DEEP DIVE
EBOOK

THE MANY WAYS WE TOUCH

THREE PRINCIPLES HELPFUL FOR ANY INTEGRATIVE APPROACH

Ken Wilber

OVERVIEW: AN INTEGRAL PARADIGM IS A SET OF PRACTICES, NOT THEORIES

In Chapter 1 of this volume, discussing "An Integral Age at the Leading Edge," we noted the fact that, in today's overall world, less than 2% of the population is at any stage or wave of consciousness that could be called "integral" in any meaningful sense (and less than 5% in the Western world). If, in a most summary fashion, the general waves of development are pictured as traditional (premodern), modern, postmodern, and integral (with yet higher waves possible), research suggests that somewhere around 50-60% of the population is traditional, 30-40% is modern, 20% postmodern, and only 2% or so (worldwide) is at integral or higher (that adds up to more than 100% because of considerable overlap in stages).[1]

However, recent research has also indicated that there is a growing movement at the leading edge—in the cultural elite, in thought leaders, in the media, arts, and academia in general—where substantial portions of the postmodern population are starting to move into integral waves of awareness. In the social sciences and humanities, for example, Jeffrey Alexander, arguably America's most gifted sociologist (and brother of the late Skip Alexander, American's greatest meditation researcher), has identified three major post-WWII phases (as we earlier saw): functionalism (*modernist*), microsociology (*postmodern* pluralist), and a new and rising third phrase: "*an age of synthesis*," an integral age at the leading edge, just now beginning.

---

[1] These percentages vary considerably depending upon which model is being used, the type of metrics, and so on. Robert Kegan, for example, in *In Over Our Heads*, estimates that 3 in 5 Americans are not at the modern (orange, worldcentric, rational) level of development—in other words, 60% or so of Americans are at ethnocentric or lower. Worldwide, using similar types of gauges, it looks like upwards of 70% of the world's population is at ethnocentric or lower (the percentage I usually give). The percentages presented in the text are simply meant to convey the fact that, no matter how we measure it, the overall number of the population at any truly integral levels is indeed modest (2-5%). The encouraging news is that the percentage at Integral is growing fairly substantially, and some authorities suggest that within the next 1-2 decades, we might reach that 10% "tipping point" at Integral levels.

We also saw that historically it has been the case that, in order for any sort of genuine transformation to occur—or any sort of real "revolution"—not only does the revolution have to be led by an elite, that elite must possess a new paradigm, which means that it must possess, not a new theory or worldview, but a new type of social practice, mode of production, concrete behavioral injunctions, or experimental exemplars. These social practices, injunctions, or exemplars—these new paradigms and methodologies—generate, enact, bring forth, and illumine new types of experiences, occasions, data, phenomena. Around these new experiences, data, or illuminations, there do indeed then grow new theories, new worldviews, new superstructures. "Paradigm" refers to the *methodologies of enacting new phenomena*, not merely to the theories that attempt to explain them, although both new paradigms and new theories swing into play as new and higher waves of consciousness continue to unfold.

Because we will be exploring what new paradigms and new theories mean, here are a few quick examples to illustrate what is involved, and then we will focus on what an "integral methodology" might look like in the coming age of synthesis—and at the *integral salons and organizations* that are now springing up around the world, crucibles of a consciousness struggling to be born.

For those unfamiliar with the work of some of the leading theorists of consciousness evolution—such as Jean Gebser, James Mark Baldwin, Clare Graves, Jane Loevinger, Jürgen Habermas, and Robert Kegan—here is a brief summary. Research indicates that, like all natural living systems, consciousness can and does undergo evolution, development, or unfoldment. These theorists believe that the general waves of evolution or unfoldment have included *archaic*, tribal-*magic*, traditional-*mythic*, modern-*rational*, postmodern-*pluralistic*—all of which together are often called "*1st-tier*" or "*deficiency*" waves—and *integral-aperspectival*—which is often called "*2nd tier*" or "*Being*" waves. 1st-tier waves have one item in particular in common: each wave believes that its worldview and values are the only true and correct values; 2nd-tier or Integral waves attempt to

include and integrate the partial truths of all 1st-tier waves (believing each is "important, true, but partial"). Because consciousness evolution is still ongoing, some researchers loosely refer to "3rd-tier" waves, which are even more encompassing but, as yet, are still in their early, formative phases.

(As we briefly mentioned in <u>Excerpt A</u>—and will further explore in <u>Excerpt D</u>—technically, using the structures associated with one line—such as, for example, the levels of Spiral Dynamics, which best applies to the values line—to refer to another line/stream, amounts to line/stream absolutism; and a theoretical nightmare. Therefore, it is more appropriate to use a content-neutral marker. If we use the content-neutral rainbow-colors scheme of the altitude spectrum—an appropriate cross-stream marker which we will explore further in <u>Excerpt D</u>—these same major and basic stages are approximately: *infrared* (archaic), *magenta* (magic), *red* (magic-mythic), *amber* (traditional mythic-literal), *orange* (modern-rational), *green* (postmodern-pluralistic)—all of which are 1st tier; and then 2nd tier, *teal* (holistic) and *turquoise* (integral). In this country, depending on how you measure it, approximately 40-60%% of the adult population embrace traditional values, 40-50%% modern values, 20-25% postmodern values, and less than 5% are stably at 2nd- or 3rd-tier waves (less than 2% worldwide; again, this adds up to more than 100% because of much overlap). When we speak of "an integral age at the leading edge," we are focusing on that 2-5%, particularly as its numbers begin to significantly increase—which is exactly what appears to be happening with the dawning age of synthesis.

To return to our topic: the mutual interaction between theories and paradigms—the modern quantum revolution in physics, for example. Several novel types of experiments (such as those in black body radiation, which simply could not be explained by any existing physical theories) eventually lead to Max Planck's bold quantum hypothesis (namely, that energy does not exist in an unbroken continuum, but rather comes in discrete bundles or packets called "quanta"—which was indeed a revolutionary idea, and is at the foundation of all quantum mechanics

theories). A new mode of data production was bringing forth a phenomenological world that could not be adequately reflected or conceptualized in the old theories, and thus new theories were required. That is, a new exemplar, experiment, injunction, paradigm, or social practice was disclosing, bringing forth, or enacting new types of experiences, apprehensions, or data which could not be adequately explained or conceptualized within the older theories (which were adequately fitted to the phenomena of the older exemplars and paradigms —the Newtonian, for example).

The old theories and practices had gained *legitimacy* in the eyes of the knowledge community engaged in these social practices ("normal science"), precisely because, in their phenomenological domains, those theories and practices worked, and worked very well (they could, after all, place a human on the moon). But the new theories trying to grow up within these older theories just weren't working—the new data could not be legitimated within the older realms of discourse, and thus a clash between older scientific exemplar-worldviews and newer scientific exemplar-worldviews was in set in play. A paradigm is a mode of phenomena production or generation, a social practice or experiment that enacts or brings forth a phenomenological world, and theories are after-the-fact frameworks that attempt to explain or elucidate the newly-disclosed worlds.[2] And the old theories just weren't working.

Put simply, a theory is a map of a territory, while a paradigm is a practice that brings forth a territory in the first place. The paradigm or social practice itself is called an "exemplar" or "injunction" (which Kuhn originally called a "paradigm," but he changed the name to "exemplar" because too many people were interpreting "paradigm" as a "super theory"

---

[2] More technically, theories and paradigms tetra-enact. Even a mental theory is, in itself, a mental injunction or paradigm. When paradigm is used to mean "social practice," it is simply highlighting the overall occasion that includes exterior (social) dimensions as well as interior (mental and cultural) dimensions. It is the "social practice" side of paradigms that is most often overlooked, and thus the side that is being most emphasized here. But no quadrant exists or acts on its own.

that could itself create facts, thus denying any real progress, which is not what he had in mind at all), and the theory is called, well, the theory. The point is that knowledge revolutions are generally combinations of new paradigm-practices that bring forth a new phenomenological territory plus new theories and maps that attempt to offer some sort of abstract or contoured guidance to the new territories thus disclosed and brought forth. But a new theory without a new practice is simply a new map with no real territory, or what is generally called "ideology."

A scientific revolution is the result of new paradigms/exemplars and new theories coming into accord with each other, both of which are anchored, not in abstractions but in social practices. These revolutions are embraced, at the start, by a handful of individuals at the leading edge, but, if validated, these new exemplar-worldviews (paradigms-and-theories) are accepted by the larger culture or knowledge community, becoming a new "normal" or "legitimated" science, which stabilizes and carries forward until the next set of pesky data arises that refuses to be humbled in the existing scheme of things, and new and heretofore undisclosed territories start to shimmer on the horizon of the possible.

A similar process is now at play, I believe, in the nascent integral salons (or organizations or gatherings or businesses or professions) spontaneously forming around the world. Before we discuss that possibility in more detail, here is another example of a knowledge revolution, this time in politics.

ALL THAT IS SOLID MELTS INTO AIR

The rise of the modern, liberal, representative democracies in the West involved, among innumerable other things, a significant shift in values from *traditional* to *modern*, which particularly began in Europe around 1600 and accelerated to something of a crisis pitch by the mid-1770s. Traditional values (e.g., amber, mythic-membership, conventional, fundamentalist religious) tended to be conformist, ethnocentric,

hierarchical, mythic-religious, and based on individuals conforming strongly to the present order. Modern values, on the other hand, tend to be egalitarian (not hierarchical), individualistic (not conformist), scientific (not mythic-fundamentalist), and place a premium on equality (not aristocracy at one end or slavery at the other).

This shift from amber to orange, or from traditional values to modern values, was presaged in the salons or "small gatherings of moderns" (the word *salon* is French, but these gatherings were also occurring in England, Scotland, and Germany, among others), where the *social practice* of *dialoging* according to orange values was carefully exercised. That is, the practice of dialogue geared toward mutual understanding, reciprocal exchange, postconventional equality and freedom was practiced by small groups of leading-edge elites. This was a collective, communal, intersubjective, dialogical discourse at the orange wave of consciousness—a social practice, paradigm, or injunction of dialogical discourse within an elite subculture whose center of gravity was orange or higher.

This new exemplar or social practice gave rise to a set of novel experiences, insights, data, illuminations, and interpersonal understandings, which new *political theories* then sought to capture. Most of these new theories of liberal democracy shared the idea that the only way to integrate individual and collective (difficult to do because any collective will of necessity limit the behavior of the individual, setting off a problematic tension) is to have the individual feel that he or she is *participating* in the laws that govern his or her behavior. In the States this was popularly summarized by the phrase, "No taxation without representation," and it essentially meant that a people have the right to be self-governing. This new practice of dialogical discourse and self-governance (generally called a "social contract") was conceptualized in different ways by leading-edge individuals ranging from John Locke to Jacques Rousseau, Thomas Paine to Thomas Jefferson, Immanuel Kant to James Madison.

This self-governance is *not* a felt requirement of amber (which will follow the law if it is part of mythic-revealed tradition), and it is not a felt requirement of red (which will follow the law if it issues from the tribal power leader). Only at orange does interiority start to demand a hand in the laws that regulate its own behavior. Only at orange do more and more individuals demand a representation in the body that governs them.

(Of course, there were several other social injunctions that were part of the orange tetra-worldspace, including an industrial base in the Lower Right that was one of single largest factors in reducing the need for slavery, because it lessened the demand for physical bodily strength in order to succeed in the public sphere, thus paving the way for, and actually allowing, the various liberation movements, including feminism and abolition. In all previous societies, physical strength was part of the requirement of extracting from nature the basic requirements for survival —and thus every previous societal type, bar none, from foraging to horticultural to agrarian, had some form of slavery; but with the industrial revolution, machines began to replace human muscle in that capacity, removing human brute strength from the equation and replacing brawn with brain. Here we are focusing on the subset of social practices or paradigms within the rising cultural elite—post-conventional or worldcentric consciousness in the individual—Upper Left—as it interacted —Upper Right—with cultural discourse—Lower Left—that was forging a new and revolutionary form of governance that would tetra-mesh with the new techno-economic base, namely, industrialization—Lower Right.)

In short, *out of this new exemplar* or social practice of orange dialogical discourse (which was enacting and bringing forth a new set of experiences, data, and illuminations) soon issued a new *theory* of political governance called the *social contract*, whose general form is: any legitimate governing system is a contract between the governors and those governed, such that the two are mutually determining, with ultimate power resting with the governed. This usually involves the election of governors by those governed, such that sovereignty does indeed rest, in the final analysis, with

the people being governed. All representative, liberal, industrial democracies are today some form of a social contract, which was first pioneered, in a micro-quadratic form, by a small cultural elite at the leading edge who were forging new types of social practice or paradigms embodying a higher, wider, deeper wave of consciousness unfolding.

This was all radically new, and affected areas of life from governance to work to marriage and family structures to forms of knowledge acquisition (science over myth) to social relations (rise of a middle class) to economic forms (capitalism over feudalism) to religion (rational Deism over mythic-literalism) to new forms of art (perspectival versus flat). So profound were all these changes that they were summarized by Marx as, "All that is solid melts into air."

THE GREAT POSSIBILITY

And so it is today, with an integral age at the leading edge. The possibility —and it is only a gossamer possibility at this time—is that a new and wider wave of consciousness—an integral wave, an age of synthesis—is beginning to emerge and push against all of the now-older waves (traditional, modern, and postmodern), throwing each of them (but especially the postmodern) into a legitimation crisis about its own validity —a crisis of legitimacy that can only be resolved by an increase in authenticity, or an actual transformation to the new and higher integral wave of unfolding (2nd tier, centauric, vision-logic, integral-aperspectival). "Legitimation," again, means a horizontal validation, and is bought by a shuffling around of surface structures; "authenticity" means a vertical validation, and is bought by a genuine transformation to a higher level or deeper structure of consciousness and culture. If a legitimation crisis is caused by an increase in depth (a higher level) in any of the quadrants, it can only be resolved by an increase in authenticity in all the quadrants to match the new level of altitude. And this is why an increase in cultural discourse from amber-mythic to orange-rational (in the Lower Left)

demanded a political transformation (in the Lower Right) from amber monarchy to orange representative democracy.

This new Integral unfolding will involve, in terms of its paradigmatic base, an actual set of social practices, not merely a new theory or set of theories. As we saw in detail in Excerpt A and briefly summarized above, a paradigm is a social practice or behavioral injunction, not simply a theory or intellectual edifice (although, of course, they tetra-evolve together). Accordingly, any new paradigm will include a set of exemplars and practices—practices that, if they contain more depth (or Eros) than their predecessors, will throw the old approaches into a legitimation crisis that can only be resolved by a vertical ("revolutionary") transformation—as we said, under these circumstances, the crisis in legitimacy can only be resolved by an increase in authenticity. Thus, a new Integral paradigm will therefore be a new set of injunctions and practices, not simply theories, not worldviews, not Web-of-Life notions, not holistic concepts—but actual practices.

What kind of practices might be the harbinger of the Integral revolution at the leading edge? What might these social practices look like?

INTEGRAL METHODOLOGICAL PLURALISM

In the above example about representative democracies and the social contract, we pointed to two broad areas of social practice, a macro-practice (or techno-economic base) that included industrialization, which, for all its pathological downsides, had as some of its positive accomplishments the lessening of the demand for physical strength in the public sphere (which therefore lessened the rule of might and hierarchies of physical power, replacing brawn with brain), which tetra-supported worldviews that, for the first time in history, began publicly valuing freedom, liberty, and equality—with individuals actually fighting and dying in revolutions for those values. On a smaller or micro-scale, that social revolution was pioneered in cultural elites whose social practices included, for the first

time in history on any sort of significant scale, a dialogical discourse and social behavior conducted via the orange probability wave of postconventional awareness (where "postconventional" does not mean post-cultural or post-social, only post-traditional forms of sociocultural). At that point, written theoretical treatises about the social contract—by Rousseau, Locke, Jefferson—actually contributed to an increase in the span of those who wished to implement the new paradigm or practice on a wider scale, by revolution if necessary (although reform, if genuine—i.e., if riding the new wave of Eros—can accomplish the same increase in authenticity via a quieter but equally effective route).

What types of micro-practices at today's leading edge might be the harbinger of an Integral wave set to emerge on a wider scale? It is still a bit early to speculate, but perhaps we can glean several possible characteristics.

First and foremost, it seems, would be an expansive and inclusive methodology (or paradigm) for generating the types of experiences that can be taken as legitimate by the new and Integral wave. *Legitimacy*, as we saw in Excerpt A, involves, among other things, the "believability" of a worldview (and therefore the likelihood that its adherents will adopt it). Each cultural worldview (in the LL) is accompanied by a series of paradigms or social practices (especially but not solely in the LR), and these practices or injunctions generate, enact, and bring forth the types of experiences that are held to be true, good, right, or—in general—valid, believable, and legitimate (which are then codified in the reigning worldview, which in turn legitimates the practices supporting the worldview, which governs the thoughts and behavior of those who are members of that particular culture or subculture: tetra-legitimacy).

Before moving to any sort of Integral paradigm, let's look at the basic paradigm that it would be succeeding, namely the postmodern or pluralistic wave. Beginning in earnest about four decades ago, most postmodern paradigms or social practices (embodying the pluralistic or green probability wave) involved social behavior that was often grounded

in group discussions that attempted to include every participant in a mode of nonjudgmental listening; this social behavior generated collective experiences of group solidarity and an indictment of individualism, with an powerful emphasis on intersubjectivity in all its forms and a condemnation of empiricism and subjectivism. Academically, written texts or chains of signifiers were therefore deconstructed according to a general practice of inverting hierarchies (making marginal center and center peripheral—thus deconstructing any and all prevailing hierarchies and hegemonic marginalizing, while simultaneously placing a premium on confessional displays of diversity); deviant behavior was therefore judged to be deviant according to items like tone (e.g., an "angry" tone might indicate "insincerity"), not content (which was largely irrelevant to the major issues at hand, which included the creation of compassionate, sensitive, and caring humans—indicated by things such as their "tone," not their content per se).

Around those very specific social practices, all occurring within the probability space of the pluralistic wave, sprang up various worldviews that conceptually codified what it was to be *legitimate* in this new worldspace, maps for how to find one's way around in this new territory. Thus, legitimacy at the green wave included adopting a worldview that was: nonhierarchical, nonjudgmental, nonmarginalizing, non-oppressive, non-Big-Picture, and nonranking. Positive items, such as intersubjectivity or cultural grounding, could be part of legitimacy, but only if they fit the foregoing exclusionary criteria (e.g., one's intersubjectivity was not allowed to be developmental, since that involved the taboo items of hierarchies and ranking).

The benefits of the healthy green wave were initially many and profound, including most environmental reforms, the civil rights movement, and feminism as a significant cultural force. The downsides were that, as the legitimacy list suggests, many of the characteristics of green legitimacy consisted of what it *was not* (it was not hierarchical, not judgmental, not ranking, not…). This is why its primary paradigm or social injunction was

"deconstruction" (by whatever name, a thorough-going criticism and usually condemnation of everything other than postmodern pluralism). That this was a performative contradiction (pluralism means to accept all views, not attack so many of them; but this version believed itself to be superior in a world where it also believed that nothing was supposed to be superior—oops!—and it believed that it was universally true that there are no universal truths—oops!) was all generally overlooked. Deconstruction (or tearing down) worked quite well, at least initially, because red and amber and orange had built much that needed to be un-built or taken down (much that was oppressive, marginalizing—racist, sexist—and unfairly judgmental). But once the deconstructive work ended in its healthy form, there was little to put in its place in terms of reconstruction, because actual construction requires taking a concrete stand, which this form of pluralism disallowed (to support and embrace one value, for example, implied that you didn't like the other values—that you were judging them or marginalizing them or even trying to oppress them, and certainly ranking them as inferior to your accepted values. Slowly, all values and beliefs started to give way to nihilism, and deconstruction completely leveled the field of human thought, leaving a smoking ruins in its place). The endgame of the pluralistic paradigm was thus all-too-often a social behavior of politically correct thought police, green Inquisitors, and boomeritis of one unpleasant sort or another—by any names, it left only nihilism and narcissism, that twin tag team from postmodern hell.

The social practices of the Integral wave will almost certainly include the healthy aspects of the pluralistic wave (via Whiteheadian transcend-and-include). For example, healthy deconstruction (as a prelude to Integral reconstruction) will likely continue to play a central role, as will hermeneutics and collaborative inquiry. But a key ingredient of Integral social practices stems from what is perhaps the main defining characteristic of the Integral probability wave itself. Namely, whereas all previous waves of culture and consciousness (tribal, traditional, modern, and postmodern) believed that their values were the only valid or correct values, an Integral

wave acknowledges the importance and validity of all of those values, not just as historically appropriate (which the other waves will acknowledge), but as *inherent ingredients* in today's spiral of growth and development. Any 1st-tier wave finds this hard to believe, let alone accept. Orange, for example, claims to possess universal truths, truths that cover all the really important bases, but it rejects amber truths outright and it recoils in disgust in the face of green pluralism and fails to grasp 2nd-tier integralism. Green pluralism fares no better, in that it claims to be inclusive and nonjudgmental, but in fact it explicitly rejects red values, it explicitly rejects amber values, it explicitly rejects orange values, and it explicitly rejects 2nd-tier values—not actually very inclusive, is it? In contradistinction to all of those exclusionary social practices, an Integral wave attempts to acknowledge, honor, and actually include all of those previous values in the ongoing spiral of its own unfolding, thus bringing together the best of premodern, modern, and postmodern, while pledging exclusionary allegiance to none of them. At the very least, all of the previous levels/stages are ingredients in an overall sequence of human growth and development, and for that reason alone none of them can be left out without crippling human growth itself (any more than you can go from letters to sentences and leave out words). The Integral waves seem to intuitively understand this, and thus are indeed "integral" or "comprehensive" (and again, for the first time ever in human history).

So what does that mean when it comes to social practices? If the Integral wave includes the essentials of the 1st-tier waves (traditional to modern to postmodern)—and then moves beyond them with its own defining emergents—then an Integral social practice would of necessity include and exercise all of the important practices, injunctions, and methodologies of the 1st-tier waves, but now set in an Integral framework that includes their

enduring contributions yet transcends their partialities, absolutisms, and exclusionary practices.[3]

The result would be a set of paradigms, behavioral injunctions, and social practices that might be called, as we have suggested, an *Integral Methodological Pluralism.* "Integral," in that the pluralism is not a mere eclecticism or grab bag of unrelated paradigms, but a meta-paradigm (or even meta-meta-paradigm) that weaves together its many threads into an Integral tapestry, a unity-in-diversity that slights neither the unity nor the diversity. "Methodological," in that this is a real paradigm or set of actual practices and behavioral injunctions to bring forth an Integral territory, not merely a new holistic theory or maps without any territory. Further, "methodology" implies a profound unity of epistemology and ontology, of knowing and being, of consciousness and form, and refuses to tear these asunder into fragmented, partial, and separated domains, but sees them as two complementary components of every occasion (two aspects of an underlying Whole reality). And "pluralism" in that there is no one overriding or privileged injunction (other than to be radically all-inclusive). Unlike postmodernism, which practiced a type of *exclusionary pluralism* that condemned all other 1st-tier values (not to mention all 2nd-tier values), Integral or *inclusionary pluralism* is a conscientiously adopted set of behavioral paradigms for acknowledging—and actually seeking out—the enduring truths in categorically every major methodology in 1st- and 2nd- and 3rd-tier probability waves.

Integral Methodological Pluralism (IMP) has two main parts: paradigmatic and meta-paradigmatic. The *paradigmatic* aspect means a

---

[3] To say an integral social practice would in fact include and exercise all of the important practices, injunctions, and methodologies of the 1st-tier waves, but now subsumed in an integral framework that included their enduring contributions but transcended their partialities and absolutisms, is to say: insofar as they represent enduring, not merely transitional, structures. See *Integral Psychology.* We will return, later in the book, to what it is during transformation that is "negated" (transcended) and what is "preserved" (included). But the point is that this "transcend and include" operates throughout the entire spectrum of growth and development, and doesn't select just one privileged stage to embrace.

careful compilation of all the primary paradigms or methodologies of presently existing modes of human inquiry—which means, the major methodologies that are presently accepted *within their own fields* or disciplines as being valid. We have already given (in <u>Excerpt A</u>) an overview of many of those fundamental paradigms—and we will continue to explore more of those "need-to-be-included" paradigms as we proceed—from hermeneutics to phenomenology to behaviorism to systems theory to meditation to collaborative inquiry to vision quest to quantum physics to depth psychology to molecular biology. All of the major modes of human inquiry possess general practices and injunctions that bring forth and illumine various types of experiences, revelations, data, and phenomena held to be legitimate by those disciplines, and an Integral Methodological Pluralism quite literally makes room for all of those major modes of inquiry (and the phenomena that they enact or bring forth).

(Why? Because there are already large knowledge communities that have spent years or decades working with these practices, and have concluded that these methodologies are true and valuable means for acquiring knowledge in their fields, and so generally we give them the benefit of the doubt. For the most part, these are sincere, truthful, conscientious human beings who have often devoted entire lifetimes to using these particular methodologies and paradigms to generate true and real and good knowledge, and we have no reason to simply trash these results with little further ado, but rather assume their legitimacy until given significant reasons otherwise. As we say, no mind is capable of producing 100% error, and that means there is some sort of "true but partial" truths in all of them, which therefore deserve to be included and integrated.)

At this point, no attempt is made to judge whether a particular practice or paradigm should or should not be included in the mix. The fact is, these paradigms or practices *already* exist, they are *already* being practiced by human beings around the world—by men and women who are sincerely convinced that these practices bring forth something of value for themselves and others—and practices that accordingly deserve a fair

hearing in the integrative forums or salons now nascently self-organizing. The first or paradigmatic part of IMP is thus a respectful compilation, without judgment, of the major methodologies for enacting, illuminating, and bringing forth various worldspaces or ways of being-in-the-world. These are the various paradigms or methodologies that, for the most part, already exist and are already being practiced by caring and concerned men and women around the world.

The second part of any Integral Methodological Pluralism, and the part that prevents it from being a 1st-tier eclecticism, is a *meta-paradigmatic set of practices* that conscientiously relate the various paradigmatic strands to each other. Put simply, Integral Methodological Pluralism includes a compilation of the most important, time-tested methodologies, as well as a set of practices that weave them together or integrate them into ways of being-in-the-world that are radically nonexclusionary. This aspect of IMP can be summarized as, "*Everybody is right.*"

(Put technically, such a meta-paradigmatic practice enacts a new domain upon the individually-enacted paradigmatic domains, such that their individually-enacted phenomena interrelate, their brought-forth horizons interact to some degree, and there is enacted upon the enacted phenomena —and accordingly there is brought forth, illumined, and most fundamentally disclosed—a new territory or domain of Integral interrelationships. In other words, this is a paradigm of paradigms—and even a paradigm of paradigms of paradigms—which means, as we now know, a practice of practices and not a theory of theories—although it possesses that, too, as its meta-theory, or the attempt to explain the results of its meta-paradigms.)

These types of meta-paradigmatic practices—as they apply to an individual, a group, a research setting, a society—will be outlined as we go along, but here is a quick preview of what might be involved. Please keep in mind that we are at this point discussing Integral practices at the leading edge, which often involve nothing more exciting than arcane academic

debates, abstruse experiments, and highly technical—which is to say, boring—streams of discourse organized around issues of methodology. These Integral methodologies, as they are refined and streamlined, and as they begin to slip out of their Integral salon settings and into the culture at large in a more popular fashion, will be vastly simpler (and hopefully more interesting) than their pioneering forms, standing in a similar relation of, say, the handheld calculator (which is now the size of a matchbox) to the original computers (which were the size of a trailer). But the point is essentially the same: what kind of practices build bridges between other practices?

In a research setting, for example, a meta-paradigmatic practice might involve "simultracking," where phenomena in various domains are simultaneously tracked according to the accepted methodologies of those domains. For example, during collaborative inquiry (which enacts the Lower-Left or intersubjective dimensions of being-in-the-world), simultaneously track the participants' brainwave patterns (which discloses aspects of the Upper-Right or objective dimensions of being-in-the-world), and then look for correlations between them. This practice of simultracking is not something that would ordinarily occur to the postmodern pluralist (who does not believe in objective science) nor to the scientist (who does not believe in pluralism). Caught in their respective quadrant absolutisms, they rarely talk to each other.

In that particular case, the paradigmatic aspect of IMP includes both of those *practices* (not just theories, but the actual practices of engaging in collaborative inquiry and of running an EEG flow pattern), and then IMP adds the second or meta-paradigmatic practice, the "Integral" part of simultracking (or running them together and actively noting any correlations), which is a practice that can enact, bring forth, and illumine the Integral interrelationships between various holons originally thought discrete or even nonexistent. In other words, this practice on a set of practices (or this meta-paradigm on the individual paradigms) brings forth and illumines the mutual interactions between actual occasions, and it

does so only from a space that theory would later call a 2nd- (or even 3rd-) tier probability wave. That is, meta-paradigmatic practices stand forth only in the worldspace of 2nd- (or 3rd-) tier consciousness, which discloses holonic and integral relationships ("the universal patterns that connect") that were operative but not visible at 1st-tier waves. (Since thinking itself is a social activity, even thinking of how these different paradigms interrelate with each other is a type of meta-paradigmatic practice—as along as what is being thought about are actual paradigms or practices, and not mere theories themselves. The territory disclosed by this practice is that of the meta-theory itself.)

On a more personal side, IMP involves things like Integral Transformative Practice (ITP) and Integral Life Practice (ILP), wherein a full range of human potentials are simultaneously engaged and exercised in order to enact and bring forth any higher states and stages of human potential, leading individuals through their own personal legitimation crisis to an increase in authenticity. This often involves, if one is doing, say, a spiritual practice, combining that practice with bodily practices, mental practices, and shadow practices—in individual quadrants—combined with ethical practices, relationship practices, and work/vocation practices (in collective quadrants). There is significant empirical evidence that such "cross-training" ("meta-paradigm" training) accelerates the development in each domain, and in a quicker fashion than practicing the domains alone and separately. (One study, for example, showed that Buddhist vipassana meditation practitioners, who combined meditation practice with weight lifting—still spending the same number of hours per week on overall practice—progressed more rapidly in their meditation practice than those just doing meditation, as judged by their teachers themselves.) On a societal scale, it involves approaching social ills with an integrative tool kit, not a piecemeal series of ameliorations that often create as many problems as they solve. 2nd-tier solutions to social problems involve sustained inquiries into ways that will allow each wave (e.g., magenta, red, amber, orange, green) to freely explore its own potentials but in ways that those

waves would not construct if left to their own exclusionary practices (and with tools applied in all quadrants, not just one or two). In academic settings, Integral Methodological Pluralism allows the creation not so much of more cross-disciplinary studies (which confirm each other in their 1st-tier prejudices) but in trans-disciplinary studies (which enact a new territory of Integral displays between old rivalries).[4]

---

[4] There is a major difference between Integral Theory and trans-disciplinary theories. The latter theories, now still in their early stages, are fumbling around a bit, and in general have taken the course of simply adding together all knowledge into a Grand Data accumulation. Unlike interdisciplinary approaches (which approach a problem using two distinct paradigms, with no desire to unite these paradigms, but simply use them simultaneously to shed light on the problem), and multidisciplinary approaches (which include 2, 3, or more paradigms to approach a problem, but also do not intend to synthesize these paradigms into a larger paradigm), transdisciplinary approaches tend to drive toward a type of Hegelian super-synthesis of all known knowledge held together in a super-paradigm. The problem with this approach is that it almost always bogs down in a handful of hidden paradigms that limit the knowledge included and restrict the actual value of the approach. The Integral Approach, on the other hand, uses a Framework that inherently includes all of the major methodologies advanced to date, and weaves these paradigms into a unified Framework that draws on the partial truths of each. Thus, what the Integral Framework includes is not all known data—an endless task— but all known major methodologies for generating that data. Thus, if part of the problem that is being approached Integrally happens to need a particular set of data generated by one of the paradigms, that paradigm will generate the data on an as needed basis, thus bypassing the being overwhelmed with an endless Data accumulation program (whether it's needed or not). Further, to make any discipline Integral, all that is then required is not to include all the other known data in the world from all the other disciplines, but simply to fill out all the dimensions of the Integral AQAL Framework with data from within the particular discipline itself (because most disciplines have sub-schools that deal with each of the 4 quadrants, and the problem has been that these 4 sub-schools are at each other's throats, instead of being included in a holistic embrace that includes all of them in a wider approach. You can thus create an Integral Law model by referring mostly to the knowledge and data generated within the overall Law discipline, but which has been, up to this moment, Balkanized and fragmented into 4-quadrant disputes and negations. Instead, all 4 sub-schools are included in a tetra-unified scheme that makes room for all of their "true but partial" contributions. It is the Integral Framework itself that is transdisciplinary, and not a ton of Accumulated Data attempted to be pulled together in a Hegelian-type synthesis, but almost always failing due not only to the sheer impossible volume of Data, but to the hidden paradigms governing the quest that aren't themselves really fully Integral (primarily because they remain implicit, and not explicitly recognized so they can be consciously operated on, but continue unconsciously generating Data with no understanding of its base). These problems are largely bypassed with an Integral Approach, which is transdisciplinary in that it transcends and includes all the major methodologies from all the major disciplines, and not all the ever-unfolding Data stream from all the major disciplines, a virtually impossible task. (Moreover, each different level of being-consciousness has a different set of Data, and without knowing all the different levels to begin with, important Data will always get left out—but you have to already have a genuinely Integral Map in order to the know all the levels, a Map the typical transdisciplinary maps lack to begin with, and thus remain caught in a vicious circle of incompleteness—they can't get a transdisciplinary Map without first having a transdisciplinary Map, and so they stumble around in the dark, haphazardly adding disciplines to disciplines with no real integral guidelines.)

In general, to put it in orange terms, any sort of Integral Methodological Pluralism allows the creation of a multi-purpose toolkit for approaching today's complex problems—individually, socially, and globally—with more comprehensive solutions that have a chance of actually making a difference. Or, to say the same thing with green terms, an Integral Methodological Pluralism allows a richer diversity of interpretations of life's text to stand forth in a clearing of mutual regard, thus marginalizing no interpretation in the process.

On an individual scale, the same approach can be applied to one's own profession, converting it into a practice of Integral Law, Integral Medicine, Integral Business, Integral Education, Integral Politics, Integral Ecology, Integral Psychotherapy, and so on. We will see examples of many of these as we proceed.

Most of the tools to do all of the above already exist (i.e., the MP of the IMP are already out there). All that is required, at least to get started, are a few integrating principles to initiate the "Integral" part of the IMP. These heuristic principles suggest simple ways to practice on those practices already out there, thus quickly converting any given practice into an Integral practice. Let's look at three such integrative principles as examples.

THE ESSENCE OF INTEGRAL METATHEORY: EVERYBODY IS RIGHT

First, one last issue. At this point we have been mostly talking about social practices in a micro-elite (such as in academia). As we saw, accepted methodologies generate the types of experiences taken to be valid and legitimate by the knowledge community practicing the paradigm: each cultural worldview (in the LL) is accompanied by a series of paradigms or social practices (in all 4 quadrants), and these practices or injunctions generate, enact, and bring forth the types of experiences that are held to be

true, good, or right by the knowledge community (or—in general—are held to be valid, believable, and legitimate by those within the horizons brought forth by the paradigm), experiences that are codified in the legitimating worldview, which in turn helps govern the behavior (UR) and the types of phenomena held to be significant (UL) by individuals who are members of that culture or sub-culture (LL/LR; with all of them, of course, mutually tetra-evolving and tetra-enacting).

In short, around social practices, paradigms, or methodologies, theories or worldviews grow.[5] Paradigms bring forth new territories, which new maps

---

[5] Even theories themselves are another set of injunctions, namely, mental injunctions, in that all enactments generally follow the three strands of injunction/paradigm, disclosure/data/phenomena, and confirmation/rejection. The "three strands of knowing" have caused confusion among a few critics, who imagined that the three strands themselves are evidence of scientism. But the three strands—(1) injunction, paradigm, or enactment; (2) bringing forth of the enacted phenomena, data, or experience; and (3) knowledge-community validation—refer only to the general features of enactment in any domain—artistic, moral, scientific, hermeneutic, etc.—and not to the specific forms that the scientific modes of enactment involve. What probably confused these critics is that I used the term "deep science" to cover the higher forms of knowledge that follow those three strands but are not confined to the sensory data of "narrow science." They therefore equated the three strands themselves with their form in deep science and accused the whole show of positivism.

Not so. In music, for example, if you want to hear a version of Beethoven's "Fifth Symphony," then perhaps you might get a piano, learn to play it by studying with a teacher, then play the Fifth, then see if the teacher (representing the music knowledge-community) agrees that what you played was, more or less, Beethoven's Fifth. Those are the three strands of phenomenological enactment applied to the performing arts, and there is nothing positivistic about that at all. The three strands are simply a summary of the types of enacting activity that we usually find when any phenomenological world is brought forth in a valid manner. Within those worlds, however, there are then the quite different and specific methodologies of science, morals, art, and so forth, each of which follows different types of methods with different validity criteria (e.g., truth, truthfulness, justness, functional fit), and each of which can be subjected to the major different judgments (cognitive truth, aesthetic attractiveness, and moral rightness, among others). All of this explained in endnote 15 for chap. 4, *A Theory of Everything*.

Further, injunction x data x confirmation refers just to the methodology or how aspect of reality enactment—there is also the who (epistemology) and what (ontology), each of which need to be included.

attempt abstractly to reflect.[6] Integral Methodological Pluralism is no different. It is a series of concrete practices; engaging these practices enacts, brings forth, discloses, and illumines a series of phenomena, data, experiences, and mutual or intersubjective prehensions—and around this entire set of disclosures and new experiences, various theories and worldviews grow, theories (and meta-theories or supertheories) that attempt to elucidate, explain, and codify the plethora of phenomena (subjective, intersubjective, objective, and interobjective) enacted or thrown up by the social practices or paradigms.

With regard to IMP, we can put the crucial point very simply: what if an individual accepted the basic validity of hermeneutics AND systems theory AND introspective phenomenology AND empirical science AND shamanic states of consciousness AND developmental psychology AND collaborative inquiry AND ecological sciences AND postmodern contextualism AND neuroscience AND meditative phenomenology…. Well, perhaps the point is annoyingly obvious. If the basic *legitimacy* of *all* of those time-tested methodologies is allowed, then the experiences that all of those social practices enact, bring forth, and illumine become grist for the mill of a new supertheory or meta-theory that accounts, or at least attempts to account, for all of them in a believable, coherent fashion.

---

[6] Incidentally, when we say that theories map or reflect territories brought forth or enacted by a social practice or paradigm, this is NOT a reflection theory of truth—it is not the representation theory, not the fundamental Enlightenment paradigm, not the Mirror of Nature view. The reflection or representation model leaves out the enaction part (which is only the most important part). That is, the reflection model imagines that there is only one territory (or one Nature that all theories are supposed to map, reflect, or represent accurately), and fails to notice that different paradigms bring forth different worlds in the first place (just as different levels of being-consciousness bring forth different phenomena, experiences, and data).

In short, there is not one world over which different theories compete for supremacy, but many worlds brought forth by many different paradigms, within which different theories then rightly compete according to the rules of engagement of the knowledge community grounded in a particular paradigm or social practice. The representation model is not wrong in its claim that accurately mapping a territory is important, but wrong in its claim that there is only one territory (a claim that secretly absolutized its own paradigm). Paradigms present or co-create worlds; theories map or represent them. Both are crucial in any integral epistemological model.

At this time, one such meta-theory is AQAL, which, we've noted, is short for "all quadrants, all levels, all lines, all states, all types." This meta-theory did not precede Integral Methodological Pluralism, but, as usual, vice versa. That is, the ingredients of the AQAL meta-theory are the phenomena (subjective, intersubjective, objective, and interobjective) enacted and brought forth by literally dozens of time-honored methodologies, injunctions, paradigms, and practices. It is the existence of these many paradigms and social practices—and the phenomena they generate—that are some of the crucial ingredients of Integral Methodological Pluralism (i.e., the "paradigmatic" part of IMP), and the AQAL Framework is a meta-theory or supertheory meant to integrate them all (the "integral" part of IMP).

The novel component of IMP is the meta-paradigmatic aspect, or the practices on the practices (which generate theories on the theories, or the meta-theory or supertheory known as AQAL). This component can be most simply summarized as the assumption that "*Everybody is right*," which generates a meta-practice of honoring, including, and integrating the fundamental paradigms and methodologies of the major forms of human inquiry (traditional, modern, and postmodern—whether in practices on practices, or practices on practices on practices, or practices on practices on practices—which gets us to turquoise). In other words, the experiences enacted by all of those methodologies are given a *legitimacy* by the IMP assumption and are actively *cultivated* by the meta-paradigmatic practices—that is, are actively cultivated by an Integral Methodological Pluralism, whether in the research setting of simultracking, the personal setting of an Integral Life Practice, or the social setting of revolutionary reforms that actually have traction because all 4-quadrant potentials are effectively tetra-engaged.

AQAL, then, is a meta-theory that attempts to integrate the most amount of material from an Integral Methodological Pluralism, thus honoring the primary injunction of an integral embrace: Everybody is right. (And, as we will see, what is discovered as this approach is pursued is that some

theories are more right than others—more comprehensive, more inclusive, more embracing, more integral—but no matter how partial, the partial truths of all views are honored and incorporated in a truly Integral Approach.)

THE FIRST USEFUL PRINCIPLE: NONEXCLUSION

On a meta-theoretical level, exactly how to incorporate what are at times conflicting paradigms into an integrative web is a difficult, delicate issue. If we accept the validity of a plurality or multiplicity of paradigms and their enacted phenomena—and given the fact that many of these paradigms do not, to put it politely, accept each other—then how to weave them all together in something of a coherent whole becomes a difficult task indeed. To say that "Everybody is right" is one thing; believably weaving them together, quite another.

There appear to be at least three integrative principles or guidelines that are useful in this endeavor—that is, three guidelines that can help incorporate the most number of truths from the most number of sources (and thus validate the most number of people, who are already engaged in those practices anyway).

The first useful integrative principle is *nonexclusion*. Nonexclusion means that we can accept the valid truth claims (i.e., the truth claims that pass the validity tests *for their own paradigms* in their own fields, whether in hermeneutics, spirituality, science, etc.) insofar as they make statements about the existence of their own enacted and disclosed phenomena, but *not* when they make statements about the existence of phenomena enacted by other paradigms. That is, one paradigm can competently pass judgments within its own worldspace, but not on those spaces enacted (and only seen) by other paradigms.

For example, we may take it as provisionally true that, as claimed by empirical physics, a water molecule contains two hydrogen atoms and one

oxygen atom. This is a provisional truth established by time-honored paradigms of empirical natural science, and it concerns statements about the existence of phenomena that are enacted, brought forth, and illumined by an elaborate set of paradigms or social practices engaged in by physical scientists. (Have you ever seen a hydrogen atom? Me neither, because it is not an experience lying around out there in the sensory world waiting for all and sundry to see, but a series of experiences that are enacted and brought forth by elaborate physical science paradigms, experiments, paraphernalia, equipment, and injunctions. Still, within those paradigms, we have reason to suppose those claims are true enough. At any event, IMP—and hence, AQAL—makes that assumption under the guiding "Everybody-is-right" meta-paradigm. I believe it when these scientists tell me that water consists of two hydrogen atoms and one oxygen atom, because these are decent men and women engaged in their social practice with integrity, and as far as I can tell, they have never lied to me before. And anyway, if I wanted to, I could spend four or five years learning how to practice the paradigm and find out for myself, but I think I'll just take their word for it right now. And notice that, within the paradigm of physical science, you can make strong judgments: it is categorically *false* that water contains 8 hydrogen atoms. So statements of "correct" and "incorrect"—"true" and "false"—*can* be adjudicated *within* paradigms.)

But when physical science goes from making a statement about the phenomena enacted by its own paradigms and begins making assertions about phenomena brought forth by other paradigms—whether in hermeneutics, depth psychology, or spirituality—we are allowed to—how shall I put this kindly?—let out a big yawn. If you have not engaged the paradigm, injunction, or social practice of another discipline (whether collaborative inquiry in hermeneutics, phenomenology in depth psychology, or meditation in spirituality)—then you will not have access to the enacted and disclosed phenomena of the paradigm, and thus you are not competent to pass judgments in that domain, any more than

somebody who refuses to learn physics is allowed to meaningfully vote on the existence of hydrogen atoms.

Nonexclusion means that the paradigm of one field can be used to pronounce on the phenomena of that field, but not on the phenomena of another field brought forth by different paradigms—and it certainly cannot be used to deny, exclude, marginalize, oppress, colonize, or otherwise do violence to other paradigms, other fields, other data domains, other experiences brought forth by other legitimately engaged injunctions. In short, one paradigm cannot be used, by itself, to exclude other legitimately enacted paradigms.

If we accept the nonexclusion principle, then—in this particular example using physics—we are faced with this task: given the experiences, data, and phenomena brought forth by the physical sciences, how can we conceptually fit those into a scheme that makes room for (or does not exclude) the other phenomena of the many other paradigms? In other words, how can we allow the existence of the phenomena of physical science without those phenomena excluding and denying others?

This is where a meta-theory or super-theory of relating data domains becomes helpful. Any plausible Integral meta-theory—by virtue of its attempt to acknowledge all major legitimated paradigms in various fields —would set implicit boundaries to the believability of any single paradigm operating on its own. An Integral meta-theory would, in effect, *free the paradigm by limiting it.*

(Typically, when one paradigm starts making judgments about other paradigms, the resulting statements are confused, wrong, silly, misinformed, or just plain idiotic. This is not the best use of that paradigm, and certainly not what it was designed to do. By limiting the paradigm to its own field of expertise, we actually free the paradigm to do what it does best, where it shines, and that is pronouncing on its own enacted data and phenomena, and helping us understand those. Taking

side-swipes at other paradigms does nothing but illustrate the ignorance of those doing so, and the whole activity is just flat out embarrassing. IMP frees all paradigms by limiting all paradigms to their own field of authority and expertise, where they may range as freely as they like over the truths that their own injunctions have so wonderfully brought forward.)

As it is now, when any paradigm oversteps its authority and begins to make pronouncements about other phenomena brought forth by other paradigms, the only principle guiding the pronouncements tends to be, "I'm right, you're wrong." My paradigm is the best, only, real, and/or authentic mode of inquiry, and the phenomena of your paradigm can all be reduced to the phenomena brought forth by my paradigm. If you are a die-hard physical scientist, you imagine that the phenomena brought forth by other paradigms (such as hermeneutics, meditation, systems theory, or postmodernism) can all be reduced to a "consilience" of laws governing fundamental physical particles; and if you are postmodernist, you return the favor and claim that all physical particles are nothing but social constructions, a reality revealed only by your own deconstructive paradigm. Thus precedes the 1st-tier food fight.

To "free a paradigm by limiting it" means that, with any genuinely Integral orientation, the already existing boundaries of a particular paradigm become more obvious (by seeing its relation to so many other paradigms), and thus when operating within those bounds, the pronouncements of a particular paradigm become even more believable, while pronouncements outside its bounds become even less so. Part of the problem with individual paradigms and the fields growing up around them is that when those paradigms pretend to cover the whole of reality, and yet when they fail to deliver the whole of reality, the entire paradigm itself is questioned and often rejected, when all that needs to be questioned is its exclusiveness claims.

But if the paradigm refuses to acknowledge its already existing boundaries, it either starts issuing promissory notes ("I cannot explain all of reality

today, but I will be able to do so tomorrow, I promise"—materialism, for example, has been issuing this promissory note with increasing gusto for two-thousand years and has never once delivered), or else the entire paradigm is rejected with disgust, if not by its practitioners, then by the rest of the world reduced to conciliatory appendages of this chosen paradigm. (Marxism, for example, reduces all human reality to dialectical materialism—to the interaction of solely physical-material realities in their developmental unfolding, which creates and enfolds all religion, all art, all science, all morals, all economics, all architecture, all class relations—all of it, when in fact each of those domains has its own developmental logic and phenomenological rules governing the form, appearance, and dynamics of its objects and subjects—has, in short, its own paradigms. But with a flick of its finger, Marxism has done with the fundamental reality of all of those domains, and reduces them, without remainder, to collective interactive bashings of material entities.) But by limiting the applicability of the paradigm to within the already existing bounds of the paradigm (in the case of Marxism, one interpretation of the LR quadrant), then its actual potential, within those bounds, is freed to make its own crucial contributions. Hence, "free a paradigm by limiting it"—which allows different data domains to retain their own reality but not nullify the reality of others.

In the present example of physics, the question was, "How can we allow the existence of the phenomena of physical science without those phenomena excluding and denying others?" AQAL meta-theory suggests one such Integral interpretation, namely: the accepted paradigms of physical sciences (e.g., chemistry and physics) are disclosing the 3rd-person singular dimensions (the UR quadrant) of holons accessed and brought forth by an orange or higher probability wave. Within that well-defined spacetime locale of the AQAL Matrix, we take physical sciences very seriously. Outside of that locale, they are simply not qualified to pass believable judgments (physical laws can't even explain the "next higher-up

level" of molecular biology, let alone entirely other-quadrant realities like meditative spirituality).

Likewise with collaborative inquiry, phenomenology, intersubjective postmodernism, interobjective systems theory, and so on. All such legitimately enacted paradigms are bringing forth and highlighting various locales in the AQAL Matrix. (How do we know this? Because numerous human beings are already doing those practices, so they must exist somewhere in any adequate map of what is.) Perhaps they are lighting up the 1st-person singular modes (the UL quadrant) of being-in-the-world at a teal wave (and thus disclosing the psychological drives of self-actualization); perhaps they are lighting up the 2nd-person plural modes (the LL quadrant) of being-in-the-world at a green wave (and thus activating a sincere concern with diversity and multicultural sensitivity); perhaps they are lighting up the 3rd-person plural modes (the LR quadrant) of being-in-the-world at a turquoise wave (and thus activating a profound ecological concern with all living beings); perhaps they are lighting up the 1st-person plural modes (the LL quadrant) of being-in-the-world at an amber wave (and thus activating a sincere concern for social stability and accountability); or perhaps they are drilling down into the 3rd-person singular modes (the UR quadrant) of being-in-the-world at a microscopic level and thus attempting to find a cure for the HIV virus.

All of those paradigms and social practices have a right to tell us about their own truths; they do not, in themselves, have the right to exclude other truths. Hence, the first useful integral guideline, that of nonexclusion. It's one of the most important principles we can offer, simply because of how often it is crudely violated.

THE SECOND USEFUL PRINCIPLE: UNFOLDMENT

The nonexclusion principle goes a long way in helping us to integrate a plurality or multiplicity of paradigms (and thus develop a meta-theory that is true to the phenomena enacted by the social practices of an Integral

Methodological Pluralism). But even within nonexclusion, numerous conflicts arise, and how to integrate those becomes a pressing issue. This is where the second integrative principle, that of *unfoldment*, can be of help.

Here's a simplistic example. Imagine the time when atoms, but not yet molecules, had evolved. Atoms—such as a helium atom—were more inclusive than their subcomponents—such as protons, neutrons, and electrons. Thus, at that time, atoms were the most integrative, most holistic, most inclusive, most evolved, most depthed holons in existence. When atoms emerged, they did not make protons and neutrons "wrong," only partial. Protons and neutrons were now truths that were part of (or included in) a yet larger truth. Likewise, when molecules emerged and included atoms as subcomponents or subholons in their own makeup, that did not make atoms wrong, only partial: true but partial, or a whole that is now part of a yet larger whole. When cells emerged and incorporated molecules, that did not make molecules wrong, inaccurate, stupid, illusory, or anything of the sort—rather, true but partial.

The principle of enfoldment suggests that if one state of affairs contains the essentials of another state, yet adds essentials not found in the previous state, then the previous state is "right" and the latter state is "more right." (As Hegel put it, "Each stage is adequate; each higher stage is more adequate.") We used the example of molecules containing atoms but not vice versa—"all of the lower is in the higher but not all of the higher is in the lower"—and we correlated this with things like Whitehead's prehensive unification ("all of the past is enfolded in the present but not all of the present is enfolded in the past"). Enfoldment thus suggests ways in which some things can be "right" and "true" and other things can be "more right" and "more true."

It appears that there is a general reason for that "true but partial" movement, namely, the Whiteheadian nature of moment-to-moment existence. As we saw in <u>Excerpt A</u>, each moment prehends, feels, or includes its predecessor, and yet also adds a new, creative, or novel aspect

that goes beyond or transcends anything in the previous moment, so that each moment transcends but includes its predecessor. That is another way of saying that each moment is true, and then each succeeding moment renders it true but partial. Each moment is a whole that becomes a part of the whole of the next moment. Each moment, or each actual occasion, is a whole/part, or a holon. Each moment is "whole," each succeeding moment is "more whole." When a new moment arises, it is the whole truth; by the time it subsides, it is merely a partial truth in yet wider unfoldings.

This holonic or holarchical pattern of flowing existence—transcend and include—is summarized in the principle of *unfoldment*. This heuristic principle suggests that all paradigms, like all moments, are in themselves true and adequate; but some paradigms can be more encompassing, more inclusive, more holistic than others. This does not render the other paradigms wrong, inaccurate, stupid, illusory, or anything of the sort—they are true but partial.

How can we believably move from nonexclusion to unfoldment? It helps if we first state the central tenet of nonexclusion in this way: no human mind can produce 100% error. If you look at the plethora of methodologies in the human arts and sciences, you will find phenomenology, hermeneutics, structuralism, poststructuralism, collaborative inquiry, participatory epistemology, social systems theory, mathematical computer modeling, and so on. As we just noted, innumerable human beings are already engaged in all of those practices. It is not a matter of whether any of those practices are worthy or not; it is simply a fact that an extraordinary number of bright, intelligent, caring, and concerned human beings are already, and often have been for decades, practicing those paradigms. This doesn't mean that those paradigms can't be criticized; but it clearly means that those practices *of necessity* contain some sort of truth because no human mind can be 100% wrong. Or, we might say, nobody is smart enough to be wrong all the time. And therefore the only really interesting question is not why poststructuralism

is right and structuralism is wrong, but what kind of universe allows both of those practices to arise in the first place? [this doesn't mean that one can't be better than another—when competing for the same similar-paradigm worldspace, some theories do better than others—in general, they are ones that extend the nonexclusion principle by legitimately accounting for more phenomena than its competitors—their partial truths are encompassed and surpassed by the better theory….]

Because the Kosmos is constructed in such a way that it obviously allows all of those paradigms to arise and to be practiced by sincere human beings, then what type of Integral meta-theoretical framework can most gracefully elucidate such a Kosmos, a framework that of necessity would find a place for all of those paradigms in an Integral Methodological embrace? If we proceed with the overall guiding principle that "Everybody is right," and we pursue that regulative principle of nonexclusion in a sustained fashion, we eventually encounter a display of unfoldment, in which certain situations themselves pass judgments *on their own less adequate displays*. This is not an outside paradigm unfairly judging another paradigm, but a paradigm itself making judgments on its own subcomponents, using its own widely-accepted rules of engagement, and thus finding some moments "more whole" or "more adequate" than other moments within that paradigm.

For example, a classic case of a "paradigm clash" is that between the Ptolemaic system and the Copernican. When we say no legitimately enacted paradigm is ever simply wrong, notice that even many of the components of the Ptolemaic system were in fact taken up and included in the Copernican (such as spherical planets and orbits, in themselves highly original conceptions at the time). The real paradigm clash in that case involved, as always, a clash in practices and not just in theories. The Copernican view supplanted the Ptolemaic because the social scientific practices of planetary measurement became so refined and precise—principally in the hands of Tyco Brahe—that Johannes Kepler could use those more precise measurements to suggest three laws of planetary motion

accounting for those newly enacted phenomena (i.e., devise a theory to match the data enacted and brought forth by Brahe's refined exemplar). Isaac Newton immediately recognized the more adequate nature of an elliptical heliocentric theory, and the "Copernican" view became the accepted scientific interpretation of these newly enacted experiences.

Ptolemy, in other words, was true but partial; Copernicus in turn was true but partial. And we now know that Kepler was true but partial: according to relativity theory, any point in the universe is central to all the others, so both heliocentric and geocentric are true, depending upon one's vantage point (i.e., the stance from which one launches one's paradigm or practice). The relativity perspective transcends and includes the Ptolemaic and Copernican.

So, again, no paradigm is ever simply wrong—true but partial, yes —"Everybody is right." But an integral nonexclusion principle adds: "but right only when addressing the phenomena enacted by the particular paradigm." And we were saying that such nonexclusion often discloses an *unfoldment* that is *enfoldment*: in any particular developmental stream, successive waves transcend and include their predecessors, and thus each wave is adequate, each succeeding wave is more adequate. We never arrive at a point where we can say: now we have the final truth, and all predecessors were inadequate. We of today stand to the Ptolemaic worldview in the same way that the world of a thousand years from now will stand to our relativity worldview: our relativity interpretation will be shown, not to be wrong, but very partial judged by a worldview that transcends and includes the enduring aspects of relativity in a system that nonetheless makes relativity look as quaint as Ptolemaic epicycles. (Notice already that several laboratories have recently generated faster-than-light phenomena. This does not mean that special relativity is wrong, because for most cases the speed of light cannot be exceeded, but there are now other perspectives that are "more true" than relativity.)

Thus, everybody can be right because some views are more right than others. None are wrong; some are simply more inclusive, more encompassing, more holistic, more integrative, more depthed, more transcending-and-including—*endlessly*. But the fact that molecules are more inclusive than atoms does not mean that we can get rid of atoms, or that atoms can be jettisoned, or that atoms have no real truths to offer just as they are. To be a partial truth is still to be a truth.

(This is the reason that developmental studies are so important in developing any theories of epistemology and ontology. Because the first thing you learn in developmental studies is that each level of development sees a very different world. This leaves you few choices. One—with virtually all schools of realism—you can claim that there is one, single, pregiven world, and each level is simply interpreting that single world differently. But if pressed, such a view will generally admit that each higher level is a more accurate interpretation of the world—just as the succeeding conceptualizations of atomic structure—orange planetary, green quarks, teal unified quarks, turquoise strings—are generally thought to be more and more accurate. But if you take that view, then in effect you are saying that we can never know any truth at all—because evolution never ends, and thus the highest level—which alone will be "most accurate"—we will never be able to know, given evolution's unending nature. Therefore humans never know any truth at all—and far from saving ontology, as realism wished to do, it has destroyed the chance of ever knowing any true ontology at all. The other option is similar to the Hegelian—"Every stage is true; every higher stage is more true." Thus, if a given theory adequately enough represents and explains the phenomena of its level, then it is a true as true can be at that level. The next level—which will transcend and include it—will contain that truth and then add new truths of its own—will be "more true." This is the stance that Integral Meta-Theory takes, because it takes developmental studies seriously.)

Thus, AQAL meta-theory handles this issue with the following interpretation: specify the locale in the AQAL matrix from which a

legitimate paradigm is launched, and the phenomena enacted and brought forth by that paradigm are as true as true can be at that locale. "AQAL indexing" (or what we also call the "Kosmic Address") and "holonic conferencing" (or what we call "semiotic tagging" [see below]) allows individual paradigms to be seated next to each other at the integrative table, in such as a way that each individual paradigm is honored and acknowledged.

Even Ptolemy? Yes: if you are standing on the earth and watching the planets move, the Ptolemaic map is phenomenologically 100% accurate: you will see exactly what Ptolemy said you will see; he had a legitimate paradigm—or a practice to bring forth a series of experiences—and an accurate map to match it. That truth simply ceases being "the" complete truth when it is realized that there are *other perspectives* in the Kosmos, including heliocentric and acentric; but for its paradigm, it is right on the money.

What about Santa Claus? Santa Claus exists at the mythic level in the UL quadrant in the overall subtle (or dream) state—a Kosmic address of Santa Claus $^{\text{(UL/quadrant, mythic/level, subtle/state)object}}$. And the root cognitive structures giving rise to the mythic view—namely, concrete operational thinking, or the rule/role mind—is likewise true but partial, and thus it will remain as a crucial ingredient—an "operand," or a part operated on by a yet larger whole, "true but partial"—in all higher cognitive development. It is never rejected in any normal, higher cognitive sequence.

Of course, *within* a paradigm, there are sound and unsound data, phenomena, maps, and judgments. For example, Ptolemy might have made some mistakes in his measurements, but those mistakes can be corrected within the prevailing paradigm. Same with Tyco Brahe. When we say "Everybody is right" and "All partial truths are transcended and included," we obviously do not mean that the errors within the paradigms are included: they are part of the baggage that is negated or transcended in a healthy sense of transcend-and-include (or hopefully those errors are

jettisoned as the truth claims are subjected to the final of the 3 strands of good knowing, that of "verification/confirmation/rejection").[7]

The integrative principle of unfoldment allows us to acknowledge the many true but partial truths in any evolutionary or unfolding display. Notice, however, that *unfoldment is not a cross-stream principle*: that is, it cannot be used to violate the nonexclusion principle—it applies only to phenomena in the same general stream or developmental line or paradigmatic current. Cross-paradigm or cross-current judgments, as we will see, need to be set in a context that also includes the third integrative guideline (that of enactment), which we will discuss in a moment.

The *unfoldment* principle, as suggested, can also be called the *enfoldment* principle—they are flip sides of the same prehensive stream. Each moment unfolds a new and creative expanse that enfolds and embraces its predecessors (an Eros that reaches up and an Agape that reaches down). The prehensive process of unfoldment/enfoldment in any stream could also be called the "natural growth principle" in any stream, and I very much agree with Whitehead that without both an unfolding-creative novelty and an enfolding-loving embrace, it is just damned difficult to account for moment-to-moment existence in any domain at all.

The unfoldment principle is particularly helpful when it comes to items such as the unfoldment of worldviews in the most general sense—Jean

---

[7] For the "3 strands of valid knowledge" see note 5. The idea, briefly, is that every valid knowledge claim—in order to bring forth the phenomena that are then framed, theorized, explained, or further acted on—consists of 3 strands: first, there is an injunction, practice, exemplar, or paradigm: "If you want to know this, do this." Thus, "If you want to know if it is raining, go to the window and look out." Or, "If you want to know if a cell has a nucleus, make a microscope, isolate a cell, stain it, and look at it under the microscope." Or, "If you want to know if Buddhanature is real, practice meditation as follows for several years while looking into your mind." Those injunctions or practices bring forth the second strand, that of data, experience, illumination, or apprehension: seeing the phenomena brought forth by the injunction, whether it is rain outside, or a cell's nucleus, or Buddhanature. The third strand is confirmation/rejection by the knowledge community that has completed the first two strands. These 3 strands bring one into the vicinity of the Kosmic Address of the phenomena addressed by the particular paradigm—whether sensory, mental, or spiritual—or phenomena in a particular quadrant, or level, or line, or state, or type.

Gebser's waves, for example, which unfold from archaic to magic to mythic to mental to integral. Each of those waves, when it emerges, is the truth and the whole truth at that time; each is adequate, integrative, holistic, and encompassing, in its time and place. (We are, of course, discussing the healthy versions of these waves, which does not preclude some waves from emerging in pathological versions that are, in those ways, often less adequate than their predecessors. "Unfoldment" does not necessarily mean "progress." For example, postmodern deconstruction, although it started out in a relatively healthy fashion, soon-enough degenerated into such extreme forms that it became on balance regressive, leading backward to nihilistic and narcissistic modes of being. There is pathological prehension as well healthy prehension; repression as well as transcendence; dissociation instead of differentiation; alienation instead of embrace. But we are now discussing the healthy, Whiteheadian prehension in the dynamic process of unfoldment and enfoldment.) Although each wave is holistic and integrative, each succeeding wave transcends and includes its essentials (in a prehensive unification—which we reconstruct as tetra-prehension), and thus each is more holistic, more inclusive, more encompassing. As Whitehead put it, "The many become one and are increased by one."

(This gives us a purely factual—not judgmental—way to determine which levels are actually higher in any hierarchy. Namely, destroy any lower level, and all the higher levels are also destroyed; destroy any higher level, and none of the lower levels are destroyed. Thus, in the hierarchy of atoms to molecules to cells to organisms, destroy the level of molecules, and its higher levels—cells and organisms—are also destroyed, whereas its lower levels—atoms—would still exist. Destroy cells, and the higher level of organisms would also be destroyed, but not any lower levels—atoms and molecules. This, as I said, is a purely factual way to determine lower and higher in any hierarchy; it is not based on any value system or preferential treatment, but on existential realities. Deniers of hierarchy have a hard time getting around this simple principle, which applies to all growth

hierarchies—such as the ones I am presenting here. Dominator hierarchies, however, are something else entirely, and follow no such rule, with those who are actually usually lower on growth hierarchies managing to seize power in a dominator hierarchy and exert enormous damage and oppression through their control mechanisms.)

In short, in healthy unfolding, each wave is holistic, each succeeding wave is more holistic. Preceding waves are not thereby rendered useless or wrong or illusory, but continue to contribute their enduring truths, holons, enactments, and expressions, which are now enfolded in the ongoing spiral of unfoldment—just as atoms and molecules continue to function in healthy cells, and cells continue to function in organisms.[8]

Unfoldment, then, shows us "true but partial," and that allows us to acknowledge legitimate paradigms as being ripples in the AQAL ocean at a particular spacetime locale. When unfoldment is coupled with nonexclusion, we have two regulative ideas or integrative principles that are helpful in honoring the primary injunction of integral meta-theory and IMP: "Everybody is right" (since they are already doing it anyway). Beginning with those two principles, we can start to construct a plausible network, matrix, or lattice—in this case, called AQAL—that honors the most number of truths from the most number of paradigms or human practices of inquiry.

In the course of such a construction, a third principle quickly suggests itself.

---

[8] What does not continue to function or exist, however, in a junior wave (or in an atoms or molecules in a cell) is its claim to be the whole truth: it is now a whole truth that is part of a larger whole truth. Hegel famously stated that "to supercede is both to negate and to preserve"—which is simply his version of transcend and include. What is negated or transcended or gone beyond is the *exclusiveness* of the particular holon, or its claim to be the whole truth. What is preserved and included are the enduring partial truths and components of the junior holon, which are taken up and incorporated into the senior holon as relatively autonomous subholons, still functioning and contributing their truths to the unfolding of further truths.

THE THIRD USEFUL PRINCIPLE: ENACTMENT

The essence of the postmodern, post-Kantian revolution (behind everything from hermeneutics to contextualism to constructivism) is that phenomena (such as the hydrogen atom) are not simply lying around out there waiting for all and sundry to see, a view now considered "hopelessly naive" and referred to as "the myth of the given" (the point being that no phenomenon is merely given). Rather, phenomena are enacted, brought forth, disclosed, and illumined by a series of behaviors of a perceiving subject. As we put it, phenomena are enacted (or partially enacted, as we will see) and brought forth by injunctions, paradigms, or social practices ("if you want to know this, you must do this"). And here is the point: all paradigms or injunctions are initiated by a subject (or group of subjects), and all subjects, for example, have available to them different states of being or states of consciousness. It follows that a different state (or level) of consciousness will bring forth a different world.

Such exactly is the principle of *enactment*. Subjectivity (or intersubjectivity, which we will discuss later) brings forth a phenomenological world in the activity of knowing that world. At this point, let me jump forward and simply give the AQAL interpretation of this postmodern revelation.

Subjects do not perceive worlds but enact them, co-create them. Different states of subjects bring forth different worlds. For AQAL, this means that a subject might be at a particular *wave* of consciousness, in a particular *stream* of consciousness, in a particular *state* of consciousness, in one *quadrant* or another. *That means that the phenomena brought forth by various types of human inquiry will be different depending on the quadrants, levels, lines, states, and types of the subjects bringing forth the phenomena.* A subject at one wave of consciousness will not enact and bring forth the same worldspace as a subject at another wave; and similarly with quadrants, streams, states, and types (as we will see in more detail).

This does *not* mean that the phenomena are not objectively there in any meaningful sense; it means the phenomena are not there for everybody. *Macbeth* exists, but not for my dog. Cells with DNA exist, but they can only be seen by subjects using microscopes (which did not exist until the orange wave, which is why cells did not "ex-ist" or stand out for magic and mythic worldviews; you can find no account of DNA in any magic or mythic text anywhere. This does not mean DNA wasn't there—that it did not "subsist"—just that it did not "ex-ist" in those worldviews or stand out in the consciousness of individuals at those waves). Nirvana exists, but not for a dualistic state of consciousness, and so on. Phenomena ex-ist, stand forth, or shine only for subjects who can enact and co-create them (or, more technically, only as they are tetra-enacted). This means, among other things, that epistemology and ontology, knowing and form, consciousness and being cannot in any fundamental fashion be separated, ripped, or torn asunder, but arise as two complementary aspects of the same occasion.[9]

---

[9] When we say that, for example, atoms do not "ex-ist" for magic individuals, we mean, as noted, that there is nothing in the consciousness (or records) of the magic individual that indicates any knowledge of atoms at all. Still, we in the modern and postmodern world—say, turquoise—assume that something like "atoms" nonetheless were real and existed in some sense during the magic epoch—and that sense we call "sub-sistence." Atoms did not ex-ist, but they did sub-sist.

But two important points about that. One, Integral Theory is a version of "panpsychism" (a term I'm uncomfortable with, preferring "pan-interiorist," meaning all holons have both exteriors and interiors, all the way up, all the way down. The interiors are the "prehensions" of Whitehead, which, as we've pointed out, we stretch to "tetra-prehensions"). And this means, before human beings even emerged—before, in fact, molecules even emerged—all 4 quadrants of atoms were involved in co–creating each other. The agency of each atom contributed to the opening or clearing in which other atoms could appear to each other—in short, the proto-consciousness or prehension of each atom contributed to the being or ontology of each atom. This wasn't just a level of ontology completely divorced from epistemology, but an occasion where knowing and being, consciousness and form, were 2 complementary aspects of the same happening, and could not be separated or torn asunder without grave violence to the reality of the atomic beings. So in this fundamental sense, epistemology and ontology cannot be separated (or more specifically, Who x How x What, epistemology x methodology x ontology).

Nor can they be separated when it comes to the human being. It is common for schools of realism and positivism to maintain that "atoms" exist without being known by humans—whereas, in actually, atoms subsist without being known by humans. But atoms are known by each other—and their mutual knowing contributes to their mutual being—their epistemology and ontology are inseparably linked. Neither being nor consciousness can be separated from the other, at any level, without grave violence. The 4 quadrants go all the way up, all the way down.

Further, when it comes to saying exactly what it is that subsists at the atomic level, human consciousness, knowing, and interpretation are inevitably brought into the picture. The fundamental fact realism and positivism keep overlooking is that different levels of being-consciousness (and different methodologies) bring forth different worlds. It is not—as the "myth of given" maintains—that there is one, single, pregiven world that is interpreted differently by different worldviews (although that of course can happen), but rather that these different levels of being-consciousness bring forth *different worlds* themselves—there is a red world, an amber world, an orange world, a green world, a teal world, a turquoise world, and so on, and each of them has different phenomena with different ontologies. Atoms—which have *subsisted* since shortly after the Big Bang—don't *ex-ist* until orange, where they are pictured as a little planetary system with sun-nucleus and planetary-electrons. At green, the atomic world now appears to be composed not only of electrons, protons, and neutrons, but mesons, bosons, leptons, and other sub-subatomic particles. At teal, these numerous particles are brought together in a unified synthesis known as the "8-fold way"—with the discovery of the Bose-Higgs particle giving added credibility to that paradigm. But at turquoise, an entirely new paradigm of super-high-energy colliders has suggested theories known variously as "string theory," "M theory," "super-string theory," and "a theory of everything"—where the universe is seen as composed of 11 dimensions, which gives rise to "multiple universes" or "multiverses." String theory is the only theory that promises to be a "theory of everything," pulling together items that previous physical theories were unable to do—but it is so complicated and so abstract, it is generally agreed that no empirical experiment will ever be able to be devised that could prove or disprove the theory. Physics, now far removed from the "empirical queen of the sciences," has become the "abstract theory of the sciences" par excellence, with a deeply Pythagorean worldview.

The point is that these different theories—and different epistemologies and different ontologies—came into being with increasingly unfolding levels of being-consciousness, and points once again to the fact that what both what "ex-ists" and what "subsists" depends on the level of epistemology (and various methodologies) co-creating a particular level of ontology. Again, these two—epistemology and ontology, knowing and being—are not two entirely separate events but 2 complementary aspects of the same occasion, an occasion tetra-enacted by all 4 quadrants simultaneously (which means, Who x How x What, or subject/epistemology x zone methodology x zone/object, at a mimimum for the Kosmic Address).

Many of these important distinctions are well highlighted by Sean Esbjorn-Hargens in his article "An Ontology of Climate Change—Integral Pluralism and the Enactment of Multiple Objects." He starts with the well-accepted tenet of Integral Theory that an object or phenomena is not merely something that is lying around out there waiting to be stumbled on, but is enacted, where enacted consists of at least a Who (epistemology) x How (methodology) x What (ontology). He points out that, in his view, where Integral Theory well emphasizes pluralistic Who's and pluralistic How's, it often assumes a single object (while this is often true, I think it perhaps overlooks my insistence that different epistemologies/methodologies enact different worldspaces, which I emphasize often). But his discussion of pluralistic ontologies is indeed illustrative.

He begins by pointing out that indeed Integral Theory maintains that single objects are only one interpretation of ontology, and that much more useful (and more accurate in a certain sense) is that each object is actually a multiply different object—an empty soda bottle, for example, can be used for a variety of purposes (a musical instrument, a flower vase, or an opportunity for a deposit refund). "In each case," he says, the ontological status of the bottle is enacted in part by the method of interacting with it….. In other words, the ontological status of an object is not entirely independent of the actor or action involved." It's important to note that this is a real difference in ontology—in the actual "thing," which literally changes with different uses—and not merely a difference in description or classification (in my opinion, this is an important difference Sean tends to overlook, which leads to an over-estimation of critical realism, as we will see. But for the moment, let us call a real change in the actual nature or real ontology of an object by the term "real ontological change" (or "real ontological object") and a change that is due merely to different perspectives, classifications, or views, by the term "descriptive ontology" or a "descriptive ontological object").

Sean wishes to view climate change (CC) as a real ontological multiple object, and not merely a descriptive ontological object or a single object, a view I fully share (we both realize it can be viewed as a single object, but not effectively).

"Ontological pluralism is enacted through an increase along three axes: *epistemological distance*, *methodological variety*, and *ontological complexity*"—what he simplifies as Who x How x What (resp.) and I have simplified as quadrant x quadrivia x domain. Sean acknowledges that Integral Theory at least recognizes this triple pluralism (including ontological: "Methodological practices bring phenomena into being"). I would say, partially bring them into being, but the point is clear enough. I also differ slightly, I believe, in that I maintain that (at least) all 3 of these co-exist, and you can't have one

without the others. I will often just say "epistemology and ontology are 2 complementary aspects of the same occasion," or at other times, "The structure of the subject co-creates the nature of the phenomena perceived"—but as I make clear, I think all 3 processes (along with a few others) are an inseparable part of Integral Methodological Pluralism (in theory and in reality). All 3 of these are often different—often quite different—but all 3 of them are always already present in any occasion (including pre-human holons, which prehend each other through various methods producing various domains). And this means, without doubt, that changing the Who or changing the How will change the What—hence, integral ontology. Moreover, while we can say that the What subsists (it possesses what Wilfrid Sellars, pioneer critic of "the myth of the given," calls "instrinsic features), we can't say what it actually is (or those intrinsic features are) without specifying the Who and the How (explicitly or implicitly).

Now, Sean says that in his How, he is including, among other items, Integral Theory, Critical Realism, Actor-Network Theory, Science and Technology Studies, and Ontological Politics. I simply want to point out that the How will change depending on exactly what the combination of those methods are. We can't simply say they are all important (in many ways, they are indeed all important, as are dozens, perhaps hundreds, of other methodologies). I know Sean realizes this; I just want to make crystal clear how sensitive that formula (Who x How x What) is to every change made in each of its variables (and I would add, to that list, names such as Jürgen Habermas, Michel Foucault, Martin Heidegger…. to Plotinus, Padmasambhava, Shankara, Eckhart…. Well, you get the Integral picture).

But that doesn't mean that we can simply include a long list of names and claim they are part of an expanded Integral Theory—especially if some of those names rather dramatically differ with the core tenets of Integral Theory or Integral Enactment Theory. We must be careful, for example, with Critical Realism's treatment of "ontology," which it ends to privilege. In too many cases, what Critical Realism calls "ontology" is not "real ontology" but "descriptive ontology"—it simply does not grasp the depths of what enactment is actually doing (even when it uses that term). As Sean approvinglysummarizes Mol's argument, "Thus, practices or methods used to understand CC do not just describe it, instead, they actually help to produce or enact it." And John Law, "The argument is no longer that methods discover and depict realities. Instead, it is that they participate in the enactment of those realities." To which Sean concludes, "When we allow for the enactive or performative nature of methods, wee begin to understand how the use of multiple methods to understand an alleged single phenomenon like CC results in multiple—but networked—objects."

Yet in every example that Sean produces of Critical Realism, claiming it supports his Integral Pluralism, the author argues for multiple descriptive objects, not multiple real objects. Tim Forsyth's "typology of environmental problems," for example, divides these problems into four major overlapping categories—local and global realities seen as "brute facts" or "institutitional facts." The brute facts are just straightforward empirical "facts." What are examples of "institutional facts"? He lists "shifting cultivation, environmental vulenerability, global deforestation, anthropogenic climate change." He states that "environmental 'brute facts' (or biophysical properties) are divided locally or globally [i.e., their differences are matters of location, not ontological reality]. The 'institutional facts" (or definitions of degradation) are controlled by discursive practices [i.e., as he says, "definitions].". Different discursive practices give rise to different topics of discussion, not to the realities of those topics themselves. His major complaint about how CC is treated is that these 4 cells get confused—and not that there aren't enough real methodologies or a wide enough pluralism of epistemologies to produce a wider understanding the multiple object known as CC. In other words, his argument is loaded with shifting descriptive ontologies, but no real ontologies (which he tends to equate with real biophysical ontologies, period). I don't disagree with his points; I disagree that they support Integral Pluralism in any real sense at all.

And I constantly find that with Critical Realism in general—the pluralities it acknowledges that are enacted (or whose ontologies actually depend in part on their epistemologies) tend to be largely descriptive ontologies, not real ontologies (which tend to be defined by science and science alone, going all the way back to Karl Popper). Nor does Critical Realism believably integrate the various knowledge domains it acknowledges. Sean at least acknowledges Integral Theory does a better job of this: "Even Critical Realism does not offer, in my mind, as powerful and as accessible a framework for doing this."

Sean also quotes Carolan, who in his examples of multiple objects says, "In other words, the object changes through translation, but the (sub)structure does not." Sean points out that Carolan arrives at this conclusion by analyzing 2 axes (x = complexity and y = epistemological distance). Sean agrees with Carolan's conclusions, then says, "I have added a third [axis] that represents methodological variety." If Carolan had done the same, he might realize that some forms of translation actually change the (sub)structure of the object as well—and *that* is a *real* change and a *real* multiple object, enacted by the How. Orange structures look at atomic realities in incredibly different ways than turquoise structures look at

them—not just different descriptive ontologies, which Carolan gives, but different (sub)structures as well—real ontologies. Again, I don't disagree with everything that Carolan is saying; I am pointing out it does not support a truly Integral Pluralism and real enactment.

Sean brings up a point raised by Brian Eddy, namely, that in addition to Who x How x What we can add "Where" and "When," and this is especially important in contextualizing the knowledge. I fully agree, but would like to point out that in Integral Theory, it goes without saying that the subject (the Who) that is doing the methodology is always already fully contextualized vis a vis "Where" and "When" by way of the Lower-Left quadrant. But it is certainly okay to make that explicit by adding it to the Kosmic Address.

Finally, Sean quotes a personal communication from Mark Edwards, whose work I admire, stating that Integral Theory needs to spend more time stating how it arrived at its own Kosmic Address, but Edwards knows Integral Theory can't do it. "No one system is up to this task. Hence the ultimately inadequate nature of all mailing systems." Integral Theory states this as the "IOU tenet"—every system is either incomplete or uncertain, and that definitely includes Integral Theory. But it futher claims that "Emptiness redeems all IOU's." That is, the relative world is forever incomplete or uncertain; only absolute knowledge—given by prajna or nondual awareness, and not vijnana or dualistic awareness—can disclose ultimate reality (Spirit or Emptiness). That reality is real; it is ultimate; it is unqualifiable (including that claim); but it can be "known" in a certain sense via Enlightenment or Awakening, i.e., satori, sahaja, metanoia, gnosis, wu, moksha—which Integral Theory puts at the center of its framework. The only value of a statement such as Edwards' is to remind us to state as fully as possible all of the pluralities that go into any system or decision that we make (knowing it will be ultimately inadequate, but more whole than the options)—and that is the one founding and most fundamental tenet of Integral Theory.

We will be returning to the idea of enactment throughout this discussion; right now the concept is helpful because it offers us another reason to honor, acknowledge, and integrate a large number of otherwise "incommensurable" paradigms. Most "paradigm clashes" are usually deemed "incommensurable"—meaning there is no way for the two paradigms to fit together—but this is so only because people focus on the phenomena, not the practices. But if we realize that phenomena are enacted, brought forth, and disclosed by practices, then we realize that what appeared to be "conflicting phenomena" or experiences are simply different (and fully compatible) experiences brought forth by different practices. Adopt the different practices, and you will see the same phenomena that the adherents of the supposedly "incommensurable" paradigms are seeing. Hence, the "incommensurability" is not insurmountable, or even a significant barrier, to any sort of Integral embrace.

Today we have a conventional or orthodox physics paradigm that says all the really important realities in the universe are fundamental particles like quarks, leptons, bosons, strings, and so on. Nothing else is fundamentally

real; everything else is essentially an arrangement of these fundamental realities. There also exists a meditative paradigm that says that all the apparent realities in the universe are created by the mind-stream itself, the stream of primordial consciousness that manifests the entire universe, including quarks and leptons. Now if we focus merely on the phenomena —the experiences or data generated by those two schools—it is indeed hard to believably reconcile them. They both insist that when it comes to *ultimates*, one of them is right, one of them is wrong. But if we realize that the phenomena of each school are actually brought forth and enacted by different practices (injunctions, paradigms), then we have an entirely different situation: we put all of the phenomena (scientific and meditative) on the integrative table; we accept all of them as true but partial; and then we ask, What meta-theory can believably accommodate both sets of data?

The reason an Integral meta-theory might indeed work is that it is based on the possibility of a real meta-paradigmatic practice—certainly in theory and often in fact—namely, a single subject can take up both practices (or paradigms) and see for himself or herself if both of them generate true phenomena or believable experiences. If, on the other hand, we assume that the phenomena are all coming from the identical worldspace, and the phenomena conflict (which they do), then an Integral meta-theory is impossible. But if we see that different practices bring forth different phenomenological domains, those phenomena can be integrated by showing a plausible, coherent, integrative framework making room for all of the enacted worldspaces—which is what AQAL attempts to do.

AQAL meta-theory therefore gives one interpretation of the above "paradigm clash" between physics and meditation as follows: the physicist in the example is highlighting the 3rd-person singular dimensions (the UR quadrant) of being-in-the-world, and is doing so generally from a green (or higher) wave of consciousness (from that vantage point, quarks do indeed "ex-ist" or stand forth in a worldspace; again, this does not mean that quarks did not exist in some sense prior to teal consciousness, only that they did not "ex-ist" or become apparent to humans until that green

structure could call them forth). The meditator, on the other hand, is activating the 1ˢᵗ-person singular dimensions (the UL quadrant) of being-in-the-world, and is doing so from a causal/nondual state (from that vantage point, you can indeed realize nirvana, a state that actually "ex-ists" or can be realized in that worldspace). The two practitioners see different things, see different worlds, because they have different social practices, different paradigms, different injunctions. However, change your practice (your methodology) and you will see a different world, essentially the same world (all things considered equal) seen by what you thought was your nemesis in the so-called paradigm clash.

And what happens when one subject practices both conventional physics and meditation? Two general things: one, they almost always agree that both quarks and nirvana are real enough; and two, they almost always agree that the ground of nirvana is more encompassing than a quark. More precisely, they tend to see the reality or ground of a state like nirvana as including or enveloping manifest phenomena, such as quarks. This is the general principle of enfoldment, but now operating on a meta-paradigmatic or cross-paradigmatic fashion (an action Shankara labeled "subration"—the deeper state, that of nirvana, "subrates" or "is more real than" that of quarks—according to those who have *experienced both*). Nonetheless, even in its cross-paradigmatic fashion, enfoldment never pronounces another truth to be not true, only less true. Again, nothing is lost, all is enfolded. (And thus the traditions would claim that quarks are "relative truth" and nirvana is "absolute truth"—both are true, but one is more true than the other—enfoldment.)

My book *Quantum Questions* is an anthology of the writings of many of the great pioneering physicists who also had profound spiritual state realizations, including Erwin Schroedinger, Neils Bohr, Werner Heisenberg, Sir Arthur Eddington, Louis de Broglie, Wolfgang Pauli, Sir James Jeans, Max Planck, and Albert Einstein. At the very least, all of those individuals, who had 1ˢᵗ-person familiarity with both paradigms (scientific and spiritual), were *unanimous* that the phenomena of the two

paradigms categorically were not incommensurable. Eddington most famously summarized this by saying that the phenomena of physics neither prove nor disprove the phenomena of mysticism. That is an excellent statement of *nonexclusion.*

Any two paradigms can, however, be cross-compared by subjects who have demonstrated a competence in both; when these physicists/mystics did so, they tended to conclude either that physis (matter) was a manifestation of a higher reality (spirit) which enveloped it, or that both physis and spirit were aspects of a greater whole. Both of those conclusions are versions of *enfoldment* (all of the lower is in the higher, but not all of the higher is in the lower). Not a single one of them believed that the discoveries of physics proved the realities of spirituality/mysticism—because of nonexclusion, one paradigm can neither prove nor disprove another.

Lastly, several of these practitioners, such as Schroedinger and Eddington, went on to point out that what is required in order to "see" any of that is a *change of state* on the part of the seer or subject: the notion of *enactment.* In other words, if you simply try to give the 3rd-person maps or symbols of a higher, wider, or deeper state of being/consciousness, you will never grasp the reality itself, which is only disclosed or brought forth by 1st-person enactment and engagement of the deeper reality itself. And these physicists were quite clear that what they found in that particular enactment was not neutrons but God; and not as a 3rd-person deduction but a 1st-person realization.

Our simpler point is that, whatever we decide about the relation of physis and pneuma (matter and spirit), there are heuristic principles that can help us move forward through what were previously thought to be "incommensurable" areas. I am not in any way suggesting that those physicists/mystics had the final word on the relation of cosmos and spirit; I am simply suggesting that it is from among the pool of those subjects who have demonstrated competence in any two paradigms, that cross-paradigmatic judgments can believably be made. The point is not so much

that you and I must master any two paradigms before we can authentically compare them, but that *somebody* can do so. (Hence there is a redeemable validity claim for cross-paradigmatic judgments). And just as I myself have never seen a helium atom, but there are good men and women who have with integrity adopted the physics paradigms and accordingly enacted a horizon from within which they assure me that, to the best of their collective judgment, helium atoms do exist (and I happen to believe them because they have never lied to me before); so also when it comes to the statements about the relation of physics and meditation, I myself take much more seriously the claims of those who have demonstrated a competence in paradigms that enact both of those respective worldspaces, because those subjects are operating within both horizons and can therefore give me an eyewitness account of what is going on in both domains, and how those domains may relate to each other.

The point is simply that, in principle, cross-paradigmatic judgments are possible because there is not simply one world against which paradigms compete for dominance, a kind of king-of-the-hill battle that tosses all losers on the garbage dump, because there are no losers. There is not one world over which all paradigms are fighting for supremacy, but many worlds brought forth by different paradigms, worlds that can be eye-witnessed by the same subjects if they submit to the discipline of the paradigms (i.e., follow the injunctions) required to enact those worlds. And while "the" world cannot contain many worlds, awareness can. And because we already know that there are in fact many worlds, it follows that we already are standing in an awareness that has cross-paradigmatic capacity, a capacity that can eventuate in meta-theoretical overview, such as the one offered by AQAL.[10]

These three regulative principles—nonexclusion, enfoldment, enactment —are principles that were reverse engineered, if you will, from the fact that

---

[10] It is not necessary that the horizons of different paradigms are reproduced identically in all subjects undergoing the discipline, only that the subjects themselves can agree on certain broad similarities, a topic we will return to at various points.

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?

THE CALCULUS OF UNCOMFORT

In a universe where hundreds of paradigms are already arising and being competently practiced by the knowledge communities organized around those paradigms—whether in biochemistry, art, cooking, systems sociology, the mathematics of complexity, archeology, hermeneutics, meditation, neurophysiology, shamanic vision quest, computer chaos modeling, engineering a bridge over a river, putting a person on the moon, producing Chateau Lafitte Rothschild—in a universe where all of that is already happening in knowledge communities that can reproduce their knowledge and pass it forward to succeeding generations—and have already done so for years, decades, sometimes centuries—finding ways to comfortably allow them all to co-exist confronts one eventually with what might be called the calculus of uncomfort.

Here is the basic problem. If I am going to act on the principle that "Everybody is right," then, as we have seen, sooner or later I run into the fact that everybody cannot be totally right or equally right. Some views are "more right" than others. And as soon as we say that somebody is "more right" than somebody else, we generate pain or uncomfort on the part of those judged less right, as well as on the part of those who even dare to make such unkind judgments.

But my point is that those judgments are categorically impossible to avoid. I know not a single person who is innocent of such judgments (and the

reason that nobody is innocent is that some views are indeed "more right" than others, and we all *already know* that some views are more right than others, which is exactly why we all have those kinds of judgments in the first place). The question, needless to say, then becomes: "Fine, some views are more right than others. So which views are more right, wise guy?"

And there begins the calculus of uncomfort or torment. For all parties involved. As we have seen, I believe that, among others, the principle of unfoldment can help us with that difficult question. The reason that I believe so is that, on balance, it is the solution that causes the least pain.

As we have seen, the principle of enfoldment suggests that if one state of affairs contains the essentials of another state, yet adds essentials not found in the previous state, then the previous state is "right" and the latter state is "more right." We used the example of molecules containing atoms but not vice versa—"all of the lower is in the higher but not all of the higher is in the lower"—and we correlated this with things like prehensive unification ("all of the past is enfolded in the present but not all of the present is enfolded in the past"). Enfoldment thus suggests ways in which some things can be "right" and "true" and other things can be "more right" and "more true."

Atoms and molecules are one thing; human beings and their views, quite another. But let it be said that human beings (or any sentient beings) are not what is being judged or ranked here, but simply the views that they may or may not adopt. And, generally speaking, there are two major ways that people (both professional philosophers and ordinary folk) have adopted in regard to this "who is more right" question. Let us take two of the extreme (and somewhat caricatured) examples just to show the difficulties involved. Human history over the last 50,000 years: evolution or devolution? Which view is "more right"?

One view ("devolution") tends to believe that the early, human, tribal state of affairs was in some sense "more right" and subsequent human history has in some important ways deviated from or destroyed (or "devolved" from) that state. The early state is often called "nondissociated," in that the subject of awareness and nature existed in state of oneness or union; subsequent history, especially the modern, is referred to as "dissociated consciousness," by virtue of what is seen as a profound splitting or dissociation between subject and object. Basically all humans now living in Western democracies are subject to the modern dissociated state.

In other versions of devolution, the preferred state that was lost is referred to as a "partnership" or "linking" society, and the dissociated state that replaced it is called a "hierarchical" or "ranking" society. (There is a bit of semantic sleight of hand here, in that all societies, individuals, and theorists are involved in ranking. In this view, for example, linking societies are ranked as better than ranking societies.) But leaving this performative contradiction aside for the moment, these partnership notions are attempting to convey a belief that something "more right" existed yesterday, and today is therefore problematic and "less right."

In short, the judgment here is that the early nondissociated state is more right than the modern dissociated state (or the nondissociated-partnership state is ranked as being a better, more authentic state, and the modern state is ranked as inferior). Indeed, the extreme versions of this view condemn the modern dissociated consciousness altogether as being "pathological" or "diseased."

The other view ("evolution") is basically the opposite. Modern consciousness, whatever its problems, contains capacities and perspectives not available to the early tribal state, and thus in important ways the modern consciousness is "more right" than the early or tribal consciousness. Indeed, the extreme versions of this view simply see the early state as "primitive," "ignorant," "superstitious," or even "barbaric."

As stated, each view sees the other as diseased. But even if we operate within those terms, which of those view inflicts more pain on more souls? Very clearly the tribal view, in that it champions a state that existed among perhaps a few million people, while it condemns as inferior a state that now characterizes billions of people. I am not saying that might makes right; I am simply pointing out that the tribal view judges and ranks billions of people to be inferior to those who possess a different state, and that is a great deal of pain handed out by this particular ranking.

(Remember I am not condemning this or any view because it is involved in ranking, because ranking is categorically unavoidable; I am simply suggesting that because ranking is unavoidable we should look instead to the calculus of torment or uncomfort that any ranking inflicts, and at first pass, the tribal view inflicts a hundredfold more pain.)

The modern view fares better in terms of the numbers of those hurt by its particular ranking system. But neither of those views, as stated, has a believable scheme that can relate the two views in a way that allows *both* of them to be *healthy*.

That is where the principle of unfoldment can help; it is basically a calculus for reducing both the depth and span of torment inflicted by categorically unavoidable ranking. Using enfoldment as a heuristic guideline (itself transcendentally deduced from the already-acknowledged existence of many worlds), the suggestion is that, when it comes to its essential or defining features, tribal consciousness was a healthy and appropriate expression of the evolving universe at that time; and the modern consciousness is likewise, in its defining or emergent form, a healthy expression of the universe for its own time. (Both tribal and modern have pathological forms, but the point right now is that neither is essentially or necessarily pathological.) At the very least, the principle of nonexclusion prevents either of these enacted worlds, from within their own horizons, condemning or judging the other as inferior.

But between those two worlds, there is at least the possibility of unfoldment, and if that is so, then enfoldment can be compassionately used to reduce the degree of suffering inflicted by our unavoidable ranking judgments.

That is the path that I personally find the least objectionable, or the one that inflicts the least amount of insult to the depth and span of an unfolding Kosmos. In that view—which is embraced in various forms, as we have seen, by theorists from Jean Gebser to James Baldwin to Clare Graves to Carol Gilligan—the essentially healthy components of one wave of unfoldment are taken up, transcended-and-included, in the ongoing waves of the unfolding universe. If any two worlds have horizons that overlap in history, then they are related by the path-directional flow of mutual understanding between those worlds, and therefore, via Whiteheadian necessity, those overlaps will stand in a relation of unfoldment and enfoldment.

One version of that interpretation, for example, would be that of Spiral Dynamics, which suggests that the early tribes were expressing the "purple" vMEME (magic or magenta altitude) or wave of adaptive intelligence, a wave exquisitely suited to the life conditions of the time; and modernity is expressing, in its healthy form, the "orange" vMEME (rational or orange altitude); and finally, that they stand in relation to each other in a Spiral of development, or unfolding adaptive capacities, which is why modern individuals at orange can indeed reactivate and cultivate the purple vMEME in themselves, but 50,000 years ago, individuals at purple could not, in fact, activate orange (because it had not yet emerged). This is exactly why the orange theorist can recontact and appreciate his or her magenta roots, but not vice versa. They stand to each other in the relation

of prehensive unification in time's stream.[11] Put differently, "All of the lower (purple magic—preoperational cognition) is in the higher (rational orange—formal operational cognition), but not vice versa." Therefore the tribal is "right," the modern is "more right"; the tribal is "inclusive," the modern is "more inclusive."

And not just with views such as the tribalist and modernist. Staying with the Spiral Dynamics examples, each 1st-tier set of values (from magic to traditional-mythic to modern-rational to postmodern-pluralistic) sincerely believes that its values are the only correct or most important values, and that the world would be a better place if everybody adopted their values. Traditional-mythic believes that society will return to real values if everybody moved away from rampant permissiveness and adopted religious, communal, and family values based on enduring moral principles. Orange-reason believes that what this country needs is more individual responsibility, initiative, and a business-like drive to help progress, profit, and excellence. Green-postmodernism believes that the entire human race is suffering from a lack of mutual respect, love, and compassion extended to all beings in equality and friendship.

---

[11] Ever wondered why the tribal consciousness itself surrendered its original state and moved on? According to the tribal/nondissociated ranking system, the very first and most fundamental state of humans everywhere was the nondissociated or nature-harmonious state. Since that state is no longer widespread, that means that at some point the tribes themselves had to abandon their own state of harmony. Why would anybody ever abandon Eden? We can't say that they were conquered by warlike "ranking" tribes, because if so, then those tribes themselves must have abandoned the original paradisical state at some point—again, why would they do that? The conclusion seems to be that either the judgment capacity possessed by the original nondissociated state itself was intrinsically unwise, or else the original state was perhaps not that paradisical to begin with. The tribal view ends up not only condemning the modern state, but retroactively condemning the original tribes who themselves abandoned that paradisical state. The unfoldment principle, on the other hand, simply sees healthy growth and development as the essential features of this overall movement. In the entire sequence from tribal to modern, there is not a step that, in itself, is a disease. That some very important aspects of the tribal state could have been forgotten, repressed, or denied by subsequent development is fully accepted and accounted for by a developmental perspective, but it does not see the development itself as diseased.

The problem is, none of those views agree with each other; nor can any of those views rest easy as long the others are taken seriously. Mythic-traditional says that all people are loved and included by God (but only if you accept their particular God; otherwise you are very likely going to hell). Orange-achievement says that when the ocean of excellence rises, all boats rise (but those not contributing to the rising water line are still harshly considered "losers"). Green-postmodernism says that it is caring and all-inclusive and wants to marginalize nobody (but in fact it vocally condemns traditional-religions, Republicans, and usually despises orange business and anything Integral). Each vMEME (or wave) will not accept the other waves *in their own terms*. The simple fact is, each 1st-tier vMEME pronounces a ranking judgment on every other meme, and a harsh judgment at that. To a 1st-tier meme, the other memes are mistakes or diseases, however politely phrased.

Beginning with 2nd-tier waves, however, there occurs what Clare Graves called "a monumental leap in meaning"—namely, the values of all the previous waves are honored and acknowledged *in their own terms*. And therefore a new possibility, a new territory, comes slowly into view on the horizon—namely, that of Integral endeavors of an entirely different order. It is from within the horizon of Integral possibilities that meta-theories such as AQAL arise, meta-theories that attempt to escape the "correct" versus "incorrect" conflicts of the previous waves (by seeing varying degrees of "correct").

A thoughtful critic might respond, "Ah, but aren't you saying that your AQAL meta-theory is right and the other theories wrong?" Not really; I am suggesting that AQAL is a meta-theory that allows the most number of theories to be right. "But you *are* saying that as an Integral meta-theory, AQAL is better than other Integral meta-theories." In a sense, yes, but those Integral meta-theories are then working within an essentially similar paradigm or injunction (namely, everybody is right), and as we have seen, theories within similar paradigms can, do, and should make competing claims because those can be judged on the merits within a similar horizon.

To the extent that different Integral meta-theories cover the same territory, there are means to adjudicate which is the more adequate. If, for example, one meta-theory includes the essentials of another, but adds elements not contained in the other, then the former meta-theory is likely the more adequate (in the sense that Kepler is more adequate that Ptolemy). But even if AQAL were the "more right" view, it would still be just a moment in the ongoing Integral stream, bound to be transcended-and-included in the yet more adequate views of its own Einsteinian tomorrow, which themselves would pass into a faster-than-light future whose contours we can only guess.

The point is that the principle of unfoldment can indeed make "more right" judgments, but compared to the other ways of making "more right" judgments, it inflicts the least amount of pain on the least number of souls.[12] Even if there are "higher" stages in any unfolding sequence, it is from within that sequence that judgments are made; the principle of unfoldment sees each wave as being intrinsically significant and adequate; sees each succeeding wave as being intrinsically more significant and more adequate; and, finally, sees them standing to each other in the relation "right" and "more right." Precisely because all three of the views of "rightness" that we discussed—the tribal view, the modernist view, and the integral unfoldment view—will in fact pronounce a ranking judgment that unavoidably inflicts pain on the views that are ranked (and on the theorist doing the ranking if he or she has a conscience), then I respectfully submit that the principle of unfoldment and enfoldment inflicts the least amount of harm.

---

[12] Technically, following the Basic Moral Intuition, enfoldment inflicts the least amount of pain on the least (span x depth) of souls.

AN INTEGRAL OPERATING SYSTEM (IOS)

AQAL is sometimes referred to as an IOS, or an *Integral Operating System*, using a computer software analogy.[13]   Once you install IOS, it sweeps the system looking to see whether any endeavor that you are pursuing at least touches bases with all the known *quadrants* (I, we, it, and its); all the known *waves* (such as preconventional, conventional, postconventional, and integral); all the known *streams* (e.g., cognitive, interpersonal, emotional, spiritual, etc.); *states* (e.g., gross-waking, subtle-dreaming, causal-formless, nondual-unity); *types* (e.g., masculine and feminine, autonomy and relationship, agency and communion); and so on. *AQAL or IOS does **not** in any way substitute for 1st- or 2nd-person (singular and plural, subjective and intersubjective) experiences of those relevant domains or the concrete social practices that bring them forth.* AQAL, used appropriately, is merely a self-scanning operating environment that checks to make sure that you yourself are engaging in those actual practices if you want anything resembling an Integral embrace to emerge in your own case.

For example, IOS scans the system to see if 1st-, 2nd-, and 3rd-person dimensions of being-in-the-world are being acknowledged and consulted in any particular situation, and it sends up a red flag if a major human potential (suggested by an Integral Methodological Pluralism) is not being included in the discussion. Broken and partial maps are not reliable for any sort of sustained journey through the Kosmos, and although no map is ever complete, some maps are more complete than others.

An IOS specifically attempts to coordinate the very best of the major paradigms in order to produce a more balanced and comprehensive approach to the Kosmos. IOS combines the strengths of the major types of human inquiry in order to produce an approach to any occasion that "touches all the bases," that refuses to leave some dimension untouched or

---

[13] "IOS" was first used by Bob Richards, a pioneer in subtle energy research and cofounder of Clarus, Inc..

ignored, that honors all of the important aspects of holons in all of the their richness and fullness. (And if the model of the AQAL Integral Framework that I am presenting leaves something out that somebody can demonstrate is important, then they should include that element in order to be Integral according to my own definitions, and do so with my blessings.)

IOS, of course, is itself nothing but a pale and abstract map; it is itself merely a 3rd-person system of signifiers. That again needs to be emphasized, because too many people, critics and students alike, mistake AQAL for some sort of ultimate reality, whereas it is simply a 3rd-person system of artifacts that attempts to represent all sorts of other realities, modes, dimensions, and paradigms—and really, nobody nowadays mistakes the map for the territory.

However—to continue the computerese—if IOS is properly downloaded and installed in any human system, it essentially *activates the 1st-, 2nd-, and 3rd-person dimensions themselves*, simply because those are the active signifieds (and referents) of the IOS signifiers. That is, even though AQAL is merely a 3rd-person map, it is a map that audibly prompts, every time you boot up: "In addition to any 3rd-person maps, are you also including 1st-person singular, and 1st-person plural, and 2nd-person singular, and 2nd-person plural dimensions of being-in-the-world in your awareness?" (Not to mention levels, lines, states, and types….)

The result is that any system operating on IOS automatically scans all phenomena—interior as well as exterior—for any quadrants, waves, streams, or states that are not being included in awareness. IOS then acts to redress this imbalance and help move the system toward a more integral, harmonious, and inclusive stance. IOS acts as an autopoietic holism, if you will. And it does so, *not* by replacing any other practices, but by pointing out the importance of actually engaging them yourself (which IOS itself does not, cannot, and was not meant to do).

When IOS suggests things such as, "Be sure to include waking states, dream states, and formless states in any overall approach to consciousness," it is not telling you, for example, what you should be dreaming, or how you should be dreaming, or what the contents of your dreams should be, or what you should be thinking in the waking state, or anything like that at all. It is simply saying, if you are not including in your approach a wide spectrum of states of consciousness (gross, subtle, causal, and nondual), then you are not being as inclusive as you could be. Likewise with 1st-, 2nd-, and 3rd-person perspectives: IOS is not in any way telling you, for example, what the 1st person should be thinking or feeling or how it should act, only that 1st-, 2nd-, and 3rd-person perspectives are already out there so you might as well include them if you want what you are doing to be called "integral" in any meaningful sense. All of those "check-points" in the IOS software are simply the sum total of legitimated paradigms coordinated with the heuristic principles of nonexclusion, enfoldment, and enactment (and set in the overall AQAL Framework).

We will continue to discuss IOS in subsequent sections. But don't let the 3rd-person signifiers mislead. What we are talking about are the contents of lived, felt, breathed awareness. We are talking about what aspects of the Kosmos we will allow ourselves to feel. Can we allow ourselves to feel deeply into all dimensions of the self-disclosing Kosmos, or we will recoil, contract, pull away from the Kosmos, and from our own Self, and run instead into one partiality or another, one absolutism or another, one broken fragment or another? IOS, although a 3rd-person operating system, simply acts as a reminder, a self-scanning alert, that there might be more ways of being-in-the-world than are presently acknowledged, a reminder that can prompt actions in the direction of a more Integral embrace, and can even offer one overview of those actions, but can never, under any circumstances, be a substitute for them.

HOLONIC CONFERENCING, OR THE KOSMIC ADDRESS

Nonexclusion, enfoldment, and enactment, as useful guidelines for an integral meta-theory, allow what is perhaps one of the most helpful applications of AQAL (or apps of an IOS): *holonic conferencing*, or what is also called "*the Kosmic Address*." Different quadrants, waves, streams, states, and types hold different phenomena; and therefore different modes of inquiry, different methodologies, different paradigms and human practices can be nonthreateningly situated in an AQAL space that makes room for all of them. Holonic conferencing allows us, for example, to index most of the significant and time-honored modes of human inquiry, understanding where each of them are useful and effective, as well where they might need to be supplemented by approaches covering some of the other important bases.

Put it slightly differently: precisely because each phenomena in the known universe *exists in a particular quadrant, level, line, state, and type*, each phenomena has what can be called its own "*Kosmic Address*"—the actual quadrant, level, line, state, and type where this particular phenomena can be found. The "planetary atom," for example, exists in the UR quadrant, the orange level, and waking state, to give a few of its address components. Thus: planetary atom $^{(UR, orange, waking)}$obj. The "obj" (which is often written just as "o") means the object or phenomena; to be complete, the Kosmic Address has to include the subject or knower, since different subjects, we have seen, bring forth different objects or different phenomena. The "knower" of the orange atom would likely also be orange, but exist in the UL quadrant, as well as same waking state. Thus:

Planetary atom = (UL, orange, waking)s x (UR, orange, waking)o

 This is why magic and mythic individuals cannot see an atom, why atoms do not "ex-ist" for magic or mythic folks—their developmental altitude (magenta and amber, resp.) is not great enough to broach the orange

worldspace, and thus the phenomena in the orange worldspace are "over the heads" of those individuals, subsisting in their Kosmos but not existing in their Kosmos.

Any field—business, medicine, psychology/therapy, consciousness studies, history, art, spirituality—can quickly be reconfigured using an IOS (or the AQAL Framework) to suggest ways to make the field considerably more integral. The reason AQAL or IOS has had such a rapid acceptance in many of those fields is that, based on honoring human capacities across a full range, IOS opens up even further potentials for any field to advance in depth and fullness, simply by recognizing those aspects of an AQAL space not yet tapped by the particular field. Doctors, lawyers, educators, therapists, businessmen and women, spiritual teachers, among others, have very quickly enriched their own practices by using AQAL to flesh out a more Integral approach that many of them were moving towards anyway. Examples of Integral Business, Integral Education, Integral Ecology, Integral Feminism, Integral Politics, Integral Therapy will be given throughout this discussion. (*The Journal of Integral Theory and Practice* has published articles in over an astonishing 60 disciplines that use the AQAL Framework to make their disciplines more Integral.)

The sum total of all known Kosmic Addresses of all phenomena located in the universe is referred to as a "*Giga-Glossary*." It is dictionary, a mega-phenomenology, locating phenomena according to the quadrant, level, line, state, and type where it can be found. This will turn out to be quite important, as we will see, in validating the existence of various phenomena (or, to use semiotic terms, in locating the referent of the sign or signifier.

To give only one example now, take the signifiers (signs or words) "dog," "the square root of a negative one," and "Spirit." Each of those has a specific location in the universe, which can be found only by following the injunctions and practices that will enact and help bring forth those phenomena. Often these locations are paradigm-specific, and thus you will not be able to see or find these phenomena if you do not follow the

injunctions, data, and confirmations of the phenomenon's specific paradigm. A dog, for example, can be found in the objective sensorimotor world (or UR quadrant), waking state, and at any level at or beyond infrared (but cannot be found below infrared or sensorimotor—a dog does not ex-ist for a cell or a molecule, for example). Thus, the Kosmic Address of a dog = (UR, infrared, waking)o. But "the square root of a negative one" cannot be found in the exterior, sensory, empirical world, like the dog, but rather exists only in the interior world—specifically, in the orange rational worldspace of the UL quadrant in the waking state that has learned mathematics. Thus, the Kosmic Address of the square root of a negative one = (UL, orange, waking/mathematics)o. And Spirit, as the ultimate nondual Reality of all realities and the Condition of all conditions, can be found only in the nondual state of consciousness in the UL quadrant. Thus Spirit = (UL, nondual state)o.

Without taking yourself to the same neighborhood as indicated in the Kosmic Address, you will not be able to see or in any way experience any of those correlative phenomena (none of the referents of the signifiers). If you don't develop to orange rationality and learn mathematics, you will never be able to find anything like the square root of a negative one. Likewise, if you don't work yourself into a nondual state of consciousness, you will not be able to experience Spirit as the Ultimate Reality—it remains "over your head." This is why something like a Giga-Glossary is so important in determining various realities. Different paradigms bring forth different worlds, and without following those paradigms, you will never experience those different worlds. And the principle of nonexclusion prevents you from dismissing those worlds—not unless you have honestly followed the injunctions, data, and confirmations of that paradigm disclosing those worlds yourself (or choose to believe those who have).

Using the Kosmic Address and Giga-Glossary has numerous important applications, one of which is known as "holonic conferencing." This means what has perhaps been the most immediately helpful IOS apps, which is usually referred to as *integrally informed practices*. What that

phrase means is that, whether one is a doctor, a lawyer, a janitor, or a waitress, one's practice can be integrally informed. This does not necessarily change the behavior of the practice itself—if you are a janitor, you are still sweeping floors—but it profoundly changes the consciousness of the one doing the sweeping. A more comprehensive map of where you are located allows you to see the context in which even the simplest activity exists, at which point sweeping the floors becomes an act of the Kosmos conducted through the consciousness of the integrally informed soul.

Some people imagine that in order to have an Integral practice of, say, dentistry, one must bring every quadrant, every level, every line, and every state to bear on the poor patient sitting in the chair in a vigorously coordinated assault on tooth decay. Well, you could if you wanted, I suppose, but that's not the basic point. The point is that an integrally informed dentist, or lawyer, or therapist, or spiritual teacher is using a holonic indexing system (or simply is using the AQAL Framework) in order to locate their own services in a larger scheme, and thus they can more effectively concentrate their efforts on what they do best, and refer the person to other paradigm-practitioners if other services are required.

But they can indeed make their own practices more Integral or comprehensive by incorporating directly into their practice some of the aspects and dimensions of AQAL space that are appropriate but not yet utilized. Dentists soon realize that the psychological state of the patient accounts for at least half of how any session goes; therapists soon realize that physical states and mental states go together (as brain and mind, muscular armor and defense mechanisms, etc.), and both of those are inextricably linked to the family and the culture at large; spiritual teachers soon realize that meditation may help the soul but won't necessarily cure a broken bone. An integrally informed practice in each of those fields allows one, at the very least, to situate one's practice in a larger Kosmos, while expanding the potential of the practice itself where appropriate, following an AQAL Framework.

As a specialist in any field, I do not have to be Integral; as a human being, I do. Integral lawyers are not ones who drop all quadrants, all levels, all lines, all states, and all types on a client's head, but ones whose consciousness is *integrally informed* by the existence of all quadrants, all levels, all lines, all states, and all types. Such an integrally informed consciousness will bring to any practice all that can be brought to it, and in so doing will begin to change dramatically the nature of the practice itself, whether performing brain surgery or sweeping the floor with awareness. (And this might indeed mean using the actual AQAL Framework as a way to flesh out and fully expand the particular practice to cover all the important bases. In fact, this is often mandatory. The idea is that, at the least, the full AQAL Framework is used as a background context, an Integral Operating System, for whatever one's practice is.)

An important side benefit is that, by locating one's practice or paradigm in an Integral space such as the AQAL Matrix, one "frees the paradigm by limiting it," as we earlier suggested. For example, when Eastern meditation was first introduced to this country on a widespread scale about four decades ago (e.g., Transcendental Mediation, Zen, Vedanta), many practitioners and teachers thought that it was a cure-all. Just meditate and you will get that new job, cure most illness, heal all neurosis. Forty years later, a more sober view prevails, among practitioners and teachers alike. However, as we were saying, holonic or integral indexing prevents such misunderstandings from the start, while highlighting those areas in the AQAL Matrix that meditation, and meditation alone, can show you (namely, the upper reaches of the Upper-Left quadrant, specifically higher states/realms). That is, most forms of traditional meditation (East or West) are activating or highlighting the 1st-person dimensions (or UL quadrant) of being-in-the-world at a causal/non-dual state. Meditation is the premier time-tested paradigm for the bringing forth and illuminating of those domains—domains that, within their enacted horizons, disclose what practitioners invariably report to be deeper

and more meaningful realities (which, if mastered competently, might even lead to nirvanic or Enlightened or Awakened states, by whatever name).

But those higher states will not, in and of themselves, cure problems at lower waves, or in other streams, or in other quadrants. State realizations are not a substitute for structural development, nor are they a cure for pathologies within structures/waves.[14] And when both teachers and practitioners realize that from the start, not only are they spared the sweeping disappointment, anger, and despair of discovering that inadequacy the hard way, they can actually focus on and celebrate even more joyously what meditation itself does that no other paradigm can do (thus "freeing meditation by limiting it").

As we will especially see in subsequent chapters, the same holonic conferencing can be helpfully used when it comes to systems theory, eco-philosophies, cultural studies, structuralism, collaborative inquiry, phenomenology, and so on. Each paradigm is appreciated all the more, not less, through a larger holonic conferencing. Each is limited, and thereby freed, to bring its own extraordinary, irreplaceable, and crucial insights to the Council of All Beings.

PROSPECTUS

If there is ever to be an Integral Age at the Leading Edge—a genuine revolutionary transformation in the cultural elite as a harbinger of a wider societal shift—I believe it will very likely involve meta-practices like "Integral Methodological Pluralism" and meta-theories like AQAL.

---

[14] For a further discussion about the particular differences between psychological structure-stages (waves) and contemplative state-stages, refer to *Integral Spirituality* chapter 4 "States and Stages" and Chapter 6 "The shadow and the Disowned Self."

But by whatever name and in whatever context, Integral Salons are in fact already forming around the world (and are already very active in many countries, including Germany, Brazil, Spain, Russia, England, to name a few), pockets of care and consciousness where individuals exercise 2nd- and 3rd-tier potentials in an ongoing effort to embrace as gracefully as possible all dimensions of the radiant Kosmos. The more one actually practices an Integral Meta-Paradigm (in personal life, in business, in education, in politics, in medicine, in spirituality), the more Eros is set rumbling through the system, agitating and pulling toward a 2nd- and 3rd-tier transformation that explodes the legitimacy crisis inherent in all 1st-tier waves and throws them open to an authentic enrichment beyond their 1st-tier imprisonment, an enrichment that is their own inherent potential and divine birthright set free in the deeper and wider spaces enacted by Integral practices.

How to extend this compassion and clarity to all sentient beings is a fiery concern that blazes forth in these salons and circles of unfolding and enfolding care, circles (online if nowhere else) that you are almost certainly involved in or you would not have read this far; circles that call out to you to give the best that you can, and then more; circles that call forth from you the best that you can be, and then more; and circles that are beginning to deposit the Kosmic habits of a tomorrow dedicated to compassion, a horizon luminous with intimacy, a future hopelessly fallen in love with love, circles drenched in the tears of a beauty descending on all beings, accepting each as they are, insisting each be more, assisting them to be so, catching them if not.

It is to those salons that I respectfully submit a consideration of three helpful guidelines for integrally informed practice—nonexclusion, enfoldment, and enactment—with the hope that they will help make room for whatever is arising, moment to moment to radiant moment, while causing the least amount of pain and extending the most amount of compassion to all our brothers and sisters manifesting with us.

We must forgive each other our arising, for our existence always torments others ("Hell is others," Sartre famously said; and the Upanishads add: "Wherever there is other, there is fear"). The golden rule in the midst of this mutual misery has always been, not to do no harm, but as little as possible; and not to love one another, but as much as you can. Therefore, let a calculus of torment as well as one of compassion guide the maps with which we navigate samsara.

In the end, yes, that which is samsara is not other than nirvana, and that which is nirvana is not other than samsara: the world of finite, manifest, temporal things crashing into each other, torturing each other, loving each other for a moment or two, every now and then, turns out to be the domain of the very and only Divine, with each and every thing, just as it is, a shimmering gesture, a luminous ornament, a sparkling jewel, spontaneously arising in the sea of the Great Perfection, the entire show nothing but the radiant smile of your own Original Face.

But in the meantime, there is this manifest mess. As long as the world is arising *around* you, then this is samsara, and therefore calculate your actions on the least harm and the most care. When the very same world is arising *within* you, then this is nirvana, and all your actions will take care of themselves, while the calculus of pain and compassion will unfold of its own accord, treating every sentient being with the utmost concern, vowing to liberate each and every one of them, knowing full well that in reality there are no others to liberate—because in the entire Kosmos there are no others at all, no inside and no outside anywhere, but merely and only This. Greet the day within you as the unfolding of your kin, watch the sun arise without opening your eyes, feel the distant galaxies rising and falling with each and every heartbeat of the only heart there is—you can feel it beating right now—and bless the entire universe arising within by consenting to feel it again, now and now and now. In the great unfoldment that enfolds all, bow to the suchness of all beings, in the only place that is ever real, and the only time that is only now—and thus in the infinite Here and the timeless Now, come finally to rest as the only Onliness of the Ultimate

Real, where you are no longer on this side of your face looking out at all of that, but the Looker has dissolved and you *are* simply All of That—one with the mountains and one with the lakes and one with the stars and one with the sky—Unborn and Undying, Unbounded and Unlimited, Uncreated and Unmade—your one and only Original Face, the Face of all that was, and all that is, and all that ever shall be.

EXPAND YOUR MIND. THRIVE FOR LIFE.

Seismic changes are underway in the 21st century, and in order to thrive you need to not only better understand your world, but to expand your mind and build the inner skills that will help you unleash your full impact. You can do so by joining Integral Life, where Ken Wilber and other transformational experts will provide you the principles, perspectives, and practices, delivered straight to your inbox every week, that represent the leading-edge of advanced personal development.

Click here to get started.