



**Excerpt B: The Many Ways We Touch—Three Principles Helpful for
Any Integrative Approach**

Overview: An Integral Paradigm Is a Set of Practices, not Theories

In **Excerpt A** from volume 2 of the Kosmos Trilogy, “An Integral Age at the Leading Edge,” we noted the fact that, in today’s world, less than 2% of the population is at any stage or wave of consciousness that could be called “integral” in any meaningful sense. If the general waves of development are pictured as traditional, modern, postmodern, and integral (with yet higher waves possible), research suggests that somewhere around 25% of the population is traditional, 40% is modern, 20% postmodern, and only 2% or so is at integral or higher.

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, has identified three major post-WWII phases: functionalism (**modernist**), microsociology (**postmodern pluralist**), and a new and third phrase: “**an age of synthesis**,” an integral age at the leading edge, just now beginning.

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 a 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** 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, Jurgen Habermas, and Robert Kegan—here is a brief summary. Research indicates that, like all natural living systems, consciousness can undergo evolution, development, or unfoldment. These theorists believe that the general waves of evolution or unfoldment have included **archaic**, **magic-tribal**, **mythic-traditional**, **modern-rational**, **postmodern-pluralistic**—all of which together are often called “first-tier” waves—and **integral-aperspectival**—which is often called “second tier.” First-tier waves each believe that their worldviews and values are the best or correct values; second-tier or integral waves attempt to include and integrate the partial truths of all first-tier waves. Because consciousness evolution is still ongoing, some researchers loosely refer to “third-tier” waves, which are even more encompassing but, as yet, are still in their early, formative phases. [When we use the terms of Spiral Dynamics, developed by Don Beck and Christopher Cowan based on the pioneering work of Clare Graves, these are approximately the vMememes or “value memes” of **beige** (archaic), **purple** and **red** (magic), **blue** (traditional), **orange** (modern), **green** (postmodern), **yellow** and **turquoise** (second tier).] As suggested earlier,

empirical research from several different sources suggests that, in this country, approximately 25% of the adult population embrace traditional values, 40% modern values, 20% postmodern values, and less than 2% are stably at second- or third-tier waves. When we speak of “an integral age at the leading edge,” we are focusing on that 2%, 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) eventually lead to Max Planck’s bold quantum hypothesis. 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 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. But the new practices and the new theories growing up around them 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 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.¹

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,” 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 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 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.

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., blue, mythic-membership, conventional) 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 slavery).

This shift from blue 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 social 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 blue (which will follow the law if it is part of tradition), and it is not felt requirement of red (which will follow the law if it issues from the power leader). Only at orange does interiority start to demand a hand in the laws that regulate its own behavior.

(Of course, there were several other social injunctions that were part of the orange tetra-worldspace, including an industrial base that was one of single largest factors in reducing the need for slavery, and which lessened the demand for physical 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. But we are here focusing on the subset of social practices or

paradigms within the rising cultural elite that was forging a new and revolutionary form of governance that would tetra-mesh with new techno-economic base.)

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 governing. This usually involves the election of governors by those governed, such that sovereignty rests, 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.

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 wider integral wave of unfolding.

This new 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, 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), which tetra-supported worldviews that, for the first time in history, began publicly valuing freedom, liberty, and equality—and actually fought and died 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 (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 according to tone, not content.

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. That is, legitimacy at the green wave included adopting a worldview that was: nonhierarchical, nonjudgmental, nonmarginalizing, and nonranking. Positive items, such as intersubjectivity, 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).

The benefits of the healthy green wave were many and profound, including most environmental reforms and the civil rights movement. 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 often condemnation of everything other than pluralism. That this was a performative contradiction—pluralism means to accept all views, not attack so many of them—was generally overlooked). Deconstruction (or tearing down) worked quite well, at least initially, because red and blue and orange had built much that needed to be un-built or taken down. 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. 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.

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 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 (traditional, modern, and postmodern) believed that their values were the only valid or correct values, any 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. Orange, for example, claims to possess universal truths, truths that cover all the really important bases, but it rejects blue truths outright and it recoils in disgust in the face of green pluralism. 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 blue values, and it explicitly rejects orange values. In contradistinction to all of those exclusionary social practices, an integral wave attempts to acknowledge, honor, and actually include all of those 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.

So what does that mean when it comes to social practices? If the integral wave includes the essentials of the first-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 first-tier waves, but now set in an integral framework that included their enduring contributions yet transcended their partialities, absolutisms, and exclusionary practices.²

The result would a set of paradigms, behavioral injunctions, and social practices that might be called an **integral methodological pluralism**. “Integral,” in that the pluralism is not a mere eclecticism or grab bag of unrelated paradigms, but a 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. 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 first-tier values (not to mention second-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 first- and second- and third-tier probability waves.

Integral Methodological Pluralism (IMP) has two main parts: paradigmatic and meta-paradigmatic. The **paradigmatic** aspect means a 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. We have already given (in **Excerpt A**) an overview of many of those fundamental paradigms—and we will continue to explore 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.

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 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 first-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 overlap, their brought-forth horizons merge 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, which means, as we now know, a practice of practices and not a theory of theories.)

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 house). 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, that 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 second-tier probability wave. That is, meta-paradigmatic practices stand forth only in the worldspace of second-tier consciousness, which discloses holonic and integral relationships that were operative but not visible at first-tier waves.

On a more personal side, IMP involves things like Integral Transformative Practice (ITP), 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. 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. Second-tier solutions to social problems involve sustained inquiries into ways that will allow each wave (e.g., purple, red, blue, orange, green) to freely explore its own potentials but in ways that those waves would not

construct if left to their own exclusionary practices. In academic settings, integral methodological pluralism allows the creation not so much of more cross-disciplinary studies (which confirm each other in their first-tier prejudices) but in trans-disciplinary studies (which enact a new territory of integral displays between old rivalries).

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 family practice, 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

At this point we have been mostly talking about social practices in a micro-elite, particularly in academia. As we saw, 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 the LR), 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 (with all of them, of course, mutually tetra-evolving and tetra-enacting).

In short, around social practices, paradigms, or methodologies, theories or worldviews grow.³ Paradigms bring forth new territories, which new maps attempt abstractly to reflect.⁴ 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) thrown up by the social practices.

With regard to IMP, we can put the crucial point very simply: what if an individual (and right now we are still talking mostly about elite academics) 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.... 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 metatheory that accounts, or at least attempts to account, for all of them in a believable, coherent fashion.

At this time, one such metatheory is AQAL (pronounced *ah quil*), which is short for “all quadrants, all levels, all lines, all states, all types.” This metatheory did not precede integral methodological pluralism, but, as usual, vice versa. That is, the ingredients of the AQAL metatheory 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).

The novel component of AQAL is the meta-paradigmatic aspect, or the practices on the practices (which generate theories on the theories, or the metatheory 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). In other words, the experiences enacted by all of those methodologies are given a *legitimacy* by the AQAL 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 Transformative Practice, or the social setting of revolutionary reforms that actually have traction because second-tier potentials are effectively tetra-engaged.

AQAL, then, is a metatheory 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.

The First Useful Principle: Nonexclusion

On a metatheoretical 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, and injunctions. Still, within those paradigms, we have reason to suppose those claims are true enough. At any event, 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 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” 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 metatheory or supertheory of relating data domains becomes helpful. Any plausible integral metatheory—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 metatheory would, in effect, free the paradigm by limiting it.

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 proceeds the first-tier food fight.

To “free a paradigm by limiting it” means that, with any integral orientation, the already existing boundaries of a particular paradigm become more obvious, 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 exclusivity 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. But by limiting the applicability of the

paradigm to within the already existing bounds of the paradigm, 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 metatheory suggests one such integral interpretation, namely: the accepted paradigms of physical sciences (e.g., chemistry and physics) are disclosing the third-person singular dimensions 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.

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 lattice. (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 first-person singular modes of being-in-the-world at a yellow wave (and thus activating psychological drives of self-actualization); perhaps they are lighting up the second-person plural modes 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 third-person plural modes 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 first-person plural modes of being-in-the-world at a blue wave (and thus activating an sincere concern for social stability and accountability); or perhaps they are drilling down into the third-person singular modes 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.

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 metatheory 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 hydrogen 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 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.

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 **Excerpt A**, 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 and 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. When it 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 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?

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 metatheoretical 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 pluralism?

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.

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 Tycho Brahe—that Johannes Kepler could 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 metatheory 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 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 deepened, 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.

AQAL metatheory handles this 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” (“integral indexing” or “holonic conferencing” [see below]) allows individual paradigms to be seated next to each other at the integrative table, in such 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.

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 Tycho 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.

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 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 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, less adequate than their predecessors. “Unfoldment” does not necessarily mean

“progress.” 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-hension), and thus each is more holistic, more inclusive, more encompassing.

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.⁵

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 metatheory: “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.

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

illuminated by a series of behaviors of a perceiving subject. As we put it, phenomena are enacted 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 have available to them different states of being or states of consciousness. It follows that a different state 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. 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 a 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. This does not mean DNA wasn’t there, just that it did not “ex-ist” in those worldviews). 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).

We will be returning to the idea of enactment throughout this discussion (particularly in **Excerpt D**); 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” paradigm 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 really important 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 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 metatheory can believably accommodate both sets of data?

The reason an integral metatheory 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 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 metatheory 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 metatheory therefore gives one interpretation of the above “paradigm clash” between physics and meditation as follows: the physicist in the example is highlighting the third-person singular dimensions of being-in-the-world, and is doing so from an orange 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 orange consciousness, only that they did not “ex-ist” or become apparent to humans until that structure could call them forth). The meditator, on the other hand, is activating the first-person singular dimensions of being-in-the-world, and is doing so from a third-tier 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 and you will see a different world, essentially the same different world 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”). 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.

Quantum Questions is an anthology of the writings of many of the great pioneering physicists who also had profound third-tier or spiritual 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 subjects, who had first-person familiarity with both paradigms, 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).

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 third-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 first-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 third-person deduction but a first-person realization.

Our simpler point is that, whatever we decide about the relation of physis and pneuma, 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 hydrogen 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, hydrogen 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 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 metatheoretical overview, such as the one offered by AQAL.⁶

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

“conflicting” paradigms are already being competently practiced all over the world; and thus the question is not, and never has been, which is right and which is wrong, but how can all of them already be arising in a Kosmos? These three principles are some of the items that need to be already operating in the universe in order for so many paradigms to already be arising, and the only really interesting question is how can all of those extraordinary practices already be arising in any universe?

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 discomfort.

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 discomfort 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 torment. For all parties involved. As we have seen, I believe that 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 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.”

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 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 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 these partnership notions are attempting to convey a belief that something “more right” existed yesterday, and today itself is therefore problematic.

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 is basically the opposite. Modern consciousness, whatever its problems, contains capacities and perspectives not available to the early 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 “diseased.”

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 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 fares just as poorly, perhaps worse, on the scale of animosity. Neither of these 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 transcendently 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 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 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; 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 purple roots, but not vice versa. They stand to each other in the relation of prehensive unification in time’s stream.⁷

And not just with views such as the tribalist and modernist. Staying with the Spiral Dynamics examples, each first-tier set of values (from magic-purple to traditional-blue to modern-orange to postmodern-green) sincerely believes that its values are the correct or most important values, and that the world would be a better place if everybody adopted these values. Blue 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 believes that what this country needs is more individual responsibility, initiative, and a business-like drive to help progress, profit, and excellence. Green 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.

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. Blue 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 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 says that it is caring and all-inclusive and wants to marginalize nobody (but in fact it vocally condemns blue Republicans and usually despises orange business). Each meme will not accept the other memes *in their own terms*. The simple fact is, each first-tier meme pronounces a ranking judgment on every other meme, and a harsh judgment at that. To a first-tier meme, the other memes are mistakes or diseases, however politely phrased.

Beginning with second-tier waves, however, there occurs what Clare Graves called “a monumental shift 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 metatheories such as AQAL arise, metatheories that attempt to escape the “correct” versus “incorrect” conflicts of the previous waves.

A thoughtful critic might respond, “Ah, but aren’t you saying that your AQAL metatheory is right and the other theories wrong?” Not really; I am suggesting that AQAL is a metatheory that allows the most number of theories to be right. “But you *are* saying that as an integral metatheory, AQAL is better than other integral metatheories.” In a sense, yes, but those integral metatheories 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 metatheories cover the same territory, there are means to adjudicate which is the more adequate. If, for example, one metatheory includes the essentials of another, but adds elements not contained in the other, then the former metatheory is likely the more adequate (in the sense that Kepler is more adequate than 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.⁸ Even if there are “higher” states or 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 healthy, appropriate, and adequate; sees each succeeding wave as being intrinsically healthy, appropriate, and 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 unfoldment view—will in fact pronounce a ranking judgment that unavoidably inflicts pain on the views that are ranked (and on 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.

An Integral Operating System (IOS)

AQAL is sometimes referred to as an IOS, or an **Integral Operating System**, using a computer software analogy.⁹ 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, and it); all the known *waves* (such as preconventional, conventional, postconventional); all the known *streams* (e.g., cognitive, interpersonal, emotional, spiritual, etc.); *states* (e.g., gross-waking, subtle-dreaming, causal-formless); *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 first-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 software 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 first-, second-, and third-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 ignored, that honors all of the important aspects of holons in all of their richness and fullness.

IOS, of course, is itself nothing but a pale and abstract map; it is itself merely a third-person system of signifiers. That again needs to be emphasized, because too many people, critics and students alike, mistake AQAL for some sort of reality, whereas it is simply a third-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 first-, second-, and third-person dimensions themselves*, simply because those are the active signifieds of the IOS signifiers. That is, even though AQAL is merely a third-person map, it is a map that audibly prompts, every time you boot up: “In addition to any third-person maps, are you also including first-person singular, and first-person plural, and second-person singular, and second-person plural dimensions of being-in-the-world in your awareness?”

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 anything like that at all. It is simply saying, if you are not including in your approach a wide spectrum of states of consciousness, then you are not being as inclusive as you could be. Likewise with first-, second-, and third-person perspectives: IOS is not in any way telling you, for example, what the first person should be thinking or feeling or how it should act, only that first-, second-, and third-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.

We will continue to discuss IOS in subsequent sections. But don’t let the third-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, contact, pull away from the Kosmos, and from our Self, and run instead into one partiality or another, one absolutism or another, one broken fragment or another? IOS, although a third-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

Nonexclusion, enfoldment, and enactment, as useful guidelines for an integral metatheory, allow what is perhaps one of the most helpful applications of AQAL (or apps of an IOS): holonic indexing or **holonic conferencing**. Different quadrants, waves, streams, and states bring forth 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.

Any field—business, medicine, psychology/therapy, consciousness studies, history, art, spirituality—can quickly be reconfigured using an IOS 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.

Holonic conferencing also leads to 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, and every line 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 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, and 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.

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.

An important side benefit is that, by locating one's practice or paradigm in an integral space such as AQAL, one "frees the paradigm by limiting it." For example, when Eastern meditation was first introduced to this country on a widespread scale about three decades ago (e.g., Transcendental Meditation, 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. Thirty 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). That is, most forms of traditional meditation (East or West) are activating or highlighting the first-person dimensions of being-in-the-world at a third-tier 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 occasions (which, if mastered competently, might even lead to nirvanic 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. 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.

As we will especially see in subsequent Excerpts, 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 metatheories like AQAL.

But by whatever name and in whatever context, integral salons are in fact already forming around the world, pockets of care and consciousness where individuals exercise second-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 second-tier transformation that explodes the legitimacy crisis inherent in all first-tier waves and throws them open to an enrichment beyond their first-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 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. 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 glance, 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.

NOTES

¹ 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.

² To say an integral social practice would in fact include and exercise all of the important practices, injunctions, and methodologies of the first-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*.

³ See note 1. 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—injunction, paradigm, or enactment; bringing forth of the enacted phenomena; and knowledge-community validation—refer only to the general features of enactment in any domain—artistic, moral, scientific, etc.—and not to the 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 science that follow those three strands but are not confined to the sensory data of “narrow science.” They therefore equated the three strands themselves with 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. 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). All of this explained in endnote 15 for chap. 4, *A Theory of Everything*.

⁴ 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.

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 create worlds; theories map or represent them. Both are crucial in any integral epistemological model.

⁵ What does not continue to function or exist, however, in a junior wave (nor 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 transform 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.

⁶ See note 4. 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 that is central to Excerpt C, subheading “A History of We’s.”

⁷ 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 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 paradisaical state—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 paradisaical to begin with. The tribal view ends up not only condemning the modern state, but retroactively condemning the original tribes who themselves abandoned that paradisaical 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.

⁸ Technically, following the Basic Moral Intuition, enfoldment inflicts the least amount of pain on the least (span x depth) of souls.

⁹ “IOS” was first used by Bob Richards, a pioneer in subtle energy research and cofounder of Clarus, Inc.