Conduct Integral research in cross-sectoral innovation cases, to analyze process of scaling and institutionalization, and strategies and social impact of late stage leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Technical Transitions</td>
<td>Multi-Level Perspective showing micro-meso-macro level interactions and pathways of innovation from niche to regime (system-level) impact; practices to develop and shield niche innovations and gain regime adoption; evolutionary insights into socially constructed selection mechanisms and structuration process; role of “distributed competence for strategic agency” in actor’s perception of limitations and opportunity, and pattern recognition; analysis of how different actors and actor groups link strategies to develop niche practices, catalyze regime disruptions, and orchestrate mutually reinforcing dynamics so innovation is adopted and regime is transformed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral research linkages:</td>
<td>Develop Integral social theory by drawing on STT’s selection mechanisms and concept of “mutual orchestration” to further understand tetra-emerging selection environments and the role of mismatches of depth and complexity in creating evolutionary tensions; look at how strategic agency can obstruct, amplify and mobilize different evolutionary tensions to achieve transformative outcomes; develop 1st, 2nd-person frames of agency and analyze how individual and collective agency changes developmentally and role of different social holons in this process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Key insights of three theories and integral research linkages.
which answer questions about how slower-moving variables such as culture and institutions change in relation to more rapid transformations in individual perspectives and values?

Conclusion
The complexity of sustainability problems is evident. What is less clear is how to catalyze the reductions in throughput and widespread transformations in human systems that are required to prevent multiple, cascading social and ecological crises. I have reviewed aspects of Integral Theory, institutional theory, resilience, social innovation, and socio-technical transitions theory, to enrich conceptual resources for illuminating the process of social transformation. Because of Integral Theory’s scope and orientation, researchers have the opportunity to weave together many middle-range discourses and practices, and a responsibility to do this in relationship to the deeply troubled patterns in the world today. There is a prevailing tendency in the integral community toward top-down theorizing. In response to calls for greater theoretical integration, we are courting other lone, brilliant philosophers such as Roy Bhaskar and Edgar Morin. I am advocating here for a different approach—one that builds up from collaborative research and promising middle-range theories to create new syntheses that are not grandiose, but instead are practical, problem-focused, and humble to the extraordinary insights within existing discourses. From this embedded vantage point, the unique contributions of Integral Theory will become apparent, and integral insights can be more effectively communicated and applied.

I believe the approach I outline in this article will aid adoption of important aspects of Integral Theory into existing transdisciplinary literatures, in particular those concepts that illuminate the central role psychological and cultural development plays in social transformation. Perhaps more importantly, integral practitioners who aim for transformative impact may be further inspired to invent and disseminate innovative social practices, and pursue political strategies to institutionalize more emancipatory, authentic and sustainable human systems. Here we can draw practice inspiration from Integral Theory, but also the many other approaches to transformative change that frame strategic action within a sophisticated understanding of complex social, cultural and ecological systems dynamics. To the extent that this places the integral practitioner in disruptive and revolutionary roles, so much the better.
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NOTES

1 This article does not directly address the many important and nuanced ontological, axiological, epistemological and practical contributions of Integral Ecology including emphasis on animal sentience and ethics, explication of the multiple and perspectival nature of the ‘ecological crisis’, and the rich practices for cultivating ecological awareness (Esbjörn-Hargens & Zimmerman, 2009).
2 Wilber (2006) argues that as consciousness evolves, emerging perspectives bring forth and enact new realities, so in this sense, individual transformation can be said to change “the world.” While this may be instantaneous from the first-person perspective, I am concerned here with the specific pathways by which this consciousness is enacted, stabilized and reproduced in cultural and social systems in the collective quadrants (LL and LR).
3 Most constructive-developmental research conducted with leaders has occurred in formal and for-profit organizational settings, focused on individual capacities (see McCauley et al., 2006), not in arenas of complex, “wicked” or “messy” societal or political problems in collaborative or cross-sector organizational/institutional contexts. Barrett
Brown’s (2011) research is an exception, but he makes no causal links between leadership stage or capacities, and the effectiveness or impact of sustainability initiatives. Despite efforts to apply the categories of *lines*, *types*, and *states* to the Right-Hand quadrants (e.g. Esbjörn-Hargens & Zimmerman, 2009), these lenses seem to emerge from important distinctions in the UL, and it is an error to import them to the collective (LL and LR) quadrants as sufficient categories, in and of themselves. It is certainly an obstacle to effective transdisciplinary communication for these categories to stand in place of more established (and authentic) macro-categories for describing cultural, economic, political, social and ecological systems.
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ETHICS AND THE NEW EDUCATION
Psychopharmacology, Psychometrics, and the Future of Human Capital
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ABSTRACT This article explores the ethical impacts of standardized testing and psychopharmacology in order to diagnose the pathologies of human capital theory as an educational metatheory. Drawing on the work of Ken Wilber and Roy Bhaskar, I build an alternative integral metatheory of education, which is deployed to reveal ethical issues involved with standardized testing infrastructures that center around a principled distinction between efficiency-oriented testing practices and justice-oriented ones. I argue further that the recent epidemic of psychotropic drug prescriptions for school-aged children is dialectically related to the dominance of efficiency-oriented testing infrastructures. Looking at the rhetoric and science surrounding the growth of educationally oriented psychopharmacology, I deploy the same metatheoretical approach to characterize the ethical difference between designing children and raising them. I conclude with a series of provocations and reflections directed at kindling the social imagination and reviving our sense that there are alternatives to dystopian educational futures.
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During the first decade of the 21st century, the world economy was set into crisis and national political discourse and policy were thrown behind the idea of continued U.S. technological and scientific superiority, more specifically the need for comprehensive educational reform to prepare American children for the techno-scientific economy of tomorrow. This climate saw federal testing policies set so that accountability metrics dominated school cultures. Prescription drugs for academic under-performance skyrocketed. Already large financial inequalities between school districts continued to increase, and technological progress in the broader culture began outstripping school infrastructures by years. This has led to the deterioration of teaching and learning in schools, failures that have been well documented (Hursh, 2008; RAND, 2011).

I argue here that there are issues deeper than the U.S. educational system’s failures (e.g., failures to provide adequate buildings, to foster a love of learning, etc.)—its sins of omission, if you will. Recent decades have shown the system capable of committing sins of commission, where educational processes become unacceptable because of what is being done to students, not just because of what is withheld, lacking, or inequitably distributed. Two trends occupy my attention here: standardized testing infrastructures that center around a principled distinction between efficiency-oriented testing practices and justice-oriented ones. I argue further that the recent epidemic of psychotropic drug prescriptions for school-aged children is dialectically related to the dominance of efficiency-oriented testing infrastructures. Looking at the rhetoric and science surrounding the growth of educationally oriented psychopharmacology, I deploy the same metatheoretical approach to characterize the ethical difference between designing children and raising them. I conclude with a series of provocations and reflections directed at kindling the social imagination and reviving our sense that there are alternatives to dystopian educational futures.
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testing infrastructures, briefly touching on the history of their use in the United States as a function of human capital theory. My proposed integral metatheory of education is employed to reveal ethically significant differences between efficiency-oriented and justice-oriented testing practices. I argue further that the recent epidemic of psychotropic drug prescriptions for school-aged children is dialectically related to the dominance of efficiency-oriented testing infrastructures, both through their common roots in reductive human capital theory and through their practical in-the-classroom compatibilities (e.g., kids on medication do better on tests). Looking at the rhetoric and science surrounding the growth of educationally oriented psychopharmacology, I deploy the same metatheoretical approach to characterize the ethical difference between designing children and raising them. I conclude with a series of provocations and reflections directed at kindling the social imagination and reviving our sense that there are alternatives to dystopian educational futures. Tomorrow’s child will inhabit the most pervasive, invasive, and complex educational configurations in history. But there are possibilities for metatheoretically guided transformative practice and design in education—ways by which to bend geo-historical forces toward the creation and perpetuation of more humane, just, and liberating educational systems (Dewey, 1916; 1929).

Integral Educational Metatheory

I have written elsewhere about the nature of metatheory, its relation to philosophy, interdisciplinarity, the sciences, and developmental psychology and education in particular (Stein, 2009; 2010a; 2010b; Stein et al., 2011). I have argued for a specific form of metatheorizing that is predominantly normative, “problem-focused and methodologically pluralistic,” and which serves as a basis for discourse-specific critique and dialectical comment; a role I have described as “the discourse regulative function of metatheoretical endeavors” (Stein, 2010). Metatheories, I have argued, are theories that set the terms by which sub-theories are built, or that “norm the norms” by which sub-theories are validated and put into practice. Therefore, metatheories are an important part of the universe of discourse and function in complex ways, especially when they are inchoate or suppressed, which is often the case in postmodern culture.

Following Jürgen Habermas, I have argued that one of the defining aspects of postmodern culture is its lack of metatheory and meta-narrative, and the related inability of individuals to build universalized and historicized action-orienting self-understandings (Ibid). According to this line of thought, it is no longer the monovocal ideological meta-narrative of modernity that inhibits the moral evolution of the species; it is now the absence of any explicit shared meta-narrative or metatheory that inhibits enlightenment. However, behind the polyvocal pastiche of our post-modern geo-historical moment, metatheories and meta-narratives exist in abundance; they have simply been forced underground. As Bhaskar (1986) demonstrated in his ideology critique of positivism, one of the most powerful things a metatheory can do is to convince the world it does not exist, or, more typically, that there is simply no alternative.

So when I propose that human capital theory is the predominant educational metatheory in post-industrial societies, I am not suggesting that it functions this way explicitly or by design, although, of course, sometimes it does (Goldin & Katz, 2008). The idea at the core of human capital theory as an educational metatheory is that the main function of educational systems in complex societies is to supply the economy with the next generation of workers. This idea has been active in political life for some time (Becker, 1964), and can be seen as a successor to the idea that educational systems function to create pliable citizens and patriots (Cremin, 1970; 1988). The idea that educational systems feed human capital into the economy organizes a related constellation of concepts and theoretical commitments (e.g., simple de-stratified economic models of human behavior, the abstract universalization of value, cost, and benefit, and the homogenization of systemsupported identities, among others). Human capital theory, in a variety of more or less explicit forms, has become the assumed consensus metatheory for a wide variety of educational configurations; from large-scale educational policy and research to the ideals parents have for their children’s education.
Because the discourse around human capital theory is very large, and there are many complex and nuanced positions, I will be making reference to a particular species of reductive human capital theory (RHCT). This is not so much a straw man as an ideal type. The term “reductive” is also a necessary qualification, because, as will become clear below, it is possible to conceive of integrally informed alternatives to human capital theory. These alternatives situate the moment of truth in RHCT in terms of more complex and differentiated social theories, dislodging the primacy of instrumental reason, and deepening theorizing about individual agency, freedom, and choice. RHCT is, by definition, incapable of dealing with complexity, agency, or dialectal and communicative reason. This is because, using Bhaskar’s terminology, RHCT is ontologically monovalent—a form of thought committed to reducing the ontological complexity of education as much as possible, concerned only with the control and prediction of closed systems.

Below I explore how the reductive-instrumental rationality of RHCT can be seen in traditional approaches to standardized testing that make simplistic and untenable assumptions about teaching, learning, and culture. Yet despite the theoretical and empirical inadequacies of these approaches to testing, the dominant narrative in educational policy is that there is no alternative to these approaches for fostering accountability and efficiency in large-scale educational organizations. Likewise, psychopharmacological approaches to educational underperformance are based upon the idea of treating ADHD and related disorders as discrete disease entities, which involves untenable assumptions about the nature of learning, behavior, and human development. Yet psychopharmacological approaches prove useful for raising academic achievement as measured by performances on standardized tests—an outcome of such unquestioned value that it is viewed as an acceptable risk to have the brains (not to mention the self-understandings) of millions of children fundamentally altered by the forced administration of psychotropic drugs.

These and other symptoms of RHCT are revealed below through the use of metatheoretical models from Integral Theory and Dialectical Critical Realism. Wilber (1995; 1999; 2006) and Bhaskar (1986; 1993) offer complimentary comprehensive philosophical metatheories. I do not have space to discuss the full range of their shared philosophical commitments, constructs, and methods, which include: reconstructive/transcendental arguments; social science conceived as an axiology of freedom; ontological emergence, change, and evolution; stratified selves/compound individuals; differentiated and laminated social realities; transformational biopsychosocial models of human agency; and the immanent possibility of geo-historical evolutionary “progress” toward a eudaimonistic society. The full Venn diagram, if you will, showing also their respective omissions and absences is a task for another time.

Here I employ two related ideas that both metatheoretical systems share: a four-fold model of social reality and a transformational biopsychosocio-cultural model of human action. Both ideas are clearly represented by Wilber’s four quadrants and Bhaskar’s four-planer social cube. These models represent human social reality, and thus the structure of human action, as a “four-planer” or “four-quadrant” autopoietic dynamic. That is, according to these models, social reality consists of at least an individual, in a cultural and social system that is reproducing itself in relation to natural realities, both those internal to the social reality (individual psychobiology) and those that are external (the biosphere). Said differently, and still resisting the urge to have an orgy of diagrams, both models are attempts to represent the full complexity of the social realities addressed by the human sciences, which must account for at least the interplay of: individual agency and psychology; cultural/hermeneutic reproduction and transmission; social systems and institutional structures; and the natural realities of the body and biosphere. Below I adopt these dynamic four-fold models of social reality and human action as the minimal components of an integral metatheory of education (IMoE).

A fully articulated IMoE would include more than just a biopsychosocio-cultural model of social reality and human action. There would be (among other things) levels of development (both individual and socio-cultural), psychological frameworks for transcendence, spirituality, and metaReality, as well as commitments to universally efficacious evolutionary processes, from the individual to the geo-historical and cosmic. But
these additional metatheoretical accouterments are not needed for my purposes here, and, in fact, may not be needed in many cases where the goals of metatheoretically enabled critique are simply to redress flagrant reductionisms and irrationalities. I do not have space to argue for this kind of opportunistic, rhetorically-made-to-order metatheorizing, which follows from my arguments elsewhere in support of a problem-focused methodological pluralism that attends to the pragmatics of discourse-specific critique (Stein, 2010b). Rather than arguing for a particular approach to metatheory, the goal of this article is to make a set of specific critical comments concerning contemporary educational configurations and to outline related possibilities for preferable futures. I turn now to this task, with a minimalist IMoE in hand.

**Human Capital Metrics: Between Efficiency and Justice**

There are several broad sociopolitical motives for institutionalizing standardized educational measurement. RHCT values representations of complex educational processes that are put in terms amenable to certain kinds of legal, economic, and political decision-making. Decisions about educational systems involve taxpayer money, conflicting values, and political disagreement, so appeals often need to be made to ostensibly unbiased and objective facts about schools, which many argue tests can provide. Modern educational systems face complexities of bureaucratization and juridification comparable to those faced by modern health care systems, where the need to measure both cost and treatment effectiveness have transformed the nature of medicine (Liebenau, 1987). Today, trends toward high-stakes accountability and efficiency-minded practices (in which testing figures prominently) aim at transforming the delivery of educational goods into an instrumental market-driven activity. The result has been cultures dominated by efficiency-oriented testing practices, where measures built to yield system level data for school leaders and political decision makers shape the intimate educational experience of students (Spring, 1989; Habermas, 1987). These practices are focused on system-level monitoring and bureaucratic functions, such as sorting students into cohorts, determining program effectiveness, and fostering accountability in the system, among other things. Justice-oriented testing practices, on the other hand, transcend but include efficiency-oriented practices. Guided by a more comprehensive understanding of teaching, learning, and culture, they are focused on monitoring and enabling the fair distribution of basic educational goods and promoting the autonomous growth of individual students. Lessons from the history of testing will help illuminate this important distinction.

**Educational Testing: A Brief History**

The roots of modern educational testing can be found in the work of the earliest psychologists. Precisely engineered electrical equipment and newly invented psychometric techniques allowed for the kinds of precise measurements that brought early prestige to psychophysics, and later, to behaviorism. As psychology grew beyond the laboratory, the importance and prestige of measurement remained, and the practice of mental testing became central to the identity of the emerging discipline (Brown, 1992). IQ testing, in particular, captured the public imagination and quickly found its way into the plans of policy makers and educational reformers (Gould, 1981). By 1930, IQ-style multiple-choice standardized testing was ubiquitous in American public schools, and was typically used to track students into different groups for instruction and management (Chapman, 1988). This growing testing infrastructure also allowed for the beginnings of the “scientific management” (aka RHCT) of school operations (Callahan, 1964). Educational researchers began, for the first time, to systematically use test results to inform their thinking about school improvements (Lagemann, 2000). These first large-scale testing efforts were carried out under the banner of organizational efficiency and educational research. They offered the kind of objectivity and simplicity of representation required by the RHCT arguments that were beginning to dominate the increasingly complex and politicized educational system.

Then, in 1931, a young high school science teacher from Michigan solved a technological problem...
that IBM had been working on unsuccessfully for years: automated test scoring. The implications and subsequent technical developments—such as the Scantron machine—would facilitate the construction of the first national standardized testing infrastructure (Lemann, 1999). The centerpiece of this newly automated testing infrastructure was the Educational Testing Service (ETS), which emerged, in part, as a result of the federal government’s interest in exercising quality control and determining how best to fund research and development. Several waves of sweeping federal legislation during the Cold War consolidated the shape of late-industrial era education, including funding to create the NSF and promote STEM education in K-12, civil rights, desegregation, and the War on Poverty programs (such as Head Start).

The federal government began recruiting the testing industry to aid in policy and program evaluation studies (Campbell, 1975). As the RHCT-based “scientific management” of educational reform drew widening support, federally mandated educational testing expanded, eventually including the NAEP, the Iowa tests, and a host of other national K-12 tests. The federal influx of support for testing led also to broad concerns that the educational system was being turned into a kind of “sorting machine” for human capital, rewarding a limited set of educational trajectories through the use of tests that focus on mostly STEM-related skills and competencies (Spring, 1989). Relatedly, the negative effects of increased testing on classroom practice continued to mount, as the high-stakes multiple-choice exam came to symbolize American education itself (Samelson, 1990; Sacks, 1999).

Yet continued advances in the computerized administration and scoring of tests fueled policymaker ambitions to build a national K-12 testing infrastructure for use in program evaluation and systems-level accountability (Phillips, 2003). The final push toward a comprehensive federal testing infrastructure began with President George H.W. Bush’s America 2000 (Bush, 1991), in which he proposed a national testing apparatus that would be tied to a national curriculum and used to assure the equitable distribution of educational opportunity, as well as American competitiveness in the global marketplace. President Clinton later endorsed the plan but backed off the idea of a national test. In 2001, No Child Left Behind (Hess, 2006) provided a federal mandate to build a K-12 testing infrastructure for accountability purposes, but not in the form of a single national test. Instead, a decentralized, competition-oriented, RHCT-inspired set of testing practices was rolled out. This spawned a rapidly expanding for-profit testing industry, which has proven to be error prone, corrupt, and dominated by simplistic psychological and psychometric theorizing (Toch, 2006). The Obama administration has dismantled NCLB, but has sustained a broad commitment to RHCT-inspired efficiency-oriented testing, putting millions of dollars into a “next generation” tech-enabled testing infrastructure that promises to increase the number of tests and the impact on school cultures, teaching, and curriculum.

**On the Difference Between Efficiency and Justice**

From the perspective of an IMoE, and its commitments to a four-fold model of social reality and human action, the history of testing is one in which there is a profound and conspicuous *road not taken*. The earliest psychometric pioneers were guided by the idea that the psychological and social sciences could be leveraged to aid in the construction of a profoundly enlightened and liberating educational system. As standardized measurement infrastructures had revolutionized the physical sciences and brought incalculable social benefit (e.g., civil engineering and medicine), so would educational measurement, continually informed by cutting-edge research, allow for the radical redesign of educational systems. Psychologists, sociologists, and educators would soon dismantle the simplistic psychological models that guided the earliest approaches to testing, putting in their place complex, four-fold, biopsychosocio-cultural models of learning and culture. These advances opened the possibility for justice-oriented testing practices that would facilitate the mass-customization of individualized education and assure the equitable distribution of resources and the fair treatment of individuals. However, the urgency with which testing was institutionalized as a part of the war effort—and in the context of rapid urbanization and public school expansion—led to a premature reification of the func-
tion and meaning of testing. Overwhelmed by the unprecedented complexity of administering modern school systems, and under increasing public pressure to prepare children to enter a rapidly industrializing economy, school leaders and administrators had little sympathy for those who were out to make testing more than a tool for bureaucratic efficiency.

The result has been that modern educational systems are dominated by testing infrastructures that neglect the four-fold complexity of social reality. History reveals that the growing prevalence of a particular view of how educational organizations should be managed propelled increases in the size and scope of testing infrastructures through the adoption of technological innovations enabling economies of scale (e.g., multiple-choice testing; the Scranton machine). This way of viewing the nature of schools was imported as “scientific management” from industry. It characterizes school systems as if they are factories processing raw materials, with objectively measurable inputs and outputs, where the dominant institutional virtue is efficiency (Callahan, 1964). Efficiency-oriented testing practices are designed to simplify the complexity of educational configurations in order to facilitate certain kinds of data-driven managerial decision-making. They are tools for surveillance and system monitoring akin to the measurement infrastructures used in industry for quality control and cost-benefit analysis.

Yet what is being measured are not objects, but people, and the traits of interest are not length, weight, or other manufacturing specifications, but qualities of mind, skill, and personality. This has led to a situation in which a system of categories built for purposes of instrumental-rationality and control has become the dominant system of categories used in schools to guide the construction of students’ action-orienting self-understandings. There is perhaps no greater insight into the detrimental effects RHCT has had on education during the past century than this: efficiency-oriented testing practices have come to provide the categories in terms of which students (and teachers and school communities) understand themselves. This state of affairs has become progressively worse during the past decade. Federal policies have increasingly promoted testing practices in which communities are shamed by school closings, teachers’ “value-added scores” are published in newspapers, and students’ life prospects (and academic self-concepts) are shaped by forms of testing that are demonstrably inappropriate for these purposes.

The claim that contemporary testing infrastructures have led to systematically distorted forms of self-understanding is supported by the fact that the history of testing has very little to do with the history of psychology and educational theory. During the century that gave us Dewey and Piaget (among many others), the testing infrastructure changed primarily in response to advances in technology and the needs of bureaucrats—not in response to advances from the learning sciences that were progressively revealing the nature of how educational processes ought to be structured. That is, as advances in educational and developmental psychology opened possibilities for approaches to assessments based on meaningful, student-centered, and psychologically realistic systems of categories and constructs, the dominant approach to testing remained focused on measuring undertheorized constructs (e.g., scholastic aptitude) using simplistic means (e.g., multiple-choice testing). Evidence continues to mount concerning the detrimental effects of these psychologically naïve testing practices, especially their stigmatizing and disempowering impact on students, and their tendency to radically truncate the pedagogical and curricular options available to teachers (RAND, 2011).

Importantly, this same reductive approach to understanding learning and teaching has led to a broad cultural movement in support of psychopharmacological solutions for educational underperformance. If testing facilitates the mischaracterization of students as objects amenable to instrumental manipulation, it is only a small step to reimagine education in terms of actual physical interventions into the biology of the child. Moreover, because these interventions improve scores on the very tests that mischaracterized the child in the first place, the approaches are reciprocally reinforcing and creating an ostensibly coherent approach to educational reform in the 21st century. This dialectically related ensemble of efficiency oriented testing, psychopharmacology, and RHCT is shaping the future of education as if there was no alternative.
Educational Psychopharmacology

Today, in schools around the world there are millions of children whose lives have been shaped by educationally oriented psychopharmacology. Although the numbers vary as a function of socioeconomic conditions (Zito et al., 2005), there is a clear and striking global trend toward increasing use, as evidenced, for example, by major growth in the markets for ADHD medications (Scheffler et al., 2007). Parenting and schooling have been transforming as a result (Diller, 2006). The media disseminates direct-to-consumer advertisements for key products, as biotech companies make huge profits from “child-focused” campaigns (Rasmussen, 2007). We find ourselves in a historically unprecedented situation facing complex moral issues. Discussing treatments for ADHD in particular, this section highlights the increasingly prominent role that psychotropic drugs play in contemporary educational configurations. These trends in educationally oriented psychopharmacology, like those discussed above regarding testing, reveal the pathologies and distortions of educational configurations dominated by RHCT.

Just as the large-scale institutionalization of efficiency-oriented testing infrastructures has been justified by the importation into education of management models from business and industry, so the rapid increase in psychotropic drug prescriptions for children has been justified by the importation of treatment models from medicine. In both cases, the ontological monovalence of RHCT has lent credibility to reductionist (flatland) models of education, which oversimplify the nature of learning processes, neglect the four-fold complexity of social reality, and characterize education as simply involving the prediction and control of closed systems. In both cases, scientific advances about the nature of learning and education are not driving reform and large-scale implementation; rather it is an economically based desire to make a certain kind of educational system “work.” Exploring the state of knowledge about ADHD, as well as the state of practices in schools, clarifies the dangers and injustices accompanying the RHCT-based medicalization of academic underachievement.

ADHD: Science, Controversy, and Ideology

ADHD is a disorder characterized by inattention, hyperactivity, and impulsiveness, and it is a good predictor of negative academic and economic outcomes (Swanson et al., 1998). Teachers are typically the first to suggest the possibility that a child might need an ADHD diagnosis (Sax & Kautz, 2003), and roughly 75% of those diagnosed are boys (Schneider & Eisenberg, 2006). Of those diagnosed, more than half are also diagnosed with conduct or oppositional defiant disorder (Jensen et al., 2001). It is family practice doctors—not child psychiatrists—that handle most referrals and issue most diagnoses and treatments (Paren & Johnston, 2009). And, overwhelmingly, the most common treatments involve the prescription of stimulant medications, such as Ritalin and Adderall (Safer et al., 1996). Although figures vary, it is estimated by the United States Centers of Disease Control that roughly 8.4% of children between the ages of 6 and 17 will at some point be diagnosed with ADHD—that is about 4.6 million children (Pastor & Reuben, 2008). And the United States appears to be setting a global trend, as numbers reflecting the annual use of ADHD medications show major recent growth worldwide (Scheffler et al., 2007).

But this is where agreements about ADHD end. Facts about the causes of ADHD and the most effective treatments for it are complex, incomplete, and contested (Paren & Johnston, 2009; Singh, 2008). The long-standing dopamine theory of ADHD suggests that executive-function deficits involving the dopamine system are responsible for symptoms (Swanson et. al., 2007). However, it is questionable whether problems with executive function alone are necessary and sufficient for a manifestation of the disorder (Sonuga-Barke, 2005). Moreover, genetic research guided by this hypothesis and looking for predictors of ADHD has been inconclusive, finding minimal evidence for the involvement of genes known to be involved with dopamine transporters and receptors (Li et. al., 2006). And while neuroimaging work has revealed suggestive anatomical and functional differences in subjects with ADHD when compared to controls, most studies have been
conducted using samples that are too small to yield conclusive results and that do not include children and adolescents (Seidman et al., 2005). Some studies do suggest possible environmental causes (Braun et al., 2006), but most research focuses entirely on casual factors within the individual. The most promising avenues for future research focus on multiple etiologies, diverse developmental pathways, and the effects of environmental factors (Nigg et al., 2004; Sonuga-Barke, 2005). Researchers hope that these avenues might eventually shift diagnostic practices away from symptom identification and toward more complex and dynamic biomarkers of individual differences (Chamberland et al., 2007; Singh & Rose, 2009).

The state of ADHD diagnosis and treatment is comparably complicated. As already mentioned, despite clear trends suggesting that certain common practices are widespread, there are, in fact, very prominent regional differences in rates of diagnosis. These differences have led many to argue that ADHD is under-diagnosed in impoverished communities while it is over-diagnosed in wealthy and middle-class ones (Diller, 1998). Although the most common treatment for ADHD is stimulant prescription drugs, what studies there are about the efficacy of these treatments do not provide straightforward results (Parens & Johnston, 2009). Studies originally suggesting that drugs worked better than behavioral therapy have been reanalyzed to reveal that, in fact, outcomes resulting from treatments involving drugs alone were less desirable than those that combined drugs with cognitive behavioral interventions, and these outcomes were only minimally superior to behavioral therapies alone (Carey, 2000). Also, it is not at all clear that drug-induced symptom reductions (as measured using DSM criteria) necessarily lead to the desired improvements in academic achievement (Loe & Feldman, 2007). Moreover, how stimulant drugs work to improve ADHD symptoms is not well understood (Singh, 2008), which is not surprising given the state of the aforementioned brain research.

The realities “in the trenches” of school and family life, where the number of diagnoses and drug treatments continues to rise, do not reflect the tentative and preliminary nature of the state of the science. This has led some to stress that this is, simply and objectively, a dangerous and uncertain situation (Hyman, 2002; Rasmussen, 2007). Nuanced ethical arguments aside, next to nothing is known about long-term usage of stimulants in childhood and adolescence. Research conducted on adults and animals has demonstrated that these drugs do have a set of undesirable physiological effects when used in large quantities over long periods, effects such as addiction and the stunting of growth (Rasmussen, 2007). It has also been demonstrated that when those who have found success with drug treatment discontinue medication, their symptoms return (Parens & Johnston, 2009). This means that as the first generation of “Ritalin kids” find their way into college and the workforce they will continue treatment for symptoms, some having been on the drug for the vast majority of their lives—nearly 20 years. Ritalin and Adderall now rival alcohol and marijuana as the most widely used recreational drugs on college campuses, where they are typically used in higher doses for off-label purposes (Diller, 2006). Billions of pills containing Schedule II substances are in circulation among an age group known for high-risk behavior, and so the possibility of an iatrogenic crisis affecting a whole generation of young adults worries many observers (Healy, 2002; Rasmussen, 2007).

Nevertheless, despite these uncertainties and risks, millions of children are diagnosed with ADHD and treated with drugs, and the prevalence of these practices continues to increase. This suggests that trends in diagnoses and treatments for ADHD are more than the result of advances in the science and art of educational psychopharmacology. The ideology of RHCT is to blame. There is evidence of clandestine and conspiratorial relations between drug companies and disability advocacy groups (such as CHADD) that have tirelessly worked at legitimizing ADHD as a widespread disorder amenable to drug treatment (Conrad, 2007; Rasmussen, 2007; Fukuyama, 2002). There are also broad shifts in culture toward “blaming the brain” for what used to be considered moral failures (Elliot, 2003), changes related to the general acceptance of a “biomedical self” in both popular culture and the human sciences (Kagan, 2009; Healy, 2002). These considerations are consistent with views that explain practices surrounding ADHD in terms of more general trends in the medicalization of the human condition (Conrad, 2007; Illich, 1977). These theorists raise concerns about what it
means to reframe underperformance and misbehavior as biological dysfunctions, suggesting it amounts to the individuation of social problems and the de-politicization of deviance.

**On the Difference Between Designing Children and Raising Children**

In light of an IMoE, it is easy to see the partialness of most current attempts at helping children with ADHD. They shift attention away from the quality of the educational configurations and toward the biology of the child. Instead of considering that social and cultural factors may be a part of the problem, the problem is located in the child’s biological substrate. Thus, the child’s brain is to be fixed to fit into available educational configurations, as opposed to fixing these configurations so they are responsive to the individual differences of the child (Olfman, 2006). This approach to treatment is an artifact of RHCT, which guides the development of educationally oriented biotech, where medical means are used to affect educational ends. As opposed to adopting a poly-focal approach concerned with the interaction of numerous biopsychosocial factors, a specific biological dysfunction is blamed and targeted with a specific biomedical intervention.

Just over a century ago some scientists began to suggest that education could be made akin to building or engineering, thus first suggesting the prospect of designing children (Pavlov, 1927; Skinner, 1938, 1971). This approach entails that the internal dynamics and growth processes of individuals be taken as objects of manipulation—working on the life being shaped, as opposed to working with it. Designing a child is a process in which a third-person perspective is adopted and an instrumental intervention is used to change behaviors, dispositions, and capabilities. In principle, there is no need to make use of relationships built on communication, compromise, or mutual expectation—no need to embrace the four-fold complexity of social reality. Instead, this approach amounts to a unilateral construction of who the child will become. Designing a child is a relationship with a monological structure of non-reciprocal imposition, established in light of the designer’s goals for the child without input from the child or consideration of the child’s goals. The child does not participate in shaping her life, but is acted on from the outside. The child experiences behavioral and dispositional changes resulting from processes beyond her control with results she does not consider herself responsible for producing.

This distinction concerns the structure of the educational relationship in question. The line is drawn between relationships that respect the child’s (limited and burgeoning) autonomy and those that override the child’s nascent autonomy in the interest of goals to be imposed upon the child. The distinction focuses on the way people intervene in children’s lives, and actually establishes a continuum applicable in the analysis of any educational relationship. Biologically focused interventions tend toward design. They make it possible to get results—to change behavior as desired—without establishing the kinds of relationships typically associated with the raising of children.

This is critical because, according to an IMoE, children establish their identities in specific socio-cultural contexts and relationships that embody specific preferences and values. Development is a dynamic process of individuation through socialization; an individual negotiates her identity in relation to the desires of significant elders and broad cultural patterns. However, when educationally oriented biotechnologies are used to affect the outcome of identity formation, a child’s ability to negotiate her own identity can be lost, as the preferences of parents or prevalent cultural norms are literally built into her biology. As noted during the discussion of ADHD, most treatments do not involve questioning the sociocultural contexts in which the child manifests symptoms. Instead, attention is focused on the biology of the child only, and it is not considered whether some of the norms and rules the child is being asked to conform to might be unreasonable. Importantly, educational configurations that work this way effectively instantiate a system of norms that is insensitive to dissent and that relies on an ability to design children who will conform. This is a violation of the child’s autonomy—literally disallowing the child’s “self-legislative” ability. Thus, parents or cultures that severely constrain the choices available to their children during identity formation are seen as repressive
All children have “the right to an open future” in which they can act autonomously and responsibly (Feinberg, 1992). And all children have a right to participate in their own development (United Nations, 1989). This brings us to the heart of the ethical violations that result from the dominance of RHCT as the metatheory of education.

**Conclusion**

I have woven a complex story about the impact of RHCT on contemporary educational configurations. Extrapolating the trends discussed suggests the emergence of a new kind of educational system in the coming decades. During the twilight of American dominance and in the context of unprecedented global interconnectedness and complexity, school systems are being redesigned to fit the strategic and instrumental needs of largely economic geo-historical interests and entities. Since the end of World War II, RHCT has set the terms by which educational possibilities are understood and pursued, resulting in a public education system of vast size and scope, conceived by policymakers as a “sorting machine” for human capital (Spring, 1989).

Now, in the early years of the 21st century, this homogeneous public education system is being dismantled and replaced by a heterogeneous mixture of (for profit) charter schools, online education providers, and what remains of traditional schools (increasingly underfunded and undervalued). What are emerging are the most complex, pervasive, and overtly economically driven educational configurations in history.

The new education is one in which the goal of the system is no longer to create citizens who share a common fund of knowledge and culture as a result of shared educational experiences. This Deweyian ideal—which, while never achieved, did serve to counteract the total cooptation of public schools by economic interests—has been almost entirely dissolved by the relentless push of RHCT-based approaches. As discussed above, testing infrastructures have become the criterion by which educational institutions are evaluated and according to which students, teachers, and school leaders understand the goals of education. The resulting simplification of educational processes has short-circuited reflective discourse about the goals of education by creating the illusion that competing educational configurations can be compared as simply as comparing the bottom line of competing companies.

Add into this mix the trends discussed above concerning educational psychopharmacology, and a picture emerges in which students’ nervous systems become part of the “system environment” (Habermas, 1987) that must be controlled in the interest of pursuing narrowly defined parameters of system success. Just as manufacturing efficiencies are often accomplished through the use of measurement practices that make invisible the collateral damages that are done to the environment, the test-driven efficiencies of the new education involve collateral damages that are hidden in the brains of students, beyond the realm of what is measured when considering the success of a school. That is, RHCT-inspired test-driven competitions between educational approaches are intended to find solutions that work (e.g., raise test scores), without regard for how this success is achieved—even if success involves normalizing the large-scale administration of psychotropic drugs to children.

As argued above, the increasing prevalence of psychopharmacological approaches in education is due in large part to the way testing has distorted communication about the goals of education. Counteracting these trends requires changing the terms of the debate. Educators will be unable to demonstrate the effectiveness of non-psychiatric approaches for as long as the means used to measure effectiveness remain simplistic and reductive. The irrationality and immorality of instrumental interventions into the brains of children will remain suppressed for as long as there appear to be no alternatives to what must be done in order to succeed in the current system. This is a path toward the economically driven auto-transformation of the human nervous system, in which educational configurations are built to alter children’s brains to fit the needs of an increasingly complex economy. The continued unilateral design of the next generation by those currently in power is a radically unjust situation in which individuals are rendered incapable of taking responsibility for their own
lives, denied the autonomous pursuit of a self-chosen conception of the good, and thus denied the freedom and self-respect typically given to responsible humans (Habermas, 2003; Nussbaum, 2006).

**Tomorrow’s Child: Redesigning Education to Recreate the Economy**

There are alternatives to these dystopian educational futures! The minimalist IMoE I have used throughout this article suggests a way forward that would lead to a fundamentally redesigned educational system. The four-fold complexity of social reality suggests a more complex “multiple bottom lines” approach to considering educational success. Beginning with the individual, it must be recognized that the reproduction of social realities is always accomplished through their transformation, specifically through the creative autonomous actions of agents who are held responsible for what they say and do. RHCT envisions a future that is simply a continuation of the present, whereas an IMoE envisions a radically open future, dependent upon the creative actions of future generations (Bhaskar, 1993). This leads to a focus on the conditions that foster the development of autonomous, reflective, and ethical individuals. That means building the educational system around the realities of human psychology and social relations, as opposed to building it around the needs of the economy.

Accomplishing such a profound shift in the priorities guiding educational design requires a new kind of testing infrastructure. It requires an approach to testing that can make meaningful learning visible, provide insights into the diverse needs of students, and thus monitor the true distribution of educational goods in society. Such justice-oriented testing practices must be based on insights from the learning sciences that enable the measurement of multi-dimensional, psychologically real learning processes; beyond the simplified, psychological naïve, RHCT-oriented tests of “basic skills.” This means designing a testing infrastructure that is intended to directly benefit teachers and students by providing them with scientific insights into their own teaching and learning processes. As opposed to tests built to simplify the complexity of educational configurations to aid administrators in decision-making, this would be a testing infrastructure that reveals the true complexity of learning processes to those undergoing them, empowering students and teachers to take control over their lives in the classroom. Current approaches to testing are so far from this ideal of testing as a liberating technology that the possibility seems almost unimaginable, which has lead many educators to spurn testing altogether. But a small group of learning scientists and philosophers have already begun radically redesign testing, pioneering powerful new directions in large-scale standardized testing (Stein, Dawson, & Fischer, 2010).

The innovative redesign of large-scale testing makes it possible to imagine a system built in light of the true complexity and diversity of human development and learning, with an expansive and compassionate vocabulary of educational evaluation and assessment, and a multitude of acceptable educational outcomes. Instead of designing students to fit the imagined needs of tomorrow’s economy, tomorrow’s economy would be conceived as open, contingent, and malleable—an economy capable of evolving to reflect the creative freedom of individuals raised into the fullness of their autonomy, responsibility, and imagination.

Contemporary policy and ideology consider the function of the educational system as merely to supply our vast global economy with human capital—educating entrepreneurial global citizens or building skills for the global work force. But what if we turned this on its head? What if we understood the economy as merely an infrastructure enabling a vast educational system, with all our entrepreneurial efforts channeled toward the betterment of human understanding and experience? RHCT values only a limited subset of what is possible as human potential. The greatest benefit of reversing the relation between the educational system and structure of the broader economy would be the resulting liberation of human potential. Humanity stands misshapen by radically partial valuations of its own possibilities. The educational frontier opens with new ideas about the values and possibilities of human life. These are more necessary now then ever, because the future is less predictable than it has ever been.
There have been cultures in which the young were educated into a form of life known by their parents and grandparents. And there have been cultures in which adults prepared children for new forms of life, which they did not know but could envision and understand. We live today in a culture in which we must prepare children for forms of life we cannot anticipate (Mead, 1970). Elders can no longer claim to fully understand the experiences their children are having and will have. Education must not be what it has been. Our children are tomorrow’s already. We must educate them openly, in the world, without pretension of profession. Their world will not be the one we have known. So we must teach the teachers not to instill yesterday’s knowledge, but to create spaces in which tomorrow’s problems become visible.
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ON SOCIAL HOLONS, IDEOLOGIES OF INTEGRAL, AND THE KOSMOPOLITAN CALL OF POLITICS

Beyond Methodological Individualism in Integral Theory and Praxis

Michael Schwartz

ABSTRACT This article explores the concept of a social holon. Grafting approaches proper to individual holons onto the analysis of social holons is a wayward form of methodological individualism—the latter abounding throughout the integral community as ideological symptom. Coupled with the lack of a robust multi-scaled historiography, this tact ends up disclosing parameters of contemporary political life in an imbalanced and ineffective manner. Turning to the examples of Foucault and others, we can instead unite our diagnoses of the present with enacting forms of political life in which our unique selves come to heed the call of a Kosmopolitan justice.
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This article argues that the concept of a social holon remains undertheorized in Integral Theory. We have not yet taken up hints scattered in Ken Wilber’s fecund writings about the distinctiveness of social holons and the methodological implications therein. In Wilber’s classic version of Integral Theory, the AQAL model that discloses individual holons remains central to the theory and to its application. This is understandable, since in the seminal Wilber-4 moment introduced in Sex, Ecology, Spirituality (Wilber, 2000), holons, as individual holons, were at the center of the theory and its view of the primary stuff of the Kosmos. Subsequently, with the emergence and maturation of Wilber-5, perspectives have come to be seen as more primary than or equiprimordial with holons; and further there has been an expanse in the view of the “furniture” of the Kosmos, that along with individual holons there are social holons, heaps, and artifacts (Wilber 2006a, 2006b).

We can postulate that social holons are holons because they exhibit what is characteristic of holons in general—at minimum, the enactment of the four fundamental drives. Social holons, in this hypothesis, maintain themselves as recognizably the same holon over time (agency), interact with not only their environment but with other social holons (communion), evolve into greater depth/complexity (Eros), and self-integrate into greater fullness, wholeness, and health (Agape). This said, Wilber has been clear that social holons operate in ways that are distinct from that of individual holons. This means, as we shall see, that simply importing approaches proper to individual holons and grafting them onto the analysis of social holons is a wayward form of methodological individualism. Despite contrary hints in Wilber’s writings, the most common approaches one finds with regard to social holons are to treat them as if they were not much different than individual holons. What shall be argued here, instead, and at a level of theoretical abstraction to be sure, is that social holons require a different figurative frame than the quadrant/quadrivia matrix; and that, as such, the map of social holons and the map of individual holons intersect with each other in a distinctive way that clarifies both, pointing to a new kind of a bifocal vision for Integral Theory and its application. For, as is postulated as early as Sex, Ecology, Spirituality, individual holons arise in the plural from the very beginning, hence
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individual and social holons co-emerge. There is no onto-genetic priority of individual over social holons.

My tact is to stay more or less within the boundaries of classic integral discourse, so to extract latent power in the metatheory so far untapped—rather than perform comparisons with other metatheories or engage in critique/criticism. After presenting this upgrade of classic integral, by theoretically clarifying the differentiation and reintegration individual and social holons—leaving us with the complex perspectivalism of the chiasmatic folding of one’s being as an individual holon and as member of various social holons—I speculate on the latent ideologies that have underwritten the emphasis on the individual over the social and the one-sidedness enactment of methodological individualism. This sets the stage for consideration of the question of politics for integral, what an integral politics looks like; as this, it will be maintained, is nothing less than the reflexive uptake and living of the chiasmatic flows of being as individual holon and as being a member of various social holons—a way of life always already orientated by the call of justice.

**Individual and Social Holons**

In light of classic integral, we can say that a social holon does not have parts as does an individual holon (holon as part/whole). It has members. Whereas parts have a holarchical and more or less fixed place within a given holon, a member’s inclusion in the social holon is more fluid. One way to grasp this is to say that social holons do not have a monadic center (no organizing consciousness). If the dog Flash goes left, all of Flash, the individual holon, goes left; but if a social holon in which Flash is a member—the human/dog family-pack—has all its members instructed to go left, Flash might not. There is a different principle of coordinating the activity of the social holon via its various members (exchanges and communication), and hence a looser principle of inclusion of member to a social holon than of a part to an individual holon. Thus, a social holon has no collective mind and is not an organism—debunking lingering lines of 19th-century thought.

Even the notion that social holons have an altitude center of gravity, while a useful shorthand at times, is technically false—social holons are not a collective mind and do not possess a collective consciousness—and blunts the deeper and fuller analysis of social holons as such. One way of presenting social holons as having a kind of center of gravity is to say that a) communication exchanges among the members coordinate collective action and enact the social glue; b) this communication has an exterior component (zone 7) and an interior component (zone 3); c) the interior component can be analyzed from the outside (zone 4) via discourse analysis; d) the discourse of the group is determined by the leader of that group; where e) the leader has an altitude center of gravity (zone 2) that finds expression in the discourse, f) such that the group is organized around the altitude of the group leader; g) in this sense the social holon has an indirect altitude center of gravity; h) ergo, we can speak of the social holon as having a kind of altitude.

While this might be so for small groups on a given occasion, as with the example of a card game that Wilber has used (Wilber, 2006b), it is dubious as a wider methodological principle—note that, most obviously, there is a kind of unidirectional causality in the argument above which, in the end, sneaks zone-2 altitude in as the principle term in the discerning and evaluating of the social holon. What is going to be avoided in the presentation that unfolds here is smuggling back in the sense that social holons have a “collective mind” that evolves in analogy to zone-2 developmental schemes—which aligns what I take to be the great insight that Wilber has advanced with regard to the difference between the agency enactment of an individual and a social holon.

Going further, to speak of discourse as inherently having an altitude is a zone-2 methodological view of language, proper to sentence completion tests, and is misleading. As I have argued in my contribution to the 2008 Integral Theory Conference (Schwartz, 2010), a more distinctly zone-4 method, such as Foucault’s discursive analytics, is—as properly a zone 4 approach—not, in the first instance, importing zone-2 developmental schemes. Discourses disclosed via this zone-4 method often are seen to operate in a manner that embraces a range of altitudes, a condition of intelligibility between two interlocutors at different altitudes (say,
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for example, at first tier, hence allergic to one another), such that in combing these two outside perspectives (zone 2, zone 4) there is seen the conditions for mutual resonance and dissonance in understanding/meaning. The implication then is one can not a priori collapse zone-2 altitudes into zone-4 discourses. There are of course zone-4 methods that point to something like evolving (zone 3) cultural worldviews; but this does not exhaust the methods of zone-4 discourse analysis. We are to remember that Lower-Left (LL) and Lower-Right (LR) waves are often stage-like (in contrast to the more strict stage unfolding of zone 2 of the Upper Left [UL])—this stage-likeness not to be overlooked and ignored, but honored so to orient a more nuanced and sensitive approach.

Further, whereas the relationship between the UL and Upper-Right (UR) developmental schemes are tightly correlative, as interior and exterior, that between upper-quadrant and any lower-quadrant developmental waves is statistical—with increasingly fluidity, so it would seem as evolution progresses. The correlation between UR and LR Kosmic developments in the physiosphere seem to be more tightly like stage growth; yet when we move into the noosphere it loosens, so that LR techno-economic waves, once laid down as a Kosmic habit, can be skipped.

Claims like the priority of novel altitudes (UL) leading to the invention of novel lower-quadrant developments, such as techno-economic waves, is in some cases valid from an empirical rather than speculative stance, but again is by no means a priori established (cf. Wilber, 2006b). There may be cases where the emergence of novel social holons (not LR techno-economic phases alone) is the condition for the emergence of zone-2 leaps in consciousness—this is an empirical question, one that requires research that honors the difference between individual and social holons. Using the quadrant model for indirect explication of a social holon, while plausible and indeed in cases helpful (see “Discussion” below), is also not always the best way of disclosing social holons in their very textures, nuances, and operations.

Disclosing a Social Holon, Part 1: Process-Gestalts

This is not to say that the quadrant model is to be discarded; quite the contrary. As a starting point we can say that a social holon is disclosed via four principle methodological perspectives—the two methodological zones of the LL and the two zones of the LR. That is, a social holon, as such, operates principally via these two lower quadrants. The social holon is not a loose analog of an individual holon, the social holon is not a mind-body, hence does not possess overall, as does a social holon, the UL and UR quadrants. The visual figure of the AQAL matrix maps individual, not social, holons. It is perhaps wise to drop that diagrammatic figure of thought when considering social holons.

To review these perspectives proper to a social holon, zone 3 is the inside view of the collective interior. It is the felt sense of the share beliefs and values of a group—we might call this the dimension of lived norms. This field of lived norms, for a complex social holon, is multiple, dynamic, and often full of tensions. Remember, these are not the cultural norms possessed by an individual; they are the cultural norms dispersed throughout the social holon and especially as regards its members-in-interaction.

Zone 4 is the outside view of the collective interior. This can entail a method like Foucault’s discursive analytics, the disclosing of patterns of languaging that escape the participants’ perspective, where discourses do more than enact meanings. Another useful method proper to this zone (discussion of how it can coordinate with Foucault’s needing on this occasion to be bracketed) is Žižek’s structuralist-Lacanian version of ideological analysis (Žižek, 2009), which helps disclose tensions within any discursive space, as with that of contemporary American politics, where a given discourse within the matrix is not reducible to a specific wave of zone-2 development.

Zone 7 is the inside view of the collective exterior, the “communication” exchanges among the members inside the system and which “motors” the system. Let’s dispense, however, with Luhmann’s term “communication,” with its associations of interiority, and instead mobilize an exterior-sounding term like signaling,
where such signaling has not different meanings but different *vibrancies* and *frequencies*. Shifts in signaling and its vibration bands/frequencies are responses to the system’s bounded interaction with its environment (where the environment can include other social holons) as well as to tensions within the system itself.

Zone 8 is the outside view of the collective exterior, most powerfully disclosed via some sort of systems theory (about which there is a significant secondary literature).

Notice then that a social holon is *not* a system; rather, a system is a dimension of social holons—pointing to the novelty of the concept of the social holon proper to the Wilber-5 version of Integral Theory. It is the interplay of these four perspectives that disclose, if only in the first instance, the process-gestalt of a social holon, pointing to a new opening for integrally informed sociocultural inquiry.

**Disclosing a Social Holon, Part II: Member Profiles and Distributions**

Having established the social holon in its basic process-gestalt enactments and constitution, the next move is to include data about its respective members. Here is where facets of the interiority and exteriority of individuals come into play. Each member of the social holon possesses the four quadrants. The lower two quadrants are the ways that the member is dynamically and complexly situated in the social holon. The upper two quadrants are at the heart of the member’s *profile*. Each member has an UL psychograph (PG) and an UR body behavior presentation (BP), with the latter being disclosed through methods developed by Goffman, Foucault, Mauss, Bourdieu, and others. With this in mind, and from the general perspective of seeing the social holon from without, we can enact a statistical analysis of the PG and BP profiles of the members of the social holon; and, as a necessary corollary, investigate further the *distributions* of the respective profiles within the social holon according to positions established by any number of intersecting factors such as economic class, gender, access to signaling media, locations and styles of discoursing, and more—that is, the ways a member’s singular LL and LR dynamically intersect with the social holon itself.

This points, or such is here the claim, toward a novel form of social theory. Let us go further, expanding the heart of the individual profile to four zones:

1. Zone 1 discloses the textures, qualities, and habits of the interior that pervades a given sociocultural complex. For example, a distracted version of focused attention and the feel of that difference, where these types of felt-experience (roughly that of the German distinction between *Erlebnis* and *Erfahrung*) are not strictly altitude determined. We might find for example that this difference in the felt-texture of experience may have something to do with age and with access to new technologies, or to consumption habits proper to other dimensions of inquiry.
2. Zone 2 discloses developmental waves and centers of gravity.
3. Zone 6 discloses the body behavioral presentation, as mentioned above.
4. Zone 5 discloses how certain body behavioral presentations enact a given sociocultural environment or situation.

Again, notice that a social holon does not possess an UL or an UR, so does not have a profile as such—its members have profiles, “hearts.” And with regard to focus on social holons, these profiles are statistically and complexly distributed throughout the social holon. The member’s UL and UR define the individual profile per se, the LL and LR define member location, its relational distribution (statistically speaking) throughout the social holon, and points toward the frequencies of how certain members directly and indirectly communicate, interact, signal, and exchange with other members.

What this mode of analysis enables, and what the use of the quadrant model for social analysis does not, is discerning the actual distribution of individual member profiles throughout the social holon, and the
complex, textured interplay of forces and factors of this member distribution as regards the operations of the social holons enactment of the four drives—rather than posit a kind of “norm” that such and such a level of development correlates with such and such a “stage” in the LL and LR. The process-gestalt of a social holon is constituted through sundry threads or waves of economic modes, discursive practices, lived norms, material exchanges, system dynamics, and more, weaving via the distributions of member UL/UR profiles. Among other matters, this form of analysis points to the sociocultural conditions enabling and disabling, in a statistical manner, individual development and health in a rigorously presented, empirically grounded (rather than impressionistic and anecdotal) manner.

The Chiasm of Individual and Social Holons

By differentiating the analysis of social holons from that of individual holons, we are called for a second move in the growth of classic integral as metatheory—that of integrating the two. Hence: Individual and social holons are the within and the without of one another. There is a kind of chiasmatic relation between the two—and we need to be attentive to which frame we are enacting at a given moment of inquiry, as individual holons possess a sociocultural dimension to their being in the world such that the sociocultural, as the lower quadrants, are within individual holons. Social holons possess members that are individual holons, which are therefore within that social holon as member. This is the chiasm of within and without.¹

This does not point only to the lineaments and contours of a formal theory. It is grounded in a felt (folk) sense of the interplay of perspectives of everyday life: Imagine being in the office with co-workers. Note your own tetra-being in the world via the quadrant model. Now “flip” that perspective sense, feeling that your own tetra-arising shift and inflect into a more objective modality as a member of the network of co-workers. Note now aspects of the profiles of the members, including age, gender, cultural background, ethnicity, education, family status, bodily appearance, styles of dressing, and so on, as distributed in specific if dynamic ways by that social holon’s parameters—salary, office role, organization position. This exercise begins to yield in direct experience, albeit in a manner of a pre-formal or folk method, the constitution of the social holon inclusive of one’s membership. This might sound more difficult to enact than it is; it only requires that one get a sense of the make-up of the social holon and then practice feeling into its dynamic constitution.

Having flipped into a social holonic frame, one then flips back to the individual holonic sense of one’s tetra-being-in-the-world, one’s sense of inhabiting that situation as Self having undergone alteration. And then one flips again into the social holon frame; the back to the individual sense; and so on. What results is a more and more fluid sense of the within and without—of being an individual holon and being a member of that social holon—actualizing the chiasm of the integral flesh of the world, to allude the great late work of Maurice Merleau-Ponty. (If for Merleau-Ponty this turned on the chiasm-folding cum reversibility of subject and object, for integral this hinges on the chiasm of the within and without of individual and social.) In the end, this is a practice, a training for life, that is not to be believed but rather to be enacted, an injunction that, as we shall see, if taken up, turns on what it can mean to live an integral political life that heeds the call of justice.

In the end this way of relating individual and collective is distinctive, inviting comparison with other social theories that take up the question of agency and structure (Giddens, 1984; Bashkir, 1989), including the quadrant-like approaches proper to a surprising number of social theorists (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2012).

The Question of Evolution

As a holon, a social holon enacts, at least in some minimal sense, the four basic Kosmic drives: agency, communion, Eros, and Agape. The first two, the horizontal drives, are readily discerned. A social holon maintains itself over time within a given environment (agency) and interacts with other social holons (communion).
The two vertical drives, Eros in particular, are trickier. Because a social holon is a complex process-gestalt of multiple dimensions, the question arises as to what would be the criteria for assessing when a social holon has transformed rather than merely made a horizontal shift.

At present the model for discerning evolution is that of the individual holon. Individual holons are parts/wholes, and it is this part/whole structure that enables evolution through recognizable patterns of transcend-and-embrace. Social holons do not have parts, but have members. Furthermore, certain social holons, like techno-economic modes of production, are stage-like in their unfolding over time. Among other factors, these two points alone call us to re-evaluate what would be the criteria for assessing the “evolution” of social holons. Of course we could give quick answers, but better would be to honor the integral virtue of deriving a priori categories from a posteriori research. I suspect that only after sustained empirical investigation into social holons will enough evidence be mounted to enable us to create new concepts to categorize their process-gestalts, providing a basis for discerning when and how a social holon has evolved.

To make this more concrete, let’s play with some examples. To begin, let us posit one social holon has a distribution of 50% of its members at a turquoise-altitude, second-tier center of gravity and the other 50% at amber-red altitude. Another social holon, comparable in its scale and scope, has a membership that is close to 100% orange-green altitude. Which one is more evolved, in a clear rather than murky way, as a social holon according to this data of altitude percentages (only one dimension of the complexity of a social holon)?

As another example, let’s explore the distribution of altitudes within the economic sphere. Let’s say that for the first social holon, 70% of the wealth belongs to 10% of the population, all of whom are high second-tier; 25% of the wealth among the remaining second-tier population; and 5% of the wealth amongst the remaining 50%, all red-amber altitude. And for the second social holon, the wealth is distributed among the population far more evenly. How does this affect our judgment of which one is a more “evolved” social holon?

As a third example, let us say one social holon has a vast majority of its members at an amber altitude center of gravity, another at red altitude center of gravity. Let’s turn to zone-4 discourses and zone-3 worldviews. Let us say the first has a worldview and set of discourses that advance violence at the sign of any conflict; let’s say that the second has a set of discourses that, like Jainism, prohibits all forms of violence. Behaviors are clearly affected by these respective mixes. Which social holon, from a second-tier or third-tier view, is more morally evolved? One has members at a higher moral-value altitude; the other has a lower percentage in moral altitude yet the dominant discourse is less prone to promote violence as a resolution to conflict (without presupposing that violence is simply to be ruled out, tout court, as skillful means).

The point is that social holons are complex, where the percentages of centers of gravity let alone the distribution of altitudes are only facets. It might turn out that social holons are, in terms of evolution, somewhere between heaps, which do not evolve, and individual holons, which do. It might turn out, from future research results, that social holons are to be assessed relative to one another through the Basic Moral Intuition or BMI (Wilber 2000), complemented by the sense of the justice of social holonic arrangements as regards the health, and well-being of its members.²

The point is that to presuppose that the ranking of social holons can be done with a view to or in analogy with UL individual altitude lines is to blur distinctions between individual and social holons.

**Discussion**

There are a number of scholarly efforts that have successfully used the AQAL model, or some variant, for economic, social, or institutional analysis. I believe there is validity in this family of approaches. Given the above remarks, too, these approaches can be viewed as the disclosing of a statistically ideal individual holon—that given x-conditions say in the LL there is a statistical likelihood that this will correspond to such-and-such a x-stage of individual capital, individual stage development, etc., within the population. This is
an important lens, but it is not the view of a social holon. I want to recommend that the notion of a social holon being proposed in this article suggests a more nuanced manner of discerning the actual operations of human collectives, pointing toward a critical-theoretical deployment of integral principles (Schwartz, 2010). Of course, all of this remains to be enacted concretely. And as well, there are meta-methodological considerations (Edwards, 2009) of how to enact the interrelations the first-order methods (e.g., between discourse analysis and system dynamics) that can only take shape as actual research efforts come forth.

**Ideologies of Integral**

There is the question of why, nearly a decade since Wilber introduced the distinction between individual and social holons, that theoretical articulation of the latter, let alone its methodological refinement and empirical enactment, remain nil. I believe this has to do with several factors, reflection upon which can help us free up space for the enactment of the chiasm of the individual and social as way of integral political life.

First, Integral Theory itself came out of a prior engagement with and participation in the transpersonal psychology and human potential movements. By definition, these have a kind of “I” focus, which became transposed as the centrality of the UL quadrant for most integral theorists and practitioners today. There is nothing however in the theory itself that the UL is a pre-given center of gravity of the model’s enactment. Second, there is the cultural inheritance of the shifting postmodern divides of public and private (this very distinction itself eroding under novel social holonic conditions), where church is differentiated from the state, and activities like spiritual practice were to be outside of certain modes of public life, proper to more private pursuits of one’s happiness. Third, and related to the second, has been the American democratic predominance of governmental or civic atomism, descending from liberalist contract theories, which strongly inform the American ethos (especially via Locke), starting as they do from the individual—in contrast, say, to a Hegelian lineage that sees self-formation as inseparable from interaction with others (a postmodern line of thought going back to Rousseau and forward today to Axel Honneth). Rights are encoded in the American cultural ethos more deeply than are the explicitness of obligations and responsibilities (as in the “Bill of Rights,” which is not titled the “Bill of Responsibilities” or “Bill of Rights and Responsibilities”).

There are many prominent integralists that champion this American political vision. Whence what I want to argue is that this championing of “democracy” as such is in tension with Integral Theory itself, where the self-sense precipitates moment-to-moment through the tetra-arising of being-in-the-world with others (Schwartz, 2010). As such, there is an ecology of rights and obligations always already folded into the norms of everyday life.

Having its pre-history in transpersonal psychology and the human potential movement, finding itself in a cultural habitus where spirituality is to be most properly and often located in sectors of private life, and where rights predominate over obligations as civic ethos, the integral community by and large has tended to enact the theory 1) with focus on the UL, and 2) with neglect of social holons, opting instead for the prevailing of various forms of methodological individualism. Despite itself, integral has tended to get caught in certain ideological currents that prioritize the individual.

The result, as I argued in my talk at the 2012 What Next Integral conference (Schwartz, 2012), has been a deep morphic groove in the community of enacting the theory as centered in the UL quadrant, posited as the locus of the master or key hermeneutic arena of perspectives; or, in greater balance, the lens through which the other quadrants are seen, interpreted, and evaluated. But the AQAL matrix does not prescribe any one quadrant as primary; instead, one can occupy any of the quadrants as the fulcrum-center of gravity and see the other quadrants through that orienting lens. For example, seeing the UL through the LR, deploying theories and methods that descend from the Western Marxist philosopher Georg Lukács (Lukács, 1968), facets of the UL are seen in a way that is not disclosed from within the UL itself, aspects of how capitalist economic flows shape the very forms of consciousness and hence of immediate experience itself (as, in this regard, one comes
to lament the complete neglect in integral circles of Guy DeBord’s *Society of the Spectacle* and its poignant diagnostic of contemporary spectacular experience (Debord, 1994; Schwartz, 2011). In principle, one can look through any of the quadrants at the other three such that dimensions of actuality and causality are disclosed anew. The task is to let go of an occulted foundational stance as regards perspective clusters proper to the any of the quadrants, especially the UL, and dissolve into a post-foundational way of being that moves amongst any of the four quadrants as shifting center of gravity to discern the other three. What emerges is a way of being and enacting actuality that can be called “integral kaleidoscopsics,” a ramified practice path and way of being that dissipates the habit of seeking a ground in the UL.

**Theory, Surface Structures, Integral Historiography**

Another facet of prioritizing the individual has been the privileging, rather than balancing, of the monological over the dialogical, where the former resonates with a strong sense of a theoretical stance (“theoretical” having many resonances, more than can be unpacked in the present context). In the enactment of the model, one of the symptoms of this monological-theoretical primary is that deep structures predominate over surface structures in a way that often looks orange-modernist: universals subsuming particulars without significant remainder (Schwartz, 2010). One result has been the failure to discern the complex, multi-faceted energies and trajectories of the specific, concrete historical circumstances that are being addressed. Over and over people of integral development and good will venture into worldly projects—only to see these projects fail. There are any number factors contributing to this, and despite talk of ‘embodiment,” one of these is the lack of honoring the nuances of surface structures and hence of the flows and currents of concrete actuality. What is requisite, and again absent from most currents of integral scholarship (outside of a few pockets of psychology and spiritual studies), is the exercising of the integral historiographic imagination—a capacity that is sorely needed.

Again, by and large, we employ modernist narrative logics on a macro or meta kind, stories about the evolution of the Kosmos, sometime scaled down to that of humanity, with an occasional binary (“dialectical”) twist in the dignity and disaster thematic. The postmodern moment of micro-histories, let alone philosophically informed and researched genealogies (as in the recent work of Sloterdijk [2013] on the emergent modernist imperative of self-development), is rare in integral circles. Even when narrative capacities expand along with perspective-taking into turquoise and indigo waves, where historical time becomes vast, beyond one’s lifetime (coordinating high level action logics, or what I would call *action schemata*), and where the modes of temporality can come to exceed linearity, integral tends to fall back upon modernist tales of irreversible linear historical time—or said otherwise, orange historiographic imagining is carried forward into higher altitudes of cognition and embodied being in the world without much adjustment.

A second-tier integral historiography would embrace the postmodern moment much more fully, leading to enacting and coordinating the complexities of various forms of narrative logics, modes of temporality, and scales of investigation. Historical schemas too would proliferate, inclusive of Hegel-like meta-stories, Foucaultian genealogies, Benjaminian messianics (Benjamin, 1968; Osborne & Charles, 2011), and more. Temporalities and tempos of becoming would also bloom—both in horizontal and vertical ways (the latter proper to Heideggerian ontological eventing, *Ereignis*, and also to gross-subtle-causal “causalities” cum-emergence). Macro, meso, and micro scales in inquiry and scholarship would all be honored, not simply dominated in an orange, top-down universal-subsuming manner, but in the interplay of scales and paces of becoming. And all of this enacted in a manner that gathers sufficient data to flesh out the inquiry. It is only via such attention to the nuances and complexities of the currents of becoming, inclusive of the irreducible force and importance of surface structures, that we intervene more effectively into actual everyday affairs. Which leads us into the final principle topic of this article—that of the political.
The Question of the Political

One of the components of everyday life that commands attention is politics—in matters of which the integral community has so far been often naïve, not only in an often pre-critical view of the political foundations of America (which gets explained away as proper to some orange altitude center of gravity that must lean toward rights; while in the context of China, “orange” explains nothing, as the priority of rights even among many scholars and philosophers is not so immediately self-evident or convincing, given the deep and pervasive Confucian cultural ethos); but too in that the question of the political—in distinction from the social, the economic, the cultural, and governance—is rarely posed. Just what might then be the distinctiveness of the political for integral?

Let us begin, in this initiatory and all too brief inquiry, with what I call the tetra-call of the Good — where the Good as otherwise than Being, always already calls Being to be otherwise (which is not by the way reducible to a call for Eros and transformation), and where this call reverberates and differentiates through the quadrants—as the call to freedom via the UL, the call of responsibility to the other via the LL, the call to vitality and capacity via the UR, and the call of justice as fairness for our system arrangements and patterns of signaling via the LR (Schwartz, In press). Let us recall that for Plato politics cannot be separated from the question of justice—a theme developed, in diverging manners, in more recent times in the thought-paths of both Levinas and Derrida. Re-inscribed for integral, and within the frame of an individual holon, politics is the mode of engagement called forth by justice as reverberating through the LR quadrant such that the other three quadrants are sensed through the moral lens of a politics of justice-fairness.

But this is only a first step. What further is required is the enactment of the chiasmatic foldings between individual and social holons. Called by justice, while having internalized a sense of the BMI, one objectifies oneself as a member of a given social holon, discerning the operations of this collective and one’s places within it. For example, I live in a beautiful middle class neighborhood in Augusta, Georgia, only a few minutes from my teaching job at Georgia Regents University. When I consider the nests of social holons to which I belong, charting this through geographical expansion, there is my local neighborhood, then the encompassing sections of the town, then the city itself, the surrounding counties, the state, the region called the “Deep South,” the United States, the Western world, the globe itself—along with transversing social holons, geographically dispersed, like my family, friends, professional and spiritual organizations, and so on. (This leaves aside for the moment the various social holons of the biosphere, as with the many red fire ants that live on the very same land that supports my house.) Each of these social holons has different norms, scales, patterns of interaction, system dynamics, and so on. Yes, it is amazingly complex!

Integral politics, as a way of life, is to enact the chiasmatic disclosure of the perspectival flesh of world, flowing between the senses of individual and collective, fiercely living in the impossible/possible call of acting on behalf of ever greater justice; inclusive of a willingness, openness, and skillfulness to engage others in deliberation and conflict resolution, in mutual learning practices, that can better coordinate action that justly serves.

This sense of justice is to be extended to all sentient beings in the Kosmos, surely from the biosphere upwards, such that there are nests and rhizomes of social holons, all the way and all the way down. Politics then is a Kosmic love affair, as one is called to be Kosmopolitan—but without bypassing the immediate and concrete issues at one’s door step. In this integral sense of the political, which moves out of political power-as-domination into political power-as-empowering (Bashkir, 1993), there is an eco-politics (where humans are only one species amongst many), a family-politics (where one has an ever changing set of roles as one ages), a state-politics (which brings forth questions and issues of governance and public deliberation), and so on. Each of these requires specific skills and knowledge-bases for improving one’s beneficial potency in responding to the always already call of justice. Quickly, we see that genealogical discernment of sundry aspects of everyday life are requisite to improve our living as a Kosmopolitan—from knowledge of the his-
History of sexuality and of family-formations, to that of the of states and governments, and so on. Such inquiries refine our sense of the social holon of which we are a part, including the inherited pathologies and imbalances (which go undetected, passing as normal). Even though one can never “master” the knowledge and skills to enact this in full, all of us can do so to some extent—helping one another do, teaching, and learning from one another. And nothing less is called forth in the taking up of an integral political life, heeding the always and forever Kosmopolitan call of infinite justice.

**The Justice of Self-Development**

The challenge is to become an integral political being, a politicized Unique Self, reflexively aware of one’s own chiasmatic fold as tetra-arising individual and as concrete member in an array and nests of social holons. It is from living this chiasmatic fold, via the call of justice and with regard to a social holon’s specific make-up and constitution, that one begins to live integral politics—a task of life long growing and maturing, daunting perhaps: but nothing less is called for.

How one is called to grow into greater capacity and health, toward this end, is not always obvious. Certain kinds of training generate forms of being in the world that do not serve justice, but quite the contrary; or others that we are not engaged in are our requisite for us to take up. Here then we have an integral update of the later Foucault’s inquiries into how various forms of self-development fold into institutions and systems - exemplified in his analyses of practices of self, pastoral care, and governmentality (Schwartz, 1998, 1999).

A key element for the sense of the political, and enacting an integral political life, is discrimination between what we ought to have in common and what is the possession of sub-groups or individuals who are members of a given social holon. One of the vastly underdiscussed themes these days, in the wake of the hegemony of neoliberalism, is that of private property. What is the extent of privatization? What is the extent of our commons, what we all possess and share in? (Is fresh air something that can or ought to be commodified?) In the midst of actually existing capitalism today, when everything seems to be handed up for privatization, this is one of the pressing deep questions pertinent to social holons like that of states and the globe community. Where this issue is also pertinent and found in social holons of other scales, such as the family. An open, mature integral politics is required to take up this pressing theme that is caricatured as some leftist, outdated theme.

**Conclusion**

In this article I have argued for the taking up of a ramified notion of social holons—which are to be chiasmatically folded, as the within/without, of individual holons. This bifocal scheme of being-in-the-world highlights a prior bias, in the integral world, toward the individual and various forms of methodological individualism. Training in integral kaleidoscopics is an initial ways of growing out of such habits, dissolving certain integral ideologies and their contracting effects. Enacting this chiasmatic integral folding of the Flesh of Being, heeding the call of justice, we are called to a kosmopolitanism—one that, attuned to the currents of both deep and surface structures, leads us into integral political life.

**NOTES**

1 In diagramming a social holon, we can envision each member as a circle-containing AQAL grid. The LL and LR are the manners in which the social holon intersects with and positions of any given individual member. Here the individual holon is within the social holon. Now, turning to an individual holon, the AQAL quadrant diagram is predominant, the generics of the social holon zones absorbed into the AQAL matrix of the individual holon. Now the social holon is within the individual holon. This is the within/the without of individual and social.
The integral notion of justice as fairness and that of the BMI are close if not identical; I discuss this briefly in “Tetra call of the good” (Schwartz, In press). To offer here a brief remark, the BMI would seem to stress the drive of Eros over the others; whereas that of justice as integral fairness is less inclined toward this drive priority. Both of these formulations have merit, and in the end engage the moral valences of actuality from different angles.

Perhaps too this relation to the political is another consequence of a metatheory that is so philosophical, for as Sloterdijk (2012) has argued, philosophy and politics have been out of joint with one another since Plato—such that, wise as she was, Arendt did not speak of her work as political philosophy but as political theory and reflection.
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THE MEANING OF PLANETARY CIVILIZATION
Integral Rational Spirituality and the Semiotic Universe
Tim Winton

ABSTRACT This article composes a formal constellation of distinct, but overlapping, philosophical, methodological, and theoretical commitments enactive within the integrative world-space. This approach is proposed as a basis for exploring a pragmatic meta-worldview capable of carrying meaning making necessary for the formation of a healthy and enduring planetary civilization. The heart of this challenge lies in finding a coherent and culturally extensible contemporary integration of humanity’s most persistent and foundational dualism—that of materialist and spiritualist views (with their respective ontic/realist vs. epistemic/idealist orientations) and the overarching meaning-making cosmologies they respectively support. I contend that current integrative approaches are still early in the developmental process of forming such a view, and that while they move us ever closer to a viable nondual orientation, they are ultimately perceived to fall on one side or the other of the divide and therefore fail, as yet, to locate a meaningfully comprehensive stance capable of uniting all of humanity under one cosmological structure. In this article I seek to develop an integral pragmatist approach, which I refer to as integral semiotic realism, as a distinction supportive of resolving the cosmological divide. An integral cosmology is then proposed based on the postmetaphysical injunction prescribed by the semiotic enactment of the notion of Planetary Civilization through the signification of integral rational spirituality. This endeavor fits within and contributes to the development of Integral Post-Metaphysics, Integral Pluralism, and an integrative realism and strives to locate unity in their diversity.
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“The action of a sign generally takes place between two parties, the utterer and the interpreter. They need not be persons; for a chameleon [sic] and many kinds of insects and even plants make their livings by uttering signs…. However every sign certainly conveys something of the general nature of thought, if not from a mind, yet from some repository of ideas, or significant forms, (my emphasis) and if not a person, yet to something capable of some how “catching on”…. That is [...] of receiving not merely a physical, nor even merely a psychical dose of energy, but a significant meaning.” [emphasis added]

— C.S. Peirce (as cited in Corrington, 1993, p. 163)

“The thermodynamic need to specify work implies semiotics, and energy quality is inherently semiotic. Work requires information…”

— S.N. Salthe (2005, p. 142)

“Which worldview can adequately depict and integrate both rationality and spirituality—and thus fully elaborate on the worth, as well as the contradictions—of traditional, modern and postmodern positions alike?”

— R. Benedikter and M. Moltz (2012, p. 58)

Correspondence: P.O. Box 1979, Byron Bay, New South Wales, Australia 2481. E-mail: tim@patterndynamics.com.au.
In this article I put forward a case that the main priority of integral endeavors, at this time, should be to work deeply within and to enable “modernity,” despite—and in fact because of—its destructive tendencies, atrocities, and its industrial-scale capacities for undermining the ecological and social foundations of Earth. That from an integral perspective, to seek to transcend modernity before we have established a healthier, horizontal manifestation of it, and before it has, in fact, reached a certain stage of maturity, will make it impossible to include it as anything but a deep and destructive shadow within an emerging Planetary Civilization. Furthermore, I contend that in order to facilitate not only the reduction of pathologies, but the enhancement of actual (and, of course, already substantial) apithological, generative health (Varey, 2004) within modernity, it is necessary to introduce a source of ultimate meaning as a foundation for strengthening appropriate ethical behavior within the modern milieu. I propose that this can be undertaken via the generation of a viable nondual, integrative planetary cosmology—one that will be acceptably interpreted as the origin of reverence, deep meaning, and ultimate significance so as to provide a source of underlying unity for the diverse perspectives of traditional, modern, post-modern and integral worldviews. A nondual approach of this nature, however, may entail modifying, within the integral context, the meaning of some of our deepest notions of “spirituality” itself.

In laying out the supporting argument for an integrative planetary cosmology (the terms integral and integrative will be used interchangeably) we will explore and attempt to configure elements from somewhat diverse philosophical, methodological, and theoretical traditions. I will start with an examination of current discussions between, and the work of, two of the most prominent integrative metatheorists—Roy Bhaskar, with his philosophy of Critical Realism/metaRealism (CR/MR) and Ken Wilber, with Integral Theory (IT). We work through the claimed and counter-claimed orientations to ontological foundationalism and epistemological bias, respectively. These assertions are examined in relation to: what it means to be interpreted to fall (not necessarily wholly, but at the very least as a bias) on one side or the other of what I refer to as the “cosmological divide”; and, why this matters. The cosmological divide is here defined as the boundary region between worldviews that are, however subtly, perceived (interpreted) to be orientated more to either an epistemological view, where some sort of conscious sentience or “interiority” pervades and is foundational to reality, or an ontological view, where “objects” or “real things” are foundational and underpin any forms of consciousness. Both Wilber and Bhaskar claim a nondual stance. I argue that, while this may be true and supportable within their own (substantial) frameworks, from a wider, pragmatic point of view, neither as yet do. It may be a third, and lesser known (though only in the English-speaking world), figure—also considered an integrative metatheorist—Edgar Morin, with his orientation to Method as a process of inquiry within the discipline of Complex Thought (CT)—and with it the possibility for constructing the meaning that will allow us to sustain “homeland Earth”—who provides the most fruitful direction in which to look for a “way” of resolving the cosmological divide.

In the middle section the connection between method, inquiry, and meaning-making is extended and an argument is mounted that a semiotic approach will best serve as the foundational logic of an integrative cosmology. Sean Esbjörn-Hargens’ (2010) work on Integral Enactment Theory (IET) and my related idea that integral enactment may be interpreted as semiotic in nature (semiotic enactment) are reviewed. Semiotic Enactment (SE) is a concept I developed initially in relation to IET to support a theory of meta-types, which in turn underpins the development of an integral sustainability pattern language, PatternDynamics (PD) (Winton, 2010a). PD may be embedded within IT as a set of meta-types, and it also has a strong resonance with, as a particular “complexity language” framework, the more general notion of CT. SE is then evolved to act as a bridge, and therefore a middle ground in its own right, that can demonstrate the nonduality of epistemology and ontology within a semiotically orientated cosmology-building context. Here we explore the idea of “semiotic depth” to compliment the strength of Bhaskar’s categories of ontological depth and Wilber’s development of epistemological depth. We go on to incorporate further aspects of Charles Saunders Peirce’s sign
theory into SE (which already borrows substantially from his semiotic philosophy) to develop a distinct type of pansemiotism, signified as integral Semiotic Realism (iSR). We investigate Stanley N. Salthe’s requirement, in light of the discoveries of the complexity sciences, for the reintroduction of the last two of Aristotle’s four types of causes—formal and final—in order to form a coherent contemporary, scientifically grounded cosmology (Zimmerman, 2013). Rupert Sheldrake’s work on formative causation via morphic resonance in morphic fields is put forward as a basis for reinstating formal causes. A tradition of thinking about energy quality (the so called 4th law of thermodynamics/energy), extending from Odum to Lotka and back finally to Boltzmann, Clausius and Carnot, is substituted for Salthe’s proposition that the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics should account for final causes.

In the concluding section I speculate on the pragmatic implications of IRS versus current integrative approaches to spirituality; the nature of its more naturalistic orientations; how IRS and its embeddedness within a Semiotic Realism may function as the basis of an integrative nondual cosmology; why this is critical to the essential project of fulfilling the promise of modernity; and why that is of central importance to the human project. Finally, we look at what the preceding items might mean for those of us identified with an integrative worldview in the development of Planetary Civilization.

Modernity and Planetary Civilization

The notion of Planetary Civilization is here not synonymous with an integral or post-postmodern society, in the sense of a society where the dominant majority of power, influence, and activity takes place from within an integral worldview. There is no doubt, however, that for the first time there is evolving a human society global in complexity, scope, scale, interconnectedness, environmental and social effects that puts us firmly in the Planetary Era (Morin, 1999; Stein, 2010): Planetary Civilization is already upon us. And it is, I suggest, in the main, distinctly modern in character. While it may be argued that some of the technologies leading the development of this latest phase of modernity and the cognition behind them fits within an integrative/post-formal emergence, it does not change the fact that their effects are at this stage only to enhance the activities of an unprecedentedly powerful modern world. And with billions of people all over the planet relentlessly taking up the opportunities afforded by modernization, the development of this Planetary phase of modernization has really only just begun. What effects self-consciously integrative communities of practice are having on this development currently, or may scale to have going forward, is difficult to determine. Only relatively small numbers are projected to enter post-formal orientations in the near future. To gain any real traction integrative initiatives will have to be strategic, targeted, and find highly leveraged approaches that are meaningful enough to act at scale in order to have significant effects within the globally dominant dynamics of modernity.

I will use Bhaskar’s (and Habermas’) (2007) convention and refer to the distinction between modernity and post-modernity as one akin more to degree than of kind. Bhaskar (2002) sees postmodernism as an element of the larger “philosophical discourse of modernity.” (PDM) Going forward, the use of the term modernity or modern will refer to both modernity and postmodernity, as they are more generally recognized, as well as Bhaskar’s distinction regarding “modernization.” Bhaskar’s last phase of the PDM, Western (Bourgeois) Triumphalism is replaced with a distinction signified by the term Planetary Civilization. While it is important to understand the differences between the various phases of modernity, particularly between what Bhaskar refers to as high modernity and so-called postmodernity, the grouping put forward here is important for the position stated in this article. It is also consistent with Wilber’s (1995) critique of both modernity and postmodernity as “flatland” worldviews (flatland being the term signifying his critique of the lack of recognition of depth, or “interiority,” as a foundational aspect of reality by both modernity and post-modernity), and that it is only at a collectively integral and individually post-formal level where a major transition begins that integrates both “interior” and “exterior” realities in a nondual orientation.
This view of modernity also reinforces the fact that sustaining the activities of the (economically) developing world (modernization), and the existing economic throughput of those nations already having industrialized (modern/post-modern), is humanities greatest challenge. This challenge can be met by finding ways to make sustaining human society and the planet we live on more meaningful and therefore more visible within modernity. A key component of this strategy is the requirement for forging a new source of “ultimate meaning” as a basis for ethical guidance. Ultimate meaning of this sort, and any deep rational for revering the cosmos (and by extension our own world), has been largely absent from modernity since it rejected the guiding spirituality of more traditional historic societies. The spiritual consciousness of traditional periods that supported the overarching ethical programs of those times, such as they were, were replaced in modernity by a cold materialist turn. Human consciousness was now relegated to but an epiphenomenon of material processes in a meaningless and purposeless universe. The destructiveness of modernity is surely linked to this “cosmology of meaninglessness.” It is like a great gaping bottomless existential hole that we try and fill with the only things that can signify high levels of meaning within a materialist cosmology—material artifacts. A form of spirituality readily acceptable within modernity could conceivably remedy this, but it would need to meet the requirement by modernity for being situated within a cosmology that is rationality explicable. In this regard the voice of modernity will have to be respected, not just because it looks like (within this view) it has to be, but because no spirituality can claim to be truly integral unless it does.

The Meaning of Metatheories

It is because of their power to influence the articulation of modernity—that is, the more horizontal development of its type, health, and maturity, and its effect on the emergence of Planetary Civilization—that the debates regarding the philosophical positions of integrative metatheories matter. To the outsider, issues related to the establishment of these positions may seem like highly intangible, overly convoluted, or trivial details, but I think we rightly assign them the utmost importance. They are the stuff of our cosmologies and our cosmologies are the source of our ultimate meaning and spirituality, and by extension the basis of our understandings, norms, ethics, actions, social, political and economic behaviors. Wars have been fought, empires forged and lost, and the dominant modes of existence for virtually everyone who has ever lived have been prescribed by the prevalence of spiritually orientated, epistemologically grounded worldviews or more materially orientated, ontologically grounded worldviews (Harman, 1998). As Mark Edwards (2010), foremost scholar of the practice of metatheorizing itself, notes:

“The impact of social theory, and particularly of big-picture theorising, can occasionally be so deep and so ubiquitous that there could hardly be a more powerful example of the influence of ideas on the concrete social practices and lived human experience. (p. 47)

As an aside and to clarify: ontologically orientated views need not be founded in the requirement that everything stem from material causes or from matter/energy as such. Certainly, Bhaskar’s ontological position is not: real things need not be “material” in his view (Collier, 1994), nor are they ultimately grounded necessarily in matter/energy in the foundational mechanisms of the intransitive domain of his system of “depth ontology.” However, the general feeling by modern Western scientifically informed views is such that any ontological position will lack rigor unless it can be interpreted that way.

Wilber asserts that, while not fundamentally materialist, Bhaskar, with his investigation into the possibility of science and the development of CR/MR, constructs a view that prioritizes ontology over epistemology and in fact separates them as distinct domains. In a recent article in the Journal of Integral Theory and Practice, Wilber (2013) states:
CR separates epistemology and ontology, and makes ontology the level of the “real”; whereas, for Integral Theory, epistemology and ontology cannot so be fragmented and fractured, but rather are two correlative dimensions of every Whole occasion (part of the tetra-dimension of every holon). (p. 43)

Bhaskar (2013), in an article published in the same issue of the journal, rejoins on Wilber’s comments:

I do not “suck consciousness out of all being and then make being the basis of the real.” On the contrary, I start with consciousness—in experimental activity—and ask what it presupposes. (p. 40)

Here, we see that Bhaskar does not accept that he is on the ontological side of the cosmological divide; nor does Wilber accept that he be relegated to the epistemological side. Wilber’s assertion about Bhaskar’s position is based on his own grounding philosophical view. In an article transcribed as a summary, for Bhaskar, by Paul Marshall (2013), of a conversation he had with Wilber where Wilber lays out his core criticisms of CR/MR, Marshall elaborates on this point, saying,

Wilber’s main criticism of Critical Realism is based on his panpsychism (or pan-interiorism, as he prefers to call it in his writings). For him, the universe is made up of sentient beings with perspectives, “all the way down” to sub-atomic particles (in the form of Whiteheadian prehension). (p. 35)

Wilber’s integration of panpsychism/pan-interiorism (epistemology) with the requirement to specify the method (methodology) in enacting objects (ontology) is perhaps best summed up by a statement used by Wilber to articulate his “post-metaphysical” stance: “the meaning of a statement is the injunction of its enactment” (Wilber, 2006, p. 268). While Wilber’s panpsychic, post-metaphysical view within IT may appear to be a more integrative stance than Bhaskar’s CR/MR ontology, it still demonstrates a bias by making the meaning of an assertion about reality (ontology) contingent on injunctions (methodology) of enactment (epistemology). It also suffers from a serious criticism in the eyes of Critical Realists. It is a criticism upon which the full weight of Bhaskar’s core philosophical edifice is brought to bear: CR/MR’s transcendental argument that purports to establish the independent ontological status of real things independent of any knowing subject. (Bhaskar, 2002). In relation to Wilber’s position from a CR/MR perspective, it is worth quoting Nick Hedlund-de Witt (2013) at length:

The claim here is that the ontological status or being of an object is brought forth through the consciousness (epistemic structures) and behavior (methodological injunctions) of the knowing subject—the being engaged in the enactment. But what then, a critical realist might ask, is the ontological status of the one who enacts? This appears to be overlooked by IT as it has been explicitly articulated to date, yet there appears to be an implicit presupposition and thus concession of the ontological existence or reality of at least one object—that is, the being engaged in the process of enactment—since in order for that being to enact anything at all, it must first exist as a real entity or object. Thus, IT and its post-metaphysical theory of enactment seems to necessarily presuppose the ontological existence or “givenness” of at least one intransitive object. How can the being of an object be constituted through the process of enactment, if the process of enactment is inexorably driven by—and
contingent on—a being that is itself an object? In this way, from the vantage point of CR, in order to begin the process of enacting or knowing anything, one must presuppose some kind of philosophical ontology—some kind of “metaphysics” if you will. And following Bhaskar’s transcendental argument, such an ontology or metaphysical proposition must presuppose the existence of an enactment-independent or pregiven world. Therefore, when Wilber claims that “post-metaphysical thinking does not rely on the existence of a pregiven world,” he appears to be unaware of the tautological and self-contradictory logic undergirding this so-called post-metaphysical position… (p. 8)

Or is he necessarily? Bhaskar’s transcendental argument is just that—and it may only be posited by a subject! Powerful as transcendental arguments may be, no doubt, in part, by virtue of the fact that they have been employed to good effect by Kant (and of course, also by Bhaskar) and thereby endowed with a certain philosophical currency, in no use are they immune to the criticism that they can only be employed by a subject in the first instance: immediate subjective experience is our sole means of primacy. In this light it is not necessarily logically clear that “in order to begin the process of enacting or knowing anything, one must presuppose some kind of philosophical ontology” when the only way this presupposition can be made is by first experiencing as a subject. Or, as Wilber might contend, the subject doing the enacting is in fact a subject/object (holon), as these two perspectives cannot be divided.

Here we see the problem: neither argument is able to emphatically claim the foundational position. To try and do so leads only to an infinite regress wherein the existence of one side of the duality presupposes the pre-existence of the other, ad infinitum. Or to put it another way, a foundational metaphysical given must be arbitrarily specified in any case: either experience or objects. To be fair, although Bhaskar is not in any way denying subjectivity, it does appear that in emphatically refusing to separate the subject from the object (or the possibility of reducing one to the other), Wilber has the more integrated view. IT, as Wilber is at pains to point out, also has its own ontology (Wilber, 2013). However, this does not change the fact that each side interprets, perhaps astutely, the stance of the other as signifying an unnecessary dualism, even though, as we will see there may be a method for reconciling the truth of both views. My point in reviewing this debate is that perhaps we are barking up the wrong philosophical trees, so to speak. Furthering this discussion will only see us flip-flop ever closer on either side of the cosmological divide without ever landing on it. However, if we were to actually land on it, perhaps we could enter onto a living structure that by its dynamism does not so easily get located in these dualities.

Remember that from a pragmatic, or more properly a pragmatist perspective (that is, the effects we see these respective views to have and thereby use to evaluate them objectively), these philosophical discussions ultimately come down to meaning and interpretation—their significance. No matter how subtle the interpretation that these positions lie on one side or the other of this duality, it is of profound importance that this splitting is in fact happening. If they are vying to provide the ground of our fundamental view of reality in an emerging integrative world-space, then their respective dualities will preclude the establishment of a cosmological view that has the potential to resonate with the constituents of all the major planetary worldviews. If it sits on the ontological side, a view will offend traditional and integral “spiritual” sensibilities; and, if it sits on the epistemological side, it will offend the essentially materialist (or at least naturalistic), “flatland” orientations of modernity/post-modernity. As I stated earlier, both philosophies have legitimate claims, within their own constructs, to nondual status; however, clearly they are not being interpreted that way by each other. Explicitly or implicitly, Wilber accuses CR/MR of predicating an ontological fallacy, and Bhaskar associates IT with what he has termed the epistemic fallacy. In the wider field of their engagement, they do not generate
the basis for a nondual cosmology. However subtly, each is interpreting the meaning of the other’s position as dualistic—as either idealism or realism, respectively.

Edgar Morin brings to his work a depth of philosophical and theoretical rigour comparable to Bhaskar’s and Wilber’s. However, his approach is not to work primarily from the establishment of a philosophical position or theoretical framework. He deliberately constructs a Method, a kind of “active inquiry” that takes as its central and foundational rational the refusal to be pinned down in dualistic thought:

Morin’s broader vision of complexity and of thought explicitly connects reason and emotion, wisdom and compassion, idealism and realism, and the other oppositions that have been created and are representatives of what he calls “simple thought.” (Montuori, 2004)

Through the idea of complexity and the discipline of Complex Thought, Morin, then, is contributing an essential component to integrative work. His Method points out the subtle interpreted duality created through the establishment of epistemological and ontological positions, no matter how “nondual” they may intend to be in-and-of themselves. This approach gives us a means of resolution. As Alfonso Montouri points out, “Morin’s method outlines a way of approaching inquiry that does not reduce or separate, and does justice to the complexity of life and experience” (Morin, 2008). For Morin, understanding complexity becomes the means of integrating dualities. And as do both Wilber and Bhaskar, he understands the importance of the connection between nonduality, the deep meaning of a spirituality so situated, and the provision of an integrated world. Montuori (2004) states that

The fact that the introductory chapter to the first volume of [Morin’s] Method is called “The Spirit of the Valley,” drawing explicitly on the Taoist tradition, is significant in many ways, pointing to what Morin calls the dialogical (not dialectical because there is no guaranteed resolution) relationship between traditional polarities, and to a deep, underlying spiritual thread running throughout Morin’s work. It reminds us that the spiritual is always present in his work, but in a far subtler way than has become the norm these days.

Theoretical and philosophical positions are indispensible and necessary. But, it is only when we have a way of resolving the final dualities they create that we have a sufficient integrative “way” that is not inclined to be interpreted as dualistic and that is therefore meaningfully nondual. This is so precisely because a way of inquiry about a complex world is inherently much more fluid than is the business of describing philosophical or theoretical foundations of that world. This fluidity imparts the ability to “shift” dynamically and continuously—an idea to which we will return—so as to avoid being pinned unnecessarily to one side or the other of thought in a static position. Morin has set us on this path by focusing (perspectival) on the dynamics and patterns that manifest as the organization of complexity itself, and how these help us understand and therefore signal to each other about the nature of our complex reality in effective and fully integrated ways. His secret is that engaging in complexity allows him to focus on a method of integrative meaning making. Morin illuminates the central position described by the relationship between an integrative “how” (form of inquiry/Method) and the generation of the field that makes possible a complex integrated “we” (perspectival system). This points strongly to a connection between our method of signaling, the meaning we make of it, and therefore what we collectively enact as the real. This puts us firmly in the domain of sign theory and a foundationally semiotic approach, which is the topic we engage next.
**Semiotic Enactment**

Having spent some time now on the context of this argument, we must now travel more quickly, the strategy being one of design wherein if the challenge is to invent the glove, a thorough investigation of the contours of the hand will be the most productive portion of one’s time. It is perhaps ambitious to cover so much ground, given the limitations of this paper; however, our purpose here is not necessarily to make an overly comprehensive case at this time, but to build on the idea of previously developed theory (semiotic enactment [SE]), and to speculate on the outlines of a related and emergent inquiry. This must then be carried forward and formed iteratively (or rejected as inaccurate) by those methods both active and revealed.

Below is a review of my previous construction (Winton, 2010a) of SE from Esbjörn-Hargen’s (2010) IET. In a move that seeks to establish a more pluralistic approach within Integral Theory and practice, Esbjörn-Hargens, no doubt influenced to some degree by his recent connection with Bhaskar and CR/MR, and perhaps too motivated by the vision of steering IT back to a more convincingly nondual position given Wilber’s post-metaphysical turn, makes a case for remedying the fact that while methodological pluralism is explicit and epistemological pluralism is implicit within IT, “curiously there is no mention of ontological pluralism within Integral Theory” (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2010, p. 146). Figure 1 represents the “triadic combination… Integral Epistemological Pluralism (IEP), Integral Methodological Pluralism (IMP), and Integral Ontological Pluralism (IOP). Integral Pluralism forms the basis of what I am calling Integral Enactment Theory (IET)” (Ibid, p. 146).

To look at IET from a semiotic perspective, in Figure 2, I simplify the diagram and focus on the “double hermeneutic—the fact that not only do (multiple but overlapping) subjects “enact” (multiple but overlapping) objects, but objects are seen also to influence the subject (via multiple but overlapping methods).

In Figure 3, the double hermeneutic is transformed into a diagram that signifies “semiotic” activity, where the multiple and overlapping infinity/figure-of-eight like lines represent an ongoing process of signaling and interpretation (hermeneutic) by a subject (which must also have an objective dimension if it is in turn being interpreted) signaling and interpreting an object (which also has a subjective dimension if it is in any way “interpreting” or determining something of the subject).

---

Figure 1. Integral Enactment Theory (from Esbjörn-Hargens, 2010).
In Figure 4, multiple and overlapping oval lines are added to Figure 3 to signify the enactment of a pattern of organization by the ongoing activity of the relationship between the two subject/objects (holons in their own right) that then form a higher order (bounded) holon (forming a holarchy) or complex perspectival system. Semiotic enactment signifies the process that illustrates the Source pattern of the creation of all meta-types—where meta-types are very foundational dynamic patterns that serve as organizing fields within complex systems of (semiotically) interacting parts.

SE demonstrates a more dynamic, iterative, systems forming, process orientated take on IET, which is itself an elaboration of the Integral framework. SE is founded in mutual active inquiry (semiotic/method) of signaling and interpretation between perspectives that shifts IET to show a different and complimentary view emphasizing the complex systems dimension of perspectival realities. This generates a range of possibilities, including the use of diagrams like the ones above to symbolize a range of known patterns of organization from systems/complexity disciplines as a language for thinking, communicating (collective inquiry of meaning making) and designing from a perspective of complexity itself. For our purposes here, it is sufficient to have demonstrated SE’s relationship to IET, IET’s (and therefore the Integral framework’s) inherently semiotic dimension, and how this move allows us to take a perspectival complex systems view based on the enactment of dynamic patterns of organization. Readers interested in leaning more about this process in

Figure 2. Diagram showing “double hermeneutic” in Integral Enactment.

Figure 3. Diagram of “semiotic” implicit in double hermeneutic.
more detail, or in learning more about a theory of meta-types and their practical application for integrative work, can see my paper, submitted as part of the proceedings of the 2010 Integral Theory Conference, “Pattern Dynamics: Creating Cultures of Sustainability” (Winton, 2010a) and the article “Developing an Integral Sustainability Pattern Language” in the *Journal of Integral Theory and Practice* (Winton, 2010b).

Figure 5 overlays the toroidal shaped semiotic “holon” (part/whole) diagram representing SE over the diagram representing the quadrants, illustrating the fact that they are different but complimentary ways of representing the foundational holon meta-type: SE signifying a more dynamic, semiotic, feminine/relational, perspectival systems view; IT representing a more static, theoretical, masculine/distinction-making, perspectival “map” (cartographical) view. Both demonstrate the integration of primordial perspectives at the “semiotic point” in the middle of the diagram.
The exercise above is undertaken to elucidate the central integrative role that a semiotic approach can play within the creation of a meaningfully nondual view. We are beginning to identify the mechanisms of a process that will allow us to see the complex interactions of perspectives themselves. SE associates the “how” of inquiry (method) with the integrative role of the second-person perspective—the “we” or the field of mutual signaling and interpretation—significance—that generates the intersubjective meaning that brings holons together as greater holons (holarchies/complex perspectival systems). This in turn emphasizes the centrality of the “we” forming function of semiotics, and it positions the process of semiotic meaning-making as the bridging territory between subjective/epistemologically orientated views and objective/ontologically orientated views. Methodology, in its most general sense, as the requirement of a primordial semiotic process, therefore becomes the keystone and foundational logic for constructing an integral nondual cosmology.

The Cosmic Logic of C. S. Peirce

The founder of semiotics, Charles Saunders Peirce, was first and foremost a logician, and he brought to this vocation a certain naturalistic orientation. He is one of the most important founders, in the latter part of the 19th century, of the American pragmatist tradition (which included the likes of John Dewey and William James). He is increasingly recognized as America’s preeminent philosophical thinker. Peirce wrote a prodigious volume of work throughout his life that continued to evolve and consolidate his triadic semiotic structure (sign/object/interpretant) as the central pillar of his logic and the idea that in the end logic and any attendant metaphysics must be grounded in method that acts to understand the means of signification. Within the postmodern milieu, semiotics has been associated with signs, their objects, interpretation and meaning making at the level of human communication, specifically in language (the “text”). However, Peirce’s “Classical pragmatasism insisted that interpretants were fully part of nature and that the sign/object/interpretant correlation was not confined to the human process and its allegedly arbitrary cultural codes” (Corrington, 1994, p. 5). Later in his career Peirce made a distinction with regard to his own work, calling it “pragmatasism” as opposed to what he felt was a degenerate, populist form promoted by James and others of the original idea of pragmatism. Pragmatasism adds to pragmatism “the key recognition that all of reality moves toward forms [emphasis added] of connectedness that give evidence to general laws and principles within an evolving universe… it starts and ends with continuity.” (Ibid)

Clearly, Peirce saw semiotics as native to more that just human language, or what we could look at as “anthroposemiotics.” Within it he saw the possibility of its actions in the evolutionary unfolding of life (biosemiotics) and in fact the evolution of the wider cosmos. Peirce did not explicitly extend semiotic to physical realities; however, I do not think he specifically precluded it. Within the renewed and extended field of a more general semiotics, and within the spirit of Peirce’s naturalistic leanings, it has been cast farther back in cosmological time in the form of geosemiotics (physiosemiotics), and I will propose that it can also function as a logic of the trans-rational domains—the theosphere (theosemiotics) and the “causal” domain (Kosmosemiotics). Figure 6 arranges these categories to graphically signify “semiotic depth” in relation to the schema of evolutionary depth illustrated by an integral diagram that includes quadrants and lines.

Peirce conceived of his semiotic (or “semeiotic” as he sometimes preferred to spell it) as the irreducible triadic relationship involved in any form of thought or inference, where our means of inference (claiming to know something) is the defining act of logic, and logic is of course the basis of reason. Semiotic logic, for Peirce, was superior to conventional dyadic forms of logic, where a thought (sign) “appears” in the mind as a relation to something (the object). Semiotic adds a third requirement—that any thought (sign) must be interpreted (interpretant)—must be brought to signify something—to develop any meaning in relation to something else (object). It places actively evolving relationality as the connection between the “subject” experiencing and the “object” experienced; or, in other words, it introduces methodology as the point of transmutation that precludes any real dualism between epistemology and ontology. The emergent interpretant
then forms a new sign, requiring interpretation in relation to its object and so on in an ongoing, evolution of meaning that illuminates the actual process of thought, or “thought processes.” Peirce conceived that we are actually in the process of thought, rather like we might describe ourselves as being “in motion,” rather than thoughts being in us.

Peirce’s semiotic has three foundational categories: **Firstness**, **Secondness** and **Thirdness**. We can relate Firstness to the sign; Secondness to the object; and, Thirdness to the interpretant. This is a somewhat crude review of Peirce’s seemingly inexhaustible development of his triadic formulations, and it simplifies the matter at the risk of conflating the categories with the things situated within them. However, we do not need a high degree of granularity here, only a recognizably accurate image. In an oft-used example Peirce relates that a child, having no conception of a “hot stove,” upon touching one will via Firstness sense a feeling (sign), which then encounters the thing it is related to, or its “referent” (object), as a “brute fact”—the pain of touching the stove. It is only in Thirdness, through an interpretation (interpretant) of the sign (Firstness) that places it in relation to the “hot” (Secondness) of the stove, that the sign becomes meaningful and therefore a source of knowledge to the child. In his text *An Introduction to C.S. Peirce*, Robert S. Corrington (1993), the interpreter of Peirce’s work who perhaps best understands the importance of his naturalism, explains of Peirce’s system:

> His founding category of firstness refers to the undifferentiated quality and potentiality prior to any stain of the actual… The category of thirdness refers to the rational law like habits that govern the world and which make meaning possible. The category of secondness, as the name implies, refers to the brute dyadic interaction that is prior to signification or fulfilled meaning. (p. 45)

These categories contain a broad logic. We have now isolated the essence of semiotic process as a relation of one thing to another through signification (a Third). In reality though, even a relatively simple system with all its multiple parts and interrelationships would create a field of intersecting semiotic interactions of unimaginably complexity. I will argue that these fields are at work in the creation (and maintenance and evolution) of
any set of relationships where parts interact to assemble wholes (or scalar hierarchies of wholes, holarchies) and create organized “form”—whether those forms are semiotically enacted in the physiosphere, the biosphere, the noosphere, the theosphere, or the Kosmosphere. Semiotic is the logical foundation wherever a precedent thing signifies something of an antecedent thing. Does not the hexagonal stone column signify the crystalline order the basalt magma preceding it? Does not the chemical scent of a flower signify its nectar to the bee; the word, its referent; an archetype, a story; witnessing, a causal field? And in each of those instances are we not evidencing a mechanism for the coming into organization of Peirce’s “forms of connectedness that give evidence to general laws and principles within an evolving universe.” If so, then, we have located a **realist** approach to **pansemiotics**.

**Integral Semiotic Realism**

In Figure 7, the diagram signifies the *dynamic pattern* of a primordial semiotic *process*. It serves as the basis of an **integral** Semiotic Realism (iSR) supportive of a naturalistic pansemiotics as the foundational mechanism of a viable integrative nondual cosmology and the positioning of Integral Rational Spirituality (IRS) within it. The diagram signifying iSR shows a relationship among elements of Wilber, Bhaskar, Morin, and Peirce’s work and integrates them within that system. Firstness is located with respect to Wilber’s first-person/interior, subjective perspective—the Upper-Left quadrant (epistemology). Peirce (1991) does not explicitly associate Firstness with the first-person pronoun or the “subject,” but he does describe it as something like pure phenomenological experience when he states that it must be

…entirely separate from all conception of or reference to anything else... The First must therefore be present and immediate... It is also something vivid and conscious; so only it avoids being the object of some sensation. (p. 190)
The arrows on the oval-like shape on the left-hand side of the diagram indicate that the sign emerges as a quality of Firstness from what is termed the “nondual origin” in an epistemic emergence of, as Peirce put it, “feeling.” In this process it undergoes an arc of evolution as it heads back to its origin in the nondual return. Here the sign progresses back through the nondual origin to encounter Secondness, which is located with Wilber’s third-person/exterior, objective perspective—the Right-Hand quadrants (ontology). Peirce (Ibid, p.189) describes Secondness as something clearly about objectiveness when he says that “it is something which is there, and which I cannot think away, but am forced to acknowledge as an object or second besides myself….” The sign/object then undergoes an ontological emergence and evolution through to its own nondual return to its source to reacquaint, as a fully distinct “other,” with its Firstness. Here it travels to the outside oval. Next it moves around the oval through a process of signification and obtains Thirdness. Thirdness is located with Wilber’s second-person/cultural, intersubjective perspective—the Lower-Left quadrant. Thirdness “as a category, refers to the power of mediation that brings the earlier dyadic structure into a higher form of relationality, a relationality that is intelligible and that manifests law-like regularity” (Corrington, 1993, p. 125). Thirdness brings a new quality of “law-like” order or “habit,” as Peirce would say, to the concept of the second-person space. It is through a method of inquiry that the “significance” of the relationship between epistemology and the ontology can be transformed into a dynamic pattern of order. This is the essence of semiotic enactment.

It is worth noting that SE specifies that every act of Firstness will also have a concomitant act of Secondness; and likewise Secondness, Firstness. Any relation is a relation between holons and therefore the diagram should be more complicated and have arrows and processes running in both directions. Rather like the reciprocal transfer of water and minerals from the roots to the leaves, versus the transit of photosynthesized sugars from the leaves to the roots in the spreading roots, trunk and canopy of a tree. This image helps illustrate the more three-dimensional dynamic torus pattern that cannot be signified so easily through a two dimensional diagram.

The “nondual origin” in the center of the diagram signifies what we have not yet discovered empirically (an may never) about the nature of reality (the intransitive domain CR/MR; zone of subsistence IT). Here we can declare our metaphysics, and like Peirce simply admit that there are certain categories we need to speculate on, or “believe,” in order to generate any fully transparent foundational philosophical view. Scientific inquiry may illuminate the mechanisms of our speculations over time—if they are real—and our speculations may provide hypotheses to assist in that work. It is not clear that transcendental argumentation or an appeal to post-metaphysics will necessarily add anything here.

The speculative postulate central to iSR (an eminently naturalistic one), and the one that supports its nondual stance is that: remaining (and evolving) from the explosive energy event of the singularity that initiated our cosmos (The Big Bang), there is a persistent aspect of this nondual origin that imparts a “unitiveness” to all of existent/transitive reality. The nondual is present as both subsistent/intransitive origin and the ongoing evolution of all existent/transitive things that emanate from it. It is non-local, non-temporal, and a dimension where there is no duality of Firstness and Secondness or the relation between them, Thirdness (no epistemology; no ontology; no methodology—the collapse of the semiotic triad). And, we need to give the standard declaration that descriptions of nonduality itself are therefore impossible—including this one, so we will have to proceed by a kind of pragmatic false analogy. Having said that, it is the view here that it is possible for what Bhaskar terms “mechanisms”—the basis of his foundational ontological level, the real—to subsist in the nondual and be efficacious in the transitive domain of existence. It is just that there is no way to signify the nature of how they might subsist as nonduality.

By virtue of being of that “unitiveness,” everything is connected to everything else and the possibility of any sort of relationship (and therefor the semiotic enactment of any existing “real thing”/holon) whatsoever is predicated on this unified nondual basis of reality. An aspect of the original cosmic singularity persists
and predicates the relatedness of the parts of anything that comes to be existent (enacted) as a holon/complex perspectival system (IT); or, in other words, that comes to be a transitive object in the actual or empirical domains (CR/MR). This is consistent with Bhaskar’s view that “the non-dual is not only ubiquitous and indispensable to any mode of (human) being or eventuation, it is prior to dual forms and phenomena, which are unilaterally existentially dependent of them” (Bhaskar, 2002, p. 10). He calls this the “ground state” where the “ground state is in its essence non-dual, though it may manifest in dual beings…” (Bhaskar, 2002, p. lvi). It is also consistent with quantum theory, at least in the notion derived from it, of non-locality as one explanation of quantum effects.

This naturalistic speculation on the nature of nonduality is the basis by which any form of semiotic is possible. It provides the Realism in integral Semiotic Realism: The Real signifies the nondual. The actual, which sits between Bhaskar’s intransitive domain and the empirically knowable, is placed in the zone of the diagram where Firstness and Secondness are in relation—where there is an “actual” occurrence—but before Thirdness confers upon it the law-like pattern of its relations (order) that enables us to empirically know it.

From Panpsychism to Pansemiotism

The semiotic realism of iSR is then a naturalistic, nondual realism that promotes a naturalistic, realist pansemiotics. The advantage of this type of pansemiotics over Wilber’s Whiteheadian panpsychism is that thought (subjective interiority, psych or “mind”) does not need to be carried down into the physical domain to do duty as a partner to material and efficient causes to explain the self-organizing capacity of an early evolving universe. I do not think a panpsychist approach will ever be accepted by modern sensibilities. It will always suffer from the homunculus critique (Deacon, 2012)—the interpretation that a little “mind” has been snuck into a domain that should not include anything related to “mind” or indeed “interiority” as such. Signs perhaps, but not “subjects.” Panpsychism is a dualistic approach and the perspective of modernity has called it out. I think modernity will ultimately reject any spirituality of this ilk and therefore any ultimate meaning that could come of it.

A sign in the (pan)semiotic sense, however, while signifying a thought (mental occurrence/thing/holon) at the mental level (noosphere), need not be construed as one at the biological level (biosphere). Here a sign (a biological occurrence/thing/holon) can be interpreted as a process of organic signification through macro-molecular inquiry. At the physical level, a sign (physical thing/occurrence/holon) need not rely on a panpsychic appeal to “prehension”—its significance can be driven by the inquiry of the actions and relations, in the main, of material and efficient causes. If in this last statement you sense a drift into outright materialism, then we need to incorporate a strategy for bringing in formal, and final causes to unite the full Aristotelian quadrat of types of causes so as to avoid the criticism that physiosemiotics is just materialism in disguise. Spirit has traditionally done duty as an explanation for final causes, where it provides the teleological pull (direction) for the Eros of an unfolding (evolving) cosmos. If we are going to effectively remove that kind of spirit (the all pervasive, pan-interior kind) from this part of our schema, by our rejection of panpsychism, then we will need to find a suitable replacement for its role as a cosmological final cause.

Energy Quality

This takes us to the inquiry of Stanley N. Salthe, a theoretical biologist with a naturalistically orientated interest in general (cosmological) evolution and the notion that energy can develop in quality. To satisfy his own naturalistic cosmological inquiry, Salthe asks the question why does anything exist at all? His answer is that “the universal has been accelerating so fast (since the Big Bang/singularity expansion) that the universe has been unable to remain in equilibrium internally… [and] This expansion beyond the range of possibility for global equilibrium gave rise to the precipitation of matter, which might be viewed as delayed
energy” (Salthe, 2013, p. 2). Equilibrium is the state of lowest energy quality of a system. In this state it contains the most randomness—or alternatively, the least information)—where information is a measure of order. Matter, because of its orderedness in relation to the equilibrium state sought by the rest of the cosmos, contains an energy gradient. The natural force of the universe is to get back to equilibrium by degrading (randomizing/“entropizing”) any energy gradient. This tendency is expressed as the second law of thermodynamics as elucidated, in the mid-19th century by Carnot’s work in energy transformation efficiencies and later Clausius’ statement regarding the relation of the direction of heat transfer in work.

Work is possible because energy gradients are there to provide the energy to do it. Work, an ordered process or system, that uses available energy (the energy gradient) to do something productive, could be viewed as the universe’s way of getting back to equilibrium. This is why organized systems, in the complexity sciences, whether they are physical or biological—and I will argue, whether they are also mental, subtle or causal—are referred to as far from equilibrium systems or dissipative systems. Salthe notes that a scalar hierarchy of energy gradients exists in the scalar hierarchy of dissipative systems evident in the cosmos: there is a lot of low-gradient energy (in the form of simpler more primitive forms of cosmic order like atoms and molecules and their clumping together into things like suns and the energy flows that radiate from them); this huge amount of lower-grade energy of the physiosphere is transformed by biological dissipative systems into energetically more qualitatively complex systems but less energetically quantitative systems—the “wasted” energy dissipated as heat entropy. The same could be said for the activities of the noosphere, which leap up again in energy quality, but reduce in quantity. For Salthe, the second law of thermodynamics specifies a final cause in cosmic evolution. For him, evolution is pulled along or steered (telos) by the foundational law that the future is dictated by an equilibrium state.

We will take a slightly different view and propose the so-called fourth law of thermodynamics as an alternative source of naturally situated final causes. In the early 20th century, when the study of energy in life systems was starting to be explored, Alfred J. Lotka (1922) noted:

> It had been pointed out by Boltzmann that the fundamental object of contention in the life-struggle, in the evolution of the organic world, is available energy [energy gradients]. In accord with this observation is the principle that, in the struggle for existence, the advantage must go to those organisms whose energy-capturing devices are most efficient in directing available energy into channels favorable to the preservation of the species. (p. 147)

Now we have a view that is less about the dissipation of energy gradients as an end in itself and much more about how well the organizational forms of dissipative systems (their energy quality or complexity) is suited to compete in the niche specified by an available energy flow (gradient). In order to exist, dissipative systems are driven to continually invest their harvested energy in complexifying (increase their energy quality) in order to maximize their rate of continuing to harvest that energy flow. Their very evolutionary persistent existence (sustainability) depends on it. Howard T. Odum, founder of the discipline of systems ecology, called this requirement the Maximum Power Principle and proposed it as the fourth law of thermodynamics (Odum, 1995). For Odum, the evolutionary competition to increase the complexity (quality) of dissipative systems was a principle in itself. He coined the term emergy to denote, and provide a basis for measuring, the total quantity of low-grade energy it takes to create a higher-grade more complex form. Emerge (with an “m”) denotes energy memory.

Rather than viewing the tendency of the universe to seek thermodynamic equilibrium as a final cause, and thereby making the continued energy transformations into more and more complex dissipative structures (including, biological, mental, subtle, and causal structures) an enabling byproduct of this process, could we
not look at it the other way around? Could it not be that the fundamental tendency of the cosmos is to expand a huge amount of energy quantity that will transform into smaller but more complex scalar holarchies of evolving energy quality? This makes more logical sense as the expansion comes before the need to reinstate equilibrium. What if the tendency to equilibrium and the entropy so generated is simply the price for winding up complex holarchies? Or, to shift our perspective a little more, what if the fourth law specifies the habit the cosmos has developed for completing the grand semiotic arch though increasing orders of signification back to its own nondual ground. Could the “aliveness” of energy and its proclivity to “wind up” not be our source of telos or final cause, which is ultimately to return to its own nondual source? This is why the torus diagram is useful for signifying iSR. It illustrates a process that is formed so as to continually evolve to feed back to its origins.

The Pragmatics of Spiritual Signification

Let me clarify the position of iSR. While it is grounded in a foundational naturalism—that is, in a commonsense view that the mechanisms of nature are distinguishable—it does not require an appeal to eliminative materialism (a view that eliminates all but material causes). This would situate it in a type of subtly dualistic realism. Nor does it require an all-pervasive spirit, which, alternatively, creates a type of equally subtly dualistic idealism. iSR is a thoroughgoing nondual view that associates the intransitive dimension (zone of subsistence) with the underlying oneness—non-local, non-temporal, not-tweness of mind/spirit/idealism vs. matter/energy/realm—of the singularity that originated our cosmos. All things that come to exist in the transitive domain do so entirely contingent on the fact that they are, moment to moment, (re)acquainted with their nondual essence through the semiotic relational evolutionary process that is predicated on their subsistence as nonduality. iSR requires only three foundational types of semiotic triads (a triad of triads if you will) to emerge from the nondual oneness, the intransitive domain, into the actual domain to provide the categories upon which all empirical phenomenon can then be enacted:

1. Sign/interpretant/object (extension of energy)
2. Origin/interpretant/evolution (extension of time)
3. Parts/interpretant/wholes (extension of space)

The first of these, energy, has a curious ontological status. It potentiates change; we can measure and quantify its effects, but we cannot measure and quantify it. No one has ever encountered energy as a substance. Its ontological status (quantity) is dependent on its quality of inducing change—quality being something we normally associate with epistemological status. Therefore, in the concept of energy lies the extension into the actual, from the intransitive, of the sign/object relationship, and therefore it has a certain “aliveness” that animates and enchants reality. Notice, neither sign (Firstness) nor object (Secondness) nor their interpretant (Thirdness) exist in the nondual ground. No-“thing” exists there, per se, at all: there is only singularity. But, correspondingly everything subsists there. Within iSR, Mechanisms (in the Bhaskarian sense) subsist in the nondual origin and have effects on existence and by this they are The Real, the ultimate category or ground state. Therefore it is not necessary, or appropriate, in this view to locate or associate “spirit” or “mind” or any kind of epistemological quality in/with the nondual, nor correspondingly should we locate or associate any kind of “material” or “objects” or any kind of ontological quantity in/with the nondual either. In our naturalistic nondual cosmology, the ultimate category is the Real—nondual mechanisms; or, perhaps a less ontologically slanted way of referring to these “mechanisms” is to signify them as a type of efficaciousness as nonduality. Spirit is existent of this efficaciousness: not the other way around and not as equivalence.

This is where iSR parts company with IT and CR/MR and all approaches to spirituality that locate spirit in, or associate it with, nondual realization. If we are of and predicated on the nondual ground then it is within
our nature to realize it (our nature is its realization). Both Wilber and Bhaskar have pointed out that this is an inescapable aspect of our everyday existence and that, in fact, it is impossible to depart from it. Within iSR, nondual realization is not signified as a spiritual realization: it is signified as Realization itself. iSR takes the pragmatasist route and (all other inferences being equal) rejects a “spiritual” signification of the nondual by virtue of its effects. One of the central and most important effects being that it entrains a subtle dualism within the signification of the nondual by virtue of “spirit’s” association with the epistemological side of the divide. As we have seen Wilber’s position is interpreted this way, even by other post-formal approaches. Bhaskar is in the strange position where because of the interpretation that CR/MR has fundamentally realist ontological leanings by his post-formal-critics, it introduces a subtle ontological dualism into the nondual from a post-formal perspective; but CR/MR also introduces the opposite subtle epistemological dualism to modern views via the interpretation of its ‘spiritual turn’ by Bhaskar’s more philosophically modern adherents.

The key perception for modernity will be that there is an unacceptable epistemological dualism in both IT and CR/MR’s approach to spirituality. Bhaskar has caused considerable consternation among his more modern supporters with his “spiritual turn.” Wilber has suffered the slings and arrows of popular discontent, by modernists of all stripes, who mostly reject his overarching spirituality, at times associating it with an unhelpful fixation on populist and superficial orientations to developmentalism, characterized by Zachary Stein as “the growth to goodness assumptions” (2010, p. 8). Arguably, too, the combination of a perceived epistemic orientation of Wilber’s description of spirituality and flawed views of developmentalism by some of his less sophisticated followers, has lead to, at times, an unhelpful type of “spiritual fetishism” (Winton, 2012). These interpretations must be separated from Wilber’s work itself, which does not suffer from this lack in sophistication. The related pragmatic effect, and the most important one at this time, is that the subtle epistemological dualism alienates the modern sensibility and therefore hobbles the development of a much-needed source of ultimate meaning there. In this sense, modernity is providing the evolutionary requirement to transcend significations of spirituality that do not have the capacity to be meaningful for all worldviews.

Both Wilber and Bhaskar have created strong integrative meaning for people with post-formal orientations who are looking for the significance of deep interconnected oneness available in communities of practice oriented to spiritual realities. The subtle dualities in Wilber and Bhaskar’s respective nondual orientations do not bother their adherents, nor should they in respect of those communities. They are mostly not interpreted that way and therefore they are mostly not significant. In fact, it appears that both IT and CR/MR act to provide the meaning that attracts people with post-formal leanings remarkably well. Perhaps this will be their central and necessary role, but it does not change the fact that they do not now, and do not look likely to have, any deep appeal to modernity in their current forms. I make this assertion based on personal experience as an integral practitioner working in the commercial realities of modernity and based on observations of the scale of uptake of anything like integral spirituality in the mainstream of modernity. Again, this is important because even if we were to get demographically unprecedented levels of people shifting to post-formal orientations, the rate of change by this process will still not likely have a significant effect on modernity in relation to modifying the rate of its destructive tendencies in a meaningful timeframe. The strategy must to be twofold: attract people to integral and equip them to work deeply within modernity with a way of being, a cosmology, and a spirituality that engages modernity in a deeply meaningful way.

**Integral Rational Spirituality (IRS)**

But how do we do that? iSR does not reject spirituality. Spiritual realities are fully supported within it, but they are located in a way that recognizes at which levels of semiotic depth they are expressed. In iSR, spirit and spirituality are only significant within the transpersonal, post-formal domains: the subtle energy fields, visions, luminosities, and radiant ecstasies of the theosphere and the causal witnessing/presence field of the Kosmosphere. Integral Rational Spirituality then is signified by two primary elements:
First, by making spirituality contingent on theosemiotic and Kosmosemiotic only (no association with the nondual ground that is different from the association obtained by activities of all levels of semiotic depth (i.e., spirituality is not privileged in relation to the nondual)

Second, semiotic depth dictates that spirituality is not signified until the transpersonal levels and therefore contingent on beings evolved to that level (i.e., spirit is not significant in the physiosphere, the biosphere, or the noosphere).

Signifying spiritual realities as theosemiotic and the Kosmosemiotic still leaves a challenge in relation to modernity. The question: “How are these spiritual realities real?” must be answered.

**Morphic Fields**

Material and efficient causes are familiar to modernity and account for the majority of explanations therein: material causes are by virtue of the substance out of which something is composed. Efficient causes are simply what we normally mean when we say one thing follows another because of it (one object bumping another for instance). Energy itself plays the role of efficient causes here. We have examined a suitable final cause (telos) in the fourth law of thermodynamics, but none of material, efficient, or final causes allow a naturalistic semiotic realism to be endowed with the capacity to prescribe organizational form. We need a convincing formal cause that explains how the animating potency of the energetic eminence of the universe (final cause) signifies order out of swirling and bumping (efficient cause) things (material cause) in order to complete a convincing integral cosmology. And, we need to connect it with the real mechanisms of our naturalistic nonduality. This brings us to the work of biologist Rupert Sheldrake, and his hypothesis of formative causation.

Sheldrake has pointed out, rather convincingly, that there are still many unsolved problems with regard to conventional scientific explanations of morphogenesis. These include the development of biological forms, which cannot be explained by DNA or any other material part of an organism, and physical forms like crystals, whose form, likewise, cannot be predicted from the known laws of physics (Sheldrake, 1998). Sheldrake relates that if an iron magnet, for example is cut up, each part is a whole magnet with a complete magnetic field. Or if a part is removed from a hologram, which is a physical record of interference patterns in the electromagnetic field, this part can give rise to the entire organizational image… Such physical analogies to the holistic properties of living organisms are examples of field phenomena. Fields are not material objects, but regions of influence. (Ibid, pp. 78)

He subscribes to an organismic philosophy of nature [that] has much in common with the Aristotelian tradition… It is more radical than vitalism in that it sees organisms at all levels of complexity, from subatomic particles to galaxies, and even to the entire cosmos, as alive. The organizing roles that used to be attributed to souls and vital factors are now thought of in terms of systems properties, patterns of information, emergent organizing principles, or organizing fields (my emphasis)… the concept of morphic fields [and morphic resonance]… represents an attempt to understand such organizing fields in an evolutionary spirit. (Ibid, p. 69)
He proposes that morphic fields work through a kind of memory of previous forms that he calls “the presence of the past,” and that formative causation depends on a kind of resonance with like past forms called morphic resonance. But,

Unlike other forms of resonance, morphic resonance does not involve a transfer of energy from one system to another, but rather a non-energetic transfer of information. However, morphic resonance does resemble other known kinds of resonance in that it takes place on the basis of rhythmic patterns of activity. (Ibid, p. 108)

Sheldrake has done a substantial amount of peer-reviewed scientific research, and proposed experiments that others have done to test his hypothesis. The results have been encouraging, but politically the modernist scientific paradigm, despite the mounting evidence, has yet to accept his views. This is evidenced by the recent controversy over the removal of a video, hosted on a popular website, of his talk on formative causation, for being “unscientific.” The widespread anger this provoked among the generally modernist commentariat may indicate a turning of the tide, a moment that “Jung called enantiodromia, whereby we become what we hate” (Morin, 1999 p. xxxviii) through an extreme action, of denial (of formative causation, in this case) that heralds the enactment of its opposite—acceptance of formative causation (Winton, 2013).

While Sheldrake’s fields of morphic resonance are a very good fit for our naturalistic means of formal causation, interestingly he does not speculate as to how they work other than to say they are non-energetic. We, however, can locate morphic fields in the nondual, intransitive domain where every pattern of organization would subsist in “superposition” (similar to the superposition prescribed in quantum theory) in non-locality/non-temporality. In that way, the organizing patterns of the universe could be seen as holographic in nature in that the sum total of all the organizing patterns of the universe subsists in each of its parts. Also, the “presence of the past” informing the persistence and evolution of these forms would subsist in the telescoping of time in non-temporality. Morphic resonance, the interference patterns that contain the “in-form-ation” of semiotic processes that create the forms, could be located in the actual domain and the things themselves in the empirical domain where they would exist empirically. Wherever there is form, then, there is “in-form-ation.” This implies semiotic in that there must be an interpretation/signification for parts to come into organized wholes rather than entropic randomness.

Conclusion

Our original purpose was driven by the pragmatic identification of an “absence” within modernity that is causing a destructive pathology within the development of Planetary Civilization. That absence is hypothesized as the lack of a cosmology that demonstrates a place and a belonging in the universe in a way that is convincing and meaningful within the rational paradigm of modernity.

Through an examination and integration of components of a range of thinkers we have constructed the outlines of a pragmatasist, naturalistically orientated, nondual, realist, integrative semiotic cosmology. The aim is to provide a grand story that has the capacity to unify, while respecting the diversity of, the major worldviews. This will only happen if that story can be interpreted in such a way that allows each worldview to find ultimate meaning that is not exclusive of the way any of the others do the same.

In constructing our cosmology we have preserved Wilber’s post-metaphysical relationship between epistemology, methodology, and ontology and Esbjorn-Hargens’ derivative “enactive” paradigm; embedded Bhaskar’s realist approach to ontological depth; and prioritized Morin’s view on Method. The centrality of signification via method to nonduality is then extended and the notion of Semiotic Enactment is further enhanced with C.S. Peirce’s semiotic philosophy to develop a mechanism, termed integral Semiotic Realism. Suitable material and efficient causes are derived from the concept of energy as the primal emergent from the
PLANETARY CIVILIZATION

Big Bang; Salthe’s cosmological proposition on the second law of thermodynamics is inverted and the related fourth law is substituted as a source of final causes; and, lastly, Sheldrake’s work on formative causation via morphic resonance is instituted as a means of formal causes.

If it is not suitable in itself, the story located within this constellation of views can at least provide the basis for a conversation about constructing a viable integrative cosmology. A cosmology that can meet the requirement that it be interpreted in a way that is not mutually exclusive, so as to be significant as a source of ultimate concern, for traditional, modern, and integral worldviews alike. The hope is that the modernist will accept it by virtue of its rational, naturalistic conceptions, approach to a limited—but powerful—scope for spirituality, and the signification of nondual realization as the ultimate category.

I think traditional religious worldviews will be satisfied that modernity is accepting of “something greater than itself”—some sort of cosmological ultimate meaning, even if this rational approach to ultimate meaning is not instantiated in their concept of God. Also, because it is not based on eliminative materialism, there should be enough scope to interpret, at least the possibility of, a broad conception of God by traditionally oriented people. Integralists, on the other hand, arguably, will have to make the most substantial accommodation and shift the signification of the ultimate category from Spirit to The Real—to a universe pervaded not by consciousness but by significance. The hope here is that post-formal ways of being and the integral communities thereby formed can grasp the flexibility they possess to shift perspectives, as specified by the dynamism of ISR itself, and achieve a pragmatic outcome in service of the evolution of a better future.

Modernity, by its acceptance of nondual realization as the ultimate category and concern, would now share an ultimate bond and a renewed significance for integralists that allows, for them, a realized modernity to be the meaning of Planetary Civilization itself. The energy thwarted by the shadow and shame of being unavoidably implicated in the activities of modernity is liberated. The importance of engaging deeply with modernity takes on new meaning and allows integralists to dispatch with the current reluctance to “enable” it as an inherently destructive manifestation. Working within modernity takes on a powerful new significance and normative force. By integrating the shadow of modernity, its ultimate gift to humanity and its ultimate promise, the light of reason, is liberated to generate its own maturity as the realization of an integral world.
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For decades, humanity has failed to respond effectively to global social and environmental challenges. We are not embracing change toward sustainability fast enough, and our rate of change is too slow in the face of complex global challenges. Despite extensive evidence that points to the need for transformational action, the type of change needed is not yet happening. Disasters, weather extremes, ethical imperatives, and extensive coverage of environmental sustainability have yet to catalyze such change. Similarly, the wealth of green initiatives and technologies and the real advantages derived from such alternatives—even economically persuasive studies—seem to be insufficient.

Our experience is that a large part of this problem may be the overprivileging of information, or rather measurable content. It is not that such measures are not needed or that scientific investigation is unnecessary. Rather, as we seek answers or direction, a significant proportion of discussion appears to prioritize what is believed to be empirical but is insufficient for understanding change. For example, humans are often viewed as “rational” beings motivated to maximize short-term individual benefit while, in reality, we consistently make many decisions for the common good (Ostrom, 1998, 2010). Motivation for environmental action is much more complex than being purely based on economic interests (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002; Simon, 1979). In the face of this we propose Integral Theory as a strong framework showing promise in helping us to catalyze a transformational shift and, vice-versa, that such a shift inherently means greater integral understanding. That is, merely relying on a so-called “flatland” approach—where we expect that the evidence and numbers will lead to change—is likely to be sub-optimal (Brown, 2011a, pp. 208-209; Slaughter, 2004). Our article assumes that objective evidence is insufficient for change and that we will not necessarily act rationally based on a risk assessment from such factors (Divecha, 2013; O’Brien & Wolf, 2010; Wilber, 2000).
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Globally, the climate is changing. By January 2013, 10 of the previous 15 years had been the warmest recorded since 1880 (NASA Earth Observatory, 2013). These global averages are reflected on a local scale. For example, on January 30, 2013, Australia set new climate records. The country’s weather bureau had to add a new color for extreme heat to its weather map and the science shifted—now making a direct link between climate change and these extremes (Karoly et al., 2013). Only months earlier, in the United States, Hurricane Sandy devastated parts of the eastern seaboard with widespread floods and power blackouts. These specific examples are consistent with a pattern of change seen globally and science that predicts more extreme and dangerous weather events.¹ In financial terms, climate change plus damage from carbon-intensive industry cost us 1.2 trillion dollars in 2010. This is approximately 1.7% of global GDP. It causes an average of 400,000 human deaths a year (DARA and the Climate Vulnerable Forum, 2012, p. 17). Moreover, these recent impacts are consistent with well over a decade of scientific warnings (IPCC, 2001; Smith et al., 2009; Stern & UK Treasury, 2007). Beyond climate change, measures of un-sustainability are equally stark. Put together, such challenges are sufficient for many to argue that the collapse of global civilization is a real (albeit avoidable) probability (Ehrlich & Ehrlich, 2013).²

Faced with such data, we have to ask why our societies are not acting quickly. The gap is obvious with climate change—the case to cut emissions, for our individual, financial, ecological and societal benefit, has existed for decades. The traditional explanations of this paradox—that is we know we can take effective affordable action and yet we fail to do so—fall far short of compelling answers.³ In the struggle to help make sense of the complexity of this, we have sought to understand and apply Integral Theory (Wilber, 2005). Integral Theory proposes that individual and collective subjective perspectives— such as values, worldviews, action logics and culture—should be actively considered as we are seeking to understand or enable sustainability action. In our own work, we have found that such consideration has assisted us to design interventions that enhance the potential for the emergence of positive futures. Another powerful theory is encapsulated within Integral Theory—constructive developmental theory. This theory, referred to as action logics in this paper, describes stages of discrete meaning-making where orders of development unfold in a specific sequence, each transcending and including concepts and cognition internalised at the preceding stage (McCauley et al., 2006). Different action logics stages inform and drive our reasoning and behavior (Cook-Greuter, 1999; Torbert et al., 2004). There is evidence such discrete stages can have an important influence on how leaders act on sustainability and environmental issues (Boiral et al., 2009; Brown, 2012; Greenwald-Robbins & Greenwald, 1994).

Assuming these action logics perspectives are powerful, we should be able to apply them to real-world problems. Many integral practitioners probably make working assessments about other’s action logics as part of tailoring interventions. Our experience is that this is helpful in generating positive outcomes. For sustainability issues we propose this can be further developed. To do this, in this article:

1. We use action logics stage descriptions to identify how individuals are framing sustainability issues in statements they make.
2. From these classifications a model more directly relevant to sustainability, based on action logics, has been developed and refined.
3. We argue that this model better highlights the discretely different ways in which specific individuals understand sustainability issues.
4. Consequently, the model should deliver better tools for sustainability practitioners to explain and overcome the flatland bias discussed above. Moreover, the tools should help with the acceptance of—and value derived from—working with Integral Theory’s individual and collective subjective perspectives.
Methodology

In this research, action logics are drawn from the framework described by Torbert and colleagues (Fisher et al., 1987; Torbert, 1987; 2004), which was underpinned by Loevinger’s (1966, 1976) research. The framework has been expanded by Susanne Cook-Greuter (1999, 2004) with further development by Terri O’Fallon (2010a, 2010b). A part of O’Fallon’s enhancement identifies action logics stages with first-, second-, third-person, etc. (n\textsuperscript{th}), perspectives (Cook-Greuter, 1999) and explicit state and stage framing incorporating early and late stages for each person perspective.\textsuperscript{4} O’Fallon’s addition is particularly useful for this research. It assists in identifying the different conceptualizations of sustainability in statements individuals make. Table 1 presents a model of action logics related to sustainability. Its development is based on the theory discussed above and through examining the two empirical studies of leaders outlined below. The model offers the potential to associate action logics with sustainability statements and develops this hypothetical correlation.

Participants

The two participant groups are:

1. Multinational Corporate Leaders (MNCL data)—a study of 30 mostly senior managers/directors of two major multinationals that are commonly regarded as being at the cutting edge of corporate sustainability delivery (primary case study interviews collected by Simon Divecha)
2. Late-Stage Action Logics Leaders (LSAL data)—a sample of 13 social and/or environmental sustainability practitioners with late-stage action logics (primary case study interviews collected by Barrett C. Brown)

Research Design

Our sample spans lower to very late-stage action logics sustainability perspectives. All the participants were interviewed by one of the authors using semi-structured interviews that were recorded and transcribed with the transcription checked against audio.

LSAL participants were initially a sample of 32 leaders and change agents from business, government, and civil society sectors engaged in sustainability work. They were assessed with a variation of the Washington University Sentence Completion Test (WUSCT) (Loevinger et al., 1970). WUSCT has been extensively refined and validated (Cohn & Westenberg, 2004; Hauser, 1976; Loevinger, 1979; Manners & Durkin, 2001), and revised (Cook-Greuter, 1999; Hy & Loevinger, 1996). Six of the leaders measured as Strategists, five as Alchemists, and two as Ironists—the LSAL participants for this article. A major strength of this sample is that it is unique—no other study has so many late stage action logics leaders discussing sustainability or complex change. A potential weakness is that, despite the researchers’ best efforts, most of the participants were familiar with Integral Theory.

The 30 MNCL participants covered a wide range of mostly senior managers in the two multinational corporations from which they were sourced. These companies’ leading examples of sustainability practice were, for example, standout projects or programs and/or visible public climate change leadership. The individuals interviewed (with limited exceptions) either had an overview of the whole company or were leading specific sections of the companies and/or activities for the companies. The choice of companies was also partly based on excellent access to senior managers and this is also a potential weakness. The researcher had not worked for the companies but had consulted and/or advised individuals and groups within the organizations. To assess action logics the participants’ responses were coded against the model developed in Table 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions Logics and Tag line</th>
<th>Characteristics / Identifiers</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunist Needs rule impulses</td>
<td>Short time horizon; focus on concrete things; manipulative; views rules as loss of freedom; views luck as central; rejects critical feed-back; externalizes blame; distrustful; stereotypes; hostile humour; flouts unilateral power; treats “what can get away with” as legitimate; punishment = “eye for an eye”; positive ethic = even trade; timely action = “I win”</td>
<td>1st-person – first person perspective is characterised by a focus on self. Focus: awareness of quality of concrete self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomat Norms rule needs</td>
<td>Committed to routines; observes protocol; avoids inner and outer conflict; conforms; works to group standard; seeks membership; status; often speaks in favorable phrases, clichés; loyalty to immediate group; sin = hurting others; positive ethic = nice, cooperative</td>
<td>2nd-person – second person perspective is characterised by a focus on self and another. Focus: awareness of the quality of concrete operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Craft logic rules norms</td>
<td>Interested in problem-solving; seeks causes; critical of self/others based on own craft logic; wants to stand out, be unique; perfectionist; chooses efficiency over effectiveness; dogmatic; values decisions based on technical merit; sees contingencies, exceptions; details with a system but not categorising across competing different sorts of systems</td>
<td>3rd-person – third person perspectives add to one's awareness the quality of abstract and formal operational thinking. Focus: an observer who can focus on another self and other(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achiever System effectiveness rules</td>
<td>Long-term goals; future is vivid; feels like initiator; not pawn; seeks generalizable reasons for action; seeks mutuality, not hierarchy, in relationships; appreciates complexity, systems; feels guilt if does not meet own standards; blind to own shadow, to the subjectivity behind objectivity; positive ethic based on self-chosen (but not self-created) ethical system</td>
<td>3rd-person – later third-person perspective adds to one's awareness the prioritisation and categorisation of abstract and formal operational thinking. Focus: an observer categorising and integrating between another self and other(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualist Relativism rules single system logic</td>
<td>Takes a relativistic perspective; focuses more on both present and historical context; often aware of conflicting emotions; experiences time itself as a fluid, changeable medium, with piercing, unique moments; interested in own and others' unique self-expression; seeks independent, creative work; attracted by difference and change more than by similarity and stability; less inclined to judge or evaluate; starts to notice own shadow (and own negative impact); possible decision paralysis</td>
<td>4th-person – fourth-person perspective involves one's awareness of the quality and contexts. Focus: on an observer observing another observer; observing another self and other(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategist Most valuable principles rule relativism</td>
<td>Recognizes the importance of principle, contract, theory, and judgment—not just rules, customs, and exceptions—for making and maintaining good decisions; relativism, moderated by understanding of complexity and natural hierarchy, allowing principled choices-approximation for action; categorized complexity; beyond win-lose to “positive-sum” games, in which many win; high value on mutuality and autonomy; interweaves short-term goal-orientation with long-term developmental process-orientation; aware of paradox that what one sees depends on one's action-logic, creative at conflict resolution.</td>
<td>4th-person – late fourth-person sees an iterating horizontal pattern; contexts within contexts - contextualising and prioritising the individualists quality and context view of systems. Focus: on an observer categorising and integrating, observing another observer, observing self and other(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alchemist Deep processes and intersystemic evolution rule principles</td>
<td>The process of meaning-making is always inadequate; meaning understood as constructed from increasingly complex theories arising from articulation and segmentation of reality; reality an ever-changing, dynamic flux of phenomena; sense unitive nature of reality but recognise meaning-making process can never accurately articulate reality; Collapse of subtle stage to causal emptiness and fullness holding of paradox and pole; may initially struggle to find agency and priority in cascade of conflicting</td>
<td>5th-person – fifth-person perspective includes one's awareness of the quality, constructs and individual’s awareness of the quality, constructs and integrating between another self and other(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironist*</td>
<td>Focuses on being as well as on witnessing moment to moment flux of experience, states of mind, arising of consciousness; holds unified perspective with the other as One; holds partnership of beyond us and them; hold and rest in the tension of not knowing and wonder into the moment - without predefined constructs and perspectives - to allow what is needed to emerge; each time a solution arises, wonder and inquire into it; hold the space for the integrative nature of consciousness to express; hold a mirror to individuals/groups to see themselves, self-reflect, and wonder; attune to evolving nature of consciousness and wonder “where are we?” “what are we becoming?” and “what is needed and wanted next”</td>
<td>6th-person – sixth-person perspective involves one's awareness of the unity of opposites. Focus: Seeing the nth perspectives, begins to step outside of those nth perspectives; begins to take a perspective using patterns of observation and perspective taking through tiers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Model of the eight most prevalent action logics amongst adults applied to sustainability as refined from this research. This model is substantially based on Torbert et al. (2004) and supplemented by Brown (2006, 2010, 2011b, 2012) and O’Fallon (2010a, 2010b). The adaptations add to our capacity to distinguish such steps in sustainability-related contexts. * Summary subject to further research.
This is an iterative process first informed by the theory, then the data informs the model which is refined and then rechecked against the data. Of the entire group, 4 to 5 answered questions and talked about sustainability in a style correlated with Strategist, 7 to 9 Individualist, 10 to 14 Achiever, 6 to 7 Expert, and 1 or 2 Diplomat.

**Measures**

We used thematic analysis to identify, analyze, and test and derive theory from the interviews. This is not confined to an observing (third-person) approach but also informed by our substantial background in sustainability issues (Boyatzis, 1998, pp. 33-53; Grbich, 2007 pp. 46-49). The analysis is a hybrid approach driven by the existing theory as well as allowing insights and categories to emerge from the data (Boyatzis, 1998, pp. 51-53). Managing categories and analysis of data was assisted by coding software (LSAL data uses NVivo8; MNCL Atlas.ti 7). Both authors have shared professional histories and/or identities with many of the two studies’ participants, in some cases with elements of insider research (Coghlan, 2001; Smetherham, 1978), which meant careful management for neutrality in our interpretation. This included monitoring the research process over years as it developed through memos and tracking changes in our assumptions. While each author sourced the MNCL and LSAL participants independently, there was one cross-over (one author was also a participant in the other’s study). Given the number of total participants (30+13), we do not believe this biased our results. Nevertheless, results from this author/participant are not quoted in this article.

**Procedures**

To illustrate the themes for this article, examples below demonstrate action logics perspectives as they apply to sustainability. These examples are representative of the research data. The MNCL data in this text was correlated with the action-logics descriptions detailed in Table 1. LSAL quotes were used from individuals who tested at the action-logics stage the quote correlated with. Quotes have been identified by the data set they were sourced from, and a pseudonym unique to each participant. It is important to emphasize that worldviews are not exclusive: although a particular participant’s interview response may be correlated with a specific action logics, this does not mean that other responses will be the same. Similarly, a LSAL participant assessed at a particular action logics is highly unlikely to only respond on sustainability in a manner correlated to one action logic. A spread of action-logics is generally found throughout each participant’s interview and in responses to WUSCT assessments (Loevinger, 1976, 1979).

**Results**

The participants discussed sustainability in ways that correlate to action logics perspectives. People, talking about sustainability, appear to discuss this framed by distinctly different worldviews. As action logics become more complex (later stage) we see step shifts in such sustainability perspectives.

**Diplomat**

The first action-logics stage that was prominent in our data was Diplomat. In the quotes below (including a very senior manager) participants were discussing why the company they work for should implement positive environmental policies (e.g., for water and greenhouse gas emissions). Statements correlated with this stage were characterized with a focus on conforming to their community, group standards (favorite phrases/clichés), and company protocols.

*MNCL (Lee):* I don’t believe in climate change. At this stage I haven’t seeked [sic]
to understand it more. I have just been going on what the media are pretty much telling me, but at the same time I haven’t seen any proof for climate change. I think our weather patterns follow cycles. Although I do understand that, you know, I went to Canada two years ago and I saw the glaciers and things and they are all melting and the Canadians are very excited because it means they get more freshwater and the temperatures are bit warmer for them, so the people up there in Canada are really embracing the climate change, if there is climate change.

MNCL (May): At the end of the day, it [sustainability] is the right thing to do, it’s the smart thing to do. Which is how we talk about….. It’s actually not how we talk about sustainability, it’s how we talk about safety, But, it’s the same thing. It’s the right thing to do in terms of conserving our natural resources, in terms of leaving a positive legacy, etc.

**Expert**

Shifts between action logic stages are characterized by a clear step change to more comprehensive and complex understanding (McCaulley et al., 2006). This shift from Diplomat is substantive—not just as individuals now gain a third-person perspective (more readily able to focus as an observer on themselves and others) but also abstract thinking capacities (O’Fallon, 2010a; Torbert et al., 2004). This is seen in the quote below with a focus on problem solving, looking for reasons, often expressed technically. In talking about this issue, Rod does not consider the systems around this problem—such as infrastructure and end-use appropriateness, as well as risk, that can make using stormwater difficult—which would be more typical of an achiever response.

**MNCL (Rod):** Sometimes I think you just have to bite the bullet and you just have to take the simple approach, but I don’t think now our bureaucracy is just capable of doing that. Just the mind boggles, all this recycled water we put out in the ocean, it could be harvested, cleansed, go through a wetland, yeah, it might be wetlands, it might be some other filtrated, I don’t know, but you could get it, it’s just water—you have bodies that aren’t used in water—if you take out the impurities and it’s fine.

**Achiever**

A differentiating aspect at Achiever is the ability to categorize clearly between a wide range of what were Expert sustainability concepts. Generalizable reasons and mutualism—recognizing the importance of other people’s perspectives become much more prominent (O’Fallon, 2010a; Torbert et al., 2004).

**MNCL (Carrie):** I like to think of sustainability in a holistic sense in that it is sort of trying to find that balance of environmental social governance and economic outcomes, but to me it’s breaking it down into simple terms; it’s about being smarter about what we do, and how we live, and how we build, how we design; it’s about being smarter, it’s being more sensible about how we use our resources, it’s being smarter with the end outcome in terms of it not using as much or producing as many harmful impacts on the environment. But, yeah it really is about improving outcomes for the environment in which we live today, so that it’s still there, and still healthy and happy tomorrow and thereafter.
**Individualist**

Individualist responses encompass the relativistic perspectives that generalized systems can be viewed from. For example, looking at the generalizable reasons explaining a particular (Achiever) system and seeking to understand what failed was problematic or did not deliver. This worldview is characterized by observing the observer—a fourth-person perspective (O’Fallon, 2010a; Torbert et al., 2004). This relativity features in the example below; Dean was discussing 100+ year organizational history and thinking over long time periods compared to other organizations:

*MNCL (Dean)*: I mean you go into investment banking, I mean they deserve everything they got in their house because, they are, I call them the forces of darkness right. They are amoral I would say, and they will do whatever they need to get the deal, and the investment banks [biologists] do whatever you need to do to get these next deal and it doesn’t matter, right. It doesn’t matter whether it’s good, it doesn’t matter whether it is ethical, it doesn’t matter anything, you just do anything get the deal, right. And for me that is … I mean it’s despicable, actually. I hate that … I hate the sort of corporate greed the sort that you see in corporations where people will do whatever they need to do, it doesn’t matter whether it’s right, ethically correct in order to maximize their bonus …. No, I couldn’t do it. I could if I take the long-term view…. It’s pretty obvious when you hear an investment bank advising you to buy or sell, they’re really only interested in the transaction, because that’s when they earn, they don’t actually care if it’s a good transaction, the right transaction, a moral transaction, just the transaction right.

**Strategist**

The shift to Strategist sees such relativistic complexity categorized, organized, and structured (i.e., systems within systems within systems). This helps to ensure action or avoid decision paralysis (O’Fallon, 2010a; Torbert et al., 2004). The examples below see individuals applying such reasoning to what could have been an individualist expression of sustainability—relativity is moderated by understanding of complexity and viewpoints—seeing the potential for positive synergy between what could have been competing isolated system-perspectives (Brown, 2010). Karl is discussing organizational sustainability motivations from an observer observing the observer perspective (fourth-person):

*MNCL (Karl)*: I think culture’s a product of three or four things. One, there is certainly a belief in whether what you are doing is the right thing for—particularly once you have kids, for your kids and their kids from future generations—which is the whole sustainability, I suppose, ethos. So I think most parents would think about that, you know, what sort of a life and environment am I leaving behind? But then you balance that with other factors like—if I want to do the right thing by those generations, but it will cost me time in order to do that. Can I afford that time or do I want that time and do I want to devote time to that when I could be spending that time doing something else? So time is a factor in that equation. The other factor in it is cost and is it going to cost me more individually or, cost my family more, in order to achieve that outcome.

*LSAL (Edward)*: At the mythic level, we dealt with national stories, national myths. This was always very fascinating… we would take a national myth, a cultural myth
of the country, and turn it transparent to development ... Like in Albania, we took the story of the seven brothers. Each brother had a different capacity and they were all trying to help the princes that had been captured by the demon to escape. People began to see that each brother’s capacity was also a development capacity that could help their country realize the MDGs.

**Alchemist**

The Alchemist perspective is rare, and there are no identifiably strong examples in the MNCL data. The LSAL example below illustrate such shifts—holding of paradox and poles and able to stand in other’s experiences (Brown, 2010; O’Fallon, 2010a):

*LSAL (John)*: And to be honest, my Buddhist practice started at that stage and one of the principles is right livelihood. And having a sort of a systems mind, I couldn’t reconcile earning an income from activities that helped organizations do work in a world that caused harm to others directly or indirectly, visibly, or invisibly. So I ended up just selecting clients that contributed to society and so I ended up being more and more towards the sustainability area. And over time my practice has diversified and then deepened. ...So I don’t organize my life so as to be able to do this sustainability practice. I’m doing the sustainability practice so as to be able to live the life that I am required to live.

**Ironist**

These individuals are very rare—our sample contains two—and, as such, the characterization of qualities and research is less than complete. However, a shift from complexity, letting go while simultaneously accepting, and a unified perspective that “holds and rests in the tension of not knowing and wonder into the moment—without predefined constructs and perspectives” characterizes this sixth-person view (Brown, 2010; O’Fallon, 2010b). For example:

*LSAL (Luz)*: What could be more generative than setting oneself to engage with the complexity of life and support flourishing and consciousness to develop?... I think I mentioned last day karma yoga and that most definitely is one way I hold [sustainability work]. So karma yoga is defined in numerous sorts of ways but the way that I hold it is that basically...the three moves of the karma yoga [are] surrender to the divine, release attachment to fruits of your labor, and work as hard as you can; and that there’s a quality to that that I bring to [my sustainability work]. ...There was a time nine years ago when there was a right and there was a wrong and I could characterize sustainability based on that. And at a certain point, my spiritual practice and my engagement with the world through sustainability work couldn’t be held together because in my sustainability work, I was stuck in dualism. I was stuck in chasing after one thing and avoiding the other, which is not yoga. That is... yoga is beyond the pairs....So then bringing karma yoga to this is that you’re carrying out acts; you’re carrying out action. But as much as you can, doing so in a recognition of nonduality, in a recognition of the one in the many.
Discussion
We have outlined a sustainability model within which actions or agency, viewpoints, abilities to catalyze change or reasons why such change may be possible are framed in markedly different ways. Comparing interview statements to an action logics framework as illustrated above is distinctive. Each sustainability perspective, correlated to a different action logic, is characterized by a step shift in cognitive and complexity capacities. Critically, as many people familiar with action logics will have experienced for themselves, once we are aware of this theoretical structure we are able to identify action logics or associate particular statements that others may make with such action logics stages (Torbert et al., 2004 pp. 68-77). However, from the MNCL data we are showing a particular statement fits with our model. This correlation cannot be taken to imply that the individual’s action logic is at a particular stage. Similarly, a LSAL individual—assessed as holding a specific worldview—will not necessarily frame sustainability only from their identifying action logic’s perspective. Therefore, we would caution practitioners about assuming a person’s action logics from any presentation, statement, or interview they make. We also note that people might consciously choose to present concepts so that they appeal to discrete worldviews. The group around them may also consciously or unconsciously influence them. It is possible to communicate in a specific action logics style that is not representative of the individual talking.

Outcomes
Modeling sustainability action logics has helped us to identify statements framed in notably different ways. We have illustrated, for example, the marked difference between statements associated with diplomat action logics on sustainability and the substantive shift to one correlated with alchemist. Categorizing the MNCL and LSAL data provided a spread of sustainability responses correlated to seven of the eight most common action logics (excluding Opportunist; this framing was uncommon). The broad span provides depth and assurance that individual statements on sustainability are differentiated across stages. It has allowed the sustainability action logics model (Table 1), initially drawn from theory, to be refined. The correlation of statements to action logics descriptors drove these refinements, which in turn improved the ability to associate statements with these descriptions. Table 1’s characteristics and identifiers, particularly from Diplomat to Strategist, are consequently more appropriate to sustainability as a result of this work. These are potent outcomes. For example, consider the difference between Rod’s expert correlated response on water and Carrie’s system view of holistic action. Within a hypothetical organization with Rod and Carrie as leaders, it is reasonable to speculate that an intervention that encompasses both perspectives is more likely to be successful. Similarly, an approach based mostly on the technical merits of water recycling (e.g., as described by Rod) is likely to be problematic. Extending from these examples, our sustainability action logics model could assist people to demonstrate the value of subjective perspectives. That is, this is a tool to help overcome the flatland bias described at the start and, consequently, provides positive insights for those seeking to enable the emergence of sustainable societies.

Strengths
Key strengths of our research include a broad data set. By specifically seeking out late stage action logics leaders, and with access to the top level of senior managers within corporate organizations, we have a set of participants who span early (conventional) action logics as well as later and rare stages. The combined MNCL and LSAL studies draw on individuals familiar, as well as unfamiliar, with Integral Theory, thus partly overcoming a limitation of LSAL data.
Models vs. Metrics
We have outlined the development of a model. However, the work developed in this study is not a rigorous metric that demonstrates how to correlate sustainability statements to action logics with very low uncertainty. While we view the development of such a metric as desirable, it is necessarily the subject of further research. Nonetheless, models that allow us to characterize phenomena, and developmental stage models such as this, can be powerful without such a rigorous validated metric (Stein & Heikkinen, 2009).

Weaknesses
While later stage action logics are associated with organizational success, the evidence for this, while growing, is limited. This article does not present a longitudinal study researching such an association for sustainability. The study has not tied the potential correlation of statements with action logics to effective intervention. Nor is there evidence yet that understanding how an individual expresses sustainability (through an action logics framework) will assist in a similar way as understanding developmental perspectives from WUSCTs might. Additionally, this work is specific to sustainability.

Implications for Research and Practice
Categorizing sustainability with action logics helps to realize the benefits of developmental perspectives for deeper understanding. We are formalizing and structuring practice that many familiar with action logics conduct—assessing statements or interactions with others to understand circumstances and enhance the likelihood of effective change. The potential is to expand the research to create a more comprehensive and validated model (and/or metric) for assessing people’s sustainability understanding and views. Such a sustainability action logics model’s power is realized through enabling better and more effective interventions. These advantages are likely given the growing body of evidence that understanding developmental perspectives assists us to generate better organizational or group outcomes.

Conclusion
Our model illustrates how people make sense of sustainability in distinctly different ways, and how classifications are specific to various sustainability viewpoints. The discreetly different perspectives through which people express sustainability in turn refine the action logics sustainability model. A developed model opens the potential to more readily apply action logics (and through it Integral Theory) to practical problems. Through such application we would expect that the work itself is further enhanced and the value placed on subjective perspectives increases in relation to sustainability. Such a focus, over time, helps apply Integral Theory and action logics more commonly and broadly. The promise of this work, to be tested through further research and action, is that we enabling positive sustainable futures.

NOTES
1 For example, massive storms like Sandy are likely to become more common (Steffen & England, 2012); also see Parry et al. (2007), Box 7.4, on Hurricane Katrina. Overall, investigations have pointed to a pattern of more frequent extreme weather events for over a decade.
2 Many others, such as Christine Lagarde, Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, highlight our challenges. She says: “The science is sobering—the global temperature in 2012 was among the hottest since records began in 1880. Make no mistake: without concerted action, the very future of our planet is in peril” (Lagarde, 2013). This is consistent with the latest science that finds that the 20th Century has been the hottest in 1,400 years (Ahmed et
al., 2013) and a wealth of economic and environmental assessments including World Economic Forum’s 2013 risk report. The Forum’s risk report highlights evaluations such as:

> The estimated economic loss of the 2011 Thailand floods, for example, was US$ 30 billion, and of Hurricane Katrina US$ 125 billion; meanwhile, the 2003 European heat wave resulted in more than 35,000 fatalities and the Horn of Africa droughts in 2011 claimed tens of thousands of lives and threatened the livelihoods of 9.5 million people. More recently, Hurricane Sandy left a heavy bill, estimated today at over US$ 70 billion for New York and New Jersey alone. (World Economic Forum, 2013)

Similar cases are documented for other environmental impacts including fish stocks of which at least one quarter are overharvested and fish catch is now declining (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Board, 2005); overproduction degrading an area of soil larger than China and India combined (Reid et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2009) and an increase in disease attributable to temperature rise (Costello et al., 2009; Patz, Gibbs, Foley, Rogers, & Smith, 2007). The estimated cost of environmental damage is USD 6.6 trillion for 2008. That was 11% of global GDP, which is bigger than the global financial crisis (Mattison et al., 2010). Future impacts are stark. For example, the OECD finds that global “terrestrial biodiversity … is projected to decrease a further 10% by 2050” with “one-third of global freshwater biodiversity has already been lost, and further loss is projected to 2050” (OECD, 2012). These impacts are not linear. As population grows, and particularly consumption, human populations exploit more marginal land, increasing proportional impact (Ehrlich & Ehrlich, 2013). Oxfam summarizes some of the drivers and consequences:

> Adding to the excessive resource-use of the well-off are the aspirations of a growing number of consumers seeking to emulate today’s high-income lifestyles. Over the next 20 years, global population is expected to grow by 1.3bn people, while the global ‘middle class’ is expected to grow from under 2bn consumers today to nearly 5bn by 2030, increasing particularly in India and China. For people moving into the lower-income end of this group, rising consumption may mean being able to afford meat, electricity, and transport for the first time – transforming their lives and life-long prospects. But for those at the higher-income end, it may mean adopting lifestyles that are deeply unsustainable. (Raworth, 2012)

3 For example, Nicholas Stern estimated that 1% to 2% of global GDP is sufficient to address climate change (DARA, 2013; Stern & UK Treasury, 2007) and the IMF finds that 2.7% of global GDP subsidizes greenhouse gas–emitting fossil fuels (Lipton, 2013). The cost of climate change is outlined in the main text of this article. However, our experience is objective facts such as these are insufficient to create the obvious changes—removing such subsidies.

4 For example, an early stage of an nth person perspective (e.g., fourth-person Individualist) is unable to prioritise across their critiques of systems. This shifts to being much more able to categorize and balance at late fourth-person, (e.g., systems within systems within systems at Strategist) (O’Fallon, 2010a). These internal and external alongside nth person perspectives greatly assisted with correlating action logics to interview material statements. Note that the elaboration of Alchemist and Ironist into additional stages, outlined in O’Fallon (2010a), is not considered in this study. Similarly, early stages—delta—are outside the scope of this article.

5 Later stage action logics are correlated with positive leadership and organizational success (e.g., see Barker & Torbert, 2011, p. 52; Joiner & Josephs, 2007; McCauley et al., 2006). The extent of this research is growing, albeit limited and with relatively small numbers of people and organizations to compare between (McCauley et al., 2006). The studies looking more specifically at sustainability outcomes rather than leadership performance or organizational successes are few, although McCauley et al. (2006) document associations between later-stage action logics and sustainability outcomes. Our personal experience supports this—conscious action logics identification assists with sustainability initiatives. For example, with very late stage action logics—where people with these capacities wonder...
“into what the system needs and wants to become next, listen closely, and principally hold the energetic tension for that next stage of maturity to emerge” and we see support for “the individuals and the system to bring forth that new way of being, in whatever ways needed” (Brown, 2012). Many familiar with Integral Theory or Action Logics may be naturally predisposed to feel that such capacities can only be a net positive asset. Studies quantifying the impact of later-stage action logics to achieving more effective sustainability initiatives or outcomes are, however, very limited.
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Extensive research on adverse childhood experiences (ACE) demonstrates strong correlations between earlier life adversity and the development of substance abuse as well as smoking and other health risk behaviors, depression, and serious health problems (Felitti et al., 1998). Higher rates of ACEs are often associated with co-occurring health risks, including substance abuse, that tend to be treated with piecemeal approaches (Larkin & Records, 2007). Substance abuse is a good example of a problem that cuts across populations and affects every facet of a person’s life (Abbott, 2002; Cornelius, 2002). Mental health, medical, family, vocational, housing, and other problems frequently need to be addressed as part of treatment (DiLorenzo et al., 2001; D’Aunno & Vaughn, 1995; Friedmann et al., 1999; Friedmann et al., 2001). Yet, while service integration has been suggested as one way to meet the diverse needs of people with substance abuse problems (Durkin, 2002; Delany et al., 2003; Friedmann et al., 1999; Friedmann et al., 2001; Kraft & Dickinson, 1997), the amount of additional on-site services for substance abusers has decreased (Etheridge et al., 1995; Etheridge et al., 1997; Fletcher et al., 2003). Recognizing that substance abuse can be both a consequence of ACEs and related problems and lead to other serious conditions, fragmented services contribute to a lack of comprehensiveness in substance abuse treatment, which is problematic.
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Mental health, substance abuse, medical, and other social services continue to be organized as separate systems of care supported by different funding streams. People with substance abuse problems are among those client populations who find it challenging to navigate these fragmented systems of care and consequently find themselves poorly served and having difficulty achieving positive outcomes, leading to calls for service integration (Durkin, 2002; Friedmann et al., 1999; Kraft & Dickinson, 1997). An ability to measure collaborative and integrative activities is especially important for programs serving substance-abusing clients. Furthermore, both practice and theory developments in social services can be advanced by creating and refining measures in social work research.

The purpose of this article is to develop the construct of service integration from an integral perspective and present findings representing an early step in development of a service integration scale. Implications and next steps toward a Whole Delivery Measure (WDM) will be addressed. Creation of the Early Scale began by building on existing literature to define activities associated with service integration and highlighting calls for collaboration and integration within substance abuse treatment agencies. The Early Scale was created as part of a larger study exploring the influence of organizational and target population characteristics on collaboration and integration activities within substance abuse treatment agencies. We examined studies of collaborative activities between criminal justice and substance abuse treatment agencies (Fletcher et al., 2009; Lehman et al., 2009) as well as those between core and supportive services within substance abuse treatment systems (Delany et al., 2008). The current study explores collaboration and integration within community-based outpatient substance abuse treatment settings in the state of Maryland (Larkin, 2010).

The Early Scale distinguishes informal collaboration activities (information-sharing, communication, cooperation, and coordination across agencies) and formal integration activities (associated with greater degrees of collaboration and consolidation, including written agreements or shared policies and oversight). The ultimate goal is to develop a complex measure that captures key aspects of organizational movements through increasing levels of service integration. This requires a multi-dimensional construct that can integrate prior work. It is therefore crucial to provide the necessary conceptual background that defines the construct of integration. Integral Theory (Wilber, 1995, 2000, 2006) is a fully integrated theory, emerging out of metaperspectival awareness, now applied across professions and around the world (Esbjörns-Hargens, 2009). Integral Theory (Wilber, 2000) usefully transcends and includes commonly used theories, has been applied to human service organizations, and supports a sophisticated approach to research in social services (Larkin, 2006; Larkin, 2006a; Larkin et al., 2012; Larkin et al., 2012; Robbins, Chatterjee et al., 2004). Having a measure of integration will help in evaluating the degree to which substance abuse treatment, and other programs responding to ACE consequences, are bringing together services in order to better facilitate a comprehensive, whole person approach toward resolving multiple problems.

The Study of Collaboration and Integration

The child welfare field has already begun to emphasize services research, and service linkage is highlighted as an important way to address the multiple needs of children and families (Darlington et al., 2005; Darlington & Feeney, 2008; Foster et al., 2008; Green et al., 2008; Marsh et al., 2006; McCurdy & Daro, 2001; Ryan et al., 2006; Walter & Petr, 2000). King and Meyer (2006) articulate a framework for understanding coordination and service integration for families of children with disabilities that includes administrative functions, service planning, and linking client families to specific services. Internationally, there has been attention to integration of all child welfare services (Gardner, 2006). There is also a movement to treat the substance abuse problems of parents involved with the child welfare system (Carlson, 2006; Smith & Mogro-Wilson, 2007). Research demonstrates that family re-unification is facilitated by integrated service programming that attends to co-occurring problem resolution (Marsh et al, 2006; Ryan et al, 2006).

Homelessness is another field exploring service linkages and integration to facilitate access. For ex-
ample, Continuum of Care is a community-based model that organizes and distributes housing and services to meet the needs of people experiencing homelessness (Goodfellow & Parish, 2000; Wong et al., 2006). In addition, the recognition that homeless people with complex and co-occurring disorders are especially challenged to find their way through uncoordinated systems (Hambrick & Rog, 2000; Rosenheck, 2000) has led to the development of a systems integration model known as ACCESS (Access to Community Care and Effective Services and Supports) (Rosenheck, et al., 2002). Homeless services researchers continue to explore the effectiveness of integration activities, including the role of frontline staff and agency processes (Rosenheck, 2001; Rosenheck et al., 2002; Rowe et al., 1998). An empirical example of Restorative Integral Support (RIS) demonstrates how the Committee on the Shelterless (COTS), an award-winning agency in Petaluma, California, integrates research-informed interventions for a comprehensive, whole person approach (Larkin et al., 2012).

Recognition that substance abuse treatment services do not adequately meet the needs of the criminal justice population has also led to exploration of service delivery mechanisms associated with collaborative and integration activities in prisons, drug courts, and community corrections agencies (Fletcher et al., 2009; Lehman et al., 2009; Mumola & Karberg, 2006; Taxman et al., 2007). Fletcher and colleagues (2009) have developed an interagency activity measure based on Konrad’s (1996) systems integration model. This measure clarifies the types of collaborative and integration activities within criminal justice agencies and demonstrates that service integration varies by correctional setting type. This measure has also been used to explore collaborative activities between different types of correctional settings (prisons, jails, and community corrections) and substance abuse treatment agencies (Lehman et al., 2009).

Some attempts at substance abuse service integration have been made out of a desire to improve recovery outcomes for people with co-occurring disorders and remove service delivery obstacles contributing to relapse (Barreira et al., 2000; Kraft & Dickinson, 1997). One study showed that on-site health services facilitated medical care within substance abuse treatment (Friedmann et al., 2001). Research on substance abuse treatment service delivery also shows that supportive services are more likely to be found in programs with a wide foundation of core services, older publicly owned programs, and programs serving more diverse, non-white, and female clients. Programs with a greater number of staff certified in substance abuse treatment were less likely to offer additional supportive services (Delany et al., 2008).

There is a need for knowledge of collaborative activities and service integration within substance abuse treatment agencies that seek to treat the whole person. When substance-abusing clients are offered a service package that addresses multiple needs, they are more likely to stay in treatment and achieve better recovery and functional outcomes (Ducharme et al., 2007). Yet, agency support services have decreased even as substance abuse problems have become more severe and complex (Etheridge et al., 1995; Etheridge et al., 1997; Fletcher et al., 2003; Friedmann et al., 1999). This points to the need for research to better understand and address dynamics involved in substance abuse treatment, providing a way to intervene with service systems to facilitate whole person response strategies.

**Conceptual Framework**

Lacking a clear definition or framework of integrated service models, discussion of collaborative and integrated service delivery is often confused (Hambrick & Rog, 2000). Longoria (2005) points out that interorganizational collaboration has become a popular idea influencing policy and practice, yet there is a need for critical thinking to define the term and its meaning, as well as action to implement and evaluate the outcomes of service linkages. In fact, there continues to be a gap in research on collaborative activities and service integration, with discussion of service linkage and integration calling for research and evidence of effectiveness (Bailey & Koney, 1996; Dennis et al., 2000; Foster et al., 2008; Gil de Gibaja, 2001; Lehman et al., 2009; Mizrahi & Rosenthal, 2001; Schofield & Amodeo, 1999; Reilly, 2001; Walter & Petr, 2000).
A conceptual framework and definition facilitates carrying out and researching collaborative activities and the development of integrated service models. It is important to note previous attempts that are specific to service integration. Horwath and Morrison (2007) engage in an in-depth exploration of collaborative partnerships and integrated services, demonstrating a continuum from low to high levels of collaboration as well as ingredients involved in collaborative child welfare activities. These authors point out that processes attending to relationships within social networks are just as important as decisions about the organization of service structures (Horwath & Morrison, 2007). Axelsson and Axelsson (2006) provide a conceptual framework as a practical guide for public health managers and researchers. This framework includes simultaneous attention to both the intensity of agreements and adjustments among staff within and across agencies (termed horizontal integration) and hierarchical management decisions about service mechanisms (termed vertical integration). These authors provide examples of combinations of horizontal and vertical integration within public health agencies (Axelsson & Axelsson, 2006).

A great diversity of service integration initiatives within human service agencies have emerged from a perspective that cares about the best ways to serve multi-problem clients, improving access to services and continuity of care (Marquart & Konrad, 1996). Konrad (1996) created a definition of services integration based on observable activities, discussing organizational relationships along degrees of formality. This model describes integration within human service agencies in terms of specific activities involved with different levels of integration. Level 1 is Information Sharing and Communication, Level 2 entails Cooperation and Coordination, Level 3 is Collaboration, Level 4 is labeled Consolidation, and Level 5 is Integration (Konrad, 1996). Distinguishing between service integration and systems integration, Dennis and colleagues (2000) further clarify the Konrad (1996) model as a continuum of systems integration that involves the interaction and merging of organizational structures. Service integration, on the other hand, takes place on the frontlines (Dennis et al., 2000).

Integral Theory (Wilber, 2000) helpfully presents the notion that there are multiple dimensions involved in service integration, which can be viewed from first-person, second-person, and third-person (singular and plural) perspectives. Collectives are made up of individuals. This is represented by the concept of the quadrants, with the upper quadrants denoting the individual and the lower quadrants corresponding to the collective (see Esbjorn-Hargens, 2009). The Right-Hand quadrants depict third-person perspectives—individual behaviors (Upper-Right quadrant) and systemic interactions (Lower-Right quadrant). Konrad’s (1996) informal activities describe Upper-Right individual behaviors taking place on the frontlines of service, while formal activities involve observable Lower-Right quadrant policies and procedures set forth within systems. Integral Theory (Wilber, 2000) points out that informal engagement in observable Upper-Right collaboration and integration activities are likely an expression of the individual’s Upper-Left awareness, including values, particularly if these observable behaviors are not supported by the policies or culture of the collective. The Lower-Left quadrant depicts the culture, or climate, of the organization, which involves intersubjective shared meanings—individual members, including their internal awareness and values, make up the social networks that share meanings and values within the organization. The shared values of the organizational culture tend to be reflected in the observable Lower-Right policies and procedures. At the same time, leadership plays an important role in drawing like-minded people to work in the agency, setting an example and tone for the climate, and designing policies and procedures that shape agency cultures (Larkin, 2006; Larkin et al., 2012).

Integral Theory (Wilber, 2000) also integrates research demonstrating that individuals develop along multiple lines, with all of us possessing unique strengths and capacities. Each developmental stage transcends and includes the previous stage, increasing one’s overall awareness through the developmental process. The developmental capacities of staff members shape programs. For this reason, as leaders and members join or leave, organizations can change drastically. If staff members value collaboration and/or integration (Left-
Hand quadrants), the informal activities (Upper-Right behaviors) described by Konrad (1996)—and related activities—are likely to emerge as a reflection of individual awareness and shared values within social networks. When leaders value collaboration and/or integration, and especially when the culture shares this value, formal policies and procedures are likely to be put in place. Full integration takes place when leadership, culture (involving developmental awareness of staff members), and policies are aligned to implement integration. Thus, Integral Theory (Wilber, 2000) includes attention to relationships and processes (Lower-Left quadrant) as well as systemic arrangements (Lower-Right quadrant) and individual activities (Upper-Right quadrant) while also bringing attention to the role of individual consciousness (Upper-Left quadrant). Individuals develop levels of awareness that involve increasing capacities for caring and compassion. Organizational integration, on the other hand, is dependent upon the combination of leadership, culture (involving social networks of members with their own developmental awareness), and policies/systemic design. Thus, it is important to clarify distinctions between quadrants and levels in the study of service integration.

Konrad’s (1996) model serves as a starting point for a measure of service integration, used in the Early Scale, because it grows out of existing literature and offers easily measurable activities. The current study builds upon previous research using this model to measure interagency activity between criminal justice and substance abuse treatment settings (Fletcher et al., 2009; Lehman et al., 2009). In the current study, the activities defined by Konrad (1996) inform the Early Scale to begin measuring collaborative and integration activities within substance abuse treatment agencies. These range from informal communication and information sharing to more formal linkage arrangements to complete service integration. The continuum from informal to formal begins to shift once inter-agency collaboration takes place, with consolidation becoming more formal and potentially leading to integration (Larkin, 2010).

Interdependence is the salient dimension in the Early Scale. Informal activities are represented by observable behaviors (Upper-Right quadrant), while formality involves the creation of policies and procedures (Lower-Right quadrant) to expedite cooperation. The Early Scale measures these formal and informal activities. The specific activities representing each of the first four levels articulated by Konrad (1996) are included in the Early Scale used in the current study. Because full integration was not manifesting in substance abuse treatment agencies when the study was conducted, activities representing full integration are not in the Early Scale.

**Methods**

**Data Source**

The data for this study were drawn from the population of substance abuse treatment programs in the state of Maryland. A listing of substance abuse treatment programs was obtained through the Office of the Director of the Maryland Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration. The office provided mailing labels for the administrators of all programs in the state of Maryland. A package was prepared and mailed to all program administrators. The package contained a letter inviting them to participate in the research, a university Institutional Review Board approved informed consent statement, a letter of support from the director of the state Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration and a short questionnaire which asked questions on treatment modality (residential, outpatient, methadone maintenance), location (urban, rural, suburban) and ownership (public, private). From this information, programs that reported being administrative offices only and programs that indicated that they provided only assessment and evaluation or detoxification only were removed from the list. The final listing included 305 programs. The administrators of these programs were sent an e-mail with a hyperlink to the online survey. 153 of the 305 identified programs responded, representing a response rate of 50.2%. The majority of the programs were outpatient drug free programs (n = 93), followed by residential programs (n = 47), and methadone maintenance programs (n = 13) (Larkin, 2010). Because of the small number of methadone programs in the sample, they were not included in the current analysis. This article is based
on data from the outpatient and residential programs, representing a total of 140 programs.

Data Collection Instrument
The questionnaire included 13 items that were designed to measure the first four levels of Konrad’s (1996) systems integration model. The following three statements were designed to measure Information Sharing and Communication:

- We give or receive educational presentations.
- We share information on services.
- We hold joint staffing/case reporting/treatment consultation.

Two statements were developed to measure Cooperation and Coordination:

- We have systematic referral and follow-up for treatment and support services.
- We coordinate policies and procedures to accommodate each other’s requirements.

The following five statements were designed to measure Collaboration:

- We have written protocols for sharing client information systems.
- We have developed joint policy and procedures manuals.
- Our organizations have uniform eligibility requirements.
- We have written agreements providing space for services.
- We have developed written agreements for training staff.

Three statements were developed to measure Consolidation:

- We share administrative oversight with these programs.
- We share budgetary oversight with these programs.
- Our organizations have pooled funding.

The program administrators were asked to name the top three organizations with which they had the most important relationships in serving the target population. They then were asked to indicate which activities they engaged in with each organization (Larkin, 2010). Because of the large number of missing data for the responses to organizations #2 and #3, we limited the analysis to the activities listed for organization #1.

Description of the Treatment Organizations
Table 1 contains descriptive data on the 140 treatment organizations contained in the study. Two-thirds of the reporting organizations were outpatient programs (66.4%) and one-third were residential programs (33.6%). When compared against a number of background factors, the outpatient and residential programs differed significantly on ownership and client capacity. The residential programs were significantly more likely to be private non-profit as compared to the outpatient facilities (53.2% vs. 36.6%) whereas the outpatient programs were more likely to be private for-profit as compared to the residential facilities (31.2% vs. 8.5%).

With regard to client capacity, as to be expected, the residential programs were significantly smaller than the outpatient programs. Eighty percent (80%) of the residential programs had a capacity of 50 or fewer clients compared to 25% of the outpatient programs. Differences by program age, geographic location, budget size, and number of paid staff were not statistically significant.
Developing the Early Scale

The 13 items listed above that were designed to capture the activities defined by Konrad were subjected to an exploratory, principle component, varimax rotated, factor analysis. The results of this analysis are contained in Table 2. As can be seen from this table, two significant factors were extracted in the total sample. The first

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample (N = 140)</th>
<th>Residential (N = 47)</th>
<th>Outpatient (N = 93)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
<td>25  17.9</td>
<td>12  25.5</td>
<td>13  14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 15 years</td>
<td>41  29.3</td>
<td>9   19.1</td>
<td>32  34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 25 years</td>
<td>37  26.4</td>
<td>12  25.5</td>
<td>25  26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26+ years</td>
<td>37  26.4</td>
<td>14  29.8</td>
<td>23  24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ownership</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>48  34.3</td>
<td>18  38.3</td>
<td>30  32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private for-profit</td>
<td>33  23.6</td>
<td>4   8.5</td>
<td>29  31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private non-profit</td>
<td>59  42.1</td>
<td>25  53.2</td>
<td>34  36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>39  28.1</td>
<td>11  23.4</td>
<td>28  30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>62  44.6</td>
<td>18  38.3</td>
<td>44  47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>38  27.3</td>
<td>18  38.3</td>
<td>20  21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 500,000</td>
<td>93  66.4</td>
<td>33  70.2</td>
<td>60  64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600,000 – $1 million</td>
<td>21  15.0</td>
<td>4   8.5</td>
<td>17  18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 million +</td>
<td>26  18.6</td>
<td>10  21.3</td>
<td>16  17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Paid Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5</td>
<td>36  25.7</td>
<td>13  27.7</td>
<td>23  24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 15</td>
<td>54  38.6</td>
<td>15  31.9</td>
<td>39  41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 25</td>
<td>18  12.9</td>
<td>7   14.9</td>
<td>11  11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26+</td>
<td>32  22.9</td>
<td>12  25.5</td>
<td>20  21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Client Capacity</strong>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>25  17.9</td>
<td>16  34.0</td>
<td>X9  9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 50</td>
<td>36  25.7</td>
<td>22  46.8</td>
<td>14  15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 100</td>
<td>33  23.6</td>
<td>8   17.0</td>
<td>25  26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 150</td>
<td>13  9.3</td>
<td>1   2.1</td>
<td>12  12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 &gt;</td>
<td>33  23.6</td>
<td>0   0.0</td>
<td>33  35.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $X^2 = 9.190$; d.f. = 2 $P \leq .01$

** $X^2 = 44.492$; d.f. = 4 $P \leq .01$

Table 1. Organization variables by program modality.
factor represents items that reflect the first two levels of Konrad’s model: “information sharing and communication” as well as “cooperation and coordination.” We defined this factor as “informal staff activities—cooperation and coordination.” The second factor comprises eight items that reflect Konrad’s third and fourth level of integration. These items represent greater degrees of collaboration and consolidation. We labeled this factor as “formal policies and system design—collaboration and consultation.” We repeated the factor analysis on the residential programs and outpatient programs separately. The findings for the residential programs were similar to the total sample with the exception that the item “we have written agreements providing space for services” failed to load on the second factor. The findings for the factor analysis conducted on the outpatient programs were also similar to the findings from the total sample with two exceptions. On the first factor, the item “we hold joint staffing/case reporting/treatment consultation” did not load significantly on factor 1 and the item “we share budgetary oversight with these programs” did not load significantly on factor 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 1: Informal – cooperation and coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We have systematic referral and follow-up for treatment and support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We coordinate policies and procedures to accommodate each other’s requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We share information on services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We hold joint staffing/case reporting/treatment consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 2: Formal – collaboration and consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We have developed written agreements for training staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Our organizations have pooled funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We have written agreements providing space for services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Our organizations have uniform eligibility requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We share administrative oversight with these programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We share budgetary oversight with these programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Factor loadings of early scale items by modality.
Table 3 contains the percentage of agencies that responded positively to the systems integration items. For the first factor, cooperation and coordination, the findings for the residential facilities and the outpatient facilities are very similar. In both cases, the item “we share information on services” was endorsed by over 70% of the reporting organizations. For factor 2, collaboration and consultation, the findings again are quite similar between the residential facilities and the outpatient facilities. For both types of facilities, over half of the organizations report that they “have developed written agreements for training staff” (57.4% and 53.8%). On the low end, only about a quarter of the agencies report that their “organizations have pooled funding” (25.5% and 26.9%). In general, the findings in Table 3 show that the residential and outpatient organizations are quite similar in reporting activities that are less structured as well as structured.

Table 4 contains an assessment of the scalability of the items contained in each factor. In Factor 1 the overall scale reliability is alpha = 0.587, showing a low but acceptable alpha. The four items contained in this scale each correlate moderately with the total scale. The overall reliability score for the second factor (alpha = 0.729) shows a much stronger reliability. The eight items contained in the scale are fairly highly correlated with the total scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample (N = 140)</th>
<th>Residential (N = 47)</th>
<th>Outpatient (N = 93)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACTOR 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. We have systematic referral and follow-up for treatment and support services</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We coordinate policies and procedures to accommodate each other’s requirements</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We share information on services</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We hold joint staffing/case reporting/treatment consultation</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACTOR 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. We have developed written agreements for training staff</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Our organizations have pooled funding</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We have written agreements providing space for services</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Our organizations have uniform eligibility requirements</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We share administrative oversight with these programs</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We share budgetary oversight with these programs</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Frequency of early scale items by modality type.
Summary of Findings

Various forces contribute to more integrated practice approaches within social service agencies, particularly in substance abuse treatment settings. In addition to an economic interest in creative responses that maximize resources, providers incorporate new knowledge to improve outcomes. For example, research on adverse childhood experiences (ACE) calls for movement beyond piecemeal interventions and fragmented services (Larkin & Records, 2007). Substance abuse treatment providers have long recognized the influence of substance abuse problems on mental health, housing, job stability, family dynamics, health challenges, and other issues. This has led to a concern about the way in which service system designs can facilitate or impede recovery (Kraft & Dickinson, 1997). The current study responds to the call for service integration by exploring empirical responses to items reflecting Konrad’s (1996) model of service integration and pointing to next steps in measurement.

The Early Scale supports social workers in assessing whether a substance abuse treatment agency provides little to no integration, informal service integration activities, or formal service integration activities. The Early Scale consists of two factors, each with four items, and the corrected item-total correlation and internal consistency are presented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We have systematic referral and follow-up for treatment and support services</td>
<td>0.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We coordinate policies and procedures to accommodate each other’s requirements</td>
<td>0.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We share information on services</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We hold joint staffing/case reporting/treatment consultation</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alpha = .587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We have developed written agreements for training staff</td>
<td>0.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Our organizations have pooled funding</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We have written agreements providing space for services</td>
<td>0.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Our organizations have uniform eligibility requirements</td>
<td>0.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. We share administrative oversight with these programs</td>
<td>0.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We share budgetary oversight with these programs</td>
<td>0.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alpha = .729</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

Summary of Findings

Various forces contribute to more integrated practice approaches within social service agencies, particularly in substance abuse treatment settings. In addition to an economic interest in creative responses that maximize resources, providers incorporate new knowledge to improve outcomes. For example, research on adverse childhood experiences (ACE) calls for movement beyond piecemeal interventions and fragmented services (Larkin & Records, 2007). Substance abuse treatment providers have long recognized the influence of substance abuse problems on mental health, housing, job stability, family dynamics, health challenges, and other issues. This has led to a concern about the way in which service system designs can facilitate or impede recovery (Kraft & Dickinson, 1997). The current study responds to the call for service integration by exploring empirical responses to items reflecting Konrad’s (1996) model of service integration and pointing to next steps in measurement.

The Early Scale supports social workers in assessing whether a substance abuse treatment agency provides little to no integration, informal service integration activities, or formal service integration activi-
ties. The Early Scale does not test levels of integration but does assess categories of observable collaborative and integrative staff and activities defined as informal and formal, which can be mapped to the Upper-Right and Lower-Right quadrants. The development of the Early Scale contributes to the growing call for service integration by providing a way for social service providers to assess specific collaborative and integrative activities while pointing to the need for a more multidimensional measure to address the research gap in service integration.

Over half of the organizations surveyed reported that they have developed written agreements for training staff with an organization with which they had an important relationship in serving the target population. Residential and outpatient substance abuse treatment agencies were similar in their reports of both informal (frontline staff activities [Upper-Right quadrant]) and formal (policies and systems design [Lower-Right quadrant]) service integration activities. These findings suggest that services in residential and outpatient substance abuse treatment organizations are being re-arranged in response to the complex needs of people with substance abuse problems. Staff persons are engaging in both informal and formal activities to accomplish this goal. A quarter of agencies reported that they have pooled agency funding to provide integrated activities. Thus, some agencies are finding ways to fund integrated services together.

**Implications for Practice and Theory**

Providers serving substance abusing and other multi-problem populations can benefit from tools to support their attention to systems of care and their ability to engage in organizational interventions in support of client recovery. Service integration can allow clients to spend more time on recovery than navigating fragmented services (Kraft & Dickinson, 1997). An ability to assess integration activities is a beginning step that can help social service providers and agency directors explore whether formal or informal collaborative and integrative activities support client recovery as well as the impact of policies on specific activities. Yet, if current fragmented organizational arrangements are not adequately serving multi-problem client groups most in need of supports, there is a need for a multidimensional measurement scale that captures all of the ingredients involved in service integration—leadership, culture, and systemic design. A Whole Delivery Measure would facilitate practice and research of comprehensive and streamlined services that support the whole person, advancing theoretical developments.

The Early Scale’s ability to distinguish formal versus informal integration may be helpful information to incorporate into supervision and staff development, which leads to new questions and next steps. If the Early Scale reveals that an agency has formal systemic policies (Lower-Right quadrant) without informal integration activities (Upper-Right quadrant), this suggests that organizational members may not be carrying out integrated service delivery in spite of policies calling for more integration. It is possible, for example, that even services offered at the same site may not be well integrated with one another (Larkin, 2010). Leaders may want to explore ways to enhance their own development to influence organizational social networks in a way that supports more informal integration activities—especially to meet the goal of formal integration policies and procedures. Restorative Integral Support (RIS), for example, emphasizes the importance of leadership and policies that promote self-care/development practices for the staff who provide the relationship-building and role modeling that creates the culture within which services are integrated (Larkin et al., 2012). Integral Theory (Wilber, 2000, 2006) helps explain that the combination of various kinds of reflective and health-oriented practices across lines of development can have a synergistic effect to mobilize overall consciousness development. One’s capacity to love and include expands along with awareness and identity (see Wilber, 2006). It may also be helpful to notice when the organizational members begin moving toward informal integration before formal integration is in place. In this case, organizational leaders can consider ways in which policies and procedures can formalize service integration in support of staff concerns.

The Early Scale was developed from broad, objective behavioral activities set forth by Konrad (1996).
There may be other activities falling within each category that were not captured in the measure. Additionally, the instrument itself does not assess organizational culture or the developmental capacity of leaders, which tend to be reflected in a range of behaviors beyond the interactions labeled here as formal, informal, or non-integrative activities. While the Early Scale measures activities, we do not know what levels of awareness and inter-subjective processes those activities reflect. Furthermore, while we can differentiate informal and formal activities labeled as collaborative and integrative, we are not able to use Konrad’s model to distinguish levels of integration. Integral Theory (2000) points out that rule-oriented, competitive, collaborative, and integrative activities are Upper-Right quadrant behaviors associated with Upper-Left quadrant levels of consciousness development. The Early Scale therefore reveals the need for a more refined and multi-dimensional conceptual understanding of service integration.

**Research Implications**

For future research, the Early Scale can assess organizational activities in the direction of service integration. This will begin the study of whether informal and formal service integration activities are associated with enhanced access to services, especially for multi-problem population groups. The measure of formal and informal service integration activities can also be a step in connecting type of integration activities to agency outcomes as well as exploring whether formal, informal, or the combination of these activities contribute to better outcomes. Of note, however, outcomes research on informal Upper-Right behaviors or formal Lower-Right quadrant policies that does not take other quadrants into account is likely to find mixed results on “integration.” In order to assess whether more integrated services produce better outcomes, there is a need to increase the practice and conceptual understanding of integration (Larkin, 2010). A Whole Delivery Measure (WDM) would include and transcend the Early Scale by assessing leadership capacity and social bonding in addition to informal and formal integrative activities. This would allow for a more nuanced understanding of service integration and the influence on agency outcomes, including whether more integrated agencies are better able to support client recovery. If integration leads to better outcomes, we may want to support agency leaders in self-development as well as offering a practice framework for integration.

A first step in creating a WDM could involve combining the Early Scale with a measure of leadership development (see Cook-Greuter, 1999) in program directors and a measure of the emotional and social well-being of staff—the Mental Health Continuum Short Form (MHC-SF; Keyes, 2007). Next, integral concepts would be applied to expand upon types of formal and informal activities (i.e., behaviors reflective of a greater spectrum of consciousness development) as well as types of social networks within which services are integrated (i.e., characterizing the healthy expression of traditional, competitive, collaborative, and integral networks within agencies). It is recommended that the WDM be tested and developed in other types of social service agencies beyond substance abuse treatment so that it can be refined for use by any agency serving people experiencing multiple problems. Focus groups would strengthen understanding of the social networks associated with staff emotional and social well-being, providing a qualitative complement to this measure. The MHC-SF could also be used as a quantitative measure of service outcomes in conjunction with focus groups among those served.

Given the increasing call for service integration, and the research gap in this area, the Early Scale is an important step leading to a WDM that facilitates research on service integration to advance the theory and practice of comprehensive, whole person supports. This will help assess and improve service access for multi-problem populations, allow for a more nuanced understanding of the impact of service integration on outcomes, and strengthen practice and research on integration.
Conclusion
This article presented the Early Scale, which measures formal and informal service integration activities within substance abuse treatment agencies in the State of Maryland, and calls for a WDM to further practice and research on service integration. The Early Scale distinguishes formal and informal service integration activities in residential and outpatient substance abuse treatment programs. A multi-dimensional measure of integration is needed to carry out research on comprehensive, whole-person supports for people experiencing multiple problems. The Early Scale can be combined with proposed measures of leadership development and healthy social networks. The article recommends supplementing the combined quantitative measures with qualitative data revealed through staff focus groups to create the WDM. The WDM can be tested and developed within a range of social service agencies assisting people experiencing multiple and complex problems associated with the accumulation of early adversity. While each agency identifies its own expected outcomes, the measurement of emotional and social well-being is likely to be useful in assessing the impact and results of comprehensive, whole-person supports upon those served.
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ASSUMPTIONS VERSUS ASSERTIONS
Separating Hypotheses from Truth in the Integral Community

Susanne Cook-Greuter

ABSTRACT This article raises some fundamental concerns about the current integral movement and its assertions about what we know and what is going to happen in the future. Many integral adherents seem to be attracted to the “good news” aspects of the integral message. The idea that more of every kind is better pervades recent writings: more cognitive complexity, more beauty, more goodness, more truth. This overlooks the fact that access to more complexity and interpretive power has just as much potential for self-delusion, ego inflation, and large-scale disregard for people as it has the potential for benefitting and uplifting humanity. Furthermore, a challenge is issued regarding the idea that humanity is on the verge of a major shift in human consciousness, and that, as a group, the integral community is going to “change the world.”
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Recently, I have felt a clear shift away from the inquiry mode that originally attracted me to integral ideas to many of its current pronouncements and certainty. As an elder in the integral community, I feel called to share my observation about the integral field and its currents at the risk of being labeled demoralizing pessimist. I tend to see myself instead as a seasoned realist. As a researcher, I want to be clear about the difference between what we can know and assert and what is mere conjecture about the future as extrapolated in a linear way from what we know so far. For the current purpose, I take on a decidedly Western, rational perspective. This does not mean that I do not also have access to post-rational and transcendent experiences and perspectives. As a researcher in ego development, I am keenly aware of all the ways we can fool ourselves. I thus want to address some concepts rarely mentioned in integral circles, namely the role of language and of polar opposites in meaning-making.

I will postulate that much of the “certainty” expressed and the “pride” that some people feel by identifying as integral practitioners may be an expression of ego’s central function to tell a coherent story and to make us the heroes in it. I appreciate the youthful, upbeat, and forward-moving energy that animates much of the integral endeavor while I wonder about its unconscious and inherent anthropocentric perspective. So let’s take a deep breath and dive into these choppy waters.

Introduction

Let me start with a deep bow to Ken Wilber. I prize the AQAL model as an elegant, robust, and useful framework. I definitely use it at least implicitly as a powerful means to do cleaner and more inclusive reflection and research (Cook-Greuter, 2005). The worldwide integral community continues to inspire me with its conscious and heartfelt applications of Integral Theory to alleviate human suffering.

I also understand that holding a statistically rarer, postconventional perspective affirms one’s specialness. Yet I cannot imagine that I am the only one who feels a sense of concern around the current proclama-
tions of our “greatness” and the attending drive for raising the consciousness of all. Not all of this seems to come from a genuine compassion for all sentient beings in the way the Bodhisattva vow calls for. Therefore, my remarks will try and elucidate some aspects of Integral Theory that may be either excluded or hidden from view or favored and put in the foreground. I do this with an invitation to all of us to keep expanding our compassion and to become aware of how easily we can get attached to noble ideals.

I speak to you as someone who grew up in a bilingual family in multilingual Switzerland. There, my first academic training was in semantics—that branch of linguistics that explores how word meanings get constructed and change over time. This early training has influenced my fascination with meaning-making ever since. I am curious about what drives our need for meaning and how this need to understand relates to adult development theory and our expanding sense of self. My 30 years of research has shown just how readily the ego, in its identification as a separate self, will usurp any content in order to boost itself and make itself feel more potent and indispensable (Trungpa, 1987). This includes a tendency to adopt any ideology that a) resonates with our own ideals and yearnings, b) gives us a sense of power and belonging, and c) promises us a sense of immortality.

Finally, I speak to you as someone whose signature strengths have been courage, curiosity, and skepticism. In this paper you will mainly hear my critical voice in order to draw attention to what is not often named in integral discourse. The more certain representatives of any “ism” are of having found the final answer, the more I react with apprehension. Certainty and knowing are regularly signs of a less seasoned ego at play, while embracing ambiguity and mystery are generally signs of more mature self-awareness. Language awareness, familiarity with ego development, and a questioning attitude toward certainty will thus be my guides in the following remarks.

The Centrality of Language In Meaning-Making

First, let me reflect on language and its role in the reification of human experience. When we recognize how language acts as a main force in socializing and civilizing us, we may come to see our basic assumptions about reality in a more sober light. As language I include all symbolic representations in whatever shape and form. All systems of notation or representation are shorthand for transmitting knowledge and experiences among people. Without such symbolic representations, today’s global commerce and instant information exchange could not exist.

Natural language seems to be the universal means by which we humans learn, communicate, and transmit accumulated knowledge to each other from generation to generation. As far as we know, there is no society that does not have a language and a concomitant set of explanations or stories for where we come from, why we exist, how we fit into nature, and what our purpose is as human beings. According to current linguistic theory, each culture and each speech community divides the original, unstructured experiential continuum in different ways according to its specific traditions, beliefs, needs, and imagination as well as its context. Each group uses its particular language to induct new members into the reality view that it embodies. At the most basic level, each discourse community transmits its accepted answers to our fundamental questions about life. It provides an orientation map by channeling our attention to what is important and thus conceptualized and labeled and, by omission, what is outside its radar.

Children are molded to become members of their relative speech community from the day they are born. Through relentless modeling of culturally specific behaviors and language, children learn to differentiate and categorize their surroundings into specific, labeled objects. All distinctions and words one acquires become part of one’s reality—a culture-specific way of parsing the otherwise buzzing confusion of sensual perceptions. By about age 3, most children use language as their primary means of communication and learning. They also know what is valued in their family and what is considered appropriate behavior, thinking, and feeling, and what is not. For most of us such knowledge becomes tacit. We generally cannot remember our
own preverbal existence or how we acquired our native tongue. Most people cannot remember how they were socialized into a particular view of reality and how they came to value what is to be considered significant in life. Very few people develop an insight into how we form, sometimes reform, and even transform our self-identities over time, that is, what stories we tell about who we are as individuals, as members of various groups, and finally as members of the human race. Even rarer is the discovery that all such explanations are stories about ourselves, not actually true selves.

By using a shared vocabulary, metaphors, and stories we assure ourselves that we matter, while at the same time affirming the cohesiveness and viability of our group. Having such mental orientation maps seems indispensable because they provide us with rules and scripts for action, and because they help us to navigate the straights of human experience.

It seems reasonable to conclude that in order to grow into adults it is not sufficient to have what Steven Pinker (1994) describes as the language instinct. There is every indication that human beings are essentially social beings. We only grow in the company of other human beings who transmit to us the culturally given definitions of who we are, who we can become, and what does and does not count as “real.”

Once we have absorbed a specific view of reality, it tends to become the only reality for us as it filters out rivaling possibilities. As Howard Rheingold (1988) put it: “Although it is rarely visible to us, we carry around in our heads a conceptual map of the world, a guidebook to rightness and wrongness, ugliness and beauty, value and worthlessness” (p. 72). Most people, especially monolingual speakers, are unaware of what I like to call the language habit and the culture-specific framing of reality that comes with it (Cook-Greuter, 1995).

In the West, constructivist developmental theories have proven to be especially powerful in chronicling how people can differ in the capacity to understand themselves and reality by gaining an ever-greater perspective on the process of meaning-making itself. Each stage in ego development theory describes a different orientation map, a different story about what to pay attention to and how to make sense of experience. Nonetheless, no matter how comprehensive our personal orientation maps may become, they are deeply flavored by the cultural, geographic, and historical contexts we live in along with our personal history, physical and mental constitution, and life conditions.

Being able to use specific terms correctly and to agree on their meaning creates a sense of empowerment and belonging. There are many adult contexts that have their own unique take on reality, which is reflected in the professional jargon that accompany them. The integral setting and various spiritual communities are no different in this regard. Having access to their shared terminology subtly, and often not so subtly, excludes those who do not know the special lingo. Phrases such as “multiperspectival,” “post-metaphysical,” and “tetra-arise” signal to us and to outsiders that we are familiar with Wilber’s philosophy and/or that we are members of the integral movement who are in the know.

Before I continue, let me reiterate: By using a shared vocabulary we continuously assure ourselves and each other of what makes sense. With every word uttered, we reinforce the shared conceptual map of our world. We use language to identify the concrete objects and events around us and to tell the stories of our group and of ourselves. I suggest that the propensity to be conditioned by the available interpretations in our environment remains active throughout our lives and in all realms of experience.

Alfred Korzybsky (1948) first referred to reality as the underlying “territory” existing prior to the human mapping of it. He warned us not to confuse the territory with the maps we are making of it. In my observation, to become conscious of reality as an undifferentiated whole beyond separating it into named object is a conscious aspect of late-stage insight. For many, this unity is most often tasted during meditation or in transcendent states and peak experiences.

Herb Koplowitz (1984) explained the territory-map distinction and the difference between the immediate, underlying unity and the language-mediated human descriptions of it as follows: “…reality is undifferentiated. It is the process of naming or measuring that pulls that which is named out of reality, which itself is
not nameable or measurable” (p. 282).

Thus we deal with abstractions in language. *Abstrahere* literally means “pulled out from” and definition, from *de-finis*, means putting a boundary where there was none before. Thus it is possible to recognize the fundamental unity of the underlying territory and the arbitrariness of all definitions and maps about it. Wilber too has made this argument in *No Boundaries* (1985). Beauty and ugliness, good and evil are interdependent concepts, two sides of the same coin only existing as abstractions from the seamless ground. We cannot reasonably refer to one without awareness of its opposite. Many of the world’s spiritual traditions seem to agree that the privileging of one side of any polarity creates much of the very suffering that permeates human experience.

Any object is formed by segmenting the undivided continuum into separate entities: the object itself (what it is), and the background against which it has been differentiated (what it is not). That also applies to self-identity, to what I consider to be “me” and “not me.” Recognizing that the boundary is constructed is a first step in questioning the distinctions we have assumed to be natural and objective throughout most of our lives. Once we are aware of the constructed nature of the boundaries we can explore and develop a more open relationship to them. In ego development research we observe that what once was distinct and “other” can become a conscious part of ourselves with increasing maturity and integration.

The discovery of the constructed nature of reality can be gained in several ways: One of them emerges naturally as a consequence of our capacity to watch our own minds and our meaning-making. I named this level of understanding *Construct-aware* because of its characteristic preoccupation with language as a filter of reality and its focus on map making. Language is also the main means by which we develop and communicate the paradoxical aspects of human existence. I will get back to the topic of ego and its story-telling function in a last section of this talk.

**Language as an Expression of the Human Spirit**

In the context of the Integral Theory Conference, the language of communication is English. We all use it more or less fluently to communicate with each other. English has become the de facto world language, the lingua franca of the 21st century. It is rapidly spreading and colonizing worldwide trade and exchange. What concerns me is that there is an abundance of vital human experience and wisdom out in the world we are not privy to because we do not have access to the reality conceptions formed and the knowledge accumulated over centuries of oral transmission in some areas of the world.

Just think of the fact that almost everyone hearing this traffics in one of the languages belonging to the Indo-European language family that originates in Sanskrit. According to Wikipedia estimates, more than 40% of the world’s people speak an Indo-European language from Hindi to Russian. Although not visible to most native English speakers, each language that was developed in remote areas of the world may see very different realities from ours and articulate its conception of life in powerfully different ways.

Wade Davis (2009), in his eye-opening book *The Wayfinders*, describes the richness of the human language pool as follows:

> Together the myriad cultures and languages make up an intellectual and spiritual web of life that envelops the planet and is every bit as important to the well-being of it as the biosphere. You might think of this social web of life as the “ethnosphere.” This term is best defined as a the sum total of all thoughts and intuitions, myths and beliefs, ideas and inspirations brought into being by the human imagination since the dawn of consciousness. (p. 2)

Davis goes on to deplore the rapid loss of languages and with them the loss of culturally diverse stories about
what it means to be a human being. As speakers of rare languages die out and more and more people share information via English, a vast treasure of past human answers to why and how we exist is being permanently lost. You may ask why the loss of diverse languages and the richness of human expression they embody should be mourned. I paraphrase Davis: A language is not merely a set of grammatical rules or a vocabulary. It is a flash of the human spirit, the vehicle by which the soul of each particular culture comes into the material world. Each language is a watershed of thought, an ecosystem of spiritual possibilities.

For those of you curious about these alternative views of reality, there is a whole literature out there attempting to communicate just how different a conception some cultures have of what it means to be a human being. No longer do we dismiss such alternative interpretation of reality as necessarily “primitive,” as once was the custom in Western anthropology. But in many cases, our interest comes too late.

I ask you therefore: Are we not amiss in perspective-taking if we do not also pay attention to these very different conceptions of life as they too are genuine forms of spirit and its variety of expression in human beings? I do wonder to what degree the integral community is aware of these wider possibilities of our rich interpretive heritage.

I wonder further what we lose by focusing merely on Anglo-Saxon conceptions of reality. Several of the originators of integral thought in the United States appear to be monolingual. Like fish in water, they are not even aware of how the linear structure of English may itself influence how they parse experience and how they think and express their theories.

The AQAL model, for example, separates human experience into four distinct quadrants with exteriors and interiors. It is true that the quadrants are said to co-arise and influence each other. Yet overall the model is taught with its components treated as separate entities. To wit, it is now possible to become a certified AQAL expert, someone who holds the correct and only legitimate view of the theory and its concepts. AQAL too—an originally dynamic and fecund theory—is herewith in danger of becoming ossified.

As speakers of English, our thought is generally characterized by linearity, as the word order is inflexible. We rely on an analytical process of differentiation, and on clear subject-object divisions. We tend to define the growth of the mind by its capacity to make ever finer distinctions and by categorizing the information into ever more complex, logically organized ways. In addition, in English we talk about the world in terms of objects more often than in dynamic terms. Just try this little experiment. Make a “fist” and look at this thing. Now open it. Where has the “fist” gone?

The view of language presented here assumes that all named abstract objects are human constructs. Hence, notions such as quadrants, types, and lines are invented concepts to describe phenomena that some group of people agrees upon makes sense in describing their experience. They are not to be taken, however, as the only way one can understand and respond to life. If any such abstract definitions are taken as absolutes and true representations of reality, we have a case of confusing the map with the territory.

The evolutionary conception of reality in the current integral movement is unfortunately touted by many as the only true way we should look at human existence as it best explains who we are and where we are headed. Although it is worldcentric in its care, it is anthropocentric in its overall message and in the role it assigns integralists in the universe. More than a mere belief, this view prides itself to be a comprehensive model of consciousness. It puts second-tier people and spiritual evolutionaries at the center of shaping the future. Not only that, it calls us to leave earlier views and ways of being behind. Even more astonishing, we are invited to see ourselves as co-creators with God of an emerging order of consciousness that will lead to a better and saner world and more.

Do some of you also hear the potential for hubris in this framing of who we are and what our place is in the universe? What this view does not demonstrate is a perspective on its own, deep-seated assumptions. Edward O. Wilson (1997) once famously said “the evolutionary epic is probably one of the best myths of all.” Unlike evolutionary integralism, Wilson does have an explicit perspective on his own field of inquiry as
a grand myth, a meaningful and powerful story rather than the truth.

As more and more people share information via English and computers, a vast treasure of past human answers to who we are and how we can meaningfully be in the world is at risk of being permanently forgotten. Would it not be a travesty of its multi-perspectival principle to assume that evolutionary Integral Theory provides the final answer to the human predicament and our innate striving for meaning?

**Linear View of Time**

There are other aspects of evolutionary Integral Theory that signal a limited perspective. For example, it has a distinctly linear view of time that begins with the Big Bang. It feels justified in equating the rise of civilizations and our expanding individual consciousness with what it observed in nature. Evolutionary Integral Theory relies for its arguments on the evidence gathered with the best of the current arsenal of scientific measuring tools, all of which were invented to extend our limited senses. Yet it ignores that the human participant observer and interpreter remains at the center of what is seen, heard, and discerned at all scales of inquiry from the subatomic to the astrophysical.

The best minds in current astronomy seem to agree that overall we deal with a profound mystery. We do not understand phenomena such as dark matter at all, a concept that was invented as a placeholder for the 95% as-of-yet inexplicable forces in the known universe. And what do we as integralists do in typical conventional-scientific fashion? We rely on irrefutable evidence so far accumulated and declare the Big Bang as the beginning of time. Now we are predicting what is going to happen next based on the patterns we observed as we extrapolate them into the future and apply them to consciousness. If we are honest with ourselves, the mysteries of the cosmos may far outweigh what we can ever scientifically ascertain from our peculiar human position and limitations.

Granted, an imminent tipping point for a second-tier transformation in consciousness is a fascinating and hopeful postulate, but where is the evidence for it? Are we open right now to consider that there could be future events that require different explanations of what the cosmos is, how it functions, and what our place in it is? In contrast to the linear evolutionary time frame, we can visualize a conception of time that sees the 13.5 billion years of the expansion of the universe as only a small part of a much longer, wave-like, or cyclical motion, or any number of other possibilities. There are cultures that do imagine such infinite cycles of time. Are we not hasty if we do not also give those very different conceptions of time at least some attention, as they might offer alternative hypotheses of how we fit in the grand scheme of things?

Can we really predict from past patterns what the future will hold? Back in 1958, Heisenberg postulated his now widely accepted uncertainty principle. More recently, research in decision-making as well as brain studies seems to seriously challenge the sense we have of ourselves as rational beings who can figure things out from past experience and purposefully create a more ideal future. There are numerous well-known biases that we all fall prey to even when we are aware of their existence. Optical illusions are but one familiar example of how our senses continuously fool us. I ask you this: To what degree does the integral movement today give the necessary space in its arguments to the well-known human propensity for biases of all kinds? As beings conscious of our mortality, most of us are afraid of not-knowing, uncertainty, and death. We need to begin to consider that projecting ourselves into the future is a standard way our “separate” selves try to assure themselves of some sense of permanence and impact. Spiritual paths are often so attractive because they offer us a sense of extension beyond the brief lifespan and the promise of a conscious homecoming into a unity experience.

A particularly American flavor in evolutionary thinking is its linear, upward and onward message as well as its youthful energy and belief in having the solution to what ails humanity. Its message is fundamentally evangelical—preaching the good news of the integral evolutionary perspective. Moreover, it claims that humanity is close to the 10% tipping point to transform into a mature, second-tier, truly integral con-
consciousness. Not every cultural observer agrees. Duane Elgin (2012) mused in a Huffington Post blog that the United States is perhaps finally entering early adulthood after having spent most of its brief history in an adolescent mindset. Characteristics of adolescence are a) its forward and upward-looking mode, b) its youthful enthusiasm and sense of entitlement, c) its sense of immortality, and d) its privileging of action over being, and change over stability.

In ego development terms, the spiritual evolutionary message thus looks more like a representation of the shift from early conventional meaning-making to a late conventional, more adult mindset with many “self-authoring” undertones—a far cry from a second-tier realization.

In addition, there is equal evidence that there are also opposite and less benign developments occurring concomitantly with the growth of consciousness that integralists are so fond of pointing out. As mentioned earlier, we cannot have any conception of growth without its counterpoint of decline, as both are aspects of the same underlying unity. I therefore submit that the privileging of a particular kind of change and transformation to the neglect of an appreciation for alternative ways of conceiving of human nature shows a crack in an otherwise elegant theory.

I wonder whether the integral movement actually lacks a basic perspective on its own American-flavored assumptions. It seems to privilege a linear, future-oriented, and anthropocentric view despite its claim of being multiperspectival, transdisciplinary, and inclusive. Is it possible that we are letting ourselves be hijacked by the integral evangelical promise? A positive bias seems to me just as potentially blinding as a negative one. Because most everyone in the current integral movement celebrates the benefits of an evolutionary view of reality, I feel I need to raise the issue of the possible costs and limitations of this view to invite more balance and reflection.

There is actually as much evidence for negative trends in the world as there is for positive ones. To name just a random few, the indicators range from the still unsolved issue of nuclear waste, the decline of habitat and loss of biodiversity, new diseases like the one causing the decimation of pollinating bees, global climate change and violent weather events, as well as our complete ignorance of the state and dynamics of the earth’s core. In addition, we realize that many communicable diseases caused by microbes once considered treatable are now developing dangerous, antibiotic-resistant strains. Finally, there is the documented rapid increase in hate groups in the United States and the increasing gap between the rich and the poor across the globe. As human beings our understanding seems to be simply too limited to anticipate the consequences of our choices and our best intentions regularly have unintended adverse effects.

**Ego as Process and Ego as Self-Representation**

As mentioned at the beginning of this article, my long-time exploration of ego development theory may offer some insight into the role of the ego in all of this. It is clear to me that there is no such thing as “ego” as it, too, is an intangible, abstract concept. And yet ego as a shared concept serves a useful purpose for us. It seems helpful to understand ourselves, our need for meaning and to communicate our lived experience to each other. In contrast, the concept of ego would have been utterly meaningless to an aboriginal denizen of the Australian outback living along song lines in dream time.

Following Herbert Fingarette’s (1963) view, I like to define the ego as that aspect of us that strives for coherent meaning. Let me paraphrase his definition of ego: “The organization or synthetic function is not just another thing the ego does, it is what the ego is. The failure of ego to integrate experience results in anxiety and meaninglessness.” I do thus propose that existential anxiety, that is a fundamental fear of death and non-being, is inevitable in the language-mediated realm of experience and that it epitomizes an essential aspect of being a conscious and thinking-feeling creature.

**Ego as process** tirelessly metabolizes, organizes, integrates, and interprets experience from both external and internal sources in order to create a sense of meaning and permanence. Ego creates a map of reality,
an evolving narrative of who I am and what I believe about the world. When we are unable to manufacture a viable story, we can become cynical, go crazy, or despair so deeply that we give up on life. In contrast, ego as representation refers to our self-identity. Ego development theory describes an invariant sequence of qualitatively different and coherent stories or self-representations along a developmental trajectory. The difficulty with the term ego is that it is often used in everyday talk to denote egocentricity as in the phrase: “leave your ego at the door.” In the latter case, ego refers to the exclusive identification and deep attachment to a defended, encapsulated self-sense, not to the meaning-giving, synthesizing function of ego or the abstract definitions of the sequence of self-identifications that constitute ego development theory.

Let me remind you of the discoveries about the nature of ego and meaning-making at the hypothesized two most mature stages we chart in ordinary human development. Unlike cultural relativism, which assumes that there are many interpretations of the same reality, later stage development embraces a far deeper uncertainty. Construct-aware persons question what we deem to be reality as based on our consensual maps of the underlying territory. They become aware that language marks an essential aspect of being human beings and, at the same time, that it can become a strait-jacket from which we cannot intentionally free ourselves, as all discursive thought is, by definition, filtered through language and thus separates us from the actual experience. Construct-aware folks become intellectually aware of how they create ever more complex and comprehensive maps or stories about reality and about themselves. They realize that all their maps are anthropocentric and stage-specific approximations of what cannot otherwise be described and shared. They start to fathom the profound underlying human need for permanence and significance that drives meaning-making.

At the Unitive stage, people come to experience the instability and the illusion of the permanent object world as created by abstraction even more fully and with greater equanimity. There is little need left to have a set identity or to be any particular way. Individuals at the Unitive stage are also less prone to inflate their self-sense as they now realize the function of the ego to provide stability and certainty in order to defend against meaninglessness. They develop an ever-greater compassion towards the nature of being an embodied, vulnerable creature with a consciousness of its own fragility and its desire to leave an imprint of its existence beyond the grave.

I wonder to which degree the hopeful predictions about an evolving consciousness and a second-tier future may well be touched by that very human need of ours for purpose, meaning, and significance. The certainty expressed by the “evolutionaries” in the integral movement is more reminiscent of a modern scientific approach to knowing than of later stage conceptions of how we know and what we can know. I suggest that a more complex view of reality must include notions of fundamental “uncertainty,” existential paradox, and the nature of interdependent polar opposites as a basis for making any claims.

In terms of its understanding of humans, integral evolutionary assertions sound more as coming from a formal operational, self-authoring, analytical, and future-focused mindset than a truly second-tier one despite “postconventional” content and worldcentric values. Ego development theory is distinct from many other theories precisely because it pays more attention to the development of meaning-making and thus looks more at how tightly or lightly a theory is held than what ideas it espouses.

How can we tell whether advocates of a particular map of reality are aware of its constructed nature? We tend to know when they have a perspective on their own theory as a belief system and when they can see its benefits and its limitations in individual psychological terms as well as from an historical, global, and cross-cultural point of view.

I invite all of us in the integral movement to remain open and to inquire into our own motivations, needs, and preferences. Let’s be alert when we are attracted to an interpretation of reality because it makes us feel more secure, special, and important. Let’s be vigilant about not confusing the map with the territory, or our favored interpretations with the seamless underlying and felt sense of experiencing life as it unfolds. We better be skeptical when someone asserts a specific view of reality as the discovery of all discoveries rather
than as a useful hypothesis, a tentative new map, and a basis from which to continue to explore the mystery of being.

**Conclusion**

I will end my reflections on what we might want to pay more attention to by posing a list of questions that are framed in polarities:

- Can we keep exploring our integral assumptions about being humans, as these too may be culturally limited, and yet value the very modern, Western legacy within which we try to offer the most life-affirming message we can?
- Can we appreciate the necessity and wisdom of the ego as a storyteller while being alert to its relentless scheming to cement itself and to affirm its separateness?
- Can we pause and let ourselves deeply experience our yearning to transcend our earthly form while accepting that we are also mortal?
- Can we passionately support the integral dream and participate in it while we remain in inquiry?
- Can we permit ourselves to assess how attached we may be to the integral ideal because of its feel-good, ego-boosting offer of conscious collective empowerment and its evangelical promise of a new world order that will save us from our human folly and yet remain realistic and open to an undetermined future?

Many of the world’s spiritual traditions as well as psychology say that the first step to both growing up and waking up is to simply “see what is” with open, non-judgmental eyes. So let’s be tender-hearted and tough-minded. Let’s be hopeful and cautious, curious and skeptical. Let’s seek transcendence and also fully appreciate our current embodiment as imperfect meaning-seeking mortals.

I thank the reader for offering me this opportunity to express my thoughts and concerns. I am grateful to all of you for having shared a precious slice of life with me as we continue to explore the human quest for meaning both as an organization and as individuals.

**NOTES**

1. To find out your own signature strengths, go to http://www.authentichappiness.sas.upenn.edu/questionnaires.aspx. A variety of the tests available on the site are free and fairly reliable.
2. Some cultural patterns clearly influence children even in utero, such as what the mother eats, how she moves during pregnancy, and what sounds and sound patterns the growing fetus is exposed to, for instance.
3. The abstract synonyms for the act of definition (“define, delineate, delimit, demarcate, determine, circumscribe, frame”) all contain the notion of boundary. A concept can only be formed by segmenting a previously undivided continuum into several interdependent entities (Cook-Greuter, 1995).
4. This figure does not include the millions worldwide that use English as a second language.
5. In July 2012, for example, *National Geographic* published a long article on vanishing voices. In it you can find examples of several of the world’s rare or dying-out languages. The article also includes examples of how these cultures parse and label their experience differently than we do in English.
6. The right-angled box representations of knowledge in the AQAL model and the Wilber–Combs Lattice are just two obvious examples of this automatic framing of knowledge in the Western mind.
7. This is especially evident in purely cognitive-oriented developmental models. Their proponents do not seem to experience and present their mathematically and statistically based models as abstractions from lived experience.
See also Gödel (1931) regarding mathematical models of reality.

Wikipedia lists over 170 biases in just three areas of human meaning making: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of
cognitive_biases.

We have to be skeptical when we begin to believe in numeric predictions about the future. Ego likes numbers and
grand generalizations and the illusion of certainty that comes from them.

See the Southern Poverty Law Center’s Spring 2013 report (http://www.splcenter.org/get-informed/intelligence-re
port/browse-all-issues/2013/spring), which lists the increase of hate groups, militia, and “patriot groups.”
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INTEGRAL POSSIBILISM
A Tool for Critical Realism and Necessity for an Integral Community
R. Elliott Ingersoll

ABSTRACT Integral Possibilism is herein presented as an alternative to the maxim that “everyone is right about something.” While in some situations everyone being right about something may be a resourceful way to begin dialogue or take a new perspective, in others it can feed relativism, and even what is best called quackery. Drawing on the Freethought Movement of the 19th century, Integral Possibilism is a cognitive reframe calling for more discernment before we seek out what someone is right about and more critical thinking when someone is clearly wrong. Integral Possibilism also acknowledges our evolutionary legacy of brains that have an inherent “belief engine” that has evolved over millions of years. This legacy includes a tendency to seek patterns and anthropomorphize intention. Because we are prone to belief, critical thinking is even more important.

KEY WORDS critical thinking; evolution; Freethought Movement; skepticism

In 2004 on the Montel Williams show, self-proclaimed psychic Sylvia Browne told a distraught Louwana Miller that her daughter Amanda Berry, who had been missing since 2003, was dead. Two years later Ms. Miller died from what many colloquially called a “broken heart.” Amanda Berry, pronounced dead by Browne in 2004, was very much alive and enduring 10 years of being held prisoner and tortured in a locked house with two other women not far from where she disappeared in Cleveland, Ohio. She escaped May 6, 2013, and is now free, although it is hard to imagine the horrors she has endured and how she and the other two women (and her child by her abductor born in captivity) will recover.

No personal god intervened to spare her this ordeal. Rather, Berry was saved by a man who heard her screams and took a chance by kicking in his neighbor’s door. This is the universe we live in and this situation is only one of millions across a planet where billions live in horrific poverty; where sexual trafficking is the third largest criminal enterprise in the world (FBI, 2013); where innocents are murdered daily; and where many fortunate enough to have a high quality of life spend much of that quality trying to psychologically block out awareness of the suffering that surrounds them. Perhaps most reprehensible, many (like self-proclaimed psychics) squander the chance to truly help others to mendaciously profit off their suffering.

It seems that rather than “everybody being right about something,” many people are actually consistently wrong about a lot of things, including speculation about what is going on in this universe; what it means; and whether any human mind can actually see the full picture at all (present author included). Granted, in some cases this is pure mendacity and psychopathy but in other cases many confused but charismatic people capture the attention of those in need of a person to give them direction and, while playing the role of such a

Correspondence: R. Elliott Ingersoll, Cleveland State University, 2121 Euclid Ave. JH 275, Cleveland, OH 44115. E-mail: ingersollelliott@gmail.com.
person, cause more harm than good. Some may object that it is not fair to equate extreme beliefs or practices like those of Sylvia Browne with an integral practice that accepts the existence of things like bioenergy fields or the legitimacy of gurus. The painful question that has arisen for me, though, is where do we draw the line between what may be legitimate help and what may be harmful quackery? In the spirit of Critical Realism, what I am calling Integral Possibilism aims to distinguish between ontological and epistemological questions. It also tries to understand objectivity in a particular context. The context I will be most interested here is a social/cultural one that is based on constructive discoveries with regard to human suffering.

The context in which I and my colleagues have had positive results with the Integral model and Integral Possibilism was in “demythologizing” how people think about psychotropic medications, psychiatric diagnoses, and the use of both in children (Ingersoll & Rak, 2006; Ingersoll & Marquis, In press). Using a basic approach to the four quadrants of the Integral model proved effective in falsifying the idea that mental illnesses were caused by chemical imbalances in the brain and that psychotropic medications corrected chemical imbalances in the brain. In this work we did not need to resort to what increasingly feels like mental gymnastics (e.g., “meta-narrative deconstructivist revisionism”); my colleagues and I simply assessed what was possible by reviewing research on the topic from physiological, psychological, cultural, and social perspectives, commenting on states and lines of development when we found promising leads in those areas. Our purpose, our context, was educating people about what was helpful psychologically and what was harmful. Our goal was to impact the training of mental health professionals, the education of and advocacy for clients as well as supporting their families. Far from being limited to what some might call strict methodological naturalism, this approach led us into the realm of how a hypothesized mind affects a physical brain (or how the brain gives the illusion of a mind that acts on the brain), how environment affects gene expression (epigenetics), and how the culture of family and things like ethnicity could shape the life experience. Our approach was “neophilic” while also thinking critically about it in the contexts of what the four quadrants represent. The possibilist approach I describe in this article has been a bridge to mainstream contexts.

I sometimes feel some integral enthusiasts are neophilic in the sense that we do not always prioritize a systematic approach to critical thinking. If we start by casting a broad and deep net thinking everyone is right about something, we can be vulnerable to fraud and potentially destructive actions and products. The promise of the Integral model is being fulfilled in many ways, and my thesis here is it will grow much more with a healthy strand of skepticism that is willing to risk offending others on occasion rather than have “truth” (or even accuracy) be a casualty. I initially thought of labeling this brand of skepticism “Integral Skepticism” but choose “Integral Possibilism,” as it has been strongly influenced by the Freethought Movement that is rooted in excitement about what is “possible.” One of the leaders of 19th-century free-thinking was Robert Green Ingersoll who, rather than insisting someone was wrong before hearing them out, would hear them out and then engage in dialogue. Ingersoll had ontological and epistemological assumptions, but was fascinated with what was possible. He remained open his entire life to the possibility of a divinity or an afterlife of some sort (possibilism) but remained unconvinced. He also honored the context of beliefs and said in many cases they grew out of love. A belief in an afterlife where one hopes to see departed loved ones, he noted, was based in love as opposed to threatening parishioners with eternal damnation, which was rooted in cruelty and control (Ingersoll, 1898). The first he said he would treat as an expression of love, and the second he would ridicule publicly and challenge until the end of his days (which he did).

My aim in the wordplay of “possibilism” is in the spirit of Critical Realism (i.e., always leave the ontological door open for phenomena that have to be explored with multiple tools and perspectives). As philosopher Daniel Robinson (2007) summarized, even a perspective like methodological naturalism, which assumes all things exist in nature and those things can only be explored with the tools of science, rests upon the assumption that this is in fact the case—an assumption about the necessity of science which is not in and of itself scientific.
INTEGRAL POSSIBILISM

What is “Free Thought?”

Since possibilism as a tool for critical thinking rests in the roots of free thought, it is important to discuss those roots. One way to define free thought is thinking for oneself without threat of coercion. This allows one to transcend received opinion and “…embodies every ideal that secularists still hold out to a nation founded not on dreams of justice in heaven [or some New Age parallel universe], but on the best human hopes for a more just earth” (Jacoby, 2004, p. 365). There are still multiple perspectives on how dissent is viewed across variations of the integral community. I have had people tell me that when they question a doctrine or belief they have sometimes been told something like, “Well, you aren’t at the right level so that is why you don’t see the truth in….” This is a weak response to dealing with dissent because if it were “true,” the person would have no chance for a valid response. Rather than encouraging growth, it narcissistically and pejoratively tries to label the questioner with some “cosmic” form of immaturity.

The idea of “levels” is more idea than substantiated construct. I have explored this at length with David Zeitler (Ingersoll & Zeitler, 2010). Certainly, there are gradations of maturity that have been supported in research (e.g., Jane Loevinger’s theory of ego identity; Robert Kegan’s orders of consciousness), but we do not have sufficient evidence to parse them into concrete levels (no one is “amber” or “orange” altitude). Another problem with this sort of response is that it implies the responder has not only reached a greater maturity than the questioner, but that the responder knows about the questioner what the questioner does not know about himself or herself. That level of psychological insight is not possible based on a disagreement over a single issue. At the very least, it requires extensive dialogue.

Freethought assumes there is psychological health in learning to and exercising one’s ability to think for oneself. Freethought relies heavily on logic, reason, and the ability to test hypotheses rather than accepting the dogmas that come from authorities. The logic and reason can be drawn from what we are calling critical realism rather than a simply materialist view of the universe. In American history, the period that runs approximately from 1875 through 1914 has been called the “high-water mark of freethought as an influential movement in American society” (Jacoby, 2004, p. 151). One of the central figures of the Freethought Movement was Robert Green Ingersoll, who felt that belief in gods or supernatural phenomena divert human energy from what might actually be helpful. Ingersoll directed freethought at social issues like authoritarian values, slavery, and women’s rights. He wrote, “When credulity, ceremony, worship, sacrifice and prayer take the place of honest work, of investigation, of intellectual effort, of observation, of experience, then progress becomes impossible” (Ingersoll, 1901). If I could have traded the thousands of hours I spent in prayer and meditation for participating in a house-to-house search for the captive women described above, the world might be a much better place today.

In the broad and deep net cast by focusing on everyone being right about something, are we too eager in accepting “belief” to be a catch-all for things we do not or cannot understand? For example, is believing in subtle energy worthwhile if physical evidence for subtle phenomena is not possible (Poortman, 1978)? Where does that leave us? Is following self-proclaimed gurus really a form of spiritual practice or self-deception? How do we decide? Ingersoll was the first to admit we live in a wonderful and mysterious universe. For example, he was fascinated by Darwin’s theory of evolution: “I would rather belong to a race of people that came from skullless vertebrae …than from a perfect pair upon which the Lord has lost money from that day to this” (Ingersoll, 1901, Vol. 4, pp. 651-652)]. He insisted on forming his own opinions by listening to others, not only with the goal of finding what others are “right” about, but also challenging them on what was inconsistent or not testable: “Education is the lever to raise mankind, and superstition is the enemy of intelligence” (Ingersoll, 1898, p. 663). Ingersoll was perhaps best known and loved for his love of life and willingness to hear out any new perspective, including new perspectives on old questions (Jacoby, 2013). It is in this spirit that I suggest that the skeptical tools from the Freethought Movement could enhance integral discourse and be a means to broader infusion of integral ideas in the mainstream (which we have failed to do thus far).
2012: A Cosmic “Non-event”

December 21, 2012, amassed a popular culture phenomenon similar to that of the “Harmonic Convergence” of 1987. Both dates were thought to correspond to the end of some part of one of the cycles in the Mayan calendar (the end of a 5,126 year-long cycle in 2012 and the end of a 52-year “hell cycle” in 1987). Believers in the fact that these dates were somehow significant also pointed to astronomical phenomena that were supposedly related to some “shift” that would or “could” take place in consciousness. In 1987, the astronomical phenomenon was an alignment between the sun, moon, and six planets, and in 2012 the alignment of the earth with a black hole at the center of our galaxy. It can be argued that the other thing these two dates have in common is that nothing occurred out of the ordinary. In 1987, the idea was that if 144,000 people gathered at spiritual power centers like Mt. Shasta in California and meditated for peace, then a great acceleration of human consciousness would occur. In 2012, a number of things were prophesied, including a reversal of the earth’s magnetic poles (which did not happen). Even if it had, there was no evidence that it would be the cataclysmic event hinted at by writers like Braden (2007) and Joseph (2007). As far as I can tell, we did not see the advent of a “wisdom age” (Russell, 2007) nor did we “pull the plug” on the Internet and begin experimenting with global telepathic experiments (as suggested by Jose Arguelles). There has not been any documentation of intensification of UFO activity, as suggested by Arguelles (2007). To be fair, one could make an argument that some of Laszlo’s (2007) predicted “discontinuities” are occurring (like geostrategic alliances aimed at balancing Western influence, changing weather patterns, and anti-globalization movements).

So what are these and similar eschatological phenomena about? Carl Jung (1959) addressed this question in an essay on the flying saucer as a psychological phenomenon. Jung also noted that eschatological ideas were more popular when a calendar people take as “real” is progressing to a new century. Jung’s idea was that whether there were actual UFOs or not, psychologically they represent mythic projections specific to our age. For Jung, the psychic need for a mediator is the power behind the psychological energy given by Christians to the image of Christ. When adherence to beliefs like those of Christianity begin to die out in a given population, the psychological energy that powered them seeks other vehicles, and in this case UFOs are one such vehicle. Such a symbol provides a relief from the tension of opposites whether it ever becomes conscious in Jung’s map of the psyche. However,

...should something extraordinary or impressive then occur in the outside world, be it a human personality, a thing, or an idea, the unconscious content can project itself upon it, thereby investing the projection carrier with numinous and mythical powers. Thanks to its numinosity, the projection carrier has a highly suggestive effect and grows into a savior myth whose basic features have been repeated countless times. (Jung, 1959, pp. 414-415)

Whether or not we agree with Jung’s conclusions that the eschatological phenomena were about meaning-making, the idea that we are meaning-making creatures raises questions from a possibilist perspective. Whether or not you agree with Jung’s system of psychology, there is ample evidence that we are meaning-making creatures. As Jung alludes to, when we feel a loss of control there are elements of our mind that experience dissonance and seek out a resolution in the process of meaning-making. In many cases, meaning-making can fuel belief, especially because when we feel like we are out of control we tend to “see” patterns that are not actually there, including some of the beliefs we claim to adhere to (Whiston & Galinsky, 2008). And unexplored, untested beliefs can be destructive.
Our Brains as Belief Engines

Michael Shermer (2011), science writer and founder of the Skeptics Society, documents how our brains are belief engines or machines, if you will. Sensory information flows in the brain have evolved over millions of years, spurring mechanisms that seek out patterns and infuse those patterns with meaning. This process Shermer (2011) calls “patternicity: the tendency to find meaningful patterns in both meaningful and meaningless data” (p.5; Blackmore & Moore, 1994). The need for and desire for control over our environment serves to increase survival and many researchers have creatively explored how control is linked with survival (e.g., Fernald, 2012). This tendency, though, can also give rise to superstitious thinking and perceiving patterns that in fact do not exist (Foster & Kokko, 2009; Whitson & Galinsky, 2008). This is when an ingrained, evolved trait can work against us. I have always told my students that the hardest thing on the planet is helping a person change a dysfunctional belief system. I wrote “helping a person change” because I am convinced that no one can coerce another person to give up a belief. Even when that person is ready to examine a belief that may be hurting them, it is hard for them to release it.

Kevin Foster and Hanna Kokko (2009) offer a short formula to summarize how patternicity arose in evolution. The formula \((pb > c)\) can be dissected as meaning superstitious behavior may develop when one believes the probability \((p)\) of a benefit \((b)\) is greater than the cost for the benefit \((c)\). As Shermer (2011) summarizes, “for example, believing that the rustle in the grass is a dangerous predator when it is only the wind doesn’t cost much, but believing that a dangerous predator is the wind may cost an animal its life” (p. 347). Since human beings are poor at calculating probability, when the cost of believing the wind is a predator is low (compared to the opposite), there evolves a selection for believing that most patterns are real. Patternic ties do, however, rely on the context and environment of the organism and that organism’s belief of the extent to which she controls the environment (locus of control). A higher internal locus of control correlates with more confidence in one’s judgment; a higher external locus of control tends to be more correlated with belief in things like ESP, reincarnation, and spiritualism (Shermer, 2011).

A second phenomenon that Shermer (2011) describes is what he calls “agenticity,” which is “…the tendency to infuse patterns with meaning, intention and agency” (p. 87). Given that we are meaning-making machines who are designed by millions of years of evolution to detect patterns (even when none exist), we also project onto the patterns we think we see intention and agency—qualities we of course have ourselves. If the pattern is a projection of self to some extent, the agenticity will be also. This concept is derived from Daniel Dennett’s (1987) idea of the intentional stance that we use to predict the actions of others based on believing they are rational agents and estimating what we believe about their desires and goals. Based on this, we then try to predict what the agent will in fact do (see also Hood, 2009).

Both patternicity and agenticity raise the question of the extent to which we transcend our brain/mind unit sculpted by millions of years of evolution in order to experience a fresh, ontological reality not previously visible to us. Much depends on how we answer this question. Again from the perspective of Critical Realism, we must delineate the parameters of our inquiry—what are the assumptions about what is “real” (ontology) and what can we know about this thing we have designated as “real” (epistemology)? Possibilism will require that there be some way to verify phenomena other than “do what I do for 10 years and then you’ll see.” We have to also be able to investigate the context and psychological mindset of anyone making claims. This is one thing we have learned about the pharmaceutical industry. While the pharmaceutical industry claimed to be mostly about science, they spend far more on marketing than research, and in fact have been convicted of criminal fraud many times for advocating a use for a drug when that use had not been supported and even in cases where it was known (scientifically) to be harmful (see Petersen, 2008, and Healy, 2012).

So in integral discourse, from a possibilist perspective, we might think of experiences like identifying with the field of awareness within which all things arise rather than a thing that arises in the field of awareness as 1) an ontological experience in consciousness not rooted in the body; 2) a trick you can teach your brain to
play if you meditate for 20 years; or 3) all of the above. The extent to which integral discourse can entertain multiple perspectives on questions like this is the extent to which it will be able to move into the mainstream. It is also the extent to which the dialogue moves in a healthy direction. The extent to which discourse is shut down by statements like “oh well, you just can’t see that reality because you’re at a ‘first-tier’ level of consciousness” is the extent to which the movement will actually become smaller until it is of little import.

From a possibilist perspective, we have to have tools that help us determine where to draw the line between belief and ontologically verifiable phenomena. There is no consistent evidence that what people like Sylvia Browne claim can be done by anybody. Despite this, people will continue to throw money at people like her because they want to believe someone can do it. Many will say I am being unfair and point out that people have a right to believe what they want to believe. I agree that they have that right but, from the context I set for myself as a mental health professional, others do not have a right to prey on those beliefs to enrich themselves and to add to others’ suffering. By the same token, people do not have the right to act on their beliefs in ways that will harm others. So I will fight to expose what I perceive as lies in the world of so-called “psychics” as well as pharmaceutical companies. Where are the lines drawn if we prioritize the notion that “everyone is right about something” rather than ask, “How do we even confirm they are right about anything?”

I submit that we first delineate what someone claims to be right about and decide how to check that claim (ontology). Again, in the spirit of Critical Realism, we can nest the quest for a process to check the claim in the givens of the world the claim derives from. But what if the “givens” themselves cannot be checked or tested to point us in a direction that would allow us to learn about what is being claimed (epistemology)? Then we are back to belief, and as I have illustrated, belief is the default position for the human brain (maybe the mind, too, but operationalizing mind is too great a digression at this point). If we possess strong evidence that belief is the default position for our brains, we will expect to have to work harder to disembed from the default position to dig deeper.

**Conclusion**

What if no one really knows what is going on? Life has proven itself to have a relentless impulse to survive, and we honestly do not know the extent of that impulse. Maybe a sexual predator imprisoning and sexually torturing three women for 10 years is just another variation of life propagating itself. I refuse to accept that in the same manner I refused the Christian doctrine of eternal damnation. But based on what? Based on my “possibilist” approach to integral that I have outlined here. While many people ponder sacred scriptures, few even bother to ask if they have been properly translated and (as most linguists will admit) translation is as much art as science. A possibilist tool kit for integral living can “put the brakes” on endless speculation by choosing a context (and save us from an endless list of adjectives that modify “integral”). Choose a context rooted in a critically examined set of values (how about healing and quality of life?), then begin “drawing the line” so to speak to separate what facilitates healing and quality of life from pabulum (words about words) and mendaciousness (cruelty masquerading as salvation).

**Notes**

1 This is a “daytime talk show” for those who, like me, live in a popular-culture blackout.
2 You can see a 17-minute talk that summarizes 25 years of work at http://www.tedxcle.com/dr-elliott-ingersoll/.
3 144,000 also is mentioned in Revelation 7:4, where the 144,000 servants of God will be marked with a seal on their forehead. These 144,000 should come from every tribe of Israel.
4 According to NASA, magnetic pole reversal is a common is more the rule than the exception and not linked to extinction-level event catastrophes. They are however excellent for compass makers (see http://www.nasa.gov/topics/earth/
Eschatology is the study of the end events of some designated time or end of the world.

Numinosity refers to the power and/or presence of a divinity (see Otto, 1923). The word has also been used in a more secular sense to refer to psychological experiences of awe and mystery.

Also see Shermer’s summaries of his work at www.ted.com.

Browne died on November 20, 2013—11 years off from her predicted date of death.
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TOWARD A METAINTTEGRAL PHILOSOPHY
Mysticism in the Philosophies of Bhaskar, Panikkar, and Wilber

John O’Neill

ABSTRACT This article explores the central role of mysticism in the work of integral philosophers Roy Bhaskar, Raimon Panikkar, and Ken Wilber. As I will demonstrate, each has a broadly trinitarian philosophy of mysticism. I will explore the importance of philosophy in their overall visions and projects and how mysticism can be seen as an evolutionary driver within each philosophy. All three philosophers have forms of participative, co-creative enaction built into their understandings of the evolutionary significance of mysticism. Moreover, each sees a comprehensive, holistic, philosophical vision energized by emerging mystical experiences with collective social and cultural dimensions as vital for the future of humanity.

KEY WORDS philosophy, mysticism; Roy Bhaskar; Raimon Panikkar; Ken Wilber

This article has largely arisen out of weekly conversations between myself and a friend, Trish Nowland, about Roy Bhaskar’s Reflections on metaReality (2012a) and Raimon Panikkar’s The Rhythm of Being (2010). These conversations, which took place as part of the Magellan Courses (2012), provided me with a supportive, encouraging, intersubjective context to study these works. Bhaskar, Panikkar, and Ken Wilber all have broadly trinitarian philosophies of mysticism at the heart of and as the driving energies within their philosophies. I will discuss the central role which mysticism plays in the work of each philosopher.

Roy Bhaskar

In Bhaskar’s Philosophy of metaReality (2012b), he discusses metaReality as the dependence and encompassing of the world of duality by nonduality. For him, this nonduality does not depend on any kind of religious belief or faith but is the necessary condition for our daily states and acts. It is a kind of everyday mysticism. It is a form of spirituality which is secular and consistent with any (or no) faith.

Bhaskar argues that the nondual sustains the world of duality in three ways: first, as ground state (and through the connectivity of ground states in what he has called the cosmic envelope), it is the ultimate ingredient of all other states of being, activity, and consciousness. These ground-state qualities of human beings include our potential for creativity, unbound love, capacity for right action, and for the fulfillment of our intentionality in the world. Second, certain features of transcendence are essential to the constitution and reproduction of everyday life. Third, nonduality constitutes the fine structure or the deep interior of any moment or aspect of being or consciousness, with qualities such as bliss, emptiness, suchness, love, and so on (Bhaskar, 2012b, pp. xli, xlii).

Transcendence in metaReality involves identification or unification or unity within an overall context, extending to the whole cosmos. This is what broadly distinguishes the philosophy of metaReality from Critical Realism, which Bhaskar still views as the best account of the realm of duality. Nonduality underpins and
sustains the latter. Bhaskar describes three mechanisms of nonduality, relations of transcendental identification, reciprocity, and co-presence. Co-presence is where something is enfolded or implicit in a being. His claim is that all other beings are enfolded within myself, and I am enfolded within all other beings also. This is important because it is the ultimate ontological basis of our possibilities of transcendental identification and the laws of reciprocity, including karma. When generalized, it also explains why we subjectively feel and experience a commitment to the project of universal self-realization, the fulfillment and flourishing of all beings in the universe (Bhaskar, 2012b, p. xlix). Reciprocity involves mutuality between beings at the ground-state level, as in like attracts like. Co-presence is identifiable in acts of transcendental identification as in watching television or being conscious of a tree.

Bhaskar has attempted to rethink being or ontology as progressively and more deeply along five successive dimensions: being as such, as processual, as totality or whole, as including transformative agency and reflexivity, and as incorporating a spiritual aspect (Bhaskar, 2012b, p. lix). In the philosophy of metaReality, he adds to these two new levels of being: being as enchanted and as nondual. Bhaskar speaks of three realms of reality: absolute reality, relative reality, and demi-reality. Underneath the relative world of duality, with all its conflicts, oppositions and alienations, is always its nondual ground and mode of constitution. Demi-reality and relative reality depend always on the creativity, loving compassion, and capacity for right action of human beings coming from their ground-states (Bhaskar, 2012b, p. liii).

Bhaskar recognizes that relative reality is the world of becoming, which includes absence, negativity, change, differences, process, evolution, and development. For him, metaReality goes beyond thinking being into being being—the ground and truth of reality (Bhaskar, 2012b, p. liii). His strongest claim in his philosophy of metaReality is that one’s objectives in life must be consistent with one’s ground-state, in which there is nothing in one’s being, one’s embodied personality, which is inconsistent with this, and that one’s objectives will eventually lead one to a path of self-realization and ultimately universal self-realization and emancipation (Bhaskar, 2012b, p. lviii).

Bhaskar links his principle of self-reference with practical mysticism. The former means that we can only act in, through, and from ourselves as our point of agency. The latter means that being a non-dual being, or close to it, or as clear and focused as we can, is consistent with being engaged practically and actively in the world, through material embodiment and social transformation toward universal self-realization (Bhaskar, 2012b, p. lxvii). He talks about how transcendental identification and agency are necessary for communication and action in the world, and shows that oppressive alienated social activities and structures are sustained and underpinned by ground-state qualities of love, creativity, and cooperation.

Bhaskar argues that nondual states and phases of our being in which we show our free, loving nature are underlying conditions of our dual world of alienation, domination, and oppression. The latter is only able to survive because of the virtuous qualities of nonduality which sustain it. He thinks that we only need to recognize and release this alienated world in order to solve our contemporary crises. Bhaskar (2012b) describes love as the expanding, developing, evolving, unifying healing force in the universe. He sees that even conditional, false, selfish, possessive, and oppressive forms of love are still forms of love. Further, even “non-loving” emotional states such as anger, hatred, and fear still presuppose some rudimentary form of love that can eventually blossom. The philosophy of metaReality embodies a mystical drive to totality, which ultimately must include loving the totality of all beings, although in ways specific to each relationship (Bhaskar, 2012b, p. 192).

Bhaskar asserts that the more one is in ground-state, the more successful one’s actions will be, expressing one’s uniquely embodied personality effortlessly, spontaneously, and joyously, which will also have a transformative effect on the world. He talks about the trialectic in which new ways of being, seeing, and acting all interact reciprocally with each other. He argues that both secular and religious emancipation projects lead to a commitment to individual and universal self-realization. He generalizes even further by arguing that
ultimately one’s intentionality and objectives must be consistent with one’s ground-state, which implies the goal of individual self-realization and leads to universal self-realization. Ultimately, Bhaskar sees enlightenment as part of a continuously unfolding evolutionary process, a path he characterizes as one of love, coherence, clarity, and emptiness.

With metaReality, Bhaskar goes beyond modernism, postmodernism, and Critical Realism by showing that concrete singulars are united at the level of their ground-states in the cosmic envelope, which provides a base for the emancipatory potential of Critical Realism. He still includes epistemological pluralism, judgemental rationality, and ontological realism in their applications to religion (Bhaskar, 2002m p. 346). Bhaskar summarizes the goal of this emancipatory philosophy of metaReality as being to find that the ultimate perspective is the awareness of the totality or the whole, including the cosmic envelope, which is implicitly enfolded within one. This will embody the reflexive unity of theory and practice, as theory situates and sustains itself within the larger whole, which is the guiding criterion of philosophy for him (Bhaskar, 2012a, p. 76).

Bhaskar is very clear about the need to eliminate heteronomies, oppressions and alienations that interfere with our ground-states, not only those within our personalities but also within systems and social structures. He advocates disconnecting with them and then clearing their residues, and sees that the only sustainable solution for the future of humanity and the planet is for duality to be rolled back from blocking the nondual realms. Bhaskar sees here the crucial importance of philosophical ideas, individual agency, and social solidarity working together. He sees this as being made easier by recognizing that everything we do in life is sustained by nonduality (Bhaskar, 2012b, p. 364).

Raimon Panikkar

The philosophical method is that of thinking, [as] an active and intelligent listening to reality itself—to the Rhythm of Being. The philosopher’s task is to place one’s mind and heart in tune with reality, allowing the very throbbing of Being to pass through one’s spirit and by so doing to change its rhythm. (Panikkar, 2010, p. 20)

For Panikkar, philosophy is an active/passive contemplative form of enactment, of interacting with, being co-responsible for, and influencing the destiny of reality. He sees wisdom as the mystical core of philosophy, requiring an openness to the whole and including the wisdom of love, as well as purity of heart (Panikkar, 1993b, p. 80). He sees mysticism as the experiential awareness of the whole, the ultimate experience of reality and/or the study of it (Panikkar, 2010, p. 244). Mysticism always includes our own contingent perspective—touching the infinite at a point, not limited to a theistic notion of reality or to religious or paranormal phenomena.

Panikkar speaks of the three eyes of sensual, rational, and spiritual experience (2010, p. 247). Only a mutual and harmonious interplay between these three elements yields a satisfying experience of reality. Man is a triad of senses, reason, and spirit, which correlate with matter, thought, and freedom. At times Panikkar includes the mystical among these forms of knowledge (2010). At a deeper level, we are beyond the three eyes, even beyond their experiential awareness when directed not to particular entities but to the entirety of reality. He wants to defend the position that the locus of mysticism is not knowledge, not even knowledge of being, but is the realm and home ground of emptiness (2010, p. 246).

Moreover, Panikkar (2010) sees mysticism as

…touching the deepest stratum of the real without the medium of consciousness. It is the groundless ground, on which everything stands and finds its support, and therefore a truly human life depends on it…. The mystical keeps silent and remains in silence, which does not speak…. It is direct experience which puts us into imme-
He describes the locus of the mystical as “the field of emptiness, rather than knowledge, even that of Being” (2010, p. 248). He adds, “The mystical discloses to us that not all can be reduced to the field of consciousness, that there is a dimension of the real irreducible to the logos. Therefore all our speech about it is a translation, or rather a creation from the field of emptiness, that is received only by those who have understood the transfer and are able to decipher its reality.” He sees this as the grandeur and weakness of mysticism. It has no language of its own; it uses a borrowed language: “Emptiness cannot be a point of reference” (Panikkar, 2010, p. 250).

Panikkar is clear that the mystical is open to the “fragility of being human.” Mystical experience needs to be discerned and validated in some way (e.g., “through a tradition, spiritual teacher, guru, mentor, or community of some sort, whether that of love, friendship, church, temple, synagogue, mosque, sangha, which serves as a point of reference” [2010, p. 254]). The three eyes, including the testimony of the senses and the demands of the mind, are indispensable to discern whether the experience is authentic. As to whether its fruits are good or bad, he considers it important to hear the affirmations of many traditions and to be open to understanding the testimony of many people to the most intimate personal experiences.

Panikkar’s most significant insight is his gradual exposition through many books of his cosmotheandric intuition and principle—that the divine, the human, and the cosmic are constitutive dimensions of reality, interconnected, interrelated, each independent in an inter-in-dependent way. This for him is the “rhythm of being,” which cannot be grasped by reason but only through an advaitic (nondual) experience using the third eye of spirit. He sees that human beings have the freedom and responsibility to play our roles in the destiny of Being, along with the Divine and the Cosmic (2010).

Panikkar characterizes the symbol of the Divine as having three features: emptiness, freedom, and infinitude, which correspond to the trinitarian paradigm of Father or Silence, Son or Logos, and Spirit or Love, reflecting a real inter-in-dependence (2010, p. 311). He asserts that God can be experienced mainly by silence, by being, because Being is silent. If we are able to perceive the silent dimension of things we shall be able to become aware of the Divine, not only because the Divine is hidden in silence, but because the Divine is Silence. Silence is not the negation of Being; it is not Non-Being. It is the absence of everything and ultimately the absence of Being. It is prior to Being. To become aware of the silence of Being and the silence of the word is close to discovering the divine dimension (1979; 2010, pp. 324-325). Panikkar is concerned about the human ways of opening up to that experience (e.g., through the practice of the presence of God). This is for him a discovery of the divine dimension in the act in which we are engaged—God’s transcendence visible in the immanent (Panikkar, 2010).

For Panikkar, our only adequate approach to the mystery of the Divine is the silence of all our faculties, body, mind and will, in an experience of the emptiness of the divine (2010, pp. 325-336). However, there is an awareness of the divine that allows us to “speak” of it when our logos is not separated from the pneuma (or spirit) (p. 337). The apophatic negative approach to the Divine takes the Absolute absolutely, by dissolving all its kataphatic, affirmative assertions in utter silence and discovering the very Emptiness of the Absolute. He sees the necessity for combining the apophatic with the kataphatic approaches to the Divine, as neither on its own is convincing. There is a co-experience and positive symbiosis between the two which relativizes both. There is always a silence behind any affirmation that makes room for other possible formulations; there is always an implicit word behind any silence that does not permit either nihilism or indifference. He sees the relation between the two as nondualistic rather than as a problematic dialectic. They are neither one nor two,
but it is not enough to keep silent in order to be in the truth, and to use words does not necessarily mean to fall into error (Panikkar, 2010).

Panikkar sees monotheism not as an absolute truth, but as a human reaction in the face of the Divine mystery. He sees the trinity as a way of speaking about the unspeakable in that there is the silence or emptiness of the Father and the love or activity of the Spirit, which if they speak at all, do so through the logos (2010, p. 249). Panikkar takes a survey through many religious and philosophical traditions to produce evidence that reality as a whole has a trinitarian structure.

Panikkar extends the notion of the divine trinity to include the whole of reality, as divine, human, and cosmic (2010). They correspond to faith, hermeneutics, and myth (1979). He sees that this broader idea of the Trinity, with its homeomorphic correlations in other religions, may open the door to a fuller Christianity in the third millennium as well as assist in the encounter between Christianity and other religions and cultures. Panikkar sees interreligious and intercultural dialogues as forms of mutual fecundation, which requires us as far as possible to stand within the horizons of our dialogue partners (Panikkar, 1977, 1989, 1999; Prabhu, 1996; Yadlapati, 2010). Christ is the Christian symbol for the whole of reality, as God, Humanity, and Cosmos (Panikkar, 2004, p. 144). Panikkar also calls him the *cosmotheandric Christ*, in and through whom the whole universe is called to share the trinitarian perichoresis.

Sharing in the experience of Christ for a Christian (e.g., through a personal I-Thou relationship with Jesus, Christian Meditation, contemplative prayer, or first-person union with Jesus) can be mystical and cosmotheandric experiences (1993, 2004). They lead into the silence of the Mystery of the Father, into solidarity with others in the human community and into an expansive awareness of embodiment in the cosmos. Panikkar regards contemplation as an essential element in all religions because it corresponds to a fundamental trait of man. It is not just praying to God but it unifies one’s life by bringing together praxis and theory, action and knowledge, immediate action and effective non-attachment.

Panikkar’s cosmovision has clear sociopolitical, environmental, economic as well as spiritual implications. He urges us to participate in the love and care of the earth and the difficulties of humanity, especially the poorest, most disadvantaged and marginalized, to assume our responsibilities so that the common effort will lead to greater justice and freedom, transforming the cosmos through cooperation with the Divine.

Finally, Panikkar challenges the prevailing scientific, technocratic, and rationalistic mythos of our times. He calls for, sees signs of, and proposes fragments of a new cosmology, story, and mythos based on cosmotheandric insight, which situates humanity within its proper place in reality, with its unique role and dignity along with God and the Kosmos, which contains the treasures from human traditions as well as being a dynamic force that weaves together old and new. He has also called this *radical trinity, radical relativity, sacred secularity, and advaita*. This vision sees the Divine, the Human, and the Cosmic as essential dimensions of a holistic view of reality, in which “everything is related to everything but without monistic identity or dualistic separation” (2010, p. 404).

Ken Wilber

The heart of integral philosophy as primarily a mental activity of coordinating, elucidating, and conceptually integrating all of the various modes of knowing and being, so that even if integral philosophy itself does not deliver the higher modes, it fully acknowledges them, and then invites philosophia to open itself to the practices and modes of contemplation. Integral philosophy is also, by virtue of its comprehensiveness, a powerful critical theory, critical of all less encompassing approaches—in philosophy, psychology, religion, social theory and politics, a theoria that is inseparable from praxis, in all levels, in all quadrants. (Wilber, 1997, p. 309, n1)
Wilber’s work is geared toward developing a world philosophy for a Kosmos that is undivided, whole, and related to itself in every way. He has been doing this by studying the knowledge, experience, wisdom, and reflections of major human civilizations and cultures—premodern, modern, and postmodern—to see what they have to tell us about human potential and growth. He has developed a comprehensive, inclusive, integral map of human potentials that distills their major components into five elements: quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types. Wilber claims that the AQAL model, which can be used in many fields, can help to make sure that all bases are considered when approaching a problem. He asserts that these five elements are present in our own awareness and so by learning to see them, appreciate and exercise them, we can accelerate our own growth and development and contribute toward a better world.

The Integral model involves the cultivation of body, mind, and spirit in self, culture, and nature. For Wilber, as soon as spirit starts to manifest, it has first-person, second-person, and third-person aspects. Mysticism can be seen as experience of God or Spirit in one or more of these persons: in first-person as the great I Am, the Supreme Identity, the ultimate absolute witnessing emptiness; in second-person as the great You, or Thou, the Divine Lover, the all-loving God, to whom I can relate in love and devotion and surrender; in third-person as the Great It, or Great System, or Great Web of Life, the Kosmos, the great perfection of existence itself, and so on (2006, p. 159).

Wilber speaks of mysticism as having an ultimate peak experience in and of the major natural states, in which a person is one with the phenomena in that realm:

To experience a oneness with all phenomena in the gross-waking state is a typical nature mysticism. In the subtle dream state, it is deity mysticism: in the causal un-manifest state it is formless mysticism. To experience a oneness with all phenomena arising in gross, subtle and causal states, is a typical non-dual mysticism. (2006, p. 93)

It is important to note that one can have a nondual state experience at virtually any stage.

Using the Wilber-Combs Lattice (2006, p. 90), it is possible to consider mysticism as including permanent access to higher, transpersonal third-tier stages. Wilber has described his own experiences of the higher stages as, respectively, seeing wholes, feeling wholes, witnessing wholes, and being the whole. Wilber acknowledges that that people will only understand his descriptions of higher states and stages if they possess the requisite levels of consciousness and experience for them, often after disciplined training, applying injunctions and practice within communities able to verify their validity. He defines enlightenment, which could be considered as the fullest possible experience and expression of mysticism, as “the realization of oneness with all the major states and structures that are in existence at any given time in history” (2006, p. 248).

Wilber often speaks of there being both an absolute and a relative “side of the street” when speaking about reality as a whole. On the absolute side of the street there is emptiness, unchanging, unqualifiable, timeless, eternal, formless Spirit, about which little can be said, but only experienced. On the relative side of the street, the world of form is evolving and going through stages of development and growth. This is fullness. In this sense, a fully enlightened human being alive today has a fuller enlightenment than one living 2,000 years ago, although the Emptiness would be the same. His AQAL model and maps are ways of expressing and describing our relative, evolving world of form, often passionately and poetically.

Wilber discusses how a leading-edge pioneer experiences higher potentials as either temporary peak experiences (or altered states) or as permanent acquisitions (enduring traits or stages). In order for temporary states to become permanent traits and stages, the pioneer must undergo some sort of learning, growth, and permanent development in those higher potentials. These first start out as free and creative novelty at the leading edge of development and evolution. As they are repeated by more holons, they begin slowly to settle into
Kosmic habits that are then available to people following after them. He gives the example of the meditative path of the Buddha (2012, Excerpt D).

Wilber describes three ways to become aware of the interior of another subject: through telepathy, through our shared transcendent self, and through harmonic empathy and resonance, such as co-presence (2012, Excerpt C). He advocates three social practices for Integral Methodological Pluralism: nonexclusion, unfoldment (or holarchical development), and enactment, which means that subjects bring forth, enact, and experience different phenomena or worlds according to their degree of development (2012, Excerpt B). He explains further how this works:

This necessity of mutual enactment is part of the creative process that simultaneously brings forth multiple subjects, multiple actions (methods), and multiple objects—the “multiplicity” in each case occurring precisely because all three of those are mutually interwoven, and as a new dimension (say, a new subject) evolves, so the other dimensions must resonate (and co-evolve) in order to resonate with the new reality, in order to keep the Wholeness part of the holon Whole. This Wholeness is not the extrinsic sum of separate domains (e.g., epistemology, methodology, ontology), but the dynamic interwoven relationship of intrinsically co-evolving, co-creating, co-enacting internally related holonic dimensions, which must, indeed, resonate with each other or face extinction. It is the reality of mutual enactment that sets up an equal necessity for mutual resonance among these dimensions in a holon, and ensures that all of them co-evolve together, adjusting and re-adjusting to each other’s reality until a genuine Wholistic resonance occurs among all of them. (2013, Appendix)

Such practices and insights can assist in developing a more comprehensive understanding and practice of collective mysticism. In his latest writing, he discusses the Kosmic address of the referents of mysticism, such as state experiences of God in a third-tier worldspace (Wilber, 2013a).

There are now numerous flowerings of evolutionary, collective future mysticism that reinforce Wilber’s point that a transition from second-tier to third-tier must be enacted collectively and collaboratively, as the structures for this are only just beginning to be laid down. Following Wilber’s Integral Methodological Pluralism, Bruce Alderman (2010) has outlined eight zones or methodologies of religion, spirituality, and mysticism, as well as providing helpful opening reflections on translineage practice. His exploration of various grammatical memes (Alderman, 2013) is also relevant to a “metaintegral” philosophy of mysticism (e.g., philosophy as, with, under, and between mysticism, mystical philosophy, mystically oriented philosophy, philosophical mysticism, etc.).

Wilber speaks of Eros as the force of love, which drives and energizes the evolutionary process from the Big Bang into our collective mystical future, as spirit-in-action. He asserts that an integral vision (2007) is necessary and helpful in order to more effectively meet the global challenges of our times and contribute to an evolutionary unfolding to greater dimensions of being and knowing and acting.

Conclusion

Common to the work of Bhaskar, Panikkar, and Wilber are multiple variations on patterns of the triadic structure of reality. They agree that a comprehensive philosophical vision must include nondual mysticism, contemplation, and spirit. For each, beyond what can be said about reality is Silence, Mystery, Emptiness, the unqualifiable Absolute. They also agree that this must be experienced and integrated within the relative realities of our daily lives. This vision must include spirit along with human and cosmic evolutionary development or becoming, into emancipating our fullest potential. Each exemplifies bodhisattvic commitments and
objectives of agapic liberating service to and solidarity with humanity, all sentient beings, and the Kosmos.

MetaIntegral philosophy is “meta” in that it allows room for pluralistic integral philosophies to dialogue, engage, and interact with each other. Mysticism shows us the deepest and highest levels and structures of reality within each thought system, as well as pointing to the absolute emptiness beyond all thought systems. MetaIntegral philosophy supports and facilitates mystical development while staying grounded within philosophical and cognitive structures. It encourages participative enaction across philosophies and lineages. The hope is that a metaintegral philosophy of mysticism can provide spacious, hospitable openings for polyamorous, co-creative, evolutionary, perichoretic, rhythmic dances of being, non-being, and becoming. May opportunities to explore such openings continue to flourish in forums and activities around the world.

NOTES

1 I have worked for most of my adult life as a social worker for the Australian Government until I retired in 2011. For many years I have also been a spiritual seeker. My explorations have included some early use of entheogens, travels in Asia, Europe, and recently the United States, mainly for integral events, as well as studying philosophy, several religions and spiritual movements, mysticism and its literature, and practicing meditation within the Catholic tradition. This was all brought together in a very satisfying way for me by the writings of Ken Wilber and his integral philosophy. I have been strongly influenced by Bernard McGinn’s (1998) description of the mystical element in Christianity as “that part of its belief and practices that concerns the preparation for, the practice of, and the reaction to, the immediate direct presence of God” (p. XV11). Christian mysticism has also been described by Laurence Freeman as “the personal loving experience of the presence of God” and by Marcus Plessted as “the quest for an experience of union with the divine” (in Nataraj, 2011, pp. 1, 83).


3 These collectives include Andrew Cohen’s evolutionary enlightenment or mysticism through identification with the Evolutionary Impulse (2006), Craig Hamilton’s Integral Evolutionary Mysticism (2013), Jeff Carreira and Patricia Alberê’s “We Mysticism” and Evolutionary Collective (2013), Bonnita Roy’s post-dialectical, transpersonal, ontological thinking (2013), Ria Baeck’s and Helen Titch Beath’s collective presencing (2013), Thomas Hübl’s evolutionary spirituality (2013), the interspiritual movement (Johnson & Ord, 2012), and causal leadership programs developed by Venita Ramirez, Geoff Fitch, and Terri O’Fallon. A very powerful and ecstatic experience of this for me was as a member of the audience at the Integral What Next event as Wilber spoke about the future of the integral movement and the world.

4 Alderman cites Thatamanil’s (2011) proposal to approach the trinity as a “locus for interreligious conversation,” if interpreted as providing both ontological grounds for theological diversity and a generative context for interreligious and intralineage engagement. Thatamanil (2011) suggests using a trinity of core ontological terms, derived partly from Hinduism, Christianity, and Buddhism. He recommends use of the terms ground, contingency, and relation, also mentioned by Panikkar (2004, p. 169). Also, Alderman (2012) sees similarities and relations between Thatamanil’s trinity and Wilber’s three faces of God, in that both “can allow translineage practitioners to enact integral fields of difference by embracing important intra-and interlineage tensions as generative and complementary rather than simply contradictory” (p. 62).

5 Kevin Bowman’s (2012) diagram for Integral Scientific Pluralism could be applied to Integral Mystical Pluralism.
Three concentric rings are super-imposed on the four quadrants: with the inner ring, Integral Epistemological Pluralism; the middle, Integral Methological Pluralism; the outer, Integral Ontological Pluralism. Such a schema could also add depth and a richer complexity to Alderman’s eight methodologies of spirituality, religion, and mysticism.

“Metaintegral” is trademarked by Sean Esbjörn-Hargens and is used by permission.
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INTEGRAL CINEMATIC ANALYSIS

Mapping the Multiple Dimensions of the Cinema and the Co-Evolution of Cinema, Consciousness, Culture, and Society

Mark Allan Kaplan

ABSTRACT This article provides an introduction to the application of integral and transdisciplinary approaches to cinematic media theoretical analysis. The works of Jean Gebser, Edgar Morin, and Ken Wilber are used to potentially integrate major cinematic theoretical and analytical approaches into a comprehensive meta-approach that covers the objective, subjective, intersubjective, and interobjective dimensions of the cinematic arts. Specific integrally informed lenses of cinematic analysis are also introduced as part of this meta-approach, based on Gebser’s perspectival structures, Morin’s cinematic complexity, and Wilber’s Integral framework. Potential benefits for this meta-approach are presented, including a deeper and more expansive understanding of the complex interrelatedness of the experience, form, language, and context of cinematic works, collective works of individual cinematic artists, genres and styles, collective movements within the medium, along with the evolution of the cinematic medium itself and its relationship with the evolution of individual and collective consciousness, culture, and society.

KEY WORDS cinema; film; media studies; Complexity; Integral Theory

The medium of the moving image began as a series of still images crudely strung together and silently projected with hand-cranked machines in small storefront theaters capturing and sharing simple and everyday movements of the physical world; over time the medium has evolved into one in which hyper-real creations of vast imaginary worlds and reflections of complex realities are projected across multiple viewing platforms that pervade our lives, from giant immersive walls of flickering light to tiny screens that we hold in our hands and projection windows that we wear in front of our eyes. Since its early beginnings many have analyzed this evolving medium, attempting to fully understand it and utilize it to its fullest potential. Many different analytical theories and approaches have evolved over time as well, including different approaches of analysis for different aspects of the medium, from form and content to the experience of the viewer to cultural and social influences; separate schools of analysis for each new evolving form of the moving image, from movies to television to video games and beyond; and the inclusion of interdisciplinary approaches from other domains of knowledge, from philosophy to linguistics to the hard sciences (Andrews, 1976; Braudy & Cohen, 2009; Kaplan, 2009; Rombes, 2009). This article is a preliminary attempt to more fully understand this continually evolving complex medium by exploring the development of an integrally informed transdisciplinary meta-approach for cinematic analysis to potentially map and integrate the plethora of analytical theories, approaches, and schools of thought, and expand our capacity to comprehend and utilize the increasing power and pervasiveness of the moving image.

For the purposes of this article, I use the terms cinema, cinematic, cinematic media, and cinematic arts to refer to the moving or kinetic image in all its evolving forms, including movies, television, video games, and home, online, and mobile video. The term “cinematic analysis” in this context covers the full range of
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analytical approaches common to these evolving forms of the cinematic arts for the analysis and evaluation of individual and collective cinematic works, genres, styles, and collective movements within the medium, and the study of the essence and evolution of the medium itself and its relationship to self, culture, and world.\(^3\)

**An Integral Map of Major Film and Media Theoretical Approaches**

To begin building a integrally informed, transdisciplinary meta-approach to cinematic analysis, we can use Ken Wilber’s four-quadrant framework of first-person (I), second-person (We), third-person (It), and third-person-plural (Its) dimension-perspectives to potentially map and integrate the major cinematic media analytical approaches into four major categories of approaches: 1) analyses of the first-person domain of the cinematic experience of both creators and viewers (i.e., phenomenological, psychoanalytical, cognitive, auteur, and reception theoretical approaches); 2) explorations of the second-person realm of the language or communicative aspects of individual and collective cinematic works (i.e., hermeneutic, semiotic, structuralist, and genre studies approaches); 3) examinations of the third-person dimensions of the material forms and properties of the medium and their effects (i.e., formalist and realist approaches); and considerations of the third-person plural aspects of the social and environmental milieu or contexts of individual and collective cinematic works and the medium itself (i.e., ideological, apparatus, feminist, Marxist, and social penetration approaches) (Andrew, 1976; Braudy & Cohen, 2009; Kaplan, 2012c).

We can attempt to further unpack these analytical domains using Integral Methodological Pluralism’s (IMP) eight-zone framework (Wilber, 2003; 2007), performing a preliminary breakdown of each of these four categories of theoretical approaches into interior/subjective or exterior/objective perspectives of each domain, giving us eight different zones of theoretical inquiry (Fig. 2). For example, we can study first-person cinematic experiences from an interior/phenomenological (zone 1) approach, examining the pure experience of viewer or creator, or we can take an exterior/psychoanalytic or cognitive (zone 2) approach, analyzing the psychological structures at work within that same cinematic experience. In the second-person language, or...
communication pattern domain, of cinematic analysis we can use an interior/hermeneutic (zone 3) approach to study how different viewing audiences experientially interpret a cinematic work, or we can employ an exterior/semiotic (zone 4) approach to study the observable meaning making patterns and structures of a cinematic work. The third-person domain of the material forms and properties of the cinematic work itself can be studied from an interior/formalist (zone 5) perspective exploring how the various forms of the cinematic work, such as visual space or editorial rhythm, are used to elicit a specific experiential effect, or from an exterior/realist (zone 6) perspective analyzing how a cinematic work in particular or the medium in general, operates as a photographic representation of object reality. Finally, we can explore the third-person plural analytical domain of the milieu of cinema from an interior/ideological (zone 7) approach studying the influence of social ideologies on the cinematic medium and individual and collective cinematic works, or we can take an exterior/apparatus (zone 8) perspective and analyze how the medium itself is an inherent mechanical/photographic representation of certain social and systemic structures (Kaplan, 2011f; 2012c).

These methodological approaches to analyzing the cinematic arts appear not to be limited to cinematic media critics, historians, and theorists, but seem to also represent ways in which we the viewer reflect on our own cinematic experiences. We can ponder our own first-person experience of a cinematic work (i.e., how a film or video made us feel or how it revealed certain patterns in our own psyche); or we can have a debate about the second-person communication process of the work (i.e., how our interpretation of a cinematic work differs from others or how our interpretation depends on our culture); or we could evaluate the quality of the third-person forms of a cinematic work (i.e., how “good” or effective was the cinematography, special effects, music, etc.); or we could appraise third-person plural social/systemic forces that have influenced a work (i.e., how a cinematic work was influenced by or makes a statement about technology, politics, economics, or various social ideologies such as feminist perspectives) (Kaplan, 2012c).
Integrally Informed Approaches for Cinematic Analysis

In addition to the above integrally informed mapping of the major film and media approaches, specific approaches of cinematic analysis can also be introduced as part of a transdisciplinary meta-approach to analyzing the multiple dimensions of cinematic media. These approaches could potentially enable a deeper and more expansive penetration of the complex interrelatedness of the experience, form, language, and context of individual cinematic works, the collective works of individual cinematic artists, genres, styles, and collective movements within the medium, along with the evolution of the cinematic medium itself and its relationship with the evolution of individual and collective consciousness, culture, and society.

Using a Cinematic Integral Methodological Pluralism Analytical Approach

To begin, we can integrate the above quadratic and zonal mapping of the major cinematic media analytical approaches into a form of Integral Cinematic Analysis or an IMP approach (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009; Wilber, 2007). This tetra-analytical meta-approach could theoretically include the integration of at least one methodology (interior or exterior zones) from each of the above four major analytical domains, covering the cinematic experience, form, language, and context in our examination of a cinematic work, collective works, and so on. For example, we could alternatively look at a collection of works within a specific genre studying their common formal structures (third-person/formalist), observe ways these forms appear to be used to communicate genre-specific meaning patterns (second-person/semiotic), how these forms and meaning patterns tend to psychologically affect an audience member (first-person/psychoanalytical), and if and how various social patterns and structures have affected these elements and patterns within these cinematic works and/or in the genre as a whole (third-person plural/ideological) (Kaplan, 2012c).

Utilizing a Cinematic All-Quadrants, All-Levels Analytical Approach

Another integrally informed approach would be through the application of the major analytical lenses of the AQAL model (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009; Wilber, 1995), which could potentially help us get to a deeper and more expansive understanding and mapping of the qualities, capacities, and interconnectedness of the multiple dimensions within and between the cinematic experience, its form, its language, and its context (Kaplan, 2010; Kaplan & Wilber, 2012).

Wilber’s AQAL model has several perspective-taking and analytical frameworks or lenses of perception through which we can perceive, experience, and integrate the multiple dimensions of existence. Here I will be exploring the potential application of these various integral lenses to cinematic analysis. These lenses, as I am organizing them here, are the holonic, quadratic, developmental, states, typological, and zonal lenses, covering the Integral framework elements of holons, quadrants, lines, levels (of development), states, types, and zones (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009; Wilber, 1995; 2007). My preliminary investigation suggests that we can use these lenses, individually and collectively, to explore multiple aspects and dimensions of all the analytical domains of the cinema. Here I will be using a few examples to suggest this potential usage of each of these lenses of perception (Kaplan & Wilber, 2012).

The Holonic Lens (Holons)

The Holonic Lens helps us look upon everything we perceive as a holon; a whole that is part of another whole. Holons are the essential building blocks of our reality. A whole atom is part of a whole molecule, which is part of a whole cell, which is part of a whole organism (Koestler, 1967; Wilber, 1995). In the cinematic arts, we can potentially map out the constructed units of the cinematic form using a holonic or holarchical approach revealing the nested holarchy of a whole frame that is part of a whole shot, which is part of a whole scene,
which is part of a whole scene sequence, which is part of a whole act (Kaplan, 2011a). We can also use the Holonic Lens beyond this level of the constructed units of the cinematic form, extending our holonic analytical vista to include the domains of the language and experience of cinematic media to help us map and understand how compelling stories, well-developed characters, and potent visual and auditory journeys need to evolve holonically. Using the holonic lens in this way we can see that, like an unbroken chain, every word, action, event, image, and sound must rise out of and transcend and include what has come before it, simultaneously birthing something new while holding traces of all that has preceded it, in order for a cinematic work to be completely engaging and believable. In addition, it appears that this holonic chain must extend beyond the confines of the cinematic work for its experiential reality to be more fully resonant; characters, story events, and audiovisual thematic patterns must have roots in the unseen world before the first onscreen image appears and must have a sense of potential resonance extending beyond the final frame (Kaplan, 2011a).

While most audience members are not consciously aware of this holonic process, the viewer appears to be able to naturally sense when there is something missing in this developmental structure: We consciously or unconsciously notice when a character does or says something that seems “out-of-character;” or when a story event seems to come out of nowhere; or an image or a sound seems out of place. These holonic breaks always “take us out of” the cinematic experience and reduce the level of immersion by some degree.

By using the Holonic Lens, we can see more clearly how cinematic artists shape richer, deeper, and more immersive cinematic visions by more accurately and completely creating holonic evolutionary cinematic structures within the text, image, and sound streams of a cinematic work. We can also see that when used in a masterful way, holonic cinematic structuring can produce great cinematic experiences, from Hitchcock’s classic shock-and-horror-inducing shower scene in Psycho (1960) to the profound ah-ha moment in

Figure 3. The nested holarchy of the constructed units of the cinematic form.
The Sixth Sense (1999) when the final piece of the story puzzle gives the film an entirely new meaning. In the case of Psycho, Hitchcock used numerous shot fragments, wholes unto themselves, each one strung together to transcend and include the previous ones, to build a whole experience that transcends the pieces themselves (Kaplan, 2011a).

The Quadratic Lens (Quadrants)
Going beyond our above usage of the quadrants to map the major analytical domains of the cinematic medium, we can also potentially use the Quadratic Lens to map numerous dimensions of these domains, including a deeper exploration of the above mentioned constructed units of cinematic form and see how these forms make up a cinematic work’s constructed cinematic reality, or the level at which we are immersed in its projected world (Kaplan, 2011b). Using the Quadratic Lens in this way we can observe that within the holonic stream of the cinematic work’s frames, shots, scenes, sequences, and acts, there appears to be four major dimensions or expressive units that make up its constructed cinematic form or reality. These four expressive units or dimensions are text (themes, characters, story, and setting), image, sound, and time (the editorial construction and expression of these expressive units over time) (Fig. 4). Unpacking this further, it appears that we tend to perceive the image as the primary objective dimension. The text tends to be perceived as the invisible interior (subjective) dimension that animates and emanates from this observable visual world, giving it its meaning, purpose, value, and emotional context. The dimension of sound appears to be primarily experienced as an invisible force that extends the invisible interior emotional and meaning dimension of text beyond the screen and into our subjective experiential field, establishing a shared intersubjective relationship between our interior and the interior dimensions of the constructed cinematic reality. The dimension of time is generally experienced as the observable systemic (interobjective) unfolding of the constructed cinematic form (Kaplan, 2010).

Figure 4. Quadratic mapping of the expressive units of the cinematic form.
When these four realms of the expressive units of cinematic form are combined in a skillful way by the cinematic artist, their coordinated expression can replicate the multidimensional sensory stimulation of actual lived-experience, and in so doing heighten and transform the cinematic experience into a deeply immersive state-inducing experience for the viewer. This process is what Russian film theorist Sergei Eisenstein referred to as the “synchronization of the senses” (Eisenstein, 1942, 1949; Kaplan, 2010).

We can also use the Quadratic Lens to go even deeper into each quadrant, exploring layers of sub-quadrants. For example, we can break down the text quadrant into the four dimension-perspectives of premise or the subjective/emotional underpinnings of the text; theme or the inter-subjective/collective meaning statements of the text; character or the objective/behavioral being-forms of the text; and story or the inter-objective/systemic environment (plot/event structure) of the text. Again, going even deeper, we can see how screen characters, as recreations of sentient beings, should have all four quadrants or dimensions of being (psychological, behavioral, relational, and environmental) for them to be perceived as realistic and believable (Kaplan, 2010, 2011b).

The Developmental Lens (Lines and Levels)

If we look more closely through the Quadratic Lens we see that within each quadrant, there are also various evolving or developmental patterns. The Developmental Lens, as I am defining it, includes two separate yet intimately connected perceptual lenses: lines and levels of development. For example, screen characters (and all sentient beings) have various lines of development in each quadrant (e.g., emotional, cognitive, moral lines of individual-interior development; cultural values development in the collective-interior; skeletal-muscular growth in the individual-exterior; social development in the collective-exterior; etc.). We also see that each of these lines evolves through various levels or stages of development (e.g., egocentric to worldcentric levels of subjective care and concern; mythic to rational to pluralistic cultural worldview stages; stages of organic brain development; industrial to informational technology system stages; etc.) (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009; Kaplan, 2010, 2011c; Wilber, 2000).

In the domain of the cinematic text there are several areas where we find lines and levels of development, beyond those within a screen character, including the various thematic and narrative plot lines that develop and evolve through the levels or acts of set-up, conflict, confrontation, and resolution in classic cinematic narrative structure (Field, 2005; McKee, 1997). In addition to these and other lines and levels of textual development, there are also numerous audio, visual, and temporal lines of development that also evolve through the same stages, acts, or levels of development, as well as often having their own parallel levels (Fig. 5).

An example of the creative use of parallel and intertwined audio, visual, temporal, and character and narrative development can be seen in The Imaginarium of Doctor Parnassus (2009), where characters who enter the Imaginarium are transported into an abstract imaginary world that reflects their own self, culture, and world in narrative, visual, and auditory form in alternative temporal dimensions; and then this audio, visual, textual, and temporal imaginary world proceeds to help them evolve to the next level of their character development.

Bringing us back to the Holonic Lens, we are reminded that development evolves holonically, in that each level or stage of development is a whole that is transcended by and included as a part of the next level or stage. The beginning or setup of a story is a whole that is transcended by and included in the middle or conflict/confrontation stage, and the middle is a whole that is transcended by and included in the ending or resolution of the work.

Since the Developmental Lens holonically incorporates lines and levels of development with the quadrants, this lens can also be a powerful analytical tool allowing us to potentially map the complex matrix of interaction between these multiple dimensions of the cinematic work (Fig. 5). Using this lens we could...
potentially analyze, map, and understand more fully how the poor use of these holonic, quadratic, and developmental structures and patterns can lead to cinematic works with major developmental holes or incomplete or obscure character, relationship, story, and visual or auditory thematic expressions, which in turn reduces viewer involvement and immersion in the work; or conversely, reveal to us how the skilled and masterful use of these dimensions can produce cinematic journeys that take us progressively to deeper and more expansive immersive experiential realms (Kaplan, 2011c).

**The States Lens (States)**

In addition to developmental lines and levels, each quadrant also contains *states*, transient shifts in various inner and outer dimensions including experiential states (e.g., psychological, emotional), physical states (e.g., biological, behavioral), relational states (e.g., cultural, communication), and social and environmental system states (e.g., weather, economic) (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009; Wilber, 1995). In a cinematic work, at the most basic level, these various human reality states can be captured and replicated to some degree through text, image, and sound. For example, we can visually and auditorily capture a storm (a weather state), and add the text/story of a person trying to get out of its way, including how this person is reacting (e.g., a fearful emotional state).
A closer look at this process through the States Lens reveals that a cinematic work can have various textual states, including character emotional states (joy, sadness, etc.), character relationship states (attraction, aversion, etc.), and narrative event states (suspense, ambiguity, etc.). There are also visual states (visual contrast or affinity, static imagery, frenetic movement, etc.); auditory states (harmony, dissonance, silence, etc.); and temporal states (slow motion, fast motion, etc.) (Kaplan, 2010; 2011d).

The Typology Lens (Types)
In addition to states and developmental lines and levels, each quadrant also contains types, which are consistent styles or common characteristic patterns (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009; Wilber, 1995). Using the Typology Lens we can observe that a cinematic work can have various textual types, including character types (protagonist, antagonist, etc.), and story plot types (arch-plot, mini-plot, anti-plot, etc.). There are also visual types, including shot types (close-up, medium shot, long shot, etc.), visual expressive element types (space, shape, color, light, etc.), types of screen formats (widescreen, full-screen, IMAX, etc.), and media formats (35mm film, 70mm film, digital video, etc.); auditory types, including sound types (background sounds, sound effects, dialogue, music) and sub-classifications like music types (classical, jazz, atmospheric, etc.), and sound-effect types (natural, human, mechanical, etc.); and temporal types including temporal progression types (linear time, nonlinear time, flashbacks, etc.) and temporal setting types (historical, present day, future, etc.) (Kaplan, 2010, 2011e).

There are also more general typologies that appear to track across all four dimensions, including genre (action, drama, comedy, horror, etc.) and style types (expressionism, neorealism, film noir, etc.), which will have specific textual, visual, auditory, and temporal patterns associated with them. In addition to typologies that are specific to the cinematic arts, cinematic works by their very nature also include human/world typologies since to some degree these works attempt to represent the human world. Believable screen characters embody real-life human personality, gender and body types; in order for their interactions to be perceived as convincing they must communicate and relate to each other through reflections of real human/world communication and cultural typologies; and for their constructed cinematic reality to be experienced as credible, it must emulate real world atmospheric, environmental and social system types, either directly or in stylized forms (Kaplan, 2011e).

The Zonal Lens (Zones)
Like the other AQAL lenses, there are many ways of applying the Zonal Lens beyond the above mapping and methodological integration of the major analytical approaches. One of these applications has the potential of deepening our understanding of the basic four quadrants of constructed cinematic reality discussed above: text, image, sound, and time. From this top level we can then potentially open up each of these four basic dimensions of the cinematic form to their interior (subjective/process) and exterior (objective/structure) dimensions, which correlate to their internal intentional and meaning-making (signification) level and their external observable/perceivable level (Kaplan, 2011f). This translates into a preliminary mapping of eight zones of Constructed Cinematic Reality: 1) Textual Signification Patterns (Inside); 2) Textual Structures (Outside); 3) Auditory Signification Patterns (Inside); 4) Auditory Structures (Outside); 5) Visual Signification Patterns (Inside); 6) Visual Structures (Outside); 7) Temporal Signification Patterns (Inside); and 8) Temporal Structures (Outside) (see Fig. 6).

In this mapping, the Zonal Lens appears to offer us a bridge between the major analytical domains of the cinematic form and the language of cinema by revealing the intricate relationship between the outside structures of cinematic form and the inside signification or meaning-making (semiotic) patterns (Kaplan, 2011f).
Applying a Cinematic Altitudinal-Perspectival Analytic Approach

Another potential integrally informed analytical approach would be to use the levels and lines of the Developmental Lens as a kind of typological categorization tool to map and analyze the structures of consciousness that are embedded in individual and collective cinematic works. One of the major ways of typologically mapping structures of consciousness is to use the worldview line and levels of development as a baseline measure (Feuerstein, 1987; Gebser, 1985; Kaplan, 2010, 2012a; Wilber et al., 2008). This type of worldview mapping was first introduced by Jean Gebser (1985), who related cultural worldviews with certain stages or structures of individual and collective consciousness and various other lines and levels of development including spatial and temporal perceptual structures, and modes of creative expression. Gebser believed that these worldviews and related perspectival and developmental structures were embedded in all works created by human beings as a reflection of their own perspectival structures. Wilber (1995, 2000) continued and expanded on this work in his mapping of these and various other developmental lines and levels.\(^\text{15}\)

To aid with this approach we can map both Gebser’s and Wilber’s work in this area across all four quadratic dimension-perspectives (Table 1). Using the stages of the worldview (collective-interior) developmental line as an altitudinal baseline, we can track these worldview altitudes with the correlated developmental lines of Circle of Care and Concern (individual-interior), fields of Spatial-Temporal Perception (individual-exterior), and Techno-Economic Structures (collective-exterior). Additional lines that appear to be important to this type of application in both Gebser’s and Wilber’s work are the lines of Subjective/Objective Emphasis and Modes of Expression, which track across the subjective/objective dimension-perspective boundaries (Gebser, 1985; Wilber, 2000). In Table 1 these lines of development, along with the major altitudes or levels

---

Figure 6. Mapping of the zones within the expressive units of the cinematic form.
of development that are relevant to worldview embedding, are correlated with the color spectrum scale, which is one of the basic neutral altitudinal scales (Wilber et al., 2008).

Using this approach we can potentially hone in on particular embedding patterns and see how they play out in a cinematic work. For example, the Circle of Care and Concern line of development can be clearly detected in individual character and character relationship development, as in the film *Groundhog Day* (1993), where the main character evolves vertically from egocentric to Kosmocentric altitudes or levels of development, along with their other corresponding worldview-related structures. Altitudinal embedding can also be detected in the set and setting of a cinematic work. For example, in the film *Avatar* (2009), the filmmaker depicts a powerful clashing between magical (tribal alien), mythic (military), and rational (scientific) cultures and their related techno-economic structures, set within the context of the application of an integral worldview–related human-to-avatar convergence technology, along with an underlying pluralistic/worldcentric theme of “Nature is precious, and we are profoundly interconnected with it” (Kaplan, 2010, 2012a).

Most films appear to be a compilation of several different worldviews, with one worldview acting as a kind of gravitational field or underlying force holding the story together, as in the above example from *Avatar*, where the pluralistic worldview theme becomes the center-of-gravity of the whole film. Another example is the film *Inception* (2010), where the expanded perspective of the integral worldview, represented by waking reality and the waking reality–based lucid awareness of the conscious dreamers, becomes both the anchor and driving force for the film and the evolution of its story and characters, as its characters and we the viewer journey through dreamworlds each representing a different worldview altitude, while attempting to remain conscious of the difference between waking and dreaming (Kaplan, 2012a).

The initial research in this area suggests that the use of an Altitudinal-Perspectival analytical approach to explore the altitudinal configuration of a cinematic work has the potential to reveal the underlying communicative patterns that connect the self, culture, and world of the cinematic creator(s) through the cinematic work to the self, culture, and world of the viewer(s). The resonance of these communicative patterns between

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worldview/Altitude</th>
<th>Circle of Care and Concern</th>
<th>Field of Spatial-Temporal Perception</th>
<th>Techno-Economic Structures</th>
<th>Subjective/Objective Emphasis</th>
<th>Modes of Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transpersonal/Indigo-Clear Light</td>
<td>Trans-Egoic</td>
<td>Trans-Perspectival/Trans-Temporal (Space-Free/Time-Free)</td>
<td>Trans-Tech (Trans-Human)/Cybernetic Organisms</td>
<td>Trans-Subjective/ Objective</td>
<td>Transcendental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral/Teal-Turquoise</td>
<td>Kosmocentric</td>
<td>Aperspectival/Evolutionary (Qualified Space/Qualified Temporality)</td>
<td>Convergence/Holistic Meshworks</td>
<td>Integrative Concretion/Conscious World</td>
<td>Integrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralistic/Green</td>
<td>Worldcentric</td>
<td>Multi-Perspectival/Non-Linear (Relative Space/Relative Temporality)</td>
<td>Informational/Value Communities</td>
<td>Deconstructive Concretion/Time Related World</td>
<td>Deconstructive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational/Orange</td>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
<td>Perspectival/Linear Temporality (Concrete Spatial/Abstractly Temporal)</td>
<td>Industrial/Corporate States</td>
<td>Abstraction/Space Related World</td>
<td>Realist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mythic/Amber</td>
<td>Ethnocentric</td>
<td>Bi-Perspectival/Linear Temporality (Limited Space/Natural Temporality)</td>
<td>Agrarian/Nation States</td>
<td>Imagination/Soul-Psyche Related World</td>
<td>Iconic/Imaginal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magical/Red</td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
<td>Uni-Perspectival/Cyclical Temporality (Spaceless/Timeless)</td>
<td>Horticultural/Tribal</td>
<td>Emotion/Natural World</td>
<td>Emotive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaic/Magenta</td>
<td>Pre-Egoic</td>
<td>Pre-Perspectival/Pre-Temporal</td>
<td>Foraging/Nomadic</td>
<td>Latent Interiority/Undifferentiated World</td>
<td>Primal/Sensory-Motor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1.* Altitudes (levels) and lines of development associated with the embedding of cinematic altitudinal-perspectival structures.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{16}
creator, artifact, and viewer appears to be a key factor in how deeply a viewer can become involved and immersed in a cinematic work (Kaplan, 2010, 2012a; Kaplan & Wilber, 2012; Wilber, personal communication, May 7, 2009; July 20, 2010).

**Using a Cinematic Complexity Analytic Approach**

The complex connection and communication between creator, cinematic work, viewer, and world is deeply explored by Edgar Morin, whose Complexity approach to the cinematic medium holds the potential for offering us a way to more fully analyze and understand this interconnectedness (2005a; 2005b). Morin begins with the observation that all human-made works are the partial product of the human imagination, and therefore the imaginary is embedded in all human-made artifacts including and especially, the cinema (2005a). Because humans imagine through imagery (mental images, dream imagery, etc.), and the cinema has the unique capacity to concretize or reify imaginary dimensions, in a sense doubling the inner image with an outer image, the cinematic image is inextricably and uniquely bound with the human imagination. This produces a complex **symbiotic-metamorphic** web of interaction between the inner images of cinematic creators and viewers and the outer cinematic image (Morin, 2005a).

Morin also notes that in addition to the cinema’s capacity for this reification of the subjective imaginary dimensions or the capacity to project an experience of subjective presence between a cinematic work and the viewer, the cinema also has the capacity to capture and represent objective forms and movement, and the juxtaposition of these objective elements replicate human-to-world meaning-making shifts of attention and perception, thus giving the viewer a sense of objective presence as well (Morin, 2005a). According to Morin, this combination of subjective/objective reification/representation and projected presences gives the cinema the capacity to induce various levels of participation or projection-identification through a complex circuit of transmutation between the multiple dimension-perspectives of the creator, the cinematic work, the viewer, and the world around them (Fig. 7).

**Figure 7.** The complex circuit of cinematic subjective-objective transmutation.
Morin defines several levels of participation, including the level of Affective Participation, which he notes as appearing to be the most immediate form of participation usually stimulated or excited by the cinematic image, and operates at the level of emotional projection and identification with the projected cinematic image and our own inner images and emotions. Morin maps two more, deeper and more visceral and immersive levels of participatory projection-identification, that of Anthropo-Cosmomorphism and Doubling-Metamorphoses; Anthropo-Cosmomorphism being a more symbiotic and magical/mythic form adding deep psychic and archetypal projection-identifications, and Doubling-Metamorphoses being that endosymbiotic archaic/magical level of full immersion where the doubling and metamorphoses of the inner and outer images are complete and the viewer becomes fully a part of the cinematic reality. All three of these levels of participation “inject humanity into the external world and the external world into the inner man” (Morin, 2005a, p.85) to varying degrees.

While Morin only clearly maps these three levels of participation, other levels are suggested in his work. After analyzing these references to other levels, I noted several parallels between Morin’s mapping of participation and the work of both Gebser and Wilber and have attempted to integrate them into a more complete map of cinematic participation, bringing together levels of participation with worldview perspectival attitudes (Fig. 8). Morin notes several techniques that appear to excite or stimulate these levels of participation and immersion, including movement, succession of shots, degree of subjective and objective presence, and the cinegenic quality or charm of the image (2005a). He also notes that the cinematic medium appears to be evolving toward a greater and greater capacity to use these techniques in more powerful and affecting ways, suggesting a possible evolutionary acceleration and intensification of affective excitation and participation. In addition, the complex circuit of cinematic subjective-objective transmutation, mapped out above, appears to be another evolutionary factor enabling the cinema to operate as an ontophylogenetic kernel within a symbiotic-metamorphic tetra-evolutionary complex that acts as both a mirror and a catalyst for the evolution of consciousness, culture, and society (Fig. 9).
Using this type of mapping of the symbiotic-metamorphic tetra-evolutionary complex of cinema, consciousness, culture, and society, based on Morin’s work, we can potentially more accurately discover and fully understand the relationships that are involved in this co-evolutionary complex between cinematic creators, works, and spectators, and their surrounding and interpenetrating cultural and social domains:

By means of the [cinematic] machine, in their own likeness, our dreams are projected and objectified. They are industrially fabricated, collectively shared. They come back upon our waking life to mold it, to teach us how to live or not to live. We reabsorb them, socialized, useful, or else they lose themselves in us, we lose ourselves in them. There they are stored ectoplasms, astral bodies that feed off our persons and feed us, archives of soul. (Morin, 2005a, p. 218)

**Conclusion**

In summary, these four approaches to cinematic analysis (IMP, AQAL, Altitudinal-Aperspectival, and Complexity) represent four distinct, yet interconnected integrally informed methodologies. Each approach appears to potentially offer us new, deeper, and/or more expansive ways of analyzing individual and collective cinematic works, genres, styles, and collective movements within the medium, and the essence and evolution of the medium itself and its relationship to self, culture, and world. Together, these approaches form a potentially integrally informed, transdisciplinary meta-approach that could possibly help us more fully reveal the inner-workings of “the cinematic machine” and help us to more accurately read and consciously utilize this powerful and influential archive, mirror, and catalyst for the individual and collective evolving human soul and spirit.
NOTES

1 The first moving images were created by taking a series of still images and projecting them together to produce the replication of movement. These first movies were recordings of movements of everyday life objects and events, such as the very first moving image captured by photographer Eadweard Muybridge, who with a commission by Leland Sanford captured the first moving images of a galloping horse on June 15, 1878 (Rausch, 2004; Thompson & Bordwell, 2009). As the medium of the moving image developed and spread over the last century it has advanced in both its technical capacity to capture and replicate external and internal realities and it has evolved and dispersed into many forms, from movies to television to interactive video games and hyper-narrative virtual worlds to online and mobile video, including emerging wearable platforms with capacities to project moving images through glasses and in wristwatches (Ben-Shaul, 2008; Kelleher, 2013; Rausch, 2004; Rombes, 2009; Sparacino et al., 2000). The medium also appears to be evolving toward a convergence of forms, exemplified by the transmedia storytelling movement where elements of a cinematic work are dispersed and integrated across multiple platforms and mediums (e.g., a movie, video game, comic book, web series, etc.) (Jenkins, 2003, 2008; Page & Thomas, 2011; Rose, 2012).

2 I am using the terms cinema and cinematic as they were originally defined, the generic label for the moving or kinetic image, because it seems like the most accurate term at this time in the evolution of the medium (Thompson & Bordwell, 2009). I am not using the terms film or video, since they have limited meaning in a world where the moving image is being created with and transmitted across and through so many different and evolving “non-film/video” formats and platforms; and I am not using the term media because I feel it is not precise enough, having possible meanings extending into mediums that do not involve the moving image, such as print media.

3 The full range of analytical approaches common to the evolving forms of the cinematic arts tend to fall into the major areas of: Theory, focusing on the study of the essence of the medium and its relationship to self, culture, and world; History, concentrating on the study of the evolution of movements and forms within the medium and the evolution of the medium itself; and Criticism, which tends to cover the analysis and evaluation of individual and collective cinematic works (Braudy & Cohen, 2009; Thompson & Bordwell, 2009).

4 In the mapping of the four analytical domains of cinematic media (Fig. 1), the labeling of the Upper-Right (UR) quadrant as The Cinematic Form is used to denote the domain of theoretical inquiry which focuses on the material elements, structures, and properties of the cinematic medium and how these quantifiably influence and effect the viewer, while The Language of Cinema (Lower Left [LL]) label is intended to represent the domain of theoretical inquiry that focuses on the communicative and relational processes that occur between the viewer, the cinematic work, and the cultural forces within and between them.

5 The above description of the inside and outside dimensions of first-person, second-person, third-person, and third-person plural domains is a preliminary breakdown of some of the different cinematic theory methodologies into the eight zones of the zonal lens (see chart on p. 270). Note that this particular categorization of these various theories and approaches into the zones is one of many possible variations, and many of these theories can easily be placed in other zones, depending on our perspective. For our purposes here I am focusing on the general focus of the established theorists in each of these theoretical domains as I am currently interpreting them. For example, both the semiotic and formalist traditions focus on the cinematic work as a material artifact and could both be easily placed in the UR quadrant; however, the theorists in the film semiotics tradition tend to focus on how the structuring of various expressive elements form a language that produces an intersubjective communication process between the viewer and the cinematic artifact, while formalists tend to focus on the formal or technical elements, such as shot composition, lighting, and editorial pacing, and how these elements effect a viewer quantitatively through the creative manipulation of their inherent autopoietic-like qualities (i.e., the inherent dialectic processes between form and function). Another example is that of the Ideological approach, which I have placed in zone 7 because most of the theorists and writings related to Ideological film theory tend to focus on social/systemic ideological influences. There is also a great deal of exploration of cultural ideological influences, which I am putting in zone 4 under Cultural Studies because these approaches tend
The above preliminary zonal mapping of the major categories of methodological approaches to cinematic theoretical inquiry (Fig. 2) uses one cinematic theoretical approach to represent each zone and it should be noted that these are not the only methods associated with each zone, as referenced in the above text and table. In addition, as noted above, each method is associated with a zone by its central focus and will also often include the use of perspectives and methods from other zones as sub-focuses within its own theoretical domain. These analytical or methodological categories of cinematic inquiry are not entirely absolute in that while a specific theory or approach may tend to have as its central focus a particular domain, as noted above, they often include some perspectives and approaches from other analytical domains to a varying degree as well. For example, while the Auteur Theory’s central focus is on the individual cinematic artist’s subjective vision (first-person/subjective), this form of analysis may also include the use of explorations of this subjective vision in relation to the cinematic language, styles, and genres used by the artist (second-person/intersubjective) or the influence of various social ideologies on the artist and their works (third-person plural/interobjective). Additionally, some theories are actually derived from several other theories, giving them a more inherent multi-domain perspective, while still appearing to hold one particular domain as its central focus. A case in point is Apparatus Theory, derived from Marxist, semiotic, and psychoanalytic film theories, which uses perspectives and approaches from these multiple theoretical domains to explore its central analytical domain of the ideological nature of the mechanics of the medium itself (third-person plural/interobjective/exterior/zone 8). This type of multi-domain theoretical perspective inclusiveness also appears to be part of a more recent postmodern trend toward more interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approaches to cinematic theory, also bringing in methodological constructs and paradigms from disciplines outside of traditional cinematic theory including approaches such as Intermediality (Petho, 2011) and Media Archeology (Huhtamo & Parikka, 2011). Individual theorists who are associated with a particular approach also appear to utilize more than one type of approach within their work, while still displaying a tendency to give more weight to and focus on their particular theoretical domain and its corresponding paradigms and constructs over the others. For example, celebrated Russian filmmaker and film theorist Sergei Eisenstein is known for both his work on the material properties and effects of the medium (third-person/interior/zone 5/formalist) and film milieu or context (third-person plural/interior/zone 7/Ideological/Marxist), however, even in his third-person plural context-oriented Ideological explorations he relates these directly or indirectly to the third-person Formalist material form and function of the medium (i.e., how a particular cinematic form, such as editorial juxtaposition, can be creatively manipulated to communicate social ideology) (Andrew, 1976; Braudy & Cohen, 2009; Eisenstein, 1942; 1949). Some

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUADRANTS</th>
<th>ZONES</th>
<th>INSIDE/OUTSIDE</th>
<th>ANALYTICAL APPROACHES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Left (UL) Quadrant</td>
<td>Zone 1</td>
<td>UL/Inside</td>
<td>Phenomenological; Phenomenological Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective/1st-Person</td>
<td>Zone 2</td>
<td>UL/Outside</td>
<td>Psychoanalytical; Cognitive; Auteur; Reception Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Left (LL) Quadrant</td>
<td>Zone 3</td>
<td>LL/Inside</td>
<td>Hermeneutic; Philosophy of Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersubjective/2nd-Person</td>
<td>Zone 4</td>
<td>LL/Outside</td>
<td>Semiotic; Structuralist; Genre Studies; Cultural Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Right (UR) Quadrant</td>
<td>Zone 5</td>
<td>UR/Inside</td>
<td>Formalist; Filmic Expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective/3rd-Person</td>
<td>Zone 6</td>
<td>UR/Outside</td>
<td>Realist; Neo-Realist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower-Right (LR) Quadrant</td>
<td>Zone 7</td>
<td>LR/Inside</td>
<td>Ideological; Feminist; Marxist; Social Penetration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interobjective/3rd-Person Plural</td>
<td>Zone 8</td>
<td>LR/Outside</td>
<td>Apparatus; Screen Theory; Intermediality; Media Archeology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
theorists contribute so much to more than one theoretical domain that they can become associated with several theoretical traditions; such as in Eisenstein’s case, where he is considered a founding theorist in both the Formalist and the Marxist theoretical traditions. In addition to some theorists using multiple theoretical domain perspectives within their own work, and some making a major contribution in more than one theoretical domain, there have also been some theorists who have more directly attempted to be holistic and integrative in their approaches, this includes the work of Jean Mitry (Andrew, 1976) and Edgar Morin (2005a, 2005b) (Kaplan, 2011f, 2012c).

7 The term *tetra-analytical*, as used here, refers to a meta-analytical approach that includes all four quadrants of subjective, intersubjective, objective, and interobjective methodological domains.

8 Note that holons evolve through a process of transcend and include. A whole atom is transcended and yet still included in the development into a whole molecule, etc. This is called *holonic or holarchic development*; and this holarchic development creates a holarchy. A holarchy is different than a hierarchy in that while each stage of development has greater depth and span, no stage is considered better or inferior than another (Wilber, 1995).

9 It is a generally agreed that the constructed units in cinematic media form a nested holarchy of frames, shots, scenes, sequences, and acts (Block, 2007; Cutting, Brunick & DeLong, 2011; Field, 2005; Harrington, 1973).

10 While the term *three-dimensional characters* is often used to refer to realistic and believable onscreen characterizations, if we look closely at the various character and acting theories and practices, such as those of master theorist Constantine Stanislavski (1989), we discover that what we are really talking about are “four-dimensional characters” that fully embody the four-dimensions of psychological, behavioral, relational, and environmental existence (Kaplan, 2011b).

11 Audio, visual, and temporal lines of development include various audiovisual and temporal thematic patterns and motifs that usually support and resonate with the textual lines of development as they all develop and evolve through the stages of a cinematic work. Examples include musical themes for characters and their stages of development, visual thematic patterns that reflect and support dramatic movements such as suspense, and temporal patterns such as flashbacks or flash-forwards that reflect and support character and narrative contextual developmental patterns.

12 In addition to the above application of the States Lens, there is a more advanced lens related to the States Lens that I call the Energetic Lens, which uses the perceptual framework of energies and energy bodies (Wilber, 2004). While this lens is not considered a major framework in Integral Theory, it does appear to have potential value in the area of cinematic analysis and will be covered in future publications. For a preliminary exploration of the Energetic Lens and its application to cinematic analysis, see “Integral Cinema Studio: The Energetic Lens” (Kaplan, 2012b).

13 Another form of typologies that also appear in cinematic works are what I call *cross-over typologies* (i.e., typologies that bridge the realms of cinematic and real-world typologies). The most common of these typologies is that of the masculine and feminine gender types. Besides masculine and feminine typologies appearing in screen characters, there are also masculine- and feminine-oriented narrative, visual, and auditory structures and patterns in a cinematic work that resonate between the screen and the audience. The most universally recognized form of this cross-over typology is that of masculine- and feminine-oriented narrative structures. Masculine-oriented narratives tend to be more event- and action-(agency) driven stories; and feminine-oriented narratives are more character- and relationship-(communion) driven stories. When we say, that movie was a “chick flick” or that was a guy’s movie, we are commonly referring to these different narrative structure types. This distinction is not as simple as it appears since men and women tend to have both masculine and feminine traits within them to varying degrees; so some men can have a higher degree of feminine traits and some women can have a higher degree of masculine traits. In general, most viewers tend to lean toward one form of cinematic storytelling over the other, and are less interested in and become less immersed in the opposite form, depending on their masculine/feminine trait tendencies and preferences, and not their actual biological gender. The reason why one of the common factors of very successful cinematic works is a balance of event- and character-driven narratives is that they appeal to both masculine- and feminine-oriented audiences (Kaplan, 2011e).

14 These eight zones of the expressive units of the cinematic form are just the tip of the iceberg because each zone can manifest in deeper quadratic patterns. For example, in the textual dimension, the outside of the text manifests in
all four dimensions of subjective characterization, intersubjective character interactions, objective story events, and interobjective story structures (i.e., sequences, acts, plot points, etc.); and inside these four dimensions of the text, are the parallel subtextual (inside/signification) patterns or the more subtle dimensions of intention and meaning-making processes. These subtextual dimensions are either a deepening of the main text or hidden undercurrents that stand in juxtaposition to the main text. When viewed as a whole we can see that we are essentially dealing with eight zones of textual and subtextual experiential, communal, objective/empirical, and systemic narrative realities (see illustration below). We can equally unpack the dimensions of image, sound and time into these same types of sub-dimensions as well, producing a matrix of the zones and subzones of Constructed Cinematic Reality and cinematic expression (see chart on p. 273).

The full use of this multidimensional Zonal Lens array can potentially help the cinematic artist create works that are powerfully immersive, while also giving them the tools to express and capture more profound and subtle dimensions of being and becoming, as well as giving the cinematic theorist a more complete set of tools for observing and evaluating these illusive dimensions (Kaplan, 2011f; Kaplan & Wilber, 2012).

15 For analytical purposes, I am making a distinction between using the AQAL Developmental Lens to analyze a cinematic work’s various lines and levels of development versus using lines and levels as a typology system to determine the particular level of development of the cinematic work as a whole “frozen-in-time” expression (artifact) created by an individual or group of continuously evolving artifact creators. This use of the Developmental Lens as a typology tool as both Gebser and Wilber apply it, I am choosing to call the Altitudinal-Perspectival Analytic Approach, since Wilber tends to classify this usage of levels as altitudes and Gebser’s focus of classification is on the perspectival altitude or level of the work (Gebser, 1985; Wilber et al., 2008). Mapping and analyzing the altitudinal-perspectival structures of created works is not a simple task, especially when we are working with cinematic artifacts. Firstly, while a cinematic work may be a complete “frozen-in-time” artifact, it is a temporal-based artifact, in that it is a work that has a temporal duration, so it can have its own evolutionary arc with multiple altitudes, within the boundaries of its
duration. Secondly, as with all other works of art, a cinematic work has many elements within it that can act as purveyors of various fixed and evolving lines and levels of development (e.g., characters, themes, visual style, etc.), as noted above (Kaplan, 2010; 2012a; Kaplan & Wilber, 2012).

The worldview structure altitudes in Table 1 are part of the Worldview line of development in the LL quadrant and are adapted from Gebser (1985) and Wilber et al. (2008). It should be noted that “transpersonal altitudes” (indigo through clear light) are also referred to as Super-Integral Altitude in various works (Wilber, 2007). The altitudes of Circle of Care and Concern are part of the moral line of development in the UL quadrant and are correlated to worldview structures in various sources, including Wilber et al. (2008) and Esbjörn-Hargens (2009). The Field of Spatial-Temporal Perception line of development is adapted from Gebser (1985). It appears that Gebser viewed these structures as individual-exterior dimensions of our being (i.e., how we physically perceive space and time) that were directly related to the worldview structures of consciousness. These may be correlated to higher brain functions/structures in the UR quadrant (Wilber, 1995). The Pre-Perspectival level of development along this line refers to the inability to be aware of or conscious of perception itself; Uni-Perspectival (1D) refers to the perception of only one Dimension of space or one-point perspective; Bi-Perspectival (2D) refers to 2-Dimensional perception or two-point Perspective; Perspectival refers to 3-Dimensional or three-point Perspective; Multi-Perspectival (4D) refers to the three dimensions of space combined with the added fourth dimension of the relative nature of time, producing the perception of various perspectives relative to subjective perception within the constantly changing field of time plus space; Aperspectival (5D) adds the fifth dimension of the perception of the various perspectives and of perspective-taking itself; and Trans-Perspectival refers to the transcendence of all perspectival fields. The Techno-Economic Structures is a line of development in the LR quadrant and are often correlated to worldview structures by Wilber in various works (Wilber, 1995; 2000). The higher altitudes of Convergence and Trans-Tech (Trans-Human) are currently emerging structures and these labels have been used by various sources but have yet to become fixed and agreed upon cultural constructs (Jenkins, 2008; More & Vita-More, 2013). However, the structures these terms refer to are commonly perceived to be part of these emergent altitudes (Kaplan, 2010; Wilber, personal communication, May 7, 2009; July 20, 2010).

For Morin, the cinematic work as part of the complex circuit of subjective-objective transmutation, is made of the four dimensions of the embedded subjective dimension of the Imaginary, the photographic representation of objective Forms, the interobjective/systemic replication of objective Movement, and the replication of intersubjective and human-to-world meaning-making shifts of attention and perception in the form of the Juxtaposition of these other dimensions, including image-to-image and movement-to-movement juxtapositions created through the editorial process.
Article Title

In Figure 7, I have added Wilber’s four quadrants of psychological, behavioral, cultural, and social to the creator and spectator dimensions here to further flush out the complexity in these domains that Morin refers to in several sections of his works (2005a, 2005b).

In Figure 8, I have added the Worldview/Altitudinal scaling for the entire range of participation processes and structures, and the labels of Symbiotic and Endosymbiotic Participation to represent participation levels of Anthropo-Cosmomorphosis and Doubling-metamorphoses, based on Morin’s description of these processes. I also added the Mental-Perspectival Immersion Zone levels and terminology based on Morin’s discussion and mapping of levels of participation within the schema of film language in Chapter 7 of *The Cinema, or The Imaginary in Man* (2005a).

In Morin’s references to techniques that appear to excite or stimulate levels of participation and immersion he refers to what is alternatively called the “charm of the image,” the “photogenie,” or “cinegenic quality” of the image, which is the moving image form of the photogenic or aesthetically pleasing capacities of the captured image (Morin, 2005a).

The above mapping of the cinematic symbiotic-metamorphic tetra-evolutionary complex (Fig. 9) is my visual representation of Morin’s analysis of the cinema through the lens of genetic anthropology, exploring how the cinema may act as a sort of ontophylogenetic kernel or catalyst for symbiotic and metamorphic developmental growth of individual and collective consciousness, culture, and society (Morin, 2005a). While there is ample research and theoretical analysis that supports and explores the cinema’s influence on individual consciousness, culture and society, and conversely the influences of consciousness, culture and society on the cinema, there is little exploring the intricate co-evolutionary web between these domains (Hodkinson, 2010; Lampropoulos et al., 2004; Lu & Heming, 1987; Kaplan, 2005; McLuhan & Fiore, 1967; Petric, 1973). I believe the above Complexity approach potentially offers us a way to do this.
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Awareness-in-Action is a critical integral meta-paradigm grounded in what appear to be the presupposed perspectives and practices of human awareness-in-action in all its myriad forms, inclusive of anything and everything people do, regardless of how purposeful or spontaneous, mental or physical, independent or interdependent these actions-in-awareness might seem. To whatever extent these apparent presuppositions might be regarded as provisionally valid, these would logically serve as necessary premises for all disciplined inquiries into, and hypotheses about, the many fields of human awareness-in-action, from politics and governance to economics and business to sociology and social work to journalism and activism. Awareness-in-Action may therefore provide the meta-paradigmatic means to create actionable knowledge within, across, and beyond established disciplinary and institutional boundaries, so that those of us concerned with such matters might learn how to respond more effectively to the interdependent political, economic, social, and ecological challenges of our time. This article summarizes the primary features of Awareness-in-Action before elaborating on some of its philosophical implications rooted in Jürgen Habermas’s critical theory, Ken Wilber’s Integral Theory, and Chris Argyris’s action science.

I. Awareness-in-Action

In Part I of this article, I summarize the meta-paradigmatic features of Awareness-in-Action revealed through the integration of the more fundamental meta-theoretical and meta-practical reconstructions developed previously (O’Connor, 2013, 1-146).
Metatheory

Triadic quadratic perspectivism (TQP) is a metatheory based on the primordial perspectives of human awareness-in-action, where primordial means original or first created and, therefore, (phenomeno)logically prior to any other type of perspective that might arise in the course of that awareness-in-action. Thus, the triadic quadratic perspectives are precisely those perspectives that appear to be always already active in every situation-action-in-awareness. Beginning (O’Connor, 2013, 5-86) with the triadic metatheory of Jürgen Habermas (1971; 1975; 1979; 1984; 1987; 1990a; 1990b; 1992; 1998; 2003) and the quadratic metatheory of Ken Wilber (2000a; 2000b; 2000c; 2003; 2007), and in contrast to Wilber’s (2000b, 436-437) own tri/quad conflation of the two, I recognize Habermas’s triadic perspectives of human action—first-person, second-person, third-person—and Wilber’s quadratic perspectives of human development and evolution—intentional, behavioral, cultural, social—as two entirely differentiated, yet nevertheless tightly integrated, multi-perspectival frames of reference for human awareness-in-action. This reveals 12 differentiated, yet integrated primordial perspectives (Fig. 1):

- A first-person, all-quadrant perspective of freedom (i.e., beauty), denoted \( 1_{AQ} \), signified by the singular-subjective pronoun \( I \) in the intentional quadrant \( (1_{UR}) \), the singular-objective pronoun \( me \) in the behavioral quadrant \( (1_{UL}) \), the plural-subjective pronoun \( we \) in the cultural quadrant \( (1_{LL}) \), and the plural-objective pronoun \( us \) in the social quadrant \( (1_{LR}) \);

- A second-person, all-quadrant perspective of justice (i.e., goodness), denoted \( 2_{AQ} \), signified by the singular-subjective pronoun \( you \) in the intentional quadrant \( (2_{UL}) \), the singular-objective pronoun \( you \) in the behavioral quadrant \( (2_{UR}) \), the plural-subjective pronoun \( you \) (or occasionally \( we \)) in the cultural quadrant \( (2_{LL}) \), and the plural-objective pronoun \( you \) (or occasionally \( us \)) in the social quadrant \( (2_{LR}) \);

- A third-person, all-quadrant perspective of truth, denoted \( 3_{AQ} \), signified by the singular-subjective pronouns \( he, she, or it \) in the intentional quadrant \( (3_{UL}) \), the singular-objective pronouns \( him, her, or it \) in the behavioral quadrant \( (3_{UR}) \), the plural-subjective pronouns \( they \) or \( these \) (or occasionally \( you \) or \( we \)) in the cultural quadrant \( (3_{LL}) \), and the plural-objective pronouns \( them \) or \( those \) (or occasionally \( you \) or \( us \)) in the social quadrant \( (3_{LR}) \).

Awareness-in-Action may therefore be understood in terms of three interdependent, irreducible perspectives—first-person, second-person, and third-person—each of which includes four constituent interdependent, irreducible perspectives—intentional, behavioral, cultural, social—all four of which are experienced intrapersonally, interpersonally, and impersonally \( (123_{AQ}) \) from within each of our—mine, each of yours, and each of theirs—three distinct personal perspectives \( (123_{AQ}) \), thus forming a multitude of interdependent, irreducible triadic quadratic perspectives that co-arise in the integral awareness \( (0) \) that each of us brings to our action situation.

Triadic quadratic perspectivism (O’Connor, 2013, 36-86) frames a more integral/différantial semiotics, which is the study of signs and their use in all types of communication, incorporating the triadic semiotics of Karl Bühler and the quadratic semiotics of Wilber. Wilber’s (2000b, 701-704; 2007, 287) universal sign, which is any aspect of reality that represents another to another, constitutes an indefinite semiotic occasion \( X_{AQ} \) comprised of an intentional signified \( X_{UL} \) (i.e., the subjective idea or association) and a behavioral signifier \( X_{UR} \) (i.e., the objective word or mark) in corresponding contexts of cultural semantics \( X_{LL} \) (i.e., meaningful interpretations of signifieds) and social syntax \( X_{LR} \) (i.e., functional rules for signifiers). As a
potential complement without apparent contradiction, Bühler’s pragmatic sign “is a symbol in virtue of being correlated with [third-person] objects and states of affairs, a symptom in virtue of its dependence on the sender, whose [first-person] subjectivity it expresses, and a signal in virtue of its appeal to the [second-person] hearer, whose external or internal behavior it steers…” (Habermas, 1984, 275, emphasis added) By recognizing that each of Wilber’s quadratic perspectives of a sign is simultaneously present in each of Bühler’s triadic perspectives of a sign, and vice versa, we can see the primordial contours of an integral/différantial semiotics (123 AQ). It is worth emphasizing that these definitions are so fundamental as to encompass a universal scope of semiotic inquiry including, but by no means limited to, conventional spoken/written language and the reason and communication for which it serves as primary medium. Such an integral/différantial semiotics should certainly include complementary, extra-linguistic forms of semiosis, from the instinctive and intuitive to the energetic and empathic to the mathematical and musical, all of which are constitutive of the manifold semiotic reality of awareness-in-action.

Furthermore, by recognizing the pragmatic implications of this semiotics, we (O’Connor, 2013, 36-86) can see the contours of a more integral/différantial pragmatics that further illuminates the study of spoken/written language use. Each of Habermas’s (1979, 68) modes of communication—the expressive personality (1), the conformative participant (2), or the objectivating observer (3)—places a primary emphasis on one corresponding claim to reality—sincerity, rightness, or truth—in the context of its corresponding domain of reality—my inner world, our social world, or the external world. Given that Habermas’s (1984, 275) formal pragmatics is based in large part on Bühler’s triadic semiotics, in which every linguistic expression employ-
ing a sign simultaneously functions as an *expressive symptom* of the speaker (1), an *appellative signal* to the hearer (2), and a *representative symbol* of the world (3), we can reconstruct each of Habermas’s modes of communicative reason and action to include its own corresponding intentional ($1_{UL}$), behavioral ($1_{UR}$), cultural ($1_{LL}$), and social ($1_{LR}$) aspects of pragmatic, or linguistically enacted, reality ($1_{AQ}$). The essential elements of this integral/différantial pragmatics are framed within TQP, which is centered on human action as expressed in the form of verbs, the use of which appears to differentiate and integrate the triadic quadratic *pronouns* that serve—both explicitly and implicitly—as spacially distributed *subjects* and *objects* of conjugated verbs, just as in the typical sentence structure of *subject-verb-object* (e.g., “I see you.”). The many forms of action, all the specific verbs, can be rendered in *past, present, and future tenses* and further modified by the use of *adverbs*, just as the many types of spacially distributed pronouns can be rendered more specific by the use of *nouns* and further modified by the use of *adjectives*. With these we have the basic grammatical elements of the *sentence*, which is the primary communicative act in spoken/written language, the communicatively competent use of which constructively enacts the variegated spacial-temporal realities—the *dimension and duration* of experience—that each and every one of us realizes différantly through the triadic quadratic perspectives common to all of us.

Finally, by recognizing the pragmatic and semiotic foundations of *praxiology*, which I (O’Connor, 2013, 1-3; 36-86) have defined as the study of human action in all its forms and fields, we can see in TQP the primordial contours of an *integral/différantial praxiology* that incorporates the insights and terminology of semiotics and pragmatics. Thus, TQP reveals that each and every human action explicitly or implicitly differentiates and integrates:

- a *personified symptom* of the first-person actor in the form of an intrapersonal claim to *freedom*, denoted $1_{AQ}$ or $F^1$,
- a *participative signal* to the second-person actor in the form of an interpersonal claim to *justice*, denoted $2_{AQ}$ or $J^1$, and
- a *representative symbol* of some third-person actor or aspect of the world in the form of an impersonal claim to *truth*, denoted $3_{AQ}$ or $T^1$,

each of which simultaneously manifests in the appropriate corresponding forms of *intentional signifieds* ($1_{UL}$), *behavioral signifiers* ($1_{UR}$), *cultural semantics* ($1_{LL}$), and *social syntax* ($1_{LR}$), all of which appear to co-arise in the integral awareness (0) that each of us brings to our différantial action situation ($1_{AQ}$).

Although it may seem complex at first, this is just the most basic form of triadic quadratic perspectivism, which I refer to as the *first derivative* and denote as TQP$^1$. For within each of the second- and third-person perspectives of human awareness-in-action—each of *yours* and each of *theirs*—there is a derivative set of triadic quadratic perspectives owing to the fact that whomever is identified as a second- or third-person in relation to some first-person is a *person* in his or her own right and therefore the origin of his or her own unique TQP$^1$ actions, interacting with the TQP$^1$ actions of the original *I-me*. In the *second derivative* form, TQP$^2$ reveals that my personified symptoms of freedom ($1_{AQ}$), participative signals of justice ($2_{AQ}$), and representative symbols of truth ($3_{AQ}$) co-arise in *mutual reflexive différance* with each of your pragmatic significations ($2.123_{AQ}$) and each of their pragmatic significations ($3.123_{AQ}$), yet still within the integral awareness (0) that each of us brings to our différantial action situation ($123.123_{AQ}$). This TQP$^2$ formulation of semiotics, pragmatics, and praxiology frames a complete integral/différantial discourse regarding what really is free ($F^2$), just ($J^2$), and true ($T^2$)—indeed, what is *real* ($R^2$)—for all three of us, thereby accounting for a different form of presupposed *firstness, secondness*, and *thirdness* essential to every semiotic, pragmatic, and praxiological occasion: *my reality, your reality, and his or her reality*.

If TQP$^2$ reveals the mutual, reflexive, différantial integration of human awareness-in-action, then TQP$^3$
confirms the fractal pattern of perspectival differentiation that reveals through potentially endless repetition its integral aperspectival meta-structure. For with every second- and third-person perspective being potentially differentiated into yet another unique set of triadic quadratic perspectives, TQP radically opens to a différantial multiplicity of unique, interdependent sets of triadic quadratic perspectives, each set of which appears to be enacted by a unique enactive I with the potential to identify within its own primordial perspectives all the other uniquely enacted sets of triadic quadratic perspectives, seemingly free of spatial and temporal limits. This infinite derivative, TQP∞, frames the quantitative extensity of integral/différantial reality, in terms of the number of people with whom, and perspectives with which, one can actively identify, inclusive of all that has been and all that might be, while simultaneously framing, as the necessary pre-condition, the qualitative intensity of integral/différantial reality in terms of the clarity of awareness present in each action situation.

Nevertheless, the integral awareness (A⁰) within which all différantial action (A∞) arises appears to be the primordial referent—the never-changing, non-perspectival, integral reality (TQP⁰ = R⁰) infusively illuminating all the transient, perspectival, différantial realities (TQP∞ = R∞)—signified by all différantial action. Hence, the perspectival pronouns as primordial signs and the perspectives themselves as primordial referents could possibly be but perspectival differentiations of identity in the primordial semiosis by which all the différantial signs and referents, names and forms, of our self-imaging/world-viewing arise in the integral awareness that we secretly, silently are. This implies that the ever-present realization of integral awareness that is always already presupposed in every différantial action is always already being relatively realized in never-ending différantial action, subject to the indeterminately constrained semiotic, pragmatic, and praxiological capacities of each and every actor. Therefore, implicating the entirety of this integral/différantial reality (R²), TQP² frames the inherently indeterminate intensity and extensity of each and every situational action-in-awareness.

**Meta-Practice**

Transparency, choice, and accountability (TCA) is a meta-practice based on the primordial practices of human awareness-in-action, which may be understood as those essential processes that are always already activating the primordial perspectives that are always already activated. Thus, transparency, choice, and accountability are precisely those practices that appear to be always already active in every situational action-in-awareness. Based in large part on my (O’Connor, 2013, 87-146) triadic quadratic perspectival reconstructions of Habermas’s (1979; 1984; 1987) theory and Chris Argyris’s (1985) practice of communicative action, including Habermas’s search for context-transcendent norms of critical-reflective discourse in the ideal speech situation and Argyris’s (1978; 1985; 1986; 1990; 1993) discovery of context-transcendent norms of critical-reflective discourse in real speech situations, I have attempted to discern some features of the meta-practical procedures implied by these metatheoretical reconstructions. For example, if these primordial practices are always already activating the primordial perspectives that are always already activated in our situational awareness-in-action, then:

- These practices are always already available for discovery—right here, right now—in every action situation.
- These practices are deceptively counter-factual in that most action appears to be a contradiction of their ideal form, yet reassuringly intuitive in that most actors idealize themselves acting this way.
- These practices are relatively content-free in the sense that these do not convey applicable knowledge of what we can, should, and do know, yet radically content-
oriented in the sense that these do convey actionable knowledge of how we can, should, and do learn.

- These practices are context-transcendent norms of human action in all its forms and fields and context-immanent evidence of human action in all its particular manifestations.
- These practices are tacit knowledge of human action that we already possess and latent potential for human action that we have yet to realize.
- These practices are fractal by design and (re/de)constructive at all degrees of depth and scale throughout the potentially infinite, yet always indeterminate meta-structure of triadic quadratic perspectival (TQP) awareness-in-action.

Consistent with these reconstructed features, I hypothesize that, within each and every real action situation, people presuppose the latent potential for an ideal action situation governed by the primordial practices of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the triadic quadratic perspectivism of that situation:

- Transparency generally means disclosing and acquiring all the relevant knowledge and information within the relevant perspectives pertaining to a particular action, free of any deception or distortion that may undermine one’s ability to reason, act, and learn. Ultimately, it refers to the primordial transparency of one’s own triadic quadratic perspectival self-imaging/world-viewing.
- Choice generally means taking perspectives and making decisions in the context of one’s awareness, free from coercion by others and free to create by oneself, however deliberately or spontaneously. Ultimately, it refers to the primordial choice to enact one’s own triadic quadratic perspectival self-image/world-view within choiceless awareness.
- Accountability generally means accepting responsibility for one’s thoughts, feelings, words, and deeds, following through on commitments made, sharing responsibility for the intended as well as unintended consequences of action, and learning from experience in all perspectives. Ultimately, it refers to the primordial accountability for one’s own triadic quadratic perspectival self-imaging/world-viewing.

At its most fundamental, the meta-practice of transparency, choice, and accountability entails discovering and expressing what is honest, right, and true in every action situation in order to promote mutual reflexive awareness, learning, and trust consistent with the degree of commitment present in that situation. But this cannot happen without surfacing the inherent difference and inevitable conflict rooted in the triadic quadratic perspectival nature of human action, including the latent as well as blatant deception, coercion, and defensiveness corrupting so many interactions, all of which nevertheless implies the very transparency, choice, and accountability we presuppose in every action situation. If we can suspend time and open space for the unavoidable reality of this difference-disclosing, conflict-ridden, but nevertheless integral discourse, then we can genuinely inquire into the subtle intervals between behavior and intention, function and meaning, mine and yours, ours and theirs, as much out of curiosity as any desire for resolution. Thus, TCA may be thought of as a presupposed imperative to pay attention to, and take responsibility for, our TQP awareness-in-action, partly because this is essential to the learning that supports more effective choices in the future, and partly because such practices reveal our previously unrecognized contributions to the contextual realities we often take for granted.
As these practices intensify, we become more aware of the linguistically-constructed nature of our indeterminate realities (R\(^N\)), wherein my personified symptoms of freedom (1\(_{AQ}\)), participative signals of justice (2\(_{AQ}\)), and representative symbols of truth (3\(_{AQ}\)), each comprised of its corresponding intentional signifieds (123\(_{UL}\)), behavioral signifiers (123\(_{UR}\)), cultural semantics (123\(_{ll}\)), and social syntax (123\(_{lr}\)), really do co-arise in mutual reflexive difference with each of yours (2.123\(_{AQ}\)) and each of theirs (3.123\(_{AQ}\)), not only as a metatheory (TOP\(^N\)), but also as a corresponding meta-practice (TCA\(^N\)) of indeterminate realizing (R\(^N\)). For one sentence after another, the language that discloses, obscures, and ultimately (re/de)constructs our world-viewing plays a concurrent role in simultaneously disclosing, obscuring, and ultimately (re/de)constructing our self-imaging through the same integral/différantial action-in-awareness. Amidst the intensifying transparency of pragmatic and semiotic reality construction, choices proliferate along the deconstructive/reconstructive edge of provisional freedom, justice, and truth, seemingly unbounded but for the unavoidable accountability that accompanies such awareness. Ultimately, the I that I think I am as the implied origin of all that I think I do within the world that I think I know approaches the same deconstructive/reconstructive edge, revealing its essential absence in light of the essential presence of awareness-in-action.

**Meta-Paradigm**

The essence of Awareness-in-Action (O’Connor, 2013, 1-146) can be summarized as the meta-practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the metatheory triadic quadratic perspectivism, both of which appear to be always already active in every situational action-in-awareness (A\(^N\) = TCA\(^N\) × TOP\(^N\)). In that quintessential situation framed by the Indeterminate Derivative of Awareness-in-Action, A\(^N\), that exemplar in which I act, you act, and s/he acts in relation to one another, we enact three unique, yet interpenetrating versions of TCA\(^N\) × TOP\(^N\), each of which frames an indeterminate total of at least 36 reciprocally interlocked perspectives within the integral/différantial realization of our situational awareness-in-action. From each of our different perspectives as a unique enactive origin of our situational awareness-in-action, each of us raises and redeems—either explicitly or implicitly—three unique, yet interpenetrating sets of triadic quadratic perspectival claims to reality (R\(^N\)), while simultaneously presuming three unique, yet interpenetrating sets of corresponding triadic quadratic perspectival contexts of reality (R\(^N\)). Awareness-in-Action thus entails the requisite practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to my pragmatic significations of reality (TCA\(^N\) × 123\(_{AQ}\)) co-arising in mutual reflexive difference with each of your pragmatic significations of reality (TCA\(^N\) × 2.123\(_{AQ}\)) and each of their pragmatic significations of reality (TCA\(^N\) × 3.123\(_{AQ}\)), all of which is essential to our integral/différantial realization (TCA\(^N\) × 123\(_{AQ}\)).

Furthermore, from each of our different perspectives as an origin of our situational awareness-in-action—a unique enactive I—each of us has the potential to engage in three primary modes of integral/différantial realization (R\(^N\)) (Fig. 1):

- Authentication is the intrapersonal mode of integral/différantial realization that entails the requisite practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to my personified symptoms of freedom (1\(_{AQ}\)), your personified symptoms of freedom (2.1\(_{AQ}\)), and his or her personified symptoms of freedom (3.1\(_{AQ}\)), each comprised of its corresponding intentional signifieds (123.1\(_{UL}\)), behavioral signifiers (123.1\(_{UR}\)), cultural semantics (123.1\(_{ll}\)), and social syntax (123.1\(_{lr}\)) of freedom, collectively denoted TCA\(^N\) × 123.1AQ = AF\(^N\). Authentication is the intrapersonal praxis by which each of us (in)validates each of our relatively knowledgeable actions in terms of its honesty and authenticity, consistent with each of our indeterminate realizations of awareness-in-action (A\(^N\)), thereby (re/de)constructing our actionable knowledge of freedom.
Legitimation is the interpersonal mode of integral/différantial realization that entails the requisite practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to my participative signals of justice (2\textsubscript{AQ}), your participative signals of justice (2.2\textsubscript{AQ}), and his or her participative signals of justice (3.2\textsubscript{AQ}), each comprised of its corresponding intentional signifieds (123.2\textsubscript{UL}), behavioral signifiers (123.2\textsubscript{LR}), cultural semantics (123.2\textsubscript{LL}), and social syntax (123.2\textsubscript{LR}) of justice, collectively denoted TCA\textsuperscript{N} × 123.2\textsubscript{AQ} = LJ\textsuperscript{N}. Legitimation is the interpersonal praxis by which each of us (in)validates each of our relatively knowledgeable actions in terms of its morality and legitimacy, consistent with each of our indeterminate realizations of awareness-in-action (A\textsuperscript{N}), thereby (re/de)constructing our actionable knowledge of justice.

Confirmation is the impersonal mode of integral/différantial realization that entails the requisite practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to my representative symbols of truth (3\textsubscript{AQ}), your representative symbols of truth (2.3\textsubscript{AQ}), and his or her representative symbols of truth (3.3\textsubscript{AQ}), each comprised of its corresponding intentional signifieds (123.3\textsubscript{UL}), behavioral signifiers (123.3\textsubscript{LR}), cultural semantics (123.3\textsubscript{LL}), and social syntax (123.3\textsubscript{LR}) of truth, collectively denoted TCA\textsuperscript{N} × 123.3\textsubscript{AQ} = CT\textsuperscript{N}. Confirmation is the impersonal praxis by which each of us (in)validates each of our relatively knowledgeable actions in terms of its accuracy and cogency, consistent with each of our indeterminate realizations of awareness-in-action (A\textsuperscript{N}), thereby (re/de)constructing our actionable knowledge of truth.

As an integration of the substantive metatheory of triadic quadratic perspectivism (TQP\textsuperscript{N}) with the procedural meta-practice of transparency, choice, and accountability (TCA\textsuperscript{N}), authentication, legitimation, and confirmation (ALC\textsuperscript{N}) collectively constitute a substantive/procedural meta-paradigm called Awareness-in-Action (A\textsuperscript{N}), by which I mean a relatively content-free, yet context-rich theory-of-practice/practice-of-theory with the capacity to integrate, via some combination of creative vision and conceptual logic, a large variety of relatively context-free, yet content-rich theories and practices from all the forms and fields of human awareness-in-action. Furthermore, while this substantive/procedural meta-paradigm may be immediately recognizable as a conceptual meta-paradigm with quasi-universal (re/de)constructive capabilities within, across, and beyond established disciplinary and institutional boundaries, it is even more important to recognize it as the perceptual meta-paradigm that appears to be always already active in our situational awareness-in-action—empirical and normative evidence, it seems, of our latent potential for more integral/différantial awareness-in-action. Finally, this substantive/procedural and empirical/normative formulation of integral/différantial semiotics, pragmatics, and praxiology accounts for a different form of presupposed firstness, secondness, and thirdness essential to every semiotic, pragmatic, and praxiological occasion—my realization, your realization, and his or her realization—not just as I can realize each of our respective realities, but as each of us can realize each of our respective realities as différentially integral to our respective realizations.

Next, awareness-in-action may therefore be understood as the substantive/procedural, the integral/différantial, and the empirical/normative meta-paradigm of authentication, legitimation, and confirmation by which we—I, each of you, and each of them—(re/de)construct our actionable knowledge of freedom, justice, and truth to guide knowledgeable action that is progressively more free, just, and true.

(A)Perspectival / (A)Practical

From each of our different perspectives as an origin of our situational awareness-in-action, freedom (F\textsuperscript{N}), justice (J\textsuperscript{N}), and truth (T\textsuperscript{N}) are, respectively, first-, second-, and third-person claims to, and contexts of, real-
ity as each of us experiences them. However, the authentication of our personified symptoms of freedom (AFN), the legitimation of our participative signals of justice (LPN), and the confirmation of our representative symbols of truth (CTN) are each inherently, inevitably first-, second-, and third-person realization praxes that we all must engage together, not as a regulative principle to be accepted or rejected upon reasonable reflection, but as a presupposed condition of our situational awareness-in-action (ANQ). Thus, Awareness-in-Action appears to be perspectively arranged in such a way that I cannot (in)authenticate my personified symptoms of freedom (TCAQ × 1AQ), (de)legitimate my participative signals of justice (TCAQ × 2AQ), or (dis)confirm my representative symbols of truth (TCAQ × 3AQ) without inevitably (in)authenticating, (de)legitimating, and (dis)confirming yours (TCAQ × 2.123AQ) and his or hers (TCAQ × 3.123AQ) as essential dimensions of our integral/differential realization (ANQ = TCAQ × 123.123AQ = ALCN × RNQ).

Likewise, each of these primordial praxes—authentication, legitimation, confirmation—foregrounds one of the three primordial perspectives—intrapersonal freedom, interpersonal justice, or impersonal truth—as each of us identifies it, while backgrounding the other two primordial perspectives for which the corresponding reality claims might be presumed, in a specific action situation, to be sufficiently realized. However, due to the primordial practices of transparency, choice, and accountability engaged by all of us with respect to the foregrounded reality claims—practices that have no predetermined boundaries—there is always the potential for each of us to challenge any of the backgrounded claims and thereby shift to the corresponding praxis. Thus, Awareness-in-Action also appears to be practically arranged in such a way that even we cannot (in)authenticate our claims to freedom (TCAQ × 123.1ANQ = AFNQ), (de)legitimate our claims to justice (TCAQ × 123.2ANQ = LPNQ), or (dis)confirm our claims to truth (TCAQ × 123.3ANQ = CTNQ) without inevitably engaging in all three of these primordial praxes as essential dimensions of our integral/differential realization (ANQ = TCAQ × 123.123ANQ = ALCNQ × RNQ).

As suggested by the substantive/procedural vision-logic of Figure 1, our mindful practice of situational awareness-in-action in its many forms and fields can facilitate a qualitative intensification of our integral/differential realization in terms of the clarity of awareness present in each of our actions, as well as a quantitative extensification of our integral/differential realization in terms of the number of people with whom, and perspectives with which, each of us can actively identify. For with every second- and third-person perspective being potentially differentiated into yet another unique set of TQPQ originating in yet another unique enactive I, each of us appears to possess the potential to bring ever more transparency, choice, and accountability to the differential perspectivism, constructivism, and contextualism of our action situations that are, nevertheless, still framed within each of our original sets of TQPQ. Indeed, the dimension and duration of awareness-in-action is always already marked by spacial difference and temporal deferral, by traces of actions near and far, past and future—mine, yours, and hers, as well as ours, yours, and theirs—such that each situational action-in-awareness is as much an effect as it is a cause of its integral difference. In other words, action can be realized in the here and now only if this action is not something wholly given, in and of itself, to this situation, but rather a situational synthesis of traces to implicated actions near and far, past and future, and thus, by definition, not here and not now. We might therefore say that action in the here and now is rhizomatically self-situating in the milieu of its own spacial-temporal multiplicity of enfolding/unfolding traces to relevant actions that are not here and not now, yet differentiably integral to the one action appearing right here, right now.

Consequently, by virtue of its presupposed TCAQ × TQPQ = ALCQ meta-structure, each situational action-in-awareness radically opens to a rhizomatic multiplicity of unique, interdependent permutations of triadic quadratic perspectival reality (TQPQ), each permutation of which appears to be enacted by a unique origin of awareness-in-action, a unique enactive I, with the potential to realize (TCAQ) within its own primordial perspectives all the other uniquely enacted permutations of triadic quadratic perspectival reality, theoretically free of spacial or temporal limits. Furthermore, as the personal particulars of this potentially
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limitless aperspectival/apractical realization \((\text{ALC}_x = R^x)\) shift from one moment to the next, the apractical realizing \((\text{TCA}_x = R^*)\) rhizomatically reconfigures this awareness-in-action into countless new permutations of aperspectival reality \((\text{TQP}_x = R^x)\), each momentary multiplicity of which is simultaneously realized by all the unique enactive Is—all the interdependent realizers—as regarded from the perspective of each unique enactive I. This Infinite Derivative of Awareness-in-Action \((A^x)\) reveals the infinitely differentiated integration and infinitely integrated differentiation of a veritable kaleidoscope of self-imaging/world-viewing as seen through all the eyes, literally all the unique Is, that have ever been or could ever be identified in my circle of integral awareness \((A^*)\).

Awareness-in-Action may therefore be understood as the one ideal action situation \((A^*)\) in which each and every one of us can ultimately realize \((R^x)\) each and every one of us as unique members of a universal civilization grounded in the ultimate realization \((R^*)\) of integral aperspectival freedom \((\text{AF}_x)\), justice \((\text{LJ}_x)\), and truth \((\text{CT}_x)\), and therefore ultimate reality \((R^*)\).

Nevertheless, while being aperspectival/apractical in the one ideal action situation, awareness-in-action is perspectival/practical in the many real action situations, because our actual realizations in any particular situation are contingent upon the differential capacities of each actor as enacted in his or her own original awareness-in-action. In other words, I am subject to my own indeterminately constrained semiotic, pragmatic, and praxiological capacities rooted in deep structures of actionable knowledge that not only limit my ability to realize \((\text{TCA}^N)\) those realities directly realized by every unique enactive I in my awareness-in-action \((\text{TQP}^N)\), but also limit the ability of those unique enactive Is to indirectly realize those realities that are directly realized by me. Each of us is, therefore, indeterminately limited in our respective capacity for authentication, legitimation, and confirmation, while inadvertently limiting each other’s capacity for authentication, legitimation, and confirmation. This Indeterminate Derivative of Awareness-in-Action \((A^N)\) therefore highlights the inherently indeterminate nature of integral/differential realization \((\text{TCA}^N \times \text{TQP}^N = \text{ALC}^N = R^N)\) rooted in the deep structures of actionable knowledge that each of us brings to our situational awareness-in-action, and does so in a manner consistent with the way we actually experience these invisibly opaque, surprisingly durable, supportive limits on our situational awareness-in-action.

\(A^N\) frames the indeterminate intentional-behavioral-cultural-social contexts within which I can identify with some of you more so than with others of you, and with some of them more so than with others of them, but not all of you or all of them to the same depth, not yet anyway, and so the mutual reflexive differential action continues—mine, yours, and hers as well as ours, yours, and theirs—as we all struggle to create enough aperspectival/apractical space to eventually integrate all our perspectival/practical self-imaging/world-viewing. This \(A^N\) formulation of integral/differential semiotics, pragmatics, and praxiology reveals that each perspectival/practical action presupposes every perspectival/practical action with any number of derivative perspectival/practical actions in a radically open-ended, yet reliably closed-minded meta-structure of Awareness-in-Action. Indeed, with each differential action being a unique, situation-specific synthesis of traces to every relevant differential action arising in integral awareness, we might say that each difference presupposes every difference that makes any difference in the differential integralism of Awareness-in-Action.

Awareness-in-Action may therefore be understood as the many real action situations \((A^N)\) in which each and every one of us is indeterminately constrained in our capacities to ultimately realize each and every one of us as unique members of a universal civilization committed to the authentication of freedom \((\text{AF}^N)\), legitimation of justice \((\text{LJ}^N)\), and confirmation of truth \((\text{CT}^N)\), and therefore indeterminate realization \((R^N)\).

These reconstructions highlight the empirical/normative complementarity between the context-immanent realization of an empirically justifiable Awareness-in-Action \((A^N)\)—the real action situation—which is inherently particular, content-rich, and perspectival/practical, and the context-transcendent idealization of a normatively justifiable Awareness-in-Action \((A^*)\)—the ideal action situation—which is inherently universal,
content-free, and aperspectival/apractical. Notwithstanding the constrained semiotic, pragmatic, and praxiological capacity unfolding in these real action situations (A\(^0\)), every such real action situation is always already enacting as potential the aperspectival/apractical realization, by the unique enactive I at the origin of A\(^1\), of all the other unique enactive Is, each of whom is the direct or indirect realizer of all the relative realities that can be realized within each and every real action situation, hence the ideal action situation (A\(^\infty\)). Thus, there is no human awareness-in-action in which the Kosmic addresses of each and every situationally relevant realizer-realized are not already being identified—whether explicitly or implicitly—in the action situation itself, which therefore invites requisite practices of transparency, choice, and accountability concerning these actual addresses as part of the authentication, legitimation, and confirmation of the reality claims made in that situation. Even more significantly, the normatively ideal action situation enfolding/unfolding within every empirically real action situation ultimately accounts for the Kosmic addresses/addressing of each and every realizer-realized that can possibly be regarded as relatively real at any time and any place within the integral awareness that each of us brings to our differential action, hence ultimate realization.

**Absolute Relativism / Relative Absolutism**

By framing a potentially infinite, yet always indeterminate meta-discourse of integral/differential realization, Awareness-in-Action opens space and suspends time for the perspectives/practices of all people, without equating all these perspectives/practices or privileging any particular perspectives/practices on the basis of authority, popularity, or otherwise biased norms of discourse. This radically inclusive pluralism seems to imply a reconstructive, rather than deconstructive, form of absolute relativism, wherein the (in)validation of anyone’s claim to any aspect of reality, however widely shared that (in)validation might be, is always provisional and contingent upon inclusion of additional counter-claims by additional participants in the ever-present, never-ending meta-discourse. By presupposing the fallible nature of their particular claims to freedom, justice, and truth in anticipation of the need to justify these claims to others, it seems that people are also presupposing the relativistic nature of realization itself, which appears to originate in the inherently relativistic Is assuming ownership of each and every claim to reality.

This, furthermore, is another way of saying that realization is, in context, whatever the participants in discourse mutually determine it to be, provided that the discourse of empirical realization is conducted on the basis of certain substantive and procedural norms considered essential by those participants. Even then, whatever consensus version of triadic quadratic perspectival reality (TQP\(^0\)) these participants might construct, together with the consensus version of transparency, choice, and accountability (TCA\(^0\)) they use to construct it, will almost certainly be (re)constructed by some of those third-persons observing, but not yet participating, in the contextualized discourse (ALC\(^0\)). Nevertheless, the presupposed norms of any such open-ended discourse—the TCA\(^*\) × TQP\(^*\) = ALC\(^*\) at least implicitly idealized by all participants—never really fail to govern even the most discordant of empirical situations, thus welcoming the play of differential consistent with the integral rules of the game. In this way, the validity basis of realization insures the reconstructive nature of this absolute relativism against the extremes of a deconstructive indeterminacy of realization that would, in the absence of any validity basis, lead inexorably to an arbitrary equivalence of all fleetingly meaningful versions of perspectival/practical realization—a completely differential, but non-integral, aperspectival/apractical madness.

Alternatively, this A\(^\infty\) meta-discourse also seems to imply a libertarian, rather than authoritarian, form of relative absolutism, by virtue of the fact that every person who engages in any discourse intuitively presupposes, despite what may be an altogether contrary experience, the immediate potential for absolute realization of freedom, justice, and truth. By pursuing these intrapersonal, interpersonal, and impersonal aspects of absolute realization within the semiotic, pragmatic, and praxiological confines of dimensional-durational experience, it appears that people are also presupposing the existence of as-yet-uncertain, but nevertheless ultimate
conclusions regarding every contextualized claim to freedom, justice, and truth via an ideal meta-discourse of ultimate realization (R∞) characterized by complete autonomy for, and complete responsibility to, all participants. As each relativistic discourse converges on a satisfactory conclusion regarding what really is free, just, and true in a particular context, the participants will tend to attribute to their new insights an additional measure of this ultimate status and proceed to act as if their consensus realization is relatively absolute—a meaningful-functional certainty that can, henceforth, be taken for granted as part of the contextual ground for their future actions, at least until another challenge presents itself.

This, however, might be another way of saying that any ultimate realizations of freedom, justice, and truth—thus, reality itself—to whatever extent such relative absolutes can be conceived in dimensional-durational experience, can only be fully acknowledged as such to the extent that everyone in the world has communicatively contemplated all of human experience with requisite degrees of transparency, choice, and accountability for an indefinite period of time. Short of this normative ultimatum, and with the absolute relativism of an ever-present, never-ending meta-discourse thus implied, there is no space or time in which an authoritarian absolutism—a deceptive, coercive, defensive decree regarding what must be real for anyone and everyone—can be confirmed, legitimated, and authenticated.

The source of this seemingly paradoxical, mutually implicating absolute relativism-relative absolutism is to be found in the integral/differential complementarity of Awareness-in-Action—that is, the dynamic interplay between the absolute realization (R∞) of the integral awareness that we are (A∞) and the relative realization (Rn) of the differential action that we do (An). Because the absolute realization of the integral awareness that we are is often only relatively realized in the differential action that we do, it is often only relatively idealized in the form of an ultimate realization (R∞) that can only ever signify in spacial-temporal form the absolute realization (R∞) always already beyond the relativity of dimensional-durational awareness-in-action. Without blurring the important distinctions between objective and subjective aspects of reality or between intrapersonal honesty, interpersonal morality, and impersonal truth, such presuppositions of ultimate realization do introduce an inescapable epistemic dimension to all relativistic pursuits of absolute realization. Nevertheless, these presuppositions do not reduce absolute realization to relative realization, or, for that matter, ontology to epistemology, for it appears that the very ideal of ultimate realization is but the semiotic, pragmatic, and praxiological experience of the as-yet-merely-intuited absolute realization without which such relativistic pursuits would lose all significance.

Therefore, in summary, the (dis)confirmation of relative truth (CTn) in fully quadratic form (123.3n) presupposes the never-ending potential for ultimate truth (CT∞) based on the ever-present intuition of absolute truth (CT∞). Likewise, the (de)legitimation of relative justice (LJn) in fully quadratic form (123.2n) presupposes the never-ending potential for ultimate justice (LJ∞) based on the ever-present intuition of absolute justice (LJ∞). Finally, the (in)authentication of relative freedom (AFn) in fully quadratic form (123.1n) presupposes the never-ending potential for ultimate freedom (AF∞) based on the ever-present intuition of absolute freedom (AF∞). Nevertheless, while ignoring the absolutely real (R∞) and pursuing the relatively ideal (Rn) from within the semiotic, pragmatic, and praxiological confines of the relatively real (Rn), we may come to discover in the ultimate realization (R∞) of our differential action the reflected refraction of the integral awareness (R∞) without which such manifestation could never have been illuminated. Hence, as if seeking to illuminate all manifestation, we eventually discover the active refraction of integral awareness revealed in every knowledgeable action and reflected in all actionable knowledge.

Awareness-in-Action may therefore be understood as the absolutely relative, yet relatively absolute meta-discourse in which our—mine, each of yours, and each of theirs—relative realizations (Rn) presuppose the never-ending potential for ultimate realization (R∞) based on the ever-present intuition of absolute realization (R∞).
Enfolding / Unfolding

To the extent that our situational awareness-in-action can be understood as the authentication, legitimation, and confirmation by which we (re/de)construct actionable knowledge of freedom, justice, and truth to guide knowledgeable action that is progressively more free, just, and true, it may also be understood as our contribution to the ever-widening, never-ending meta-discourse of human development and evolution. If so, then human development and evolution can be explained, interpreted, and evaluated in terms of the meta-practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the metatheory of triadic quadratic perspectivism in each and every real-world action situation. Furthermore, once we recognize in this situational awareness-in-action the actual discourses of human development and evolution, we can also use this meta-paradigm to explain, interpret, and evaluate the abstract discourses about human development and evolution.

This suggests that situational awareness-in-action, in all its empirical indeterminacy \((A^N = TCA^N \times TQP^N = ALC^N = R^N)\), may be understood as the actual discourses of human development and evolution in which surprisingly novel claims to reality are subjected to the rigors of integral/differential realization in familiar real-world contexts, the subsequent authentication, legitimation, and confirmation of which constitute the abstracted discourses about human development and evolution, both past actual and future potential. If so, then the pacemaker in human evolution might be defined in terms of the quality of the ALC\(^N\) discourse arising in each and every real action situation, wherein the surprisingly novel actions of some unique enactive Is may in due time, through the tri-tetra-meshing of a deepening, widening discourse, contribute to the source code of an as-yet-uncertain (r)evolutionary advance beyond the institutionalized standards of actionable knowledge. Furthermore, the deepening capacities for awareness-in-action that emerge through the progressive realizations of these unique enactive Is—the capacity, that is, for increasingly differentiated integration and increasingly integrated differentiation toward an implicated aperspectival/apractical ultimatum—would indeterminately deconstruct and reconstruct all the actionable knowledge previously realized by these Is, including the multifarious stories about their own development and evolution—both past actual(s) and future potential(s).

That being said, it is worth emphasizing that Awareness-in-Action merely clarifies those essential TQP\(^N\) perspectives into which we must inquire if we are to generate, via TCA\(^N\) practices, valid insight into our own or anyone else’s deep structures of actionable knowledge, as these structures are, in the most general sense, relatively stable conditions of possible awareness-in-action. It does not, however, presuppose any particular levels, any particular multi-level theories, or any particular multi-structural patterns of human development and evolution—or, for that matter, even the existence of human development and evolution—beyond what can be discerned as our latent potential for integral/differential awareness-in-action. Whatever this phenomenon we call human development and evolution really is and regardless of how we describe its multi-structural patterns—from multi-leveled hierarchy to multi-cultural heterarchy to multi-layered holonarchy or from multi-dimensional matrix to multi-phasic spiral to rhizomatic multiplicities—it appears to be integrally/differentially realized through the potentially infinite, yet always indeterminate awareness-in-action of the multifarious Is participating in this phenomenon.

Therefore, if multi-structural patterns of human development and evolution actually exist—regardless of what those patterns are or how universal/particular they may be—then we must have created, can only discover, and should certainly be verifying/falsifying any such hypothesized multi-structural patterns through the normative practices of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the triadic quadratic perspectivism of situational awareness-in-action \((A^* = TCA^* \times TQP^* = ALC^* = R^*)\). After all, the ideal action situation appears to be the deepest of the apparent deep structures, the most universal of the apparent universal structures, of actionable knowledge guiding knowledgeable action in real action situations—that ultimate meta-structure through which all (multi-)structures are indeterminately (re/de)constructed in the natural course of our ever-present, never-ending awareness-in-action.
This radically post-metaphysical formulation suggests the need for a necessary humility with respect to the discourse about human development and evolution, one that recognizes the unavoidable relativity and inherent fallibility of each of our unique perspectives and practices within that discourse, as well as the developmental-evolutionary implications of that discourse itself, as can only ever be revealed through the discourses of authentication, legitimation, and confirmation. For regardless of whether our situational awareness-in-action is self-consciously about individual development—mine, yours, or his/hers—and collective evolution—ours, yours, or theirs—the (a)perspectival and (a)practical (pre)suppositions we bring to that awareness-in-action appear to inscribe the many ways we actually realize that development and evolution. Hence, the quality of our engagement in these discourses would seem to determine the quality of our contributions to the actual discourses of human development and evolution—not only what we contribute, but how we contribute—while subtly transforming any participation we might have in the various formal and informal discourses that purport to be about the leading edge of human development and evolution. In due time, these abstracted discourses about the past actual(s) and future potential(s) of human development and evolution should gradually (re/de)construct to reflect whatever (re/de)construction is presently unfolding in the leading-edge discourses of human development and evolution, which may or may not involve many of the same people.

Awareness-in-Action may therefore be understood as an (a)perspectival/(a)practical meta-discourse of, and about, human development and evolution, enfolding within its visual-logical meta-structure all (multi-) structural patterns of human development and evolution that might actually unfold in the course of our ever-present, never-ending awareness-in-action, at least to whatever extent these (multi-)structural patterns might be authenticated, legitimated, and confirmed by the multifarious Is enfolding/unfolding that awareness-in-action.

Bias & Crisis
There is certainly nothing easy about the requisite practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the triadic quadratic perspectivism in challenging action situations, notwithstanding the possibility that we intuitively commit to these unrealistic ideals in every real action situation. With each and every one of us being implicated in an ever-present, never-ending meta-discourse in which questions of truth, justice, and freedom are always at issue, is it really any wonder that we are almost always in conflict concerning what really is true, just, and free for each and every one of us? Perhaps it is because we have good reason to anticipate this inevitable conflict over the inherent différance of our various actions that we seem so predisposed to rationalize and compromise rather than justify and modify our views, defending and controlling rather than disclosing and inquiring. Where intuition and reason meet at the myriad sites of everyday awareness-in-action, we anticipate more than just the ideals to be realized in this very moment ($A^\infty = TCA^\infty \times TQP^\infty = ALC^\infty = R^\infty$). We also anticipate the yawning chasm between the ideal and the real ($A^N = TCA^N \times TQP^N = ALC^N = R^N$) as an inescapable interval of indeterminate depth, scale, and outcome.

Anticipating this interval, we tend to enact some of the différantial conflict we would prefer to avoid in the form of persistent biases rooted in the perspectival nature of Awareness-in-Action:

- **Authentication bias** is an absence of requisite degrees of transparency, choice, and accountability afflicting the intrapersonal mode of integral/différantial realization, sustaining my tendency to regard my personified symptoms of freedom ($1_\lambda$), your tendency to regard your personified symptoms of freedom ($2.1_\lambda$), and his or her tendency to regard his or her personified symptoms of freedom ($3.1_\lambda$) as inherently more valid than either of the others’ and thereby impairing our ability to create actionable knowledge of freedom. Due to authentication bias, each of us tends to overestimate the validity of our own
intrapersonal realization—our capacity for intrapersonal reason, action, learning—while underestimating the validity of the others’, thereby impairing the honesty and authenticity of our awareness-in-action.

- **Legitimation bias** is an absence of requisite degrees of transparency, choice, and accountability afflicting the interpersonal mode of integral/differential realization, sustaining my tendency to regard my participative signals of justice (2AQ), your tendency to regard your participative signals of justice (2.2AQ), and his or her tendency to regard his or her participative signals of justice (3.2AQ) as inherently more valid than either of the others’ and thereby impairing our ability to create actionable knowledge of justice. Due to legitimation bias, each of us tends to overestimate the validity of our own interpersonal realization—our capacity for interpersonal reason, action, learning—while underestimating the validity of the others’, thereby impairing the morality and legitimacy of our awareness-in-action.

- **Confirmation bias** is an absence of requisite degrees of transparency, choice, and accountability afflicting the impersonal mode of integral/differential realization, sustaining my tendency to regard my representative symbols of truth (3AQ), your tendency to regard your representative symbols of truth (2.3AQ), and his or her tendency to regard his or her representative symbols of truth (3.3AQ) as inherently more valid than either of the others’ and thereby impairing our ability to create actionable knowledge of truth. Due to confirmation bias, each of us tends to overestimate the validity of our own impersonal realization—our capacity for impersonal reason, action, learning—while underestimating the validity of the others’, thereby impairing the accuracy and cogency of our awareness-in-action.

ALC\textsuperscript{N} biases appear in a variety of forms—from self-deceptions to logical fallacies to cognitive biases, and from psychological projections to personality clashes to developmental insufficiencies—but can only persist in the absence of requisite degrees of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the triadic quadratic perspectivism of real-world action situations. In the absence of requisite TCA\textsuperscript{N} × TQP\textsuperscript{N} = ALC\textsuperscript{N}, we tend to unilaterally control communication about controversial issues, emphasizing verifying rather than falsifying evidence for our own views and rationalizing arguments in order to defend our respective versions of reality against valid critique from those with whom we cannot help but seek validation. While impairing our efforts to mutually (in)validate novel claims to freedom, justice, and truth in one action situation after the next, these ALC\textsuperscript{N} biases secretly and systematically undermine the validity of our actionable knowledge of freedom, justice, and truth, which feeds forward into progressively less justifiable reality claims even more prone to inspiring the ALC\textsuperscript{N} biases on which each of our unilateral realizations increasingly depend.

When presented with choices about what information to consume and with whom to communicate, we tend to make selections that exacerbate our ALC\textsuperscript{N} biases and contribute to the ideological balkanization of politics, economics, religion, and the media, wherein who we are is all-too-easily reduced to what we believe regardless of why we believe it or how we might change that belief. We tend to filter the infinite cornucopia of information available to us in this hyper-mediated, postmodern world in order to satisfy our own ideological pre-conceptions, facilitated by our freedom to choose only those news channels, news feeds, and discussion groups we prefer and complicated by the deliberate and hidden biases used by editors and search engines to pre-filter and pre-package what they publish and present as if it is unbiased knowledge. Mesmerized by the entertaining appearance of one-click access to everyone and everything worth knowing, we risk becoming a fragmented society of self-referencing, self-justifying, self-deceiving sub-cultures whose parochial presumptions about what really is free, just, and true seem to require ever less discourse in order to validate the
ever increasing production and consumption of conveniently consistent information. This ideological balkanization thus presents the deceptive appearance of mutual validation in the form of collective $\text{ALC}^N$ biases sustaining our tendencies to regard our versions of freedom, justice, and truth ($123_{AQ}$), your tendencies to regard your versions of freedom, justice, and truth ($2.123_{AQ}$), and their tendencies to regard their versions of freedom, justice, and truth ($3.123_{AQ}$) as inherently more valid than either of the others’ and thereby impairing all of our abilities to create actionable knowledge of freedom, justice, and truth ($123.123_{AQ}$).

Awareness-in-Action may therefore be understood as the authentication, legitimation, and confirmation biases by which we—I, each of you, and each of them—tend to regard our own personal realizations as inherently more valid than the others’ and thereby impair our ability to create actionable knowledge of freedom, justice, and truth.

Nevertheless, even these $\text{ALC}^N$ biases would be readily manageable were it not for the intervening power of institutions—whether political, economic, or social in nature—the norms of which all-too-often covertly, if not overtly, preclude the context-transcendent norms of authentication, legitimation, and confirmation ($\text{ALC}^\infty$) we nevertheless presuppose with every context-immanent action-in-awareness. This institutionalized preclusion of $\text{ALC}^\infty$ is most commonly revealed in the relatively stable patterns of institutionalized awareness-in-action in which the reasonable justification of situationally relevant claims to truth, justice, and freedom is subverted, via the institutionalized power to deceive, coerce, and defend, into the unreasonable rationalization of corresponding claims to success as defined by the institution. In these powerfully subverted patterns of institutionalized awareness-in-action, then, success takes on the deceptive, coercive, defensive appearance of substantive truth, justice, and freedom without recourse to procedures of transparency, choice, and accountability that would otherwise challenge the accuracy, morality, and honesty of that success. When political, economic, and social institutions—from governments to corporations to universities—subordinate the conscientious pursuit of truth, justice, and freedom, independent of success, to that of success, independent of truth, justice, and freedom, they institutionalize within these very patterns of awareness-in-action the latent potential for political, economic, and social crisis.

The subversion of justifiable knowledge into rationalizable success that can only be sustained by a corrupted form of institutionalized power depends for its success on the tacit acceptance of a critical mass of institutionalized actors willing to defer indefinitely the very discourse they nevertheless presuppose as a cognitive, moral, and volitional potential with every single action. This tacit acceptance of success over knowledge, which is typically engineered by those in power through deceptive propaganda, coercive incentives, and defensive routines, appears to render unnecessary the sort of critical integral discourse that would otherwise tend to emerge spontaneously in challenging action situations in which controversial claims to reality confront common presumptions about reality. After all, how much discourse is really necessary to determine the extent to which people have succeeded in fulfilling uniform standards of success while conforming to norms against discourse? Likewise, how much discourse is likely to emerge in an institutional context that defines ideal action as nothing other than that which successfully avoids discourse? Being normatively unnecessary, such discourse is more readily deflected, refused, and even punished by those powerful actors who find themselves challenged on occasion to live up to the context-transcendent norms of honesty, morality, and accuracy they inadvertently imply even in their efforts to stifle any such discourse. Hence, where knowledge and power meet at the myriad sites of everyday awareness-in-action, we anticipate more than just the inescapable interval between the ideal and the real. We also anticipate the epic struggle to discern the subtle forces of deception, coercion, and defensiveness within, between, and beyond established institutions that threaten indeterminately our every attempt to realize some justifiable measure of the ideal in this real life.

As the one field of Awareness-in-Action fractures along the hidden fault lines of $\text{TQP}^N$, our nascent capacities for integral/différantial realization begin to (re)emerge in the seemingly inevitable three-fold crisis of our own making:
• **Authentication crisis** is the dawning awareness of the extent to which our actionable knowledge of valid freedom has been systematically undermined by increasingly conspicuous disregard for requisite degrees of transparency, choice, and accountability in the intrapersonal mode of realization, such that we no longer trust the established procedures for validating our personified symptoms of freedom (123.1). In an authentication crisis, the honesty and authenticity of our awareness-in-action—our sense of freedom—is in serious doubt due to a perceived widespread breakdown in intrapersonal reason, action, and learning.

• **Legitimation crisis** is the dawning awareness of the extent to which our actionable knowledge of valid justice has been systematically undermined by increasingly conspicuous disregard for requisite degrees of transparency, choice, and accountability in the interpersonal mode of realization, such that we no longer trust the established procedures for validating our participative signals of justice (123.2). In a legitimation crisis, the morality and legitimacy of our awareness-in-action—our sense of justice—is in serious doubt due to a perceived widespread breakdown in interpersonal reason, action, and learning.

• **Confirmation crisis** is the dawning awareness of the extent to which our actionable knowledge of valid truth has been systematically undermined by increasingly conspicuous disregard for requisite degrees of transparency, choice, and accountability in the impersonal mode of realization, such that we no longer trust the established procedures for validating our representative symbols of truth (123.3). In a confirmation crisis, the accuracy and cogency of our awareness-in-action—our sense of truth—is in serious doubt due to a perceived widespread breakdown in impersonal reason, action, and learning.

These definitions of ALC\(^N\) crisis offer explanatory, interpretive, and evaluative insights—at an admittedly high level of abstraction—into the subtle features of systematic deception, distortion, coercion, corruption, dysfunction, and disruption that can manifest at all degrees of depth and scale in all the fields of awareness-in-action, from politics and government to economy and business to society and community. Consider, for example, some of the more critical and controversial issues of our time—from the politics of perpetual war to the economics of perpetual debt to the sociology of perpetual propaganda—each of which might be characterized in more general terms as an ALC\(^N\) crisis-in-progress wherein the very procedures by which we attempt to understand these substantive threats to truth, justice, and freedom are, at best, suspect and, at worst, corrupted by those who benefit most in terms of power and wealth from whatever lack of freedom, justice, and truth the rest of us are forced, or allowed, to endure. Among other things, this implies that the underlying cause of the interdependent crises afflicting humanity—whether specifically construed as political, economic, social, or ecological in nature—can be more generally construed as the systematic disregard for requisite degrees of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the triadic quadratic perspectivism in challenging action situations.

Generally speaking, the greater the need for transparency, choice, and accountability in newly arising action situations—which increases as institutionalized structures of actionable freedom, justice, and truth prove insufficient to contend with ever-more-challenging situations—the greater will be the ALC\(^N\) crisis-potential embedded in these action situations. Furthermore, the more systematic the disregard for requisite procedures of transparency, choice, and accountability in these ever-more-challenging action situations—which is a function of how deliberately designed, powerfully enforced, and tacitly accepted that disregard really is—the more confusing and painful will be the personified symptoms, participative signals, and representative symbols of the inevitable, yet indeterminate ALC\(^N\) crisis. Finally, the more confusing and painful the signs
of ALC\textsuperscript{N} crisis, the greater will be the opportunity for integral/différantial discourse about, not only the signs of crisis, but the deep-structural conditions of possible authentication, legitimation, and confirmation that are presently arrested throughout society. The quality of this integral/différantial discourse about the substantive/procedural conditions of possible discourse within, between, and beyond established institutions, whether normatively permitted or, more likely, obstructed by those institutions, is therefore critical to the genuinely progressive, yet always indeterminate evolution of society. Lacking sufficient quality, progressive evolution in the deep structures of actionable freedom, justice, and truth throughout society is deferred and distorted into perpetual change in the superficial content of these established structures—the promises and policies, products and services, programs and opinions that circulate with ever-greater success through ever-more-powerful multi-institutional networks—providing those of us in the uncritical masses with the comforting illusion of perpetual progress to mask the systematic regress in our cognitive, moral, and volitional capacities.

With the pressure that only crisis seems to provide, we bring more awareness to our predicament, drawing intuitively on our self-evident capacity to bear witness to our crumbling certainties, which is the necessary pre-condition for the différance-disclosing, conflict-ridden discourses needed in response to these crises. That response, however, requires awareness-in-action: the damned if I do, damned if I don’t choice that each and every one of us makes when we dare to utter something genuinely novel in an all-too-familiar situation in which the vast majority of people appear to be suffering under the pretense of a knowledge sufficiently integral as to require no critical discourse, while nevertheless rewarding quiet allegiance. As if appealing to a deeper community that does not yet exist, I source from within my own intuition the controversial claims to a more authentic approach to freedom, a more legitimate approach to justice, and a more cogent approach to truth, expecting these procedural claims to be swiftly rejected by everyone I know, while trusting that these may in due time, through the tri-tetra-meshing of a deepening, widening discourse, contribute to an as-yet-uncertain (r)evolutionary advance beyond the institutionalized structures of actionable knowledge that fomented the current ALC\textsuperscript{N} crisis. Unbeknownst to me, you too are making surprisingly similar claims against familiar indifference, as is she and he, such that it is only a matter of time before we can engage in the requisite degrees of (in)authentication, (de)legitimation, and (dis)confirmation needed to resolve the ALC\textsuperscript{N} crisis, at least between us, if not yet between us and them. As we bring more awareness to this deepening, widening, (r)evolutionary discourse, we (re)establish more coherent, justifiable procedures of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the triadic quadratic perspectivism in these ever-more-challenging action situations, thereby (re/de)constructing our actionable knowledge of freedom, justice, and truth in order to guide knowledgeable action that is progressively more free, just, and true.

Awareness-in-Action may therefore be understood as the authentication, legitimation, and confirmation crises in which we—I, each of you, and each of them—realize the extent to which our actionable knowledge of freedom, justice, and truth has been systematically undermined by increasingly conspicuous disregard for requisite degrees of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the triadic quadratic perspectivism of our knowledgeable actions.

It bears repeating that there is certainly nothing easy about Awareness-in-Action. Regardless of how conscientious we are, our real efforts to fulfill the ideals of TCA\textsuperscript{∞} × TQP\textsuperscript{∞} = ALC\textsuperscript{∞} will always fall short, even when they nevertheless produce what we regard as acceptable conclusions in each specific situation. Due to the inherent fallibility of human action, we cannot escape the awareness that, regardless of how satisfied we are with the validity of our actions, including the validity of other people’s actions on our behalf, this validity remains provisional and open to reasonable challenge from any one of us and any one of them, at any time and any place. Once again, each action presupposes every action with any number of derivative actions in our radically open-ended, yet reliably closed-minded real action situations. Nevertheless, the ultimate futility of any search for perfect freedom, justice, and truth does little to dissuade us from the utter necessity of our search for provisional freedom, justice, and truth, rooted as it is in the propositional nature of action-in-
awareness—the putting forward of differential claims to reality with each and every worldly action, as if expressions of unrelenting faith in the integral awareness that must, ultimately, redeem these claims in integral/differential realization.

II. Critical Integralism

In Part II of this article, I elaborate on some of the philosophical implications of Awareness-in-Action, including its post-metaphysical proceduralism, praxiological integralism, and (r)evolutionary criticalism.

Post-metaphysical Proceduralism

Awareness-in-Action not only describes how people really do reason, act, and learn in all these forms and fields, but also prescribes how people really should reason, act, and learn if they are interested in creating actionable knowledge of freedom, justice, and truth that supports knowledgeable action that is more free, just, and true. In bridging the empirical realization and normative idealization of human awareness-in-action, this formulation also signals a decisive shift from the metaphysics of unconditional declaratives, or substantive statements of what we know to be real, independent of how we know it, to the post-metaphysics of conditional imperatives, or procedural statements of how we should act if we want to know what is real. Thus, in the form of a conditional imperative, if we want more freedom, justice, and truth in our lives and in the lives of those around us, then we should engage in the meta-practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the metatheory of triadic quadratic perspectivism in challenging action situations.

This formulation is therefore consistent with Habermas’s (1992a, 34-9) emphasis on procedural rather than substantive conceptions of reason, wherein the standards of what is or is not reasonable are grounded in the conduct of discourse rather than the content of that discourse—in how we validate knowledge rather than what we currently regard as valid knowledge. So instead of attributing degrees of reasonableness to specific claims to reality, such as my truth claim versus your truth claim, any such attributions should be directed at the specific practices of realizing by which you and I attempt to justify our respective claims and determine what really is true. Furthermore, as already demonstrated (O’Connor, 2013, 7-143), this formulation incorporates wholesale the other major themes in Habermas’s (1992) post-metaphysical philosophy, including the shift from foundationalist to fallibilist premises in validation and the expansion of exclusively impersonal-representative conceptions of realization to include interpersonal-participative and intrapersonal-personified conceptions based on the pragmatic perspectives and historic contexts of communicative reason.

Although he does not specifically position his work as such, Argyris’s action science is an impressive exemplar of post-metaphysical proceduralism at work in real-world communities of practice. As previously presented (O’Connor, 2013, 119-43), the action science method (Argyris et. al., 1985, 98-102) is centered on a form of critical-reflective discourse consistent with the procedural norms of valid information, free and informed choice, internal commitment to the choice, and vigilant monitoring of its implementation in order to detect and correct error. Consistent with these intentional values, specific behavioral strategies include “sharing control with those who have competence and who participate in designing or implementing the action,” replacing “unilateral advocacy… or inquiry that conceals the agent’s own views” with a forthright combination of advocacy and inquiry, illustrating “attributions and evaluations with relatively directly observable data,” and encouraging “the surfacing of conflicting views… in order to facilitate public testing” of these views.

The primary purpose of such discourse is, according to Argyris and his colleagues (1985, 5), to help each community of practice create actionable knowledge of its own patterns of reason, action, and learning consistent with the most rigorous standards of critical social science, including: “(1) empirically disconfirm-
able propositions that are organized into a theory; (2) knowledge that human beings can implement in an action context; and (3) alternatives to the status quo that both illuminate what exists and inform fundamental change, in light of values freely chosen by social actors.” Argyris (1985, 79) justifies this bridging of the empirical and the normative by ensuring that both the substantive content and procedural conduct of discourse are open to potential critique by all participants as an essential feature of that discourse.

Yet another form of post-metaphysical proceduralism features prominently in Wilber’s (1999b, 128; 1999c, 192; 2000e, 379-80; 2000d, 495-7; 2000e, 217-22) procedural model of valid knowledge, which calls for the grounding of any substantive theory with a practical injunction to take a specific action, followed by an experiential apprehension of the empirical evidence resulting from that action, and culminating in a communal (dis)confirmation of whatever theoretical knowledge was claimed. Wilber’s proceduralism is modeled, not on the norms of discourse as with Habermas and Argyris, but on the scientific method, the systematic rigor of which he would like to see extended from the natural sciences in which it originated to the established social and emerging spiritual sciences essential to a more integral understanding of reality, without confusing or conflating any of these domains with the others.

Accordingly, Wilber’s (2000a, 705-7; 2000e, 215-22) notion of experiential apprehension establishes an extraordinarily broad scope for valid knowledge—all quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types—that he intends to be limited only by the requirement that any claim to valid knowledge be justified by recourse to a practical injunction through which others can apprehend in their own direct awareness the empirical evidence that purportedly justifies that claim. As he (Wilber, 2000e, 379-80) emphasizes, such a practical injunction will generally take the form of what I have described as a conditional imperative: If you want to know that, then do this. “This injunction, exemplar, or paradigm is, as Thomas Kuhn pointed out, an actual practice, not a mere concept.” Once properly engaged, “the injunction or exemplar brings forth a particular data domain—a particular experience, apprehension, or evidence…. This apprehension, data, or evidence is then tested in the circle of those who have completed the first two strands; bad data or bad evidence is rebuffed, and this potential falsifiability is the third component of most genuine validity claims; it is not restricted to… sensory claims alone: there is sensory experience, mental experience, and spiritual experience and any specific claim in each of those domains can potentially be falsified by further data in those domains.”

Wilber’s (2000e, 108-19) insistence that each and every form of valid knowledge is enacted by a practical injunction consistent with Thomas Kuhn’s widely misunderstood notion of a paradigm may be one of his most significant challenges to the contemporary discourses about everything from the new science to new age spirituality to conscious evolution, which tend to equate their purportedly new paradigms with theories worth adopting rather than practices worth engaging. For his part, Kuhn (1970, 182) gradually distanced himself from the misappropriated term paradigm, even going so far as to propose instead, in the second edition of The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, the theft-deterring term “disciplinary matrix: disciplinary because it refers to the common possession of the practitioners of a particular discipline; matrix because it is composed of ordered elements of various sorts each requiring further specification.” He (Kuhn, 1970, 182) further clarified that “all or most of the objects of group commitment that my original text makes paradigms, parts of paradigms, or paradigmatic are constituents of the disciplinary matrix and as such they form a whole and function together.”

As for the shared understandings comprising the disciplinary matrix that defines a scientific community, Kuhn (1970, 182-7) identifies: i) symbolic generalizations that are logical, formal, or readily formalizable; ii) models and heuristics that supply metaphors and analogies; iii) values concerning the evaluation of evidence and the relative merits of competing theories (e.g., accuracy, consistency, simplicity, plausibility); and iv) exemplars, or shared examples, of concrete problem-solutions that show scientists how their normal puzzle-solving work is to be done. With regard to this fourth element, exemplars, Kuhn (1970, 186-7) specifically noted that “for it, the term paradigm would be entirely appropriate, both philologically and autobiographi-
IParemly; this is the component of a group’s shared commitments which first led me to the choice of that word.”’ In Kuhn’s view, this disciplinary matrix, or paradigm in the broad sense, not only defines the membership of a specific scientific community in terms of who actually understands and implements the paradigm, but also explains the source of the socio-technical community structure by which most scientific knowledge progresses. As he discovered, scientific fields progress through an alternating rhythm of what we might call evolution, characterized by relatively stable periods of highly productive knowledge accumulation consistent with the established paradigm of the community, and revolution, characterized by relatively turbulent intervals during which the community, in whole or in part, adopts a new paradigm that better accounts for an expanded body of empirical evidence, thereby initiating a new period of scientific evolution.

Wilber’s (2000e, pp. 217-222) further emphasis on the necessity of communal (dis)confirmation that adheres to an empirically non-reductionist version of Karl Popper’s rather strict standard of falsifiability presents yet another challenge to those inclined toward metaphysical theorizing. Building on the premise of fallibilism advocated by Habermas, wherein theories are only ever recognized as provisionally valid and therefore subject to revision, falsifiability requires that theories be formulated in a way that facilitates systematic revision and potential refutation in light of a preponderance of falsifying evidence. In Popper’s (2002a, p. 48) view, “the criterion of the scientific status of a theory is its falsifiability, or refutability, or testability.” While advocating for the standard of falsifiability in all domains of knowledge identified in his AQAL Integral Theory, Wilber (2000e) condemns the reductionist forms of empiricism with which it is typically paired in communities of practice within, or overly influenced by, the physical sciences:

As it is now, the Popperian falsifiability principle has one widespread and altogether perverted use: it is implicitly restricted only to sensory data, which, in an incredibly hidden and sneaky fashion, automatically bars all mental and spiritual experience from the status of genuine knowledge. This unwarranted restriction of the falsifiability principle claims to separate genuine knowledge from the dogmatic, but all it actually accomplishes, in this shrunken form, is a silent but vicious reductionism. On the other hand, when we free the falsifiability principle from its restriction to sensory data, and set it free to police the domains of mental and spiritual data as well, it becomes an important aspect of the knowledge quest in all domains, sensory to mental to spiritual. And in each of those domains, it does indeed help us to separate the true from the false, the demonstrable from the dogmatic. (p. 221)

Be that as it may, it is equally important to preclude any reductionist forms of falsifiability itself that may creep into our disciplined pursuits of genuine knowledge within and across the various domains of a fully resurrected empiricism honoring whatever we can apprehend in our own direct awareness. Note, for example, that in the passage quoted on the previous page, Wilber (2000c, pp. 379-380) claims that “this apprehension, data, or evidence is then tested in the circle of those who have completed the first two strands; bad data or bad evidence is rebuffed, and this potential falsifiability is the third component of most genuine validity claims.” At first glance, this may appear to be a simple misstatement, because of course it is not empirical evidence that should be rejected if it fails to conform to the accepted theory, but rather the accepted theory that should be challenged by any preponderance of falsifying evidence. However, he (Wilber, 2000e, pp. 220-221) vigorously asserts the same claim in a subsequent book, twice, just prior to the passage quoted above, arguing that “the validity of these data is demonstrated by the fact that bad data can indeed be rebuffed, which is where Popper enters the picture,” and “whereas bad data in those domains are indeed falsifiable, but only by further data in those domains, not by data from lower domains!”

While it may be appropriate, on occasion, for scientists to marginalize some empirical evidence in fa-
vor of better evidence resulting from more effective and consistent applications of a practical injunction, this has nothing to do with the practice of falsification. The standard of falsifiability is not supposed to police the domains of sensory, mental, and spiritual data in service to accepted theories in those domains, because doing so will likely be in service to the confirmation biases of theorists who favor the accepted theories. As Popper (2002b, 124) himself warned, “if we are uncritical we shall always find what we want: we shall look for, and find, confirmations, and we shall look away from, and not see, whatever might be dangerous to our pet theories. In this way it is only too easy to obtain what appears to be overwhelming evidence in favor of a theory which, if approached critically, would have been refuted.” Wilber (2000e, 220) is not unaware of this, as he does note, amidst his contradictory misinterpretations of falsifiability, that “genuine knowledge must be open to disproof, or else it is simply dogma in disguise.” But it is theories—not empirical evidence—that must be open to disproof, because it is theories—not empirical evidence—that can become dogma in disguise. Thus, if one is to apply the strict standard of falsifiability in whatever domain of reality, it is the accepted theory that should be falsifiable in light of a preponderance of acceptable evidence, and certainly not the inverse.

This is important because any such misunderstanding of falsifiability within a community of practice purporting to be practicing falsification would exacerbate whatever tendencies that community might already have toward the social mode of instrumental rationality known as strategic action. In strategic action, as we have already seen, the predominant standard of validity is not falsifiable or even verifiable truth—let alone justice and freedom—but rather rationalizable success, indeed unilateral success, of one theory over another, one theorist over another, or one community over another, based on a systematically biased filtering of the empirical evidence. If Argyris’s (1985, 90-1) action science is any indication, the professional communities of practice in which knowledge is created and disseminated may already be governed by the discourse-stifling, debate-promoting norms of strategic action—define and achieve goals, maximize winning, minimize losing, minimize negative feelings, and be rational—which tend to preclude, through tacit habits of deception, coercion, and defensiveness, the sort of discourse in which established orthodoxy can be reasonably (dis)confirmed in light of a growing body of empirical evidence. When proceeding under the guise of a distorted notion of falsifiability that targets acceptable evidence in service to accepted theory, this instrumental preclusion of transparency, choice, and accountability institutionalizes the confirmation, legitimation, and authentication biases by which individuals and communities tend to regard their own established theories as inherently more valid than emerging alternatives and thereby impair their ability to create, through (re/de) constructive discourse, actionable knowledge of truth, justice, and freedom.

In my view, falsifiability implies, as another conditional imperative, that if we are serious about the progressive quest for increasingly valid theories enacted by exemplary forms of practice, then we should actively seek empirical evidence that can falsify, in addition to that which can verify, our theories and thereby challenge ourselves to develop better theories that take into account an increasingly comprehensive body of evidence. By this interpretation, falsifiability actually supports a proactive approach to theoretical innovation intended to balance a potentially biased standard of verifiability that, for all of its grounding in empirical evidence of apparent justifiability, ignores the prototypically postmodern recognition of the theory-laden nature of empirical evidence and, therefore, the empirical bias toward verifying the currently accepted theory. (Morrow & Brown, 1994, 70-2) Furthermore, a sophisticated application of falsifiability, similar to that advocated by Imre Lakatos (1974), would require that any proposed falsification of the accepted theory be justified, not simply by the empirical falsification of one or more of its constituent propositions or predictions, but by recourse to a more acceptable theory offering a more comprehensive explanation and interpretation of all the relevant empirical evidence. In this way, the standard of falsifiability can support, though certainly not guarantee, progressive theoretical reconstruction rather than potentially regressive theoretical deconstruction.

Interestingly enough, Kuhn’s (1970, 77) research reveals that “once it has achieved the status of a paradigm, a scientific theory is declared invalid only if an alternate candidate is available to take its place.
No process yet disclosed by the historical study of scientific development at all resembles the methodological stereotype of falsification by direct comparison with nature. That remark does not mean that scientists do not reject scientific theories, or that experience and experiment are not essential to the process in which they do so. But it does mean... that the act of judgment that leads scientists to reject a previously accepted theory is always based upon more than a comparison of that theory with the world. The decision to reject one paradigm is always simultaneously the decision to accept another, and the decision leading to that decision involves the comparison of both paradigms with nature and with each other. Hence, it would seem that the key to successful application of any standards of falsification and verification is to legitimate these standards in the Kuhnian paradigm of the scientific community—specifically the values and social practices that supply the standards and procedures for critically evaluating the merits and demerits of competing theories as well as the exemplary practices that tend to (re)create these theories.

From a metatheoretical perspective, the enduring challenge in such a disciplined proceduralism is to preclude any form of perspectival confusion whereby the empirical evidence apprehended in one perspective (e.g., objective quantitative evidence) is used—either mistakenly or unfairly—to invalidate a theory that is based on empirical evidence apprehended in another perspective (e.g., subjective qualitative evidence). Such perspectival confusion may be one source of the occasional paradigm clashes that arise between established and/or emergent communities of practice, whose paradigms are, as Kuhn observed, at least somewhat incommensurable because the exemplars of one community cannot disclose the evidence so readily disclosed by exemplars of another, and even to the extent that some evidence overlaps, each paradigm will tend to inform different theoretical interpretations of that shared evidence. This is certainly part of the inspiration for my inquiry into metatheory—as I am sure it was for Habermas and Wilber before me—and I believe that triadic quadratic perspectivism may constitute an integral theory necessary—though not necessarily sufficient—to preclude the paradigm clashes that undermine our quest for realization.

From a meta-practical perspective, the enduring challenge in such a disciplined proceduralism is to preclude any form of practical coercion whereby the provisional validity of one theory/practice (e.g., the orthodox paradigm) is presumed—either overtly or covertly—to invalidate alternative theories/practices (e.g., heterodox paradigms) simply because the orthodoxy wants to preclude a paradigm change within their field. Unfortunately Popper’s falsifiability, even in its most inclusionary (e.g., Wilber) and sophisticated (e.g., Lakatos) reinterpretations, can do little more than support the disciplined justification of impersonal truth within communities of practice that have, by other means, managed to transform their deceptive, coercive, and defensive habits of reason and communication. The communal (dis)confirmation of truth, even when secured from confirmation bias in principle or in practice, cannot in itself secure the (de)legitimation of interpersonal justice (i.e., respect, morality) and the (in)authentication of intrapersonal freedom (i.e., sincerity, honesty) that necessarily co-arise in parallel with every justification of impersonal truth, particularly during revolutionary intervals of paradigm change. This is certainly part of the inspiration for my inquiry into metapractice—as I’m sure it was for Habermas and Argyris before me—and I believe that transparency, choice, and accountability may constitute an integral practice necessary—though not necessarily sufficient—to preclude the deception, coercion, and defensiveness that undermines our quest for realization.

In his most recent book, Wilber (2007, 258) distills his procedural model of valid knowledge—injunction, apprehension, confirmation—down to a memorable post-metaphysical maxim: The meaning of a statement is the means of its enactment. In other words, substantive meaning is to be validated only through procedural means. While placing a primary emphasis on the practical injunction from his original model, Wilber’s maxim might be generously interpreted to imply the experiential apprehension of the meaning so enacted as well as the communal confirmation without which the verbal equation established by the word is between the meaning of a statement and the means of its enactment would be severed. Hence, to the extent that all three procedural elements may be justifiably interpreted within this one maxim, it appears to be a use-
ful alternative. However, it is not without some precedent.

A central premise in Habermas’s (1984, 297-298) pragmatic theory of meaning and validity is his contention that “we understand a speech act when we know what makes it acceptable.” In other words, “a hearer understands the meaning of an utterance when… he knows those essential conditions under which he could be motivated by a speaker to take an affirmative position.” Restating Habermas’s premise in Wilberian form suggests that the meaning of a statement is knowledge of the conditions that would make it valid. As we (O’Connor, 2013, 139-149) have already seen, the essential conditions under which one person will affirm the validity of another’s statement are, for Habermas, the situation-specific satisfaction of the context-transcendent norms of discourse, which he has articulated in terms of the ideal speech situation. Thus, more concisely, the meaning of a statement is the discourse of its validation.

Given the apparent contrast between Wilber’s means of enactment and Habermas’s discourse of validation, we might want to remind ourselves of the practical injunctions of Habermasian discourse, which I (O’Connor, 2013, 115-139) have already explored in terms of the Argyrisian exemplar of critical-reflective discourse, the intentional values and behavioral strategies of which were recapitulated near the beginning of this section. Better yet, we could look for sufficiently dialogical versions of practical injunction, experiential apprehension, and communal confirmation consistent with a procedural approach to the discourse-centered validation of substantive theory. Hence, consider again the paradigmatic features of critical-reflective action science as articulated by Argyris (1985, 5) and his colleagues. The standard of “empirically disconfirmable propositions that are organized into a theory” is clearly recognizable as the falsifiable substance of any scientific approach to impersonal truth, although it stops short of differentiating a more inclusive empirical falsifiability/verifiability applicable to the discourses of interpersonal justice and intrapersonal freedom, which are always at least implicated in any discourse of truth. Furthermore, the standard of “knowledge that human beings can implement in an action context” is just as clearly recognizable as the injunctive procedure that should accompany any substantive theory, and especially those in the social and spiritual sciences in which the objects of theory include human subjects themselves. Finally, the standard of “alternatives to the status quo that both illuminate what exists and inform fundamental change, in light of values freely chosen by social actors” may be interpreted as the actors’ apprehended experience of what is in relation to what might be, with this creative tension between the empirical real and the normative ideal being the special province of distinctively critical-reflective paradigms, which, as Wilber (1999b, 112-118) himself once recognized, have applicability across the spectrum of natural, social, and spiritual sciences. Thus, in light of my (O’Connor, 2013) proposed integral reconstruction of both Argyrisian and Habermasian theories of critical-reflective discourse—including essential insights from Wilber, Kuhn, and Popper, as well as Bühler (2011), Mead (1967), and Derrida (2002)—the genuinely post-metaphysical genealogy of Awareness-in-Action should now be reasonably clear.

More significantly, this exploration suggests that the themes of post-metaphysical philosophy are more-or-less consciously recognized in every action situation in which even explicit claims to freedom, justice, and truth convey meaning only to the extent that they are actively justified—hence verified or falsified—in direct experiential awareness, while the potential for such active justification is always presupposed in every action situation. Indeed, the presupposed ideality of awareness-in-action, denoted \( A^\circ = TCA^\circ \times TQP^\circ = ALC^\circ = R^\circ \), appears to be implicitly post-metaphysical, even when the actual reality of awareness-in-action, denoted \( A^N = TCA^N \times TQP^N = ALC^N = R^N \), appears to be explicitly metaphysical. Thus, even when human action in real-world situations displays, as it so very often does, a preponderance of assertions without injunctions, assumptions before apprehensions, and satisfaction in lieu of realization, all such human actors presuppose the counter-factual potential for post-metaphysical actions that do justice to the inherently fallible, yet irreducibly necessary practices of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the triadic quadratic perspectivism in that situation. The mindful practice of Awareness-in-Action, then, is intended to establish
these post-metaphysical ideals (TCA<sup>∞</sup> × TQP<sup>∞</sup>) in the context of all relatively (post-)metaphysical real action situations (TCA<sup>N</sup> × TQP<sup>N</sup>), by justifying controversial assertions with actionable injunctions, illuminating familiar assumptions with novel apprehensions, and finding satisfaction in the progressive (in)authentication, (de)legitimation, and (dis)confirmation of both substantive theories and procedural practices.

Awareness-in-Action is therefore formulated with the intent to differentiate and integrate substantive and procedural conceptions of realization, wherein the standards of what is or is not real are grounded in the perspectival content of reality as well as the practical conduct of realizing, in what we regard as real as well as how we realize what is real. Hence, the substantive metatheory of reality—meaning intrapersonal freedom (123.1<sub>AO</sub> = F<sup>N</sup>), interpersonal justice (123.2<sub>AO</sub> = J<sup>N</sup>), and impersonal truth (123.3<sub>AO</sub> = T<sup>N</sup>)—mutually implicates the corresponding procedural meta-practice of realizing—meaning transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to freedom (TCA<sup>N</sup> × F<sup>N</sup> = AF<sup>N</sup>), justice (TCA<sup>N</sup> × J<sup>N</sup> = LJ<sup>N</sup>), and truth (TCA<sup>N</sup> × T<sup>N</sup> = CT<sup>N</sup>). Likewise, bracketing the (phenomeno)logical extremes of relative realization (R<sup>N</sup>), substantive theories of absolute reality (R<sup>0</sup>) and ultimate reality (R<sup>∞</sup>) mutually implicate corresponding procedural practices of absolute realizing (R<sup>0</sup>) and ultimate realizing (R<sup>∞</sup>). Finally, as conveyed in the deliberately redundant notation for indeterminate realization (R<sup>∞</sup>), a term with both substantive and procedural connotations, the triadic quadratic perspectivism (TQP<sup>∞</sup>) of substantive reality (R<sup>0</sup>) mutually implicates the transparency, choice, and accountability (TCA<sup>N</sup>) of procedural realizing (R<sup>N</sup>). With this in mind, I offer a new post-metaphysical maxim: The (integral/différantial) reality of a declarative is the imperative to (integally/différantially) realize it.

Awareness-in-Action may therefore be understood as a substantive/procedural meta-paradigm centered on the procedural meta-practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the substantive meta-theory of triadic quadratic perspectivism, which can be integrally/différantially realized in each and every action situation, thus facilitating the empirically and normatively justifiable (in)authentication, (de)legitimation, and (dis)confirmation of each and every action claiming knowledge of reality.

**Integral Différantialism / Différantial Integralism**

If indeed Awareness-in-Action is applicable to each and every form and field of human awareness-in-action, then this meta-paradigm provides the means by which we can proactively create actionable knowledge within, across, and beyond established disciplinary and institutional boundaries in service of greater freedom, justice, and truth. More specifically, this relatively content-free, yet context-rich meta-paradigm clarifies what appear to be some of the essential premises for an action-oriented integral philosophy concerned with helping people realize their full potential in the full variety of real-world situations.

Awareness-in-Action embraces the general idea—though not the specific formulation—of Wilber’s (2003; 2007) post-metaphysical integral methodological pluralism, which aims at a meta-paradigmatic integration of paradigmatic pluralism consistent with his formulation of Integral Theory. With regard to the meta-paradigmatic aspect of Integral Methodological Pluralism, Wilber (2003b; 2003d) proposes three integrative principles—nonexclusion, enfolding, and enactment—in order to create the conceptual space necessary to incorporate a great variety of paradigmatic practices already in use by disciplined scholar-practitioners seeking valid knowledge in their respective fields:

Nonexclusion means that “Everybody is right”—or more technically, that the experiences brought forth by one paradigm cannot legitimately be used to criticize, negate, or exclude the experiences brought forth by other paradigms. The reason that «everybody is right» is called enactment, which means that no experience is innocent and pregiven, but rather is brought forth or enacted in part by the activity of the sub-
ject doing the experiencing. Thus, one activity (or paradigm) will bring forth a particular set of experiences—experiences that are not themselves innocent reflections of the one, true, real, and pregiven world, but rather are co-created and co-enacted by the paradigm or activity itself, and, accordingly, one paradigm does not give “the correct view” of the world and therefore it cannot be used (as if it did) in order to negate, criticize, or exclude other experiences brought forth by other paradigms. However, if one practice or paradigm includes the essentials of another and then adds further practices—such that it “enfolds” or includes the other—then that paradigm can legitimately be claimed to be more integral, which is the *enfoldment* principle. Together, these guiding principles give us an Integral Methodological Pluralism that is the warrant for AQAL metatheory. (Wilber, 2003b)

Wilber (2003b, part ii) contends that, “these three regulative principles—nonexclusion, enfoldment, enactment—are principles that were reverse engineered, if you will, from the fact that numerous different and seemingly ‘conflicting’ paradigms are already being competently practiced all over the world; and thus the question is not, and never has been, which is right and which is wrong, but how can all of them already be arising in a Kosmos? These three principles are some of the items that need to be already operating in the universe in order for so many paradigms to already be arising, and the only really interesting question is how can all of those extraordinary practices already be arising in any universe?”

With regard to the *paradigmatic* aspect of integral methodological pluralism, Wilber (2003, d; 2007, 37) proposes a set of eight complementary methods, or families of paradigms, framed by the four quadrants of his Integral Theory: *phenomenology* and *structuralism* as the inside and outside of his intentional UL, *hermeneutics* and *ethnomethodology* as the inside and outside of his cultural LL, *autopoiesis* and *empiricism* as the inside and outside of his behavioral UR, and *social autopoiesis* and *systems theory* as the inside and outside of his social LR. As he (Wilber, 2007, 33) describes it, integral methodological pluralism “involves, among other things, at least 8 fundamental and apparently irreducible methodologies, injunctions, or paradigms for gaining reproducible knowledge (or verifiably repeatable experiences). The fundamental claim of Integral Theory is that any approach that leaves out any of these 8 paradigms is a less-than-adequate approach according to available and reliable human knowledge at this time.” He (Wilber 2007) says that the easiest way to understand this dyadic quadratic model:

…is to start with what are known as the quadrants, which suggest that any occasion possesses an inside and an outside, as well as an individual and a collective, dimension. Taken together, this gives us the inside and the outside of the individual and the collective. These are often represented as I, you/we, it, and its (a variation on 1st, 2nd, and 3rd-person pronouns; another variation is the Good, the True, and the Beautiful; or art, morals, and science, and so on—namely, the objective truth of exterior science, or it/its; the subjective truth of aesthetics, or I; and the collective truth of ethics, or thou/we)…. If you imagine any of the phenomena (or holons) in the various quadrants, you can look at them from their own inside or outside. This gives you 8 primordial perspectives—the inside and the outside view of a holon in any of the 4 quadrants. (pp. 33-34)

Thus, as the above passage clearly states, this revised version of AQAL asserts the existence of perspectives for the *inside* and the *outside* of the *inside* and the *outside* of the *individual* and the *collective*, and, by virtue of the tri/quad conflation just invoked, it simultaneously asserts the existence of perspectives for
the inside and the outside of the first-, second-, and third-person, which are, respectively, the inside of the individual, the inside of the collective, and the outsides of the individual and the collective.

While accepting the validity of Wilber’s formulation of integral methodological pluralism, Sean Esbjörn-Hargens (2010, 146) offers a refinement that explicates the epistemological and ontological pluralism implied by Wilber’s methodological pluralism. His more encompassing notion of Integral Pluralism clarifies the mutually implicated epistemological pluralism of who enacts, the methodological pluralism of how they enact, and the ontological pluralism of what is enacted—in short, who × how × what. Using climate change as an example, Esbjörn-Hargens (2010, 144) contends that, “we do not have a simple case of many perspectives looking differently at a single object (e.g., a circle of people looking at a red ball in the middle) but rather have multiple perspectives using a variety of techniques, practices, and injunctions to enact multiple objects that overlap with and diverge from each other in numerous ways to generate an object that goes under the signifier of [climate change].” His (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2010, 157-158) key point is that, in addition to the multiple methods of any methodological pluralism, we must also recognize the multiple subjects and the multiple objects that, as he puts it, en-ter-act to create all the multiple realities, which are, in his view, already articulated in AQAL.

Unfortunately, Wilber’s tri/quad conflated, dyadic quadratic formulation of primordial perspectives, which serves as the conceptual framework for his integral methodological pluralism—that is, the integral theory on which his integral practice is based—is completely inconsistent with the actual primordial perspectives of human awareness-in-action, thus rendering incoherent his particular formulations of Integral Theory and practice. While the methods themselves are relatively valid as they are employed by various scholar-practitioners in their respective fields, the multi-perspectival methodology that Wilber designed to differentiate and integrate these methods is inconsistent with the primordial perspectives that are always already active in the work of all these scholar-practitioners—inconsistent, that is, with the essential or integral perspectivism they implicitly enact in every situation. Furthermore, as demonstrated in my (O’Connor, 2013, 217-45) critique of this formulation, because the tri/quad conflated, dyadic quadratic perspectives of AQAL are conceptual products of a deceptively simple conflation between equation/conflation and differentiation/integration with respect to the purely triadic (123) and purely quadratic (X₃₀) primordial perspectives—1 = Xulum; 2 = Xlul; 3 = Xur+lr—these AQAL perspectives simply do not exist anywhere in human awareness-in-action other than as illogical, irredeemable claims that they exist.

Hence, it is not just that AQAL is not quite primordial enough, as would be the concern with any multi-perspectival metatheory purporting to be primordial enough to serve integral methodological, epistemological, and ontological purposes, but rather that AQAL completely distorts the triadic (123) and quadratic (X₃₀) perspectives purportedly differentiated and integrated within AQAL, rendering incoherent each and every perspective in AQAL and, thus, any methodology, epistemology, or ontology based on AQAL. After all, if the tri/quad conflated AQAL is not the correct way to articulate the primordial perspectives of human awareness-in-action and triadic quadratic perspectivism is correct, then each and every attempt to apply AQAL in some field of theory or practice is actually preventing people from realizing in their own active awareness the primordial perspectival metatheory of TQP that is, nevertheless, always already implicitly active in those action situations. Nevertheless, Wilber’s general idea of an integral methodological pluralism, consistent with the principles of nonexclusion, enfoldment, and enactment, remains quite promising to the extent that it invites alternative formulations of paradigmatic pluralism and meta-paradigmatic integralism consistent with these premises. Likewise, many of the important insights offered by AQAL scholar-practitioners, including Esbjörn-Hargens’ emphasis on epistemological, methodological, and ontological pluralisms, can nevertheless be retained within alternative formulations that are free from the contradictory constraints of AQAL.

As an alternative to AQAL, Awareness-in-Action offers what appears to be a more coherent and justifiable formulation of paradigmatic pluralism and meta-paradigmatic integralism that is consistent with
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principles of nonexclusion, enfoldment, and enactment, but grounded instead in the primordial perspectives and practices of our situational awareness-in-action. Awareness-in-Action encompasses both the ever-present realization (R^\circ) of the integral awareness that I am (A^0) and the never-ending realization (R^n) of the differential action that I do (A^n), which are indeterminately realized (R^n) in each and every situational action-in-awareness (A^n) through the procedural meta-practice of transparency, choice, and accountability (TCA^n) with respect to the substantive metatheory of triadic quadratic perspectivism (TQP^n). It therefore includes the (a)perspectival/(a)practical realizations of each and every realizer-realized that can possibly be regarded as relatively real within my circle of integral awareness—that is, the potentially infinite, yet always indeterminate epistemological-ontological multiplicities of my methodological awareness-in-action.

Awareness-in-Action constitutes a substantive/procedural form of meta-paradigmatic integralism—a praxiological integralism—from which a substantive/procedural form of paradigmatic pluralism—a praxiological differentialism—is derived based on its primordial perspectival structure. As already presented, the triadic praxes of authentication (TCA^N \times 123.1_{AQ} = AF^N), legitimation (TCA^N \times 123.2_{AQ} = LJ^N), and confirmation (TCA^N \times 123.3_{AQ} = CT^N) constitute the most important differentiation of integral/differential realization (TCA^N \times 123.123_{AQ} = R^N) without which people tend to confuse and conflate intrapersonal, interpersonal, and impersonal modes of realization along with their corresponding domains of reality—freedom, justice, and truth. Within each of these triadic praxes, we can further differentiate a quadratic pluralism oriented toward the integral/differential realization of each of our claims to the intentional, behavioral, meaningful, and functional aspects of freedom, justice, and truth (Fig. 2):

- Praxiological intentionalism entails the requisite practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to our individual-subjective intentions, which includes my claims to intentional freedom, justice, and truth (123_{UL}), your claims to intentional freedom, justice, and truth (2.123_{UL}), and his or her claims to intentional freedom, justice, and truth (3.123_{UL}), denoted TCA^N \times 123.123_{UL} = ALC^N_{UL} = A^N_{UL}.
  Praxiological intentionalism is the praxis by which each of us (in)validates the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and impersonal intentions that each of us brings to the action situation, consistent with each of our indeterminate realizations of awareness-in-action.

- Praxiological behavioralism entails the requisite practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to our individual-objective behaviors, which includes my claims to behavioral freedom, justice, and truth (123_{UR}), your claims to behavioral freedom, justice, and truth (2.123_{UR}), and his or her claims to behavioral freedom, justice, and truth (3.123_{UR}), denoted TCA^N \times 123.123_{UR} = ALC^N_{UR} = A^N_{UR}.
  Praxiological behavioralism is the praxis by which each of us (in)validates the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and impersonal behaviors that each of us brings to the action situation, consistent with each of our indeterminate realizations of awareness-in-action.

- Praxiological interpretivism entails the requisite practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to our collective-subjective meanings, which includes my claims to meaningful freedom, justice, and truth (123_{LL}), your claims to meaningful freedom, justice, and truth (2.123_{LL}), and his or her claims to meaningful freedom, justice, and truth (3.123_{LL}), denoted TCA^N \times 123.123_{LL} = ALC^N_{LL} = A^N_{LL}.
  Praxiological interpretivism is the praxis by which each of us (in)validates the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and impersonal meanings that each of us brings to the action situation, consistent with each of our relative realizations of Awareness-in-Action.
AWARENESS-IN-ACTION

- Praxiological *functionalism* entails the requisite practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to our collective-objective *functions*, which includes *my* claims to *functional* freedom, justice, and truth (\(123_{<LR}>\), *your* claims to *functional* freedom, justice, and truth (\(2.123_{<LR}>\), and *his* or *her* claims to *functional* freedom, justice, and truth (\(3.123_{<LR}>\), denoted \(TCAN \times 123.123_{<LR>} = ALCN_{<LR>} = AN_{<LR>}\). Praxiological functionalism is the praxis by which each of us (in)validates the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and impersonal *functions* that each of us brings to the action situation, consistent with each of our indeterminate realizations of awareness-in-action.

Likewise, within each of these triadic praxes, we can also differentiate a secondary quadratic—or perhaps, more accurately, a quadratic dyadic—pluralism oriented toward the integral/differential realization of each of our claims to the *individual*, *collective*, *subjective*, and *objective* aspects of freedom, justice, and truth (Fig. 2):

- Praxiological *individualism* entails the requisite practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to our *individual* intentions-behaviors, which includes *my* claims to intentional-behavioral freedom, justice, and truth (\(123_{UL-UR}>\), *your* claims to intentional-behavioral freedom, justice, and truth (\(2.123_{UL-UR}>\), and
his or her claims to intentional-behavioral freedom, justice, and truth \( (3.123_{\text{UL+LR}^7}) \), denoted \( \text{TCA}^N \times 123.123_{\text{UL+LR}^7} = \text{ALC}^N_{\text{UL+LR}} = A^N_{\text{UL+LR}} \).

- Praxiological collectivism entails the requisite practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to our collective meanings-functions, which includes my claims to meaningful-functional freedom, justice, and truth \( (123_{\text{UL+LL}^7}) \), your claims to meaningful-functional freedom, justice, and truth \( (2.123_{\text{LL+LR}^7}) \), and his or her claims to meaningful-functional freedom, justice, and truth \( (3.123_{\text{LL+LR}^7}) \), denoted \( \text{TCA}^N \times 123.123_{\text{LL+LR}^7} = \text{ALC}^N_{\text{LL+LR}} = A^N_{\text{LL+LR}} \).

- Praxiological subjectivism entails the requisite practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to our subjective intentions-meanings, which includes my claims to intentional-meaningful freedom, justice, and truth \( (123_{\text{UL+LL}^7}) \), your claims to intentional-meaningful freedom, justice, and truth \( (2.123_{\text{LL+LR}^7}) \), and his or her claims to intentional-meaningful freedom, justice, and truth \( (3.123_{\text{LL+LR}^7}) \), denoted \( \text{TCA}^N \times 123.123_{\text{LL+LR}^7} = \text{ALC}^N_{\text{UL+LL}} = A^N_{\text{LL+LR}} \).

- Praxiological objectivism entails the requisite practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to our objective behaviors-functions, which includes my claims to behavioral-functional freedom, justice, and truth \( (123_{\text{UR+LR}^7}) \), your claims to behavioral-functional freedom, justice, and truth \( (2.123_{\text{LR+UR}^7}) \), and his or her claims to behavioral-functional freedom, justice, and truth \( (3.123_{\text{LR+UR}^7}) \), denoted \( \text{TCA}^N \times 123.123_{\text{LR+UR}^7} = \text{ALC}^N_{\text{UR+LR}} = A^N_{\text{UR+LR}} \).

Therefore, within both of these alternative overlapping triadic quadratic formulations, we find 12 distinct complementary primordial praxes, each of which might be further described as a diverse cluster of discrete praxes that share a single primordial perspective while enacting different empirical features of that perspective, including, but not limited to, an indeterminate plurality of relatively stable (multi-)structural patterns of awareness-in-action. Nevertheless, regardless of where we place the differential emphasis on the primordial praxes of this praxiological differentialism, \( \text{TCA}^N \times \text{TQP}^N \) are the substantive/procedural features of the praxiological integralism by which this differentialism is derived and therefore enactive of each and every primordial praxis. Simply put, the meta-paradigmatic integralism of Awareness-in-Action always already infuses a constitutive paradigmatic differentialism that includes all the primordial praxes of Awareness-in-Action.

However, the ever-present, never-ending potential for novelty in human action, which applies to the conduct as well as the content of that action, means that each and every one of us will conduct each and every one of our respective praxes in a different way simply due to the differential integralism of the Awareness-in-Action we all nevertheless share. Even if all three of us agree, for example, to the definition of a praxis designed to (dis)confirm the objective truth claims of our shared social context \( (123.3_{\text{LR}^7}) \) through a specific form of impersonal praxiological functionalism \( (\text{CT}^2_{\text{LR}}) \), each of us will enact that praxis differently and in so doing create a praxis that is, as we all might agree, at least marginally unique. The implications of this are interesting because it means that each and every one of us enacts a unique version of each and every pluralistic praxis—and of the integral meta-praxis itself—even when we all agree in theory on what that praxis is and how to do it well. When we actually do it, each of our versions will be somewhat unique and therefore the realities enacted by you, me, and her will be somewhat unique as well—not necessarily enough to cause a conflict between each of us, but if not between us, then more likely between us and them. Hence, this differential integralism only begins with the differentiation of the primordial praxes common to all of us. It then differentiates further to include the differentialism within, between, and beyond disciplinary and institutional boundaries common to some of us and ultimately differentiates enough to embrace every conceivable praxis.
that might originate from *any* one of us—from any unique enactive *I* in the potentially infinite, yet always indeterminate derivatives of integral aiperspectival/apractical Awareness-in-Action.

Therefore, due to the origin of praxiological integralism/différantialism in the unique enactive *I* whose purview, by virtue of *TCA* × *TQP*, potentially includes each and every other unique enactive *I*—each of whom is the direct or indirect realizer of all the other perspectives that are realized within each and every action situation—it appears that *each* paradigm presupposes *every* paradigm with *any* number of derivative paradigms in the radically open-ended, yet reliably closed-minded meta-paradigm of Awareness-in-Action. Hence, *each* direct realization presupposes *every* direct realization with *any* number of indirect realizations in the potentially infinite, yet always indeterminate epistemological-ontological multiplicities of methodological Awareness-in-Action. Nevertheless, regardless of who is enacting these integral/différantial paradigms in all their potentially infinite diversity, *TCA* × *TQP* are the normative ideals apparently presupposed in every empirically real action situation, and therefore the essential premises by which each of our unique versions of integral/différantial praxiology should be guided. Simply put, the *empirical diversity* of praxiological integralism/différantialism in *real* action situations mutually implicates the *normative unity* of praxiological integralism/différantialism in the *ideal* action situation.

Awareness-in-Action may therefore be understood as an integral différantialism / différantial integralism centered on a paradigm of paradigms that encompasses both the ever-present realization of the integral awareness that we are and the never-ending realization of the différantial action that we do—an essentialist formulation that facilitates a comprehensivist application honoring the full potential and variety of the human experience, including our experiences of the worlds beyond humanity.

**(R)Evolutionary Criticalism**

Finally, as a distinctively *critical* integral philosophy, Awareness-in-Action offers actionable insights into the subtle sources of deception, distortion, coercion, corruption, dysfunction, and disruption that can manifest at all degrees of depth and scale in all the forms and fields of human action. It does so by virtue of the empirical/normative complementarity between the *context-immanent realization* of any particular action and the *context-transcendent idealization* of all universal action. More precisely, human action is always already *critical* as well as *integral*, due to the creative tension between *what is* and *what could, should, and would be*, if only *real* actions in all their empirical diversity (*A* = *TCA* × *TQP* = AL*CN* = *R*) conformed to the normative unity of *ideal* action (*A* = *TCA* × *TQP* = AL*CN* = *R*). Awareness-in-Action can therefore be described as a *critical integralism*, which captures the idea of an inherently *critical* meta-paradigm infusing an otherwise *integral* meta-paradigm, thus grounding its essentialist/comprehensivist aspirations in the unavoidably (r)evolutionary challenge of human action in real-world contexts.

The term *critical*, as used in contemporary critical theory, generally refers to a class of social scientific theories and practices that share a similar commitment to the interdisciplinary critique of *what is* from the perspective of *what might be*. More specifically, in the wake of Habermas’s (1971) early formulation, critical social science can be usefully described as a normative method of *critical-reflective intervention* that transcends, yet includes the traditional social science methods of *empirical-analytic explanation*, which is oriented toward the functional understanding of society in its *objective* forms, and *historical-hermeneutic interpretation*, which is oriented toward the meaningful understanding of society in its *subjective* forms. Within the society-wide object-domain of critical theory, common issues of concern to critical theorists have included:

- Ideology, false consciousness, projection, and coercion in social relations (e.g., Habermas, 1971; Argyris, 1985; Wilber, 1999b)
- Distorted and dysfunctional communication in groups and organizations (e.g., Ar-
gyris, 1985) and in sociocultural evolution (e.g., Habermas, 1979; 1987)
• Crisis tendencies in advanced capitalist democracies, particularly those rooted in
  lifeworld/system conflicts (e.g., Habermas, 1975; 1979; 1987)
• Dysfunction in structural-hierarchical human development, including translational
distortions within each level and transformational demands between lower and higher
levels (e.g., Wilber, 1999b, 60-1)
• Critical evaluation of critical theory itself as a necessary part of its application (e.g.,
  Argyris, 1985)
• Critical reflexivity and community-based practice of the social science practitioner
  (e.g., Argyris, 1985)
• Methodological, epistemological, and ontological presuppositions of social and other
  sciences (e.g., Argyris, 1985; Habermas, 1971; 1979; 1984; 1987; Wilber, 1999b;
  2000b; 2003; 2007).

While there is no single, definitive formulation of critical theory, Raymond Geuss’s (1981, 76) concise
synopsis based on the early work of Habermas (1971) and his predecessors at the Frankfurt School offers
a metatheoretical articulation sufficient for our present purposes. “A critical theory is a very complicated
conceptual object; it is addressed to a particular group of agents in a particular society and aims at being
their ‘self-consciousness’ in a process of successful emancipation and enlightenment. A process of emanci-
pation and enlightenment is a transition from an initial state of bondage, delusion, and frustration to a final
state of freedom, knowledge, and satisfaction.” Although Habermas (1971) seems to use emancipation more
prominently than enlightenment, Geuss contends that both terms have an interdependent meaning across the
multiple sources of critical theory. As he (Geuss, 1981) clarifies, “various texts inform us that ‘emancipation
and enlightenment’ refer to a social transition from an initial state to a final state which has the following
properties:

1. The initial state is one both of false consciousness and error, and ‘unfree existence.’
2. In the initial state false consciousness and unfree existence are inherently connected
   so that agents can be liberated from one only if they are also at the same time freed
   from the other.
3. The ‘unfree existence’ from which the agents in the initial state suffer is a form of
   self-imposed coercion; their false consciousness is a kind of self-delusion.
4. The coercion from which the agents suffer in the initial state is one whose ‘power’
   or ‘objectivity’ derives only from the fact that the agents do not realize that it is self-
   imposed.
5. The final state is one in which the agents are free of false consciousness—they have
   been enlightened—and free of self-imposed coercion—they have been emancipated.
   (p. 58)

The emphasis on self-imposed deception and coercion that we find in critical theory does not, in my
interpretation, preclude the simultaneous existence of deception and coercion from others with whom one is
living and working. As I see it, the intrapersonal forms of deception and coercion are internalized, likely via
the socialized me that is habitually (con)fused with the enactive I, from the externalized forms of deception
and coercion—both conscious and deliberate as well as subconscious and inadvertent—that one encounters in
his or her interpersonal and impersonal relationships. Nevertheless, once internalized through decades of far-
less-than-ideal socialization, a particular habit of self-imaging/world-viewing that is mistakenly considered
to be valid and defended as such against all normal challenges is indeed a form of self-imposed deception and coercion that is best revealed and revised through a practice of well-informed, well-facilitated mutual, reflexive, differential, yet integral realization, which is the distinctively critical aim of Awareness-in-Action.

Continuing his metatheoretical synopsis, Geuss (1981) contends that a “typical critical theory… will be composed of three main constituent parts”:

1. A part which shows that a transition from the present state of society… to some proposed final state is ‘objectively’ or ‘theoretically possible’, i.e. which shows:
   a. that the proposed final state is inherently possible i.e. that given the present level of development of the forces of production it is possible for society to function and reproduce itself in this proposed state;
   b. that it is possible to transform the present state into the proposed final state (by means of specified institutional or other changes).
2. A part which shows that the transition from the present state to the proposed final state is ‘practically necessary,’ i.e. that:
   a. the present state is one of reflectively unacceptable frustration, bondage, and illusion: (a) the present social arrangements cause pain, suffering, and frustration; (b) the agents in the society only accept the present arrangements and the suffering they entail because they hold a particular world-picture; (c) that world-picture is not reflectively acceptable to the agents, i.e. it is one they acquired only because they were in conditions of coercion;
   b. the proposed final state will be one which will lack the illusions and unnecessary coercion and frustration of the present state; the proposed final state will be one in which it will be easier for the agents to realize their true interests.
3. A part which asserts that the transition from the present state to the proposed final state can come about only if the agents adopt the critical theory as their ‘self-consciousness’ and act on it.” (p. 76)

As this description makes perfectly clear, the special province of critical theory is that creative tension between the empirical reality of what is—such as a present state of bondage, delusion, and frustration—and the normative ideality of what might be—such as a final state of freedom, knowledge, and satisfaction—within any specific context of human action. However, a careful reading also reveals a decidedly substantive and potentially metaphysical bias toward the content of real/ideal human action that stops short of differentiating the corresponding procedural conduct of real/ideal human action that can account for the inherently active transition from what is to what might be. Without such a post-metaphysical differentiation, the critical theory is hampered by an over-emphasis on the substantive critique that has already been conducted by the theorist and an under-emphasis on the procedural critique that will have to be conducted by those practitioners charged with making this critical transition in real-world situations. Perhaps with some irony due to the all-too-common tendencies toward instrumental rationality so well documented by later critical theorists, a critical theory that is heavy on communicated substance and light on communicative procedure is more likely to be rationalized in counter-productive strategic action than justified in communicative action. As Argyris (Argyris et al., 1985, 93) has discovered in real-world communities of practice, the widely-enforced, yet self-imposed forms of deception and coercion characteristic of strategic rationalization are bolstered by pernicious defensive routines that make it normatively inappropriate for members to even discuss the possibility that the critique in question might be valid for their community. Hence, the absence of potential enlightenment and emancipation are due to procedures of deception, coercion, and defensiveness that require for their
resolution procedures of transparency, choice, and accountability.

In contrast to a purely substantive form of criticalism focused on the content of real/ideal action, in which critique is limited to a declarative imperative to adopt a contextualized critical theory, Awareness-in-Action is also a procedural form of criticalism focused on the conduct of real/ideal action, in which critique is led by a declarative imperative to engage a contextualized critical praxis: \( A^N = TCA^N \times TQP^N = ALC^N = R^N \). Additionally, this particular formulation of substantive/procedural criticalism is thoroughly integral/différantial, as it encompasses both the absolute realization of the integral awareness that we are—hence, the integral enlightenment and emancipation that is nowhere yet now-here—and the relative realization of the différantial action that we do—hence, the différantial enlightenment and emancipation that is our ultimate destiny.

Because the absolute realization of the integral awareness that we are is often only relatively realized in the différantial action that we do, it is often only relatively idealized in the form of an ultimate realization (\( R^\ast \)) that can only ever signify in spacial-temporal form the absolute realization (\( R^n \)) always already beyond the relativity of dimensional-durational awareness-in-action. This appears to give rise to the distinctively critical tension between, on the one hand, the empirical realization of a particular, context-rich, context-immanent, perspectival/practical awareness-in-action—the action situation that is already realized—and, on the other hand, the normative realization of a universal, content-free, context-transcendent, aperspectival/apractical awareness-in-action—the action situation that is always idealized—both of which are always already aspects of our situational awareness-in-action.

With these formulations in mind, we can carefully reconstruct Geuss’s outline of a critical theory by redefining the present state as the empirically justifiable realization of human action in some specific real-world context (\( A^N = TCA^N \times TQP^N = ALC^N = R^N \)) and the proposed final state as a credible approximation to the normatively justifiable realization of human action in that same real-world context (\( A^\ast = TCA^\ast \times TQP^\ast = ALC^\ast = R^\ast \)). Once again, in my view, human awareness-in-action is always already critical due to the creative tension between what is and what could, should, and would be, if only real actions (\( A^N \)) conformed to the presuppositions of ideal action (\( A^\ast \)). Hence, we can see in the three parts of a critical theory outlined above a general account of the creative tension between the present state of what is and the proposed final state of what could be in part 1, what should be in part 2, and what would be in part 3. Alternatively, we might like to re-phrase this more personally in terms of the creative tension between the present state of who we are and the proposed final state of who we could be in part 1, who we should be in part 2, and who we would be in part 3. Furthermore, we can see at least a substantive suggestion of the corresponding critical praxes of impersonal (dis)confirmation in part 1, interpersonal (de)legitimation in part 2, and intrapersonal (in)authentication in part 3 by which we could, should, and would transform, through mutual, reflexive, différantial, yet integral critique, our conduct and, thus, also the content of that conduct. In doing so, we would be mindfully practicing Awareness-in-Action as our self-consciousness in a process of integral/différantial emancipation and enlightenment—a(n) (re)volutionary praxis of integral/différantial realization—not as a metaphysical metatheory to be discussed and deferred indefinitely, but as a post-metaphysical meta-paradigm to be enacted and evaluated immediately in real-world action situations.

Consistent with this reconstruction, deliberate applications of Awareness-in-Action may be described as critical integral interventions fallibilistically oriented toward the integral/différantial realization of situational awareness-in-action, within and beyond the context of the semiotic, pragmatic, and praxiological capacity constraints previously established in the course of that awareness-in-action. As I use the term, intervention is quite simply the mindful practice of Awareness-in-Action through which we cannot help but act in ways that may present challenges to those with whom we are interacting, particularly if our actions are designed to address what we regard as insufficient degrees of \( TCA^N \times TQP^N \) in established institutions or disciplines whose members may prefer to maintain the status quo. Even the most conscientious efforts to create actionable knowledge of freedom, justice, and truth—enlightenment—that, in turn, supports knowledgeable
action that is more free, just, and true—emancipation—are typically resisted, often vehemently, by those who benefit most in terms of power and wealth from whatever lack of freedom, justice, and truth others are forced, or allowed, to endure. However, without denying its (r)evolutionary implications and applications, it is important to remember that Awareness-in-Action is primarily about bringing more awareness to our own actions and creating conditions in which others may do the same so that we may all realize more of the ideal potential we presuppose with every action we take.

Bearing in mind the mutual, reflexive, and differential nature of these critical integral interventions, we mindful practitioners of Awareness-in-Action will recognize our own substantive and procedural fallibility and, hence, the need for (in)authentication, (de)legitimation, and (dis)confirmation of any such intervention—and of the critical integral praxis itself—as essential features of that intervention and the very means to our own situational realization. Therefore, if the underlying cause of the interdependent crises afflicting humanity—whether specifically construed as political, economic, social, or ecological in nature—can be more generally construed as the conspicuous disregard for requisite degrees of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the triadic quadratic perspectivism in challenging action situations, then the most effective (r)evolutionary responses to these crises would require critical integral interventions to (re)establish these post-metaphysical norms of Awareness-in-Action, thereby facilitating our mutual, reflexive, differential, yet integral realization of the relatively unfree, unjust, untrue, and, therefore, unreal conditions in which we have, unwittingly, been living and working.

Awareness-in-Action may therefore be understood as a critical integralism attuned to the interdependent political, economic, social, and ecological challenges of our time. Thus, if we want to realize more freedom, justice, and truth in our lives and in the lives of those around us, then we should engage in the meta-practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the metatheory of triadic quadratic perspectivism in challenging action situations.

**Conclusion**

In lieu of a more traditional conclusion in which I would summarize what I have already presented, I think it preferable to make an object of all that has been presented and invite some attention to the justification considerations at least implied in the formulation and presentation of Awareness-in-Action. If, as I have proposed, the reality of a declarative is the imperative to realize it, then the reality of my proposed meta-paradigm, Awareness-in-Action, should be justifiable by recourse to some exemplary procedure by which you, the reader, might realize for yourself the substantive reality of the whole hypothesis, including the claims to truth, justice, and freedom either expressed or implied in my (O’Connor, 2013) book. Beyond the justification of integral reconstruction that I painstakingly demonstrated in the course of writing that book and that you would necessarily engage in the course of reading that book, there remains much potential for wider discourses of confirmation, legitimation, and authentication within the pluralistic communities of scholar-practitioners committed to the continuing evolution of Integral Theory, critical theory, and action science. Hence, the very formulation of Awareness-in-Action provides the normative procedures for its own critical integral verification or falsification—$A^* = TCA^* \times TQP^* = ALC^* = R^*$—as any formulation of action science, critical theory, or Integral Theory very well should.

Furthermore, given that I have intentionally formulated Awareness-in-Action as a meta-paradigm, the imperative to realize these purported realities can also include mindful engagement in a paradigmatic application of Awareness-in-Action—that is, the meta-practice of transparency, choice, and accountability with respect to the metatheory of triadic quadratic perspectivism—in any form or field of human awareness-in-action. Any such critical integral intervention within, between, or beyond established disciplinary and institutional boundaries can proceed with the secondary aim of either verifying or falsifying the propositions of Awareness-in-Action while engaged in the primary task of paradigmatic reconstruction guided by these...
provisionally validated propositions. After all, if my hypothesis is something less than correct, or perhaps deeply flawed in some way that awaits discovery in the midst of application, then you will be able to make a significant contribution to what I think we can both agree is a worthwhile, yet unfinished project.

Finally, given that the essential premises of Awareness-in-Action are based on what I hypothesize to be the essential presuppositions of the awareness-in-action already being practiced by each and every one of us, the imperative to realize these purported realities requires nothing so much as bringing a more contemplative awareness to your own situational awareness-in-action, just as I brought to mine prior to making these discoveries. You simply pay close attention to who you are and how you act in various situations—pay attention, that is, to the perspectives and practices emerging in every situational action-in-awareness —and see if you can discover for yourself some of the fundamental presuppositions in your own awareness-in-action. After all, if my hypothesis is correct, then you too will realize in your own active awareness the latent potential for integral aperspectival/apractical awareness-in-action generally consistent with my particular formulation for Awareness-in-Action. If nothing else, bringing more awareness to your own actions and creating conditions in which others may do the same should help us all to realize more of the ideal potential we presuppose with every action we take.

NOTES

1 This article is an abridged version of the third part of my book of the same title (O’Connor, 2013), which can be consulted as needed for the metatheoretical and meta-practical foundations of this more advanced presentation.
2 I mention in this introduction some of the more obvious fields of human awareness-in-action, including politics, governance, economics, business, sociology, social work, journalism, and activism. I might just as well include philosophy, psychology, education, law, and medicine. Furthermore, once we come to terms with the universal nature of human awareness-in-action in all its myriad forms, it appears as if every field of inquiry—including physics, biology, ecology, engineering, religion, spirituality, literature, entertainment, and art—might be defined as a field of human action without detracting from its particular distinctiveness. Finally, beyond the academy, the fields of human awareness-in-action certainly include marriage, domestic partnership, parenting, friendship, and the practice of community. The question, therefore, is what isn’t a field of human awareness-in-action?
3 A central feature of Wilber’s all-quadrant, all-level (AQAL) formulation of Integral Theory is the particular way he equates and conflates the quadratic perspectives—intentional, behavioral, cultural, social—for which his metatheory is best known with the triadic perspectives—first-person, second-person, third-person—exemplified by the metatheory of Jürgen Habermas. In the series of books and articles published from 1995 through 2007 (2000a, 149-153; 2000b, 430-437; 2000c, 146-8; 2003, part i; 2007, 18-23), including the earliest and latest presentations of AQAL, Wilber makes it perfectly clear that he considers the quadratic perspectives and the triadic perspectives to be identical and interchangeable, with:

- the first-person perspective (1) being identical to his intentional perspective, the conflated form of which he labels with the pronoun I in his upper-left (UL) quadrant;
- the second-person perspective (2) being identical to his cultural perspective, the conflated form of which he labels with the pronoun We in his lower-left (LL) quadrant, noting that this first-person plural pronoun is intended to represent the relationship between first-person I and second-person You; and
- the third-person perspective (3) being identical to his combined behavioral and social perspectives, the conflated forms of which he labels with the pronoun It in his upper-right (UR) quadrant and Its in his lower-right (LR) quadrant.

I refer to this essential feature of the AQAL formulation as the tri/quad conflation.
I present throughout this article a new system of perspectival/practical notation that may facilitate, in subsequent publications by me and others, more efficient and effective communication about the major features of Awareness-in-Action. This notation emerged in the course of my (O’Connor, 2013) articulation of these ideas and can be interpreted as an alternative to Wilber’s (2003c; 2007) AQAL-based integral mathematics of primordial perspectives.

As should be clear from the presentation, my perspectival signs are entirely consistent with the visual-logical geometry of the integral/differential metatheory of triadic quadratic perspectivism, which is based on accurate definitions of the first-, second-, and third-person perspectives, as well as the individual-subjective, individual-objective, collective-subjective, and collective-objective perspectives within each of these personal perspectives. Furthermore, the practical signs I introduce in reference to my proposed meta-practice build on these perspectival signs to yield at least the beginning of an internally consistent system of signs that unfolds from, and enfolds into one single sign of non-dual Awareness-in-Action. While it is necessary to study this text in order to learn this corresponding notation, it is not necessary to learn the notation in order to understand this particular text. So if the notation is more of a distraction, then simply ignore it and concentrate on the surrounding text to which it refers.

With regard to the most elementary perspectival notation, Wilber typically uses 1p for the first-person, 2p for the second-person, 3p for the third-person, and 123p when referring to all three personal perspectives. Furthermore, he equates and conflates his 1p with his UL quadrant, his 2p with his LL quadrant, his 3p with his combined UR and LR quadrants, and therefore his 123p with all four of his quadrants, or AQ. In contrast, I have omitted the “p” in my triadic perspectival notation, 123, as it is an unnecessary term that obstructs the use of subscript notation for the quadratic perspectives, such as 1_{AQ}, which designates the first-person, all-quadrant perspective found only in triadic quadratic perspectivism.

My choice of the terms authentication, legitimation, and confirmation to refer to the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and impersonal modes of realization is based on a variety of considerations, including the use of identical or similar terms by Wilber, Habermas, and Argyris to refer to different, but not entirely unrelated, aspects of human action, development, and evolution. In short, different theorists use these terms in different ways, and in this respect I am no different.

Argyris (1985) uses the term confirmation in reference to empirical validation in the context of his critical social science. My use of the term empirical is radically extensive/intensive in that it includes all 12 primordial perspectives for each and every person identified in an action situation. In my parlance, empirical validation is used interchangeably with realization and includes empirical confirmation of truth, empirical legitimation of justice, and empirical authentication of freedom. While Argyris does address issues of interpersonal rightness and intrapersonal sincerity consistent with Habermas’s formal pragmatics, I think his use of the term empirical is limited to truth claims and his use of confirmation is therefore linked exclusively to truth claims and, thus, constitutes a simplified, non-quadratic version otherwise consistent with my use of the term.

Wilber (1999b, 128; 1999c, 192; 2000d, 495-497; 2000e, 217-22) uses confirmation as the third strand of his procedural model of valid knowledge, which begins with a practical injunction to take a specific action, followed by an experiential apprehension of the result from the action, and culminating in a communal (dis)confirmation of the knowledge claimed by those who followed through on the injunction. Although the scope of Wilber’s definition of valid knowledge extends to every perspective in AQAL—all quadrants, levels, lines, states, types—AQAL does not recognize the fully triadic nature of each and every quadratic perspective arising in an action situation. Therefore, although he may intend for his confirmation to serve as a comprehensive form of dialogical validation that can, via his tri/quad conflation, address claims to interpersonal justice/goodness and intrapersonal freedom/beauty just as readily as it addresses claims to impersonal truth, in reality it cannot do so within the confines of the tri/quad conflated AQAL. His actual use of the term confirmation is therefore similar to my actual use of the term: impersonal quadratic, at best, or a more reductionist indefinite quadratic validation.

In his early work on the developmental sociology of religion, Wilber (1999a, 13) used the term legitimacy to describe “how well a given religion provides meaning, integration, and value on a particular level” of development and the term authenticity to describe “how well a given religion promotes transformation to higher levels altogether.” With
regard to methodology, he (1999b, 119-25) proposed structural-hermeneutical analysis to determine the degree of authenticity and functional-empirical analysis to determine the degree of legitimacy of a particular religious expression. Approximately 20 years later, Wilber (2003a, part iii) defined legitimacy as “adequacy in horizontal translation” and authenticity as “adequacy in vertical transformation…. Thus, authenticity is a measure of the degree of depth or height of a belief system (so that a turquoise worldview is more authentic than a blue worldview), and legitimacy is a measure of how well that worldview functions at its own level. A particular worldview can be very legitimate (or happily accepted by most members of the culture) but not very authentic (e.g., it might be a purple or red belief structure). On the other hand, some worldviews might be very authentic (representing, say, turquoise or vision-logic cognitions) and yet not very legitimate (or not accepted by the ruling or ruled classes).” At first glance, there appears to be very little common ground between Wilber’s use of these terms and my use of the similar terms authentication and legitimation. However, I would suggest that Awareness-in-Action reconstructs orthodox theories of the developmental/evolutionary spectrum of all human actions, including religious insights and expressions, and thereby clarifies the issues addressed by Wilber (1999b), notably allowing for the intrapersonal authentication, interpersonal legitimation, and impersonal confirmation of each and every religious insight and expression.

As for Habermas, his use of this terminology is limited to legitimation and legitimacy, which for him (1979, 178) “means that there are good arguments for a political order’s claim to be recognized as right and just; a legitimate order deserves recognition. Legitimacy means a political order’s worthiness to be recognized.” Setting aside his narrow focus on political orders, my use of legitimacy as the degree to which a particular action—including institutionalized actions—is considered just, right, and moral is similar, yet more inclusive and therefore more widely applicable to every form and field of human action.

6 The term Awareness-in-Action is intended to signify both the absolute realization of the integral awareness that I am and the relative realization of the différantial action that I do, while precluding any latently hierarchical conceptual opposition within the complementarity of awareness/action. It is challenging to find the right terms to articulate non-dual ideas without inadvertently denoting dualism, as is the case with the term nondual itself, which includes the term dual, and is therefore suggestive of precisely that which it is intended to not-suggest. Once understood as a deliberately dualistic term for nondualism, the linguistic tension in Awareness-in-Action might be appreciated for the meaning it carries and the inquiry it inspires. It may also be permissible to use either of the terms awareness or action separately, often for purposes of brevity, without conveying any dualistic intentions. Thus, in my parlance, awareness and action are always awareness-in-action (or action-in-awareness), all three of which are deliberately denoted with the same sign: A. Thus, A\(^0\) signifies Awareness, the Zero Derivative (i.e., Integral) of Action, as well as the Zero Derivative of Awareness-in-Action, as all three are the same. Likewise, A\(^N\) signifies the Indeterminate Derivatives of Action, Awareness-in-Action, and, with a little extra interpretation, Awareness, which is integral to différantial action.

7 Nearly every term introduced in this praxiological pluralism—from intentionalism, behavioralism, interpretivism, and functionalism to individualism, collectivism, subjectivism, and objectivism—is burdened with problematic connotations that appear to be unavoidable. My intent is simply to offer relatively neutral descriptive terms closely aligned with the terms I use for the primary and secondary quadratic perspectives in TQP. It would be a mistake to assume that my use of any one of these terms is the same as its use in any particular philosophical school of thought. Furthermore, it is important to recognize that each and every one of these quadratic primordial praxes is fully triadic in multiple derivatives, thereby embracing the integral discourses of authentication, legitimation, and confirmation with respect to its limited domain. This alone renders each and every one of these primordial praxes distinct from any methods currently operating under any names. Therefore, instead of trying to interpret the meaning of my use of each term by analogy to its use by others, it would be more effective to deduce the meaning from the whole context of Awareness-in-Action.

8 I coined the term critical integralism to capture the idea of an inherently critical meta-paradigm infusing an otherwise integral meta-paradigm, thus grounding its essentialist/comprehensivist aspirations in the unavoidably (r)evolutionary challenge of human action in real-world contexts. As I hold it, I think there may be room within this concept to embrace a number of alternative formulations/articulations of the nexus between Integral Theory and critical theory.
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The objective of this article is to use Critical Realism to modify the Integral Methodological Pluralism (IMP) framework for interdisciplinary ecological research that addresses both human and natural components of ecosystems. The resulting framework is a Critical-Realist Integral Methodological Pluralism (CRIMP). Integral Theory has already been applied to the field of ecology in a foundational book, *Integral Ecology* (Esbjörn-Hargens & Zimmerman, 2009). The book draws explicitly on IMP as a basis for truly holistic ecological research that honors the AQAL model. IMP consists of a set of methods, rooted in the core principles of *nonexclusion*, *enfoldment*, and *enactment*, and grouped into eight broad methodological families based on interior and exterior views of each of the four quadrants.

Some problems with IMP have already been identified—and some pre-emptively acknowledged by Wilber himself (2006, pp. 41-42f)—most notably pertaining to inconsistencies arising from the distinction between the interior versus exterior views of each quadrant (Smith, 2006). Building on these critiques, I suggest that overlaying the interior and exterior perspectives onto a single four-quadrant framework fails to retain a vital distinction between subject and object, causing a significant departure from the zones yielded by a parsing out of quadrival and quadradic perspectives. Consequently, although IMP’s eight resulting zones represent an elegant model of Integral Theory’s anti-dualistic post-metaphysics, their relative importance is imbalanced (e.g., empiricism includes much more diverse and substantial methodological possibilities than autopoiesis). Although in principle the eight zones are metaphysically balanced, in practice they risk confusing or even alienating potential integral researchers.

Whether or not it was the intent of Esbjörn-Hargens and Zimmerman to preserve the quadrival/quadradic distinction of IMP’s eight zones is unclear, since the connection is implied but not made explicit in *Integral Ecology*. In any case, what is clear is that the IMP framework, as it stands, needs revision and adaptation for adoption as a useful tool in interdisciplinary ecological research. To that end, the following section presents a revamping of the IMP framework, starting by reinstating the quadradic/quadrival (subject/object) distinction, retaining but modifying each of the three IMP principles, and recasting it in the more accessible integrative metaphysical system offered by Critical Realism. Before doing so, I will summarize the quadrant/quadrivia distinction as discussed in *Integral Ecology* and discuss its importance, and then present a short introduction to Critical Realism.

**Quadrants and Quadrivia**

Ecological problems are by their very nature systemic problems arising out of imbalances in the interobjective interactions between system members. They thus tend to situate most squarely within the Lower-Right quadrant. However, their fundamental systemic nature also means that both their contexts and influences extend into all quadrants. For example, an influx of nitrogen into an ecosystem has the potential not only to alter the functionality of the system (Lower Right), but also the behavioral (Upper Right) and experiential (Upper Left) dimensions of individual member organisms of the system, as well as the semiotic niches those

---

1 This article is a summary of a poster presented at the 2013 Integral Theory Conference.
2 For a full description of IMP, see, for example, *Integral Spirituality* (Wilber, 2006).
Figure 1. Quadrivial perspective on a hypothetical fish kill (Esbjörn-Hargens & Zimmerman, 2008).

Figure 2. Generalized quadratic perspective (Esbjörn-Hargens & Zimmerman, 2008).
individual members mutually create (Lower Left). For this reason, methods for generating purely systemic (Lower Right) understandings of ecosystems, although central, are by themselves inadequate for sound ecological research. An integral ecological research approach thus draws on insights from all four quadrants.

But an additional layer of complexity exists when research is enacted within one of two fundamental perspectives. To look “in” is to examine the various ways each of the four quadrants influences a given phenomenon. To look “out” is to examine the ways a holon (i.e., the researcher) engages with each of the four quadrants. While a contentious point in Integral Theory, the subject/object dualism exemplified by Descartes’ metaphysics and reinforced broadly in modern thought offers a useful notion for drawing this distinction. The subject/object dualism stems from skepticism about the existence of an external world, as well as a traditional ontological conception of being as beings-extant, or lying present-there (Cucen, 1998). The subject, or the “I”, the “ego,” or the “res cogitans” is that which thinks (i.e., the perceiver). In asserting the uniqueness of subject, everything external to the “I” becomes object (i.e., the perceived). In integral language, looking “in” at a given external object or phenomenon is to take a quadrivial perspective that favors the primacy of the object, and looking “out” at the world from the interior vantage point of a holon is to take a quadradic perspective that favors the primacy of the subject. Illustrations of the quadrivial and quadradic perspectives in ecological research under the traditional IMP, taken from Integral Ecology, are shown in Figures 1 and 2.

Critical Realism

Critical Realism is a philosophy of science that combines a philosophy of natural science called Transcendental Realism, and a philosophy of social science called Critical Naturalism (Bhaskar 1997, 1998). Transcendental Realism is a critique of empiricism based on a transcendental argument that asks the question of what reality must be like in order for experimental (empirical) science to even be possible, and replies that it must be structured, differentiated, and changing (Ibid). Through the transcendental argument, Bhaskar demonstrates that empiricists commit what he calls an “epistemic fallacy” by reducing the real or intransitive (ontological) domain of reality—consisting of real generative mechanisms and structures that transcend our observations of them—to mere constant conjunctions of events (epistemology) (Bhaskar, 1989, pp. 13, 15-17). Although we can in principle come to accurately understand such real structures, Bhaskar argues, their reality is ultimately independent of such understanding.

On the other hand, Critical Naturalism is a philosophy of social science that asks the question of whether the Transcendental Realism model of natural science can, in principle, be applied to the social sciences, and answers in the affirmative. However, Bhaskar qualifies this with additional considerations owing to the emergent property of human agency in the social domain, and its co-creative relationship with structure (Bhaskar, 1989, p. 92). Critical Naturalism resolves the agency/structure binary by asserting structure as a determinative pre-condition for agency, but agency as capable of transforming structure. Agency and structure are thus “existentially interdependent but essentially distinct” (Ibid). An additional qualification to the naturalistic possibility of social science lies in the “holistic, hermeneutical and historical character of social objects.” This character necessitates an understanding of them as “partially conceptually articulated totalities in continual transformation,” which defy the possibility of closed-system experimentation and instead require “purely explanatory (non-predictive) criteria of confirmation and falsification” (Bhaskar, 1989, p. 93). Nonetheless, given these caveats, social objects are scientifically knowable.

3 Integral Theory’s post-metaphysical position seeks to dissolve subject/object dualism by maintaining that the ontology of objects and the epistemology of subjects are inseparable. In practice, however, the subject/object distinction is useful in categorizing the various perspectives a researcher can take. Recasting this distinction in Integral Post-Metaphysics, an inside-out perspective deals with the four-quadrant dimensions of experience, and an outside-in perspective with the four-quadrant contexts of the experienced.
Critical-Realist Integral Methodological Pluralism

Starting with the basic building blocks of the quadrivial and quadradic perspectives, we can begin to reconstruct IMP based on critical realist principles. Figures 3 and 4 present critical realist adaptations to the objective quadrivial and subjective quadradic domains, respectively.

With regards to the quadrivial perspective (Fig. 3), the division between interior and exterior quadrants along the y-axis distinguishes the domain of the real (i.e., the underlying structures and generative mechanisms that pre-exist and give rise to all manifest phenomena) from that of the actual (i.e., those manifest phenomena). This distinction is foundational because Critical Realism’s entire metaphysics turns on the transcendental argument explained above, which attacks the position of actualism that Bhaskar ascribes to classical empiricism, epitomized by David Hume. The actualism implied by classical empiricists reduces the domain of the real (e.g., natural laws) to the domain of the actual (e.g., empirical regularities). The division, along the x-axis, between individual and collective mechanisms and phenomena is not addressed explicitly by Bhaskar. However, this division is worth making given the fundamental ontological and methodological differences between “hard” atomistic sciences like chemistry and physics and “soft” systems-oriented natural sciences like ecology.

Turning to the quadradic perspective (Fig. 4), the two axes of Integral Theory’s quadradic framework and the four irreducible quadrants they yield dovetail with Critical Realism’s synthesis and resolution of two defining dichotomies of the social sciences: that of agency/structure, and individualism/collectivism. Bhaskar resolves these dichotomies by synthesizing the opposing poles in a transformational and relational conception of the social world in which the relations that individuals enter into are themselves structures that pre-exist those individuals, but are only reproduced (or transformed) by the actions and interactions (i.e., agency) of those individuals for whom they are necessary conditions (Bhaskar, 1989, p. 4). The fact that these social structures both pre-exist and rely on individuals—and can be transformed through their agency—establishes a dialectic between individuals and society and structures and agency that preserves their independence and irreducibility. This dynamic is reflected in the four irreducible quadrants of the subject and the arrows interconnecting them.

Although the Upper-Right quadrant (cognitive structures) is not an explicit component of Critical Realism, it is very important in Integral Theory and indeed implicitly embedded in much of the Critical Realism discourse on structure, often obscured by Bhaskar’s apparent bias toward the social over the individual (Marshall, 2012). Since many social theorists—and Bhaskar is no exception—tend to see humans as inextricably social organisms, they tend to neglect the purely individual structures of consciousness (namely the neurosensory “hardware” of the human brain, nervous system, etc.) as well as its cognitive “software” (the operating system encoded through patterns of experience, culture, language, etc.). Although social theorists would be right to argue that much of these latter elements are products of social structures in the conventional sense, it is undeniable that such cognitive programming is in large part co-determined by material structures of the brain, and directly manifested in consciousness (i.e., the phenomenological experience at the level of the individual). As such, individual cognitive structures should not be reduced to social structures.

Situated oppositionally across a reflective dual plane, the quadrivial and quadradic perspectives yield a critical realist–adapted version of IMP, or CRIMP, presented in Figure 5. In addition to the eight fundamental zones yielded by the four quadrants in each of the two perspectives, a ninth zone arises out of the subject/object duality: the empirical. Distinct from both the real and the actual in the quadrivial perspective, the empirical domain is a subset of the actual in that it consists of only those manifest phenomena that are empirically observed (or, in integral terminology, “enacted”) by a human observer. In keeping with the integral principle of co-enactment, the empirical thus represents the realm of reality that is mutually constituted, or co-created, by subject and object, perceiver and perceived, ontology and epistemology. As such, what arises in the empirical realm is a product of the particular metaphysical paradigm under which the empirical phenomena come
Figure 3. Critical realist–adapted quadrivial (objective) perspective.

Figure 4. Critical realist–adapted quadradic (subjective) perspective.
into being. In critical realist terms, the empirical realm is where the *transitive* dimension of knowledge (i.e., as a real social object, as opposed to *intransitive* objects of knowledge, which exist independently of mental activity) are produced (Bhaskar, 1987).

It is of particular importance for natural scientists to note that, in accordance with Critical Realism, the four quadrants of the subject in Critical Naturalism actually comprise only a small (though very special and important) subset of the objective domain of Transcendental Realism. This is because, according to Bhaskar, the realm of the real contains everything, including humans, their cultures, societies, thoughts, beliefs, and so on. Therefore, scientific knowledge of the human world is possible in the same fundamental way (qualified by certain aforementioned caveats) that such knowledge of the natural world is possible (Bhaskar, 1989). Conversely, precisely in virtue of the additional emergent properties of the social world that distinguish it from the natural, special consideration of these social elements must be made. A central tenet of CRIMP-informed research thus follows:

> Whenever the object(s) of research overlap in explanatorily relevant ways with subjective agents (i.e., humans or their culture), a quadradic (subjective) analysis of those subjective agents is required.

This means that, for example, when humans exert substantial influence on an ecosystem (arguably the case in all ecosystems), the four-quadrant subjective dimensions of those human agents ought to be analyzed in addition—and in relation—to the various biophysical dimensions. Additionally, to the extent that CRIMP research is participatory and reflexive, this leads to a second, related tenet:

---

*Figure 5. Critical realist–adapted Integral Methodological Pluralism (CRIMP).*
Since research is carried out by human agents who are themselves embedded in four-quadrant social contexts, a quadradic (subjective) analysis of researchers themselves is recommended.

**Modifications of IMP**

Critical-Realist Integral Methodological Pluralism represents a significant metaphysical departure from the original IMP framework, while still maintaining many of its integral underpinnings. To start, CRIMP upholds the three IMP principles of nonexclusion, enfoldment, and enactment—with a few qualifications. First, the IMP principle of *nonexclusion*—that all forms of knowledge are at least partially true as long as they pass the validity tests of their respective (disciplinary) paradigms—corresponds roughly to a combination of the Critical Realism notion of science, broadly, as an *adequating practice*—metaphorically, a working of cognitive matter into a matching representation of a non-cognitive object—with the principle of *epistemic relativity*; that is, that (at least transitive) objects of knowledge are essentially infallible insofar as “all knowledge is transient, and neither truth values nor criteria of rationality exist outside historical time” (Bhaskar 1989, pp. 23-24). Here, Critical Realism extends the principle of *judgmental rationality* as a means of qualifying epistemic relativity and a tool for adjudicating between various truth claims by asserting that science is not arbitrary and that there are rational criteria for judging some theories as better and more explanatory than others (Bhaskar, 1987).

Critical Realism’s judgmental rationality is also related to the second IMP principle of *enfoldment*—that some perspectives are more inclusive and/or account for more complexity (i.e., are more developed) than others. Although enfoldment is one of IMP’s three stated principles, developmental dynamics are wholly absent from its eight-zone framework. To remedy this, CRIMP incorporates a third (*z*) axis, in addition to the traditional x- and y-axes delineating the quadrants, to show that as scientific research progresses and our knowledge (and perspectives) becomes more integrated, nuanced, and complex, these perspectives begin to approach a true understanding of the generative mechanisms behind all phenomena, suggesting a potential convergence at nondual consciousness. CRIMP thus accounts for the correspondence between subject and object, and their simultaneous evolution or development, passing through, for example, prerational, rational, postrational, integrative, and transrational stages. The current CRIMP model is centered on a rational to integrative level of development, reflective of academia’s disciplinary realities and interdisciplinary possibilities.

Finally, CRIMP upholds the IMP principle of *enactment* by highlighting the importance that the subject’s epistemological values and biases bring to bear at the exterior limit of objective phenomena (Right-Hand quadrants of a quadrivial perspective). This principle is illustrated in two places in the CRIMP framework. On the developmental *z*-axis, the correspondence between level of development of subject and object reinforces the principle of enactment, but without reducing ontology to epistemology. Within the quadrivial (object) domain, it is important to note that the domain of the empirical (that which is actually observed or experienced by human subjects and thus subject to the transitive modes of science; i.e., epistemic values) is a subset of the actual (that which is actually manifest in form or occurrence), which in turn is a subset of the real (the underlying generative structures and mechanisms that precede and give rise to those manifest phenomena).

Beyond the three revised IMP principles, CRIMP is additionally based in the following six critiques of, and modifications to, IMP:

1. The nondualism implied by IMP’s post-metaphysics can be awkward for scientific researchers whose metaphysical paradigm relies upon a subject/object distinctness.
CR asserts non-identity between subject and object as the first moment of scientific understanding. CRIMP thus reinstates subject/object duality using quadrivial/quadradic distinction as a model.

2. Some of IMP’s eight methodological zones (e.g., autopoeisis) may be too abstract or narrow in most mainstream academic research contexts. CRIMP distinguishes the four quadrants of social (quadradic) and natural (quadrivial) sciences and allows for broader methodological associations within each quadrant—distinctions that give most scientists a better sense of their own location on the map.

3. IMP zones fail to explicitly account for the influence of epistemic values on research outcomes. CRIMP represents this important space as the domain of the empirical.

4. IMP’s autopoeisis zones confuse the internal logic of exterior entities like the cognitive circuitry of the brain with the true interiority of external things (i.e., their underlying generative mechanisms). CRIMP puts the generative mechanisms of objective reality in the Left-Hand (interior) quadrants, separate from the exterior manifestations of these mechanisms in the Right-Hand quadrants.

5. IMP conflates the agentive (inter-)actions of subjects with external structures, neglecting the potential for agency-in-action to transform structures. CRIMP recognizes the simultaneous inner and outer dimensions of actions and behaviors. Insofar as human actions—both individual and collective—usually entail both structurally determined and agentive dimensions, the former belong in the Right-Hand quadrants and the latter in the Left-Hand quadrants.

6. IMP fails to explicitly account for a transformational dialectic between research objects and subjects. CRIMP incorporates a developmental (z) axis into the two-dimensional x-y integral quadrant map, accounting for the potential of knowledge and action to transform structures for individual and societal emancipation.

The result of these IMP-adaptations is a model (Fig. 5) yielding nine zones that are more fluid, familiar, and broadly accessible for researchers who may never have heard of, for example, social autopoeisis. The quadradic/quadrivial (subject/object) distinction that CRIMP maintains also corresponds to a general distinction between the social and natural sciences, which especially helps researchers in the nebulous (multi-/inter-/trans-) discipline of ecology to more easily orient their own work on the map and relate it to that of their peers within the discipline, as well as potential collaborators across disciplines and even outside the university.
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