
 all
 hide

Start Date: 04/11/07

1



Bonnitta Roy

- Purpose** To orient the participants to the major themes in the Process Model
- Outcome** A better understanding of the Process Model
- Questions**
 - What is the purpose of theory?
 - How does cognition lay down categories of self-world-others/ values?
 - What is the Ontological Dimension?
 - What is the difference between a process in a structural approach, and process from a process approach?
 - What are the conditions of structural enfoldment and how do they limit our potential for addressing complex issues?
 - What is the difference between perspective and view?

Introduction

The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Process Model

I

One of the most common questions I receive about the Process Model is "Do you think Wilber doesn't know these things?" I don't think that anything I have written about has escaped Wilber's understanding. In fact, there are many places in his writing that I could have used, in little tidbits, to substantiate the Process Model - like I used his writings on the always already to substantiate the characteristic of the ontological-but I didn't want to do one of those cut and paste jobs that take Wilber out of context to substantiate what is presented as an alternative to Wilber's AQAL model.


While I was talking to Jonathan the other day, I was likening theory-building to painting. On rare and wonderful occasions, one might see a painting that seems to get at the very core of your being. For me once it was a Vermeer at the Met that seemed to sum up my very existence-all of existence-in one fell swoop. In other words, it seemed to be a kind of Theory of Everything.

How this can be is a fascinating topic someone should write about some day. But my point being is that when a great work of art speaks to us this way, we don't usually perceive it as somehow being in competition or conflict with other works of art. We usually accept art works as being in relation. Except in some postmodern forms which borrow from the construction of the *raison d'etre* of text-we don't usually think of painting as going out on a search and destroy mission.


And yet, when someone comes out of the closet, as it were, with a new theory, people expect that the theory-builder is on a search and destroy mission-we almost always write as if we were on a search and destroy mission. But that's silly. It's not what I want my theory to be "about." Certainly my theory has personal meaning for me. It is founded on some experiential elements in my life, on some thought experiments, and is my best way of charting where I am at, at bedrock-in theoretical terms.

To write it, I have drawn from where the universal touches down in me-it may or may not touch

base with the universal in you. It may or may not have interpersonal or transpersonal meaning for you. Whether it does or not, IMO, is a test of its share-ability, which is ...more...

revised 04/10/07 5:57AM  edit

↳ 2 Edward Berge

04/12/07 12:16AM 



?? I have a question...

hide

Just to get my own ball rolling you said above:

"Going forward requires a better understanding of the ontological dimensioning of reality, and being able to ground that understanding in a way that avoids the postmodern problem of pre-givens."

Why do you find it necessary to avoid pre-givens? What is correct about pomo, or Madhyamika for that matter, when it comes to avoiding metaphysical postulates about the ontological dimension?


And as a follow up to those questions, you said in the article the following in footnote 31, p. 135:

"The actual exegesis of the relationship between openness, or open awareness in the ontological dimension and the notion of emptiness, is well beyond the scope of this article. Suffice it to say that the Process Model is aligned with the Dzogchen Bon texts in which open awareness is contrasted to both sunyata (emptiness) and the permanent subject that realizes it;"

Perhaps you might explore here the ontological dimension of open awareness with the sunyata of Nagarjuna, as they seem akin to me.

 private

↳ 3 Bonnitta Roy

revised 04/12/07 10:04AM 



Ed asks:

hide

And as a follow up to those questions, you said in the article the following in footnote 31, p. 135:

"The actual exegesis of the relationship between openness, or open awareness in the ontological dimension and the notion of emptiness, is well beyond the scope of this article. Suffice it to say that the Process Model is aligned with the Dzogchen Bon texts in which open awareness is contrasted to both sunyata (emptiness) and the permanent subject that realizes it;"

Perhaps you might explore here the ontological dimension of open awareness with the sunyata of Nagarjuna, as they seem akin to me

Wow! That's a big question.
I'll start with this one, then.

Some background ... the footnote is referenced to a new book by Anne Klein and Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche, called "Unbounded Wholeness." The authors make both this contrast you quoted above, and the other in the article I quoted contrasting open awareness with any kind of consciousness at all. These are merely the bold conclusions of their writing style... which takes the reader through these very subtle shifts in perception, creeping as it were, toward the understanding they are wanting to share.

For me, its a question of distinction. If we are able to make distinctions, however subtle -- or even more interestingly, if we hear/ read someone else making distinctions which we don't grok -- then that points to something. It's like all these flavors are constantly being brewed -- some of them are overwhelming, and easily shared, like the clove in the ham-- some of them are much more subtle and complex.

It is one thing to perceive objects. It is quite another to have apperceived the emptiness in them. The emptiness is quite a subtle flavor. There is a kind of radical shift from the perception of objects to the apperception of the emptiness in them.

[by 'apperceive' I mean the experience of having a kind of (non-objective, non-conceptual) revelation come through awareness, similar to but in contrast with the way 'perceive' is the experience of having an object (or concept) come into awareness. they are similar processes, because they are effortless arisings. so, for example, you might perceive an object in one manner -- let's say you see the tree and its separateness-- and then at once apperceive it in [...more...](#)



edit



4

Bonnitta Roy

revised 04/12/07 7:58AM



hide



OK. Now that I've situated your question "within the literature" -- and you've heard all that before, anyways -- let's take this down a notch or two. Let's try to get some basic clarity out of this. Forget Bon Dzogchen-ists and Nargajuna!

We usually talk about dualistic thinking, in terms of quite sophisticated ways of speaking and writing and talking. I want to talk about something more fundamental. I want to talk about the complementary nature of the most fundamental type of cognition -- the root cause at the very beginning. We consider dualistic thinking a "problem" because it brings up confusion. But at the root cause, there is this complementarity, and a process that is very interesting, and is the process that brings up our world.

Imagine there is a seamless continuum -- an aspectless, vibrant process that is "reality". One of the transformations of this process is called "mentation" -- its what we are familiar with as cognitive potential -- from which we know reality. In order for any "thing" or structure, or category to arise from this seamless continuum, a cognitive transformation has to occur. The seamless continuum transforms into a field of complements, and "things" happen. In order for an object to arise at all, there has to be a transformation of complements "emptiness" "form" -- in a sense, there needs to be a process where they are teased apart. So when an object arises in our perception, we may mistake it for being "only form" when in fact, it is inimically paired with its complement. ...

What we usually call "perceiving" is a cognitive transformation of the seamless continuum, along complementarities -- a subject/object complement beneath which are the layers of interior/exterior and one/many complementarities.

The field is continuously morphing. For the most part, we are habituated to the same relations among the categories ("a subject perceiving an object" and the like). But this is

not necessarily so. The field is fluid, flexible, and inexhaustive.

Here is a thought experiment. Try to allow yourself to see the complementary aspect of everything that arises. See that in order for there to be "tree" there is an expansive field of "non tree." In order for there to be object, there is the delimited perceiver, subject. Can I peer into the object [...more...](#)



5 Edward Berge

04/12/07 12:42PM



Bonnie,

You said: "[Tibetan Bon Dzogchen]...understood that Nagarjuna's critique was radical, but in a sense it has a kind of 'lack'. According to my understanding of Klein/ Rinpoche, they sensed, Nagarjuna notwithstanding, that 'emptiness' was supported by a subject -- however subtle -- what we might term the causal Self, the subject permanence of Ramana, for example."

And it is my understanding of Nagarjuna, and Derrida for that matter, that they are most definitely and emphatically **not** supporting emptiness by a subject, however subtle. I cannot say that I understand them as saying the same as what you're saying about Bon's unbounded wholeness, as I am yet not familiar enough with it to make an accurate comparison. But to me N and D, at least those parts that converge in their respective Venn diagrams, sound a lot like what you're describing as ontological a-wareing. However, continuing the Venn diagram analogy, there are areas that do not touch and so retain subtle distinctions and differences. I just don't see the distinction you made above, via the cited authors, as accurate.



6 Edward Berge

revised 04/12/07 1:26PM



To respond to your post 4 Bonnie:

It would be nice to just forget the similarities and differences of the Dzogchen and Nagarjuna, eh? But can we? We are both invested in their respective teachings in how they move us to a-ware and interpret this "unbounded wholeness."


Yes, from my own, personal experience I grok what you're saying here. I've done these experiments and can at times (out of time) reside in the simple feeling of being/becoming. As you say, these are not "special states of consciousness" available only to the elite and long-time meditators; this is available to each and every one of us, here and now, as a birthright.

So yeah, we each have this core "experience," for lack of a better word. So why do we end up competing for the better interpretation? And by "we" I don't just mean you and me but Dzogchen and Nagarjuna, Wilber and Derrida, and on and on and on. It's the battle for the best grasp on the ungraspable "reality" that I tire of.

It's like my latest musings (pun intended) on art. There's an aspect(less) of it that resides just in my immediate, felt response to art without all the interpretations and explanations. Why does it always have to "mean" something? And why do the power brokers always have to dominate and control this meaning? This is just as much, if not more so, the condition of brokers of "reality" as it is brokers of commodities.



 7 Jonathan Reams

04/12/07 5:44PM 



Building on that idea...

Ed, you wrote:


"So yeah, we each have this core "experience," for lack of a better word. So why do we end up competing for the better interpretation? And by "we" I don't just mean you and me but Dzogchen and Nagarjuna, Wilber and Derrida, and on and on and on. It's the battle for the best grasp on the ungraspable "reality" that I tire of."

This phrase of "competing for a better interpretation" triggered something in me that I will briefly mention here. Part of my view of things these days is that we each need to create knowledge for ourselves. I'm fond of a Gadamer quote from Truth and Method that "all understanding is ultimately self understanding." So may be in addition to the connotation of competing that does indeed exist in many ways, there is a notion that to understand anything we have to go through a process of self revelation in relation to the constant unfolding of this process that we are. Thus we could also be collaborating, standing on each other's shoulders to get a better view of things.



private

 8 Daniel Gustav Anderson

04/22/07 4:58PM 

I think Jonathan's reference to Gadamer here is very appropriate to this context. I'll take it from the other direction, though--the concept Gadamer borrows from Heidegger, that of the horizon. We can only see so far in any particular direction; some see further in some directions than others. (Nagarjuna, for example, understood the dialectic as well as anyone, and was a great spiritual master--and he believed in the literal existence of Mount Meru.)

Now, this leads me to the very first point Bonnie raised in this thread, regarding the response she often gets to her work: "You know, Wilber already thought of that." Well, so what if Wilber thought of it already? This response to Bonnie's work suggests that the respondent assumes Wilber has all the answers, and that further work is irrelevant, silly, or perhaps even a threat. And that attitude is counterproductive in my opinion. Why assume a certain bald gentleman out of Boulder, one thinker out of many, has all the answers, and foreclose all further discussion? Seems reductive to me. There are other words to describe this tendency...

This is related to the project of theory-building generally. What is the purpose of making a unified field theory? Bonnie's analogy to the Vermeer suggests it's in part aesthetic for her. William Blake found it to be a political gesture, a liberatory gesture (paraphrasing here): I must create a system of my own or be enslaved by another man's. For me, it's about solving problems. I see a set of problems that are nested within one another, causally connected to one another, in a sense eating and feeding one another, and I would like to solve said problems--so I try to think of ways to address the whole bubbling cauldron.

And as Bonnie suggests, this sort of thing can be done beautifully. St. Thomas Aquinas wrote with the beauty of a Baroque fugue. Why did Aquinas do this, however? Why was he trying to synthesize from Scripture and Plato and Aristotle and canon everything into one final answer? I'd like to bracket that question for now, but consider what happened to those who found gaps and misplacements in Aquinas's Final Answer.

Blake's Devil is whispering in my ear: Beware orthodoxies! Conversations solve problems better, get more work done, and benefit ...more...



private

9 **Bonnitta Roy**

04/23/07 6:47AM



Daniel!
You are terribly and terrifically and heroically eclectic!

all light and tears ...



edit

hide

10 **Richard Carlson**

04/23/07 11:00AM



Bonnie

Congrats on a very nice piece of writing, I will take a linguistic turn in my comments to parse what you call ontological dimensioning and tease out some questions your text poses for me regards what you call a "process view". It may require a bit of patience as I painstakingly attempt to make some rather elementary points. If you are still with me at the end I will applaud your tolerance for following my interpretive improvisations. I will start with a certain quote from the language terrorist himself:

"speaking of the first word of Being (das fruhe Wort des Seins: to khreon), Heidegger writes: "The relation to what is present that rules in the essence of presencing itself is a unique one (ist eine einzige), altogether incomparable to any other relation. It belongs to the uniqueness of Being itself (Sie gehort zur Einzigkeit des Seins selbst). Therefore, in order to name the essential nature of Being (das wesende Seins), language would have to find a single word, the unique word (ein einziges, das einzige Wort). From this we can gather how daring every thoughtful word (denkende Wort) addressed to Being is (das dem Sein zugesprochen wird). Nevertheless such daring is not impossible, since Being speaks always and everywhere throughout language" (p. 52).

Such is the question: the alliance of speech and Being in the unique word, in the finally proper name. And such is the question inscribed in the simulated affirmation of différance. It bears (on) each member of this sentence: "Being / speaks / always and everywhere / throughout / language." (Derrida)

You write: "For example, consider the ontological dimensioning of object constancy. The self "qua self" does not navigate the experience of developing object constancy. Rather, object constancy is part of the constituent development of what we term "self". Therefore, object constancy has a strong ontological component to it, because it preconstitutes the self".

My first question is can we even speak of object constancy without considering the manner in which we name and language the "objective world"?

I am sure you are familiar with the example from the life of Helen Keller in which her awakening to Being is through a process which can be called "an awakening to language". What can be understood from HK's narrative is that the ...more...



private

11 **Richard Carlson**

04/23/07 11:08AM



(cont II)

notes on process view



view

hide

Guenther's study of creativity and reductionism is largely accomplished by drawing comparative examples between the Dzog-chen and the Yogacara Buddhist schools. Some of the problems the Dzog-chen thinkers encountered with the Mahayana Yogacara thinkers were in their fixation on symbols and semiotics which ended in static end states that closed off creativity and play. G writes "it was felt by the Dzog-chen thinkers that attention was too easily riveted on the symbols thus activated and that this constituted an impediment to process itself." (Guenther)

He also writes: "As said by the structural model of the mind proposed by the Vaibhasikas they modified this static model by conceiving of mind/mentation, which for them was sole reality as a process structure, constantly engaged in phenomenal transformation (Polyani) They also noted that living systems tend to optimize themselves and thus introduce the idea of optimizing thrust (self-organization) . Nevertheless the Yogacara thinkers were hampered by their insistence mentation/mind as an ultimate thing..... The goal was radical transformation of an entity called either "pure information" (vijñaptimatra) or pure mind/mentation (vijñanamatra)" (G)

The problem which Guenther puts in a nutshell is that the Yogacara thinkers have entangled themselves is co-created ontologies which they have optimized only to become "static end states" totalizing Being in ones of its multiplicity of "triune holomovements"...

The process view advanced in your paper aims at integration of the AQALS model - as I understand it - it aims to re-think the AQALS model in terms of process and not structure. In following this course it posits the AQALS model -however modified it maybe from the model advocated by Ken Wilber- in advance of the process it employs to excavate it. This leads me to think that the AQALS pattern is a pre-given strange attractor of the process model. One of the goals of the theory appears to be to reconcile itself with a pre-existent quaternary ontological structure and rescue it through a re-visioning by "process view". And herein one must ask if a fixation with pre-given holonic models couches similar dangers to those which the Yogacara thinkers encountered when they entangled themselves in Mandela symbols and static end states?

Although Guenther's model is clearly influenced by the myths and narratives of [...more...](#)



private



12

Jonathan Reams

04/24/07 3:00AM



hide



In response to [Daniel Gustav Anderson \(8\)](#)

I got such a good laugh reading your last paragraph!

I have come to view this idea of knowledge creation, in relation to my quote from Gadamer, is the path of our unfoldment in many ways. But I also think that this then means that implicit within the horizon of my pre-understanding of the term is something very different than "knowledge as information." Maybe more like "knowledge becoming wisdom." The first can be shared through means like the exchange of words like we are doing here. This is grounded in a degree of common signification for the words used, and some work at times to build that commonality for specific terms.

The second, to my mind at least, is not conveyed or carried in such linguistic signifiers in the same manner. They can point to it, but unless the experience/wisdom is present within one, the meaning of the words will not succeed in conveying their intended meaning. The term "adequatio" is one I came across through Parker Palmer, and points to the need for an adequate experience being present within the knower for the thing being conveyed to be known.

From this little aside, I relate it to the PM in that I view the constructs of/within the epistemological field to be capable of either being more or less grounded in/tethered to the ontological dimension. For me, it is then the degree of this infusion of the epistemological with the ontological encounter that enables a coherence of view to emerge.



private



13

Richard Carlson

05/02/07 10:09PM



Apologies for a bit of an aside but something just occurred to me regards my previous post of "Being expressing itself through the One Word."

Helen Keller experience is kerygmatic, a sudden initiation into Logos upon comprehending (interpreting) the first word. Contrary to Derrida assertion that there is no one name of Being, because due to the binary structure or the co-dependent arising of language, it cannot be conveyed through its alliance with the "one word", for HK, Being is disclosed through the one word: W-A-T-E-R. Before water there is no chain of signification. It is the one word, "Das einzige Wort" that awakens her from a misty consciousness into the living presencing of "That".

Before differance initiates its binary dance of opposites along the infinite curvature of four dimensional space/time, a word must first be spoken! The rupture of Logos precedes the process of signification. In HK's instance, the force of the Word thrust her in an instant from a half-slumbering archaic to an awakening rational consciousness. She suddenly leaps over worlds, as if the remembrance of a long forgotten presence accelerates her being's development in time. Her awakening to a timeless remembered presence is her experience of metanoia which allows her to transcend and integrate vast cognitive domains into her new state of being.

Once she is initiated by the first word her consciousness tunes into language and the world it discloses. Once she comprehends the word and begins communication through its infinite chain of signifiers she begins to tune into the strange attractor of differance and so finds her center of gravity in the rational proper. Her mastery of language and subsequent participation in the process of signifying a world are all dependent on the assimilation of the "first word". So we can change Derrida's formulation of genealogies: for if Difference precedes Being it is because Difference is in turn the first word spoken by Being.

rc



private



14

Bonnitta Roy

05/06/07 8:50AM



In response to [Richard Carlson \(13\)](#)

Hey Richard,

Your notes are overwhelming me.
I've read.
I've sat.
I've written.
Here we are.

When you put the question of Difference before Being, you are trying to foreclose the ontological with an epistemological conjunction ("before", "after"). From a view within the

ontological dimensioning of reality, there are the anterior and the posterior aspects -- they are entangled aspects, not related in a direction of time. HK is a perfect example. The experience of first word occurs in time, but it throws itself back to timeless, always already Being. The individual occurs in time, but resonates back to the timeless, always already Being. *This is the experience of the ontological dimensioning of reality* that the PM is pointing to.

The mind/mentation desires to concretize this experience, and seeks to establish a basis. Difference, or Being - which came first? Chicken or Egg - which came first? The depth of your narrative of yours and others explorations into these kinds of conundrums, is overwhelming. There are infinite worlds enfolded in words. But it seems to me not the case that *world* is enfolded in *word* -- and I see HK's awakening to word as being based in world. HK narrates:

"We walked down the path to the well-house, attracted by the fragrance of the honey-suckle with which it was covered. Someone was drawing water and my teacher placed my hand under the spout. As the cool stream gushed over one hand ..."

HK didn't say "there was a blank and then ' ... I stood still, my whole attention fixed upon the motions of her fingers. Suddenly I felt a misty consciousness' " ...

No, there was already a world, a world of perception (of honey-suckle fragrance, the coolness of the stream) a narrative space (path to the well house) .. a sense of otherness (someone was drawing waer my teacher) and a sense of body (placed my hand). My sense of it, is that being an embodied self in a shared world is a requirment for language ... just as much as then language can go on to bring forth new worlds, new types of embodiments, new types of intersubjectively shared spaces.

The question then becomes, not which is prior, *absolutely*, word or world, but what is the condition of their enfoldment in any given experience. In the one case, world is enfolded ...more...



15

Bonnitta Roy

05/06/07 11:58AM



How does "process view" facilitate a re-thinking of thought,- and if thought is aligned with speech - without becoming ensnared in language traps and the totalizations of thinking processes? How does "process view" re-think the context of the whole?

hide

I suspect that our way of thinking has exhausted its potential. Although we can theoretically go on forever, creating infinite parcellations of new knowledges, there is something funny that is happening. There is a sense in which all our thinking keeps bumping into limitations -- limitations of language, limitations of resource, limitations of developmental levels, limitations of cultures... Additionally, there seems to be a recursive aspect to all these limitations -- the self is limited by culture, but cultures are limited by the contribution of the individuals; the eco and the ego are limited by each other, language limits experience, and experience limits language, etc.... For me, "limitations" and "recursivity" are like meta-tags to a system of thinking that has exhausted itself, or "thinking" as a system that has exhasuted its potential. A system that is both self-limiting and recursive must be a unity, a "whole" -- but it is a bounded whole. It is self-limiting and recursive because it is a bounded whole. The language of a bounded whole is self-referentially tautological, and totalizing.

But is this the whole we seek? Or is there an unbounded whole of which we can be aware through some capacity -- call it a new thinking, a new speech, or call it other -- what capacity do we have to access this unbounded whole? First, we must find some degree of freedom from language traps and the bounded systemics of thinking. Where do we look for some degree of freedom? Do we have *even a tiny inkling of sense where this freedom might await us?*

If we had the cognitive capacity to do so, we could describe the boundary conditions of this system that is thought -- our hall of mirrors. The perspectives within this hall of mirrors are endlessly morphing into worldviews. But the worldviews themselves -- all of them -- are constrained by their self-reflective recursive limitations. All our terms self-define; all objects self-entail subjects; all worldviews entail the relativism of endlessly sliding contexts.

The second law of thermodynamics is a boundary condition in science. [...more...](#)



edit



16

Richard Carlson

05/06/07 1:59PM



hide



Bonnie,

Your ability to penetrate to the heart of the matter is inspirational. That you followed my improvisational rant is also impressive since, I was not sure of its outcome. Here are some comments you made that I felt were really enlightening:

"The question then becomes, not which is prior, absolutely, word or world, but what is the condition of their enfoldment in any given experience. In the one case, world is enfolded in the unified self, and the self then works from that basis outward toward language; in the other condition, world is enfolded in the word, and the self has to work through the word to get to the world.

Or maybe the sequence has been closed, perhaps by Derrida, such that we are left with only a set of ontic things and signifiers, that have exhausted their potential to stand in for the new. Guenther speaks of self-radiance of the sun. Derrida always seems to me to have the self-radiance of a dying star. Is there a death signifying the end and a death signifying the beginning?

In a sense, we are all Helen Kellers, trying to make contact, to connect with others what has already come up through us, that core encounter. Does our language have the capacity, as you suggest, to pull someone through the tunnel to the awakening of what has been encountered, in the pooly depths of Being? or does shared language depend upon an "us" having shared those pooly depths? or is it even possible that any one is excepted from the pooly depths of which we speak? "

RC

Yes aren't we all Helen Kellers? Just a short follow up on Keller and in my next post - which will require some in depth contemplation- I will try and respond to the other fabulous questions you raise. I hope I have not sidetracked the conversation so far with HK, but there is just one more clarification I wish to make. I should probably qualify the statement of Keller to say that "human consciousness" and "human subjectivity" is inextricably linked to the word which is its house of being. My intention here is not to make the solipistic argument that the common sense view of the world independent existence is incorrect, the world does exist before the word because she does still play in it, but her "human consciousness" which includes the ability for self-reflection exists only in [...more...](#)



private

17 **Bonnitta Roy** 05/07/07 5:32AM  [hide](#)



Richard,
Please follow your muse here. There was a lot you wrote about text/word/nature ... that I didn't understand, but I intuited a great deal of depth there. And Helen Keller is a great focus of inquiry ... since we are aligned with her "predicament".

thanks so much for the insightful inquiry,

Bonnie



18 **Richard Carlson** 05/08/07 1:14PM  [hide](#)



Bonnie

I actually have taken your feedback and turned my initial response into an essay on Keller in a consideration of Habermas conventional and post-conventional consciousness/morality. The target of course is Derrida, Differance and the one Word.

In considering the dying star of language and the infinite recursivity of thought one must re-evaluate the role of Theory in pointing a way out from the gravitational field which define the boundary conditions of the rational.


I guess this was the main jest of my initial response and it pertains not only to process view but to all theoretical movements toward the integral. Theory can too easily lead to a more or less static end state in which answers become reified in final conclusions whereas integrality IMO is an unending process of clearing a horizon toward Being

This was the impetus behind the following rephrased question, namely if play is the work of process view can it both "tune into" Being and disclose "the sign" which expresses the epochal moment in which thought is poised to become enfolded in Being?

Or, does the value of process view and/or other integral theory lie in the Theory itself or in the movements they prescribe which by necessity lead beyond them? Or more specifically how does the discursive methodology of process view find its way into embodied practices?

rc



19 **Bonnitta Roy** 05/09/07 6:51AM  [hide](#)



In response to [Richard Carlson \(18\)](#)

I actually have taken your feedback and turned my initial response into an essay on Keller in a consideration of Habermas conventional and post-conventional consciousness/morality. The target of course is Derrida, Differance and the one Word.

I am wondering if what you are thinking here will pertain to Martin's idea of the transversal axis of Kierkegaards post-conventional morality?

In considering the dying star of language and the infinite recursivity of thought one must

re-evaluate the role of Theory in pointing a way out from the gravitational field which define the boundary conditions of the rational.

From a process view, there is no death and no birth. For example, we don't see the child die and the man born-- we see the development of a human being. If you take as your premise "there is no death and no birth", then process thinking encourages you to envision a larger process-whole which can encompass both forms in transformational relation. In this way, process thinking creates larger and larger wholes, without subtending lesser parts. Process thinking understands that the oak is in/from/through the acorn, and the acorn is in/from/through the oak. What kind of larger process-whole can encompass Derrida and a way out/beyond?

I guess this was the main jest of my initial response and it pertains not only to process view but to all theoretical movements toward the integral. Theory can too easily lead to a more or less static end state in which answers become reified in final conclusions whereas integrality IMO is an unending process of clearing a horizon toward Being

Structural based theories always lead to static end states, because such thinking delimitates categories by assigning boundary conditions. In order for language to live, distinctions must be made. But distinctions should be made from within experience, and then given voice. If someone wants to participate, then s/he must return to their own experience and evaluate from there. Evaluating from signifier to signifier is a recursive hall of mirrors. All the novelty is in the experiences, at the core where language discharges and recharges.

I love the way you wrote this

integrality is an unending process of clearing a horizon toward Being

We always try to come up with a succinct definition of integral and we eventually get bound up with notions of meta-meta systemic [...more...](#)



20

Bonnitta Roy

05/09/07 8:31AM



The Problem Situation



hide

view

Rich,

Since you said you personally liked Guenther's style, allow me to ge a little esoteric here in the spirit of "high play".

Guenther starts his book Matrix of Mystery by articulation the "problem situation":

Simply put, this book probes the folowing: how is it that man is both the encodement (as preserver) and the encoder (as transmitter) of essential insights into the structure of Reality? Stating it in another way, how are we to understand that fantastically improbable complexity termed "man" so that that equally complex notion of "tradition"-- as that which preserves and transmits essential insights-- is itself comprehensible?

Does the PM explore useful ways to answer this question? Does a process view address the problem situation?

enjoy...

Bonnie

I have attached Guenther's following two paragraphs in a word document that further articulates the questions about problem situation.



21

Bonnitta Roy

05/12/07 5:34PM



hide



In response to [Bonnitta Roy \(20\)](#)

My hunch is there is a common "resolution" to the role of the observer in quantum mechanics, and the role of language in postmodern thought. Bohm was heading in the right direction here. My hunch is that the pivotal insight (view) of the postmodern/ quantum observer midnight hour will hinge on something that goes like this:

It is not the role of the linguistically embedded subject/ observer that needs to be calculated into the interpretation of the phenomenal experience / the experiment, but the role of thinking itself-- since the observer/ linguistic subject-- is merely a construction of thought in the first place.

I believe that sums up the greater view and the expression of that needs to be in process terms.

Bonnie



[Open Draft Response](#)



[Contribute](#)

All times are displayed in your local time (Eastern)

1 **Bonnitta Roy**

04/10/07 5:57AM



The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Process Model

I

One of the most common questions I receive about the Process Model is "Do you think Wilber doesn't know these things?" I don't think that anything I have written about has escaped Wilber's understanding. In fact, there are many places in his writing that I could have used, in little tidbits, to substantiate the Process Model - like I used his writings on the always already to substantiate the characteristic of the ontological-but I didn't want to do one of those cut and paste jobs that take Wilber out of context to substantiate what is presented as an alternative to Wilber's AQAL model.

While I was talking to Jonathan the other day, I was likening theory-building to painting. On rare and wonderful occasions, one might see a painting that seems to get at the very core of your being. For me once it was a Vermeer at the Met that seemed to sum up my very existence-all of existence-in one fell swoop. In other words, it seemed to be a kind of Theory of Everything.

How this can be is a fascinating topic someone should write about some day. But my point being is that when a great work of art speaks to us this way, we don't usually perceive it as somehow being in competition or conflict with other works of art. We usually accept art works as being in relation. Except in some postmodern forms which borrow from the construction of the raison d'etre of text-we don't usually think of painting as going out on a search and destroy mission.

And yet, when someone comes out of the closet, as it were, with a new theory, people expect that the theory-builder is on a search and destroy mission-we almost always write as if we were on a search and destroy mission. But that's silly. It's not what I want my theory to be "about." Certainly my theory has personal meaning for me. It is founded on some experiential elements in my life, on some thought experiments, and is my best way of charting where I am at, at bedrock-in theoretical terms.

To write it, I have drawn from where the universal touches down in me-it may or may not touch base with the universal in you. It may or may not have interpersonal or transpersonal meaning for you. Whether it does or not, IMO, is a test of its share-ability, which is the measure of it's utility:

Is the Process Model a useful tool (1) for personal understanding, for personal organization of ideas; (2) for interpersonal understanding, as a heuristic tool for discourse; (3) for transpersonal understanding-does it point to a place beyond a you and a me and an us? And (4) for universal meaning-can it function as a hitchhiker's guide to the kosmos?

II

More simply stated, the Process Model describes a process that creates the interior-

exterior and one-many (singular plural) categories which constitute the quadrant domains, and the perspectives. It assigns this process to the Epistemological Field. This process is not only responsible for the various interpretations we give to reality, more fundamentally, it is also the process that creates the way self-world-others arises embedded in primary values and beliefs-such as what exists for us, and what doesn't-and is responsible for the set of existents (whether objects, subjects, or concepts) that qualify as "empirically veridical facts" that maintain any given "reality." In energetic terms, the Process Model is saying that "reality" is a complex equation of relations that "discharges" moment to moment, from an aspectless core, and retreats, moment to moment back to that source for "recharging." The core is the pole of freedom, and the discharge is the momentum of habituation.

The Process Model suggests that not all of reality comes through this equation, but there is also another kind of dimensioning of reality, which is called the Ontological Dimension. The PM borrows from Dzogchen in making this distinction, between what arises within the Epistemological Field (the perspectives, self-world-other, inherent existence and value, concepts and etc...) and what arises without these categories. Wilber, in alluding to states of awareness that transcend the subject-object perspective, that transcend the perspective of the personal singular-plural-alludes to this, too. He has of course provided us with the Wilber-Coombs lattice, where the states menu runs across the top of the stages menu-but I felt the need to make this trans-perspective or a-perspectival dimension more explicit.

From the process model article itself, it is not clear what is the relationship between what Wilber understands as state-stages, and what my understanding of the ontological aspect of reality is. The process model wants to carry this question forward. I think that Wilber's model (note, not Wilber the man) deals with the states of awareness in a rather clumsy and perfunctory manner. So this is an area to develop. I believe we need to develop it in a way that more than covers the Vedantic states, but also creates a place to explicitly address Gebser's a-perspectivity, as well as the ontological notions of Dzogchen, Aurobindo and Heidegger (primarily among others). Going forward requires a better understanding of the ontological dimensioning of reality, and being able to ground that understanding in a way that avoids the postmodern problem of pre-givens. I believe that the PM has a favorable way to build that understanding-we might explore that further here in these forums. I hope the way that the Process Model illustrates the ontological, is a good start.

III

The Process Model relies heavily on Jason Brown to add a hard-scientific, empirically veridical aspect to how the categories of perspectives arise in cognition. The Process Model adds to Brown's theory of cognitive microgenesis, a process-dynamic language to describe the microgenies-it speaks in terms of the "operators" versus the microgenies, the dynamics, versus the micro-structures. In addition, the Process Model describes the "movement" of the agentic aspect of cognition from interior to exterior, as well as to other selves. Finally, the Process Model accounts for subjective unification of the self as the basic unit of being that stands in for its becoming.

Here is where it is important to understand the enormous scope of the Process Model. The PM model is not only describing how the categories or structures are created-it points out that this continual process-which is for the most part hidden from us-continues to create static "units of being" that are abstracted from the seamless continuum of becoming-the source and field of their generation. Making this process transparent is a first goal of the PM-on the way toward orienting ourselves toward, working toward, a pure process view of the kosmos.

It is here, at a very fundamental and quite complex level, that I make the critical distinction

between Wilber's structural approach, and what I term a "pure process approach"-keeping in mind how Guenther maintained such an approach. While it is true that Wilber describes processes that are responsible for the relations between his structures (primarily developmental processes and holarchic relations) he doesn't start with processes that prescribe the structures. That is, a process approach sees structures not as "things", but merely as relations within generative processes. The structures as "discrete units" disappear in the field of their transformational relations.

A metaphor I like to use is of the structuralist and the processualist describing 4 glasses with water in them. Both agree that the glasses are the structures, and the water the shared process. But whereas the structuralist is "seeing" 4 glasses of water on a counter, the processualist, is "seeing" 4 glasses submerged in a water tank. In the former, it is possible for process to be delimited by structures; in the latter, it is not. In fact the structures "glasses" could just as well disappear.

IV

The Process Model does some critical theory, by taking a close look at the conditions of structural enfoldment that prescribe the microgeny of the conventional cognition; and suggests that these are not fixed aspects of reality, but are fluid and flexible, such that given one set of enfoldments, the mind can be perceived as if it were in the body, and given a different set of enfoldments, the body and the world can be perceived as if they were in the mind. The Process Model suggests that neither perception is somehow "more spiritual" than the other; or somehow seeing reality "as it is" versus an "illusion of reality". The Process Model suggests there is a dynamic and active process that is continually laying down categories of cognition through various conditions of structural enfoldment.

The Process Model looks at the different developmental and evolutionary paradigms that can be derived from different assumptions of structural enfoldment. For example, Wilber's transcend and include holarchy, depends upon one kind of paradigm of structural enfoldment, whereas Brown's microgenesis is a process "in reverse" where wholes give rise to finer and finer articulated "parts". It is easy to see that these two paradigms represent a "divide" across religious and spiritual disciplines. The Process Model suggests we need a new way of looking at these paradigms, to understand how they arise as conditions of structural enfoldment, and to move beyond their partial truths to an understanding based on generative order-where parts and wholes actualize each other and there is a sense of balanced parody. If we can do this, then we can create new potentials for addressing complex issues.

V

Perhaps the most difficult distinction introduced by the Process Model, is the distinction between perspective and view. It is almost impossible to speak of "what is view" without speaking in terms of "perspective." Therefore, it may be possible each and every time, to tag a description of the notion of view with a corresponding perspective. It is a challenge to see that, despite this being the case, there is a strong and important distinction between them. One can hardly "get at" the notion of view directly-rather the path toward view is dialogic (in the Bohmian sense) and is revealed by encounter (in the ontological sense). The Process Model hopes to be useful in carrying forward the notion of view.

3 Bonnitta Roy

04/12/07 10:04AM



close



Ed asks:

And as a follow up to those questions, you said in the article the following in footnote 31, p. 135:

"The actual exegesis of the relationship between openness, or open awareness in the ontological dimension and the notion of emptiness, is well beyond the scope of this article. Suffice it to say that the Process Model is aligned with the Dzogchen Bon texts in which open awareness is contrasted to both sunyata (emptiness) and the permanent subject that realizes it;"

Perhaps you might explore here the ontological dimension of open awareness with the sunyata of Nagarjuna, as they seem akin to me

Wow! That's a big question.
I'll start with this one, then.

Some background ... the footnote is referenced to a new book by Anne Klein and Tenzin Wangyal Rinpoche, called "Unbounded Wholeness." The authors make both this contrast you quoted above, and the other in the article I quoted contrasting open awareness with any kind of consciousness at all. These are merely the bold conclusions of their writing style... which takes the reader through these very subtle shifts in perception, creeping as it were, toward the understanding they are wanting to share.

For me, its a question of distinction. If we are able to make distinctions, however subtle -- or even more interestingly, if we hear/ read someone else making distinctions which we don't grok -- then that points to something. It's like all these flavors are constantly being brewed -- some of them are overwhelming, and easily shared, like the clove in the ham-- some of them are much more subtle and complex.

It is one thing to perceive objects. It is quite another to have apperceived the emptiness in them. The emptiness is quite a subtle flavor. There is a kind of radical shift from the perception of objects to the apperception of the emptiness in them.

[by 'apperceive' I mean the experience of having a kind of (non-objective, non-conceptual) revelation come through awareness, similar to but in contrast with the way 'perceive' is the experience of having an object (or concept) come into awareness. they are similar processes, because they are effortless arisings. so, for example, you might perceive an object in one manner -- let's say you see the tree and its separateness-- and then at once apperceive it in another way, its still the same percept, but now you see the tree and its non-separateness with yourself. You might then go on to conceptualize (abstract, generalize, signify) that apperception in one way or another]

Nargarjuna was careful to carry forward the distinction between the conceptual ultimate "emptiness" and the non-conceptual ultimate "emptiness". He reminds us that "emptiness" is not a kind of void from which form arises, rather emptiness is IN THE FORMS as they

arise. That is, if you pursue the "basis" of any form, you find that the form is unsupported, i.e. "empty". That is a second shift- it's another, more subtle flavor in our brew-story.

Then there is a third shift.

My understanding is that the kinds of argument/ organization of thinking that led the scholastic Indian Buddhists to the notion of emptiness was not a natural way of thinking to the process-orientation of the Tibetan Bon Dzogchen. They understood that Nagarjuna's critique was radical, but in a sense it has a kind of "lack". According to my understanding of Klein/ Rinpoche, they sensed, Nagarjuna notwithstanding, that "emptiness" was supported by a subject -- however subtle -- what we might term the causal Self, the subject permanence of Ramana, for example. If we give Nagarjuna the benefit of the doubt about the causal subject (or subject permanence), we can still take that suggestion one step further, suggesting that "emptiness/form" is supported by at least a cognating consciousness, ie, one that operates in a field of complementarities, one fundamental one of which is emptiness/form.

The other day I heard Wilber (streaming on the web) say that, if nothing else, "Spirit is Fiesty". That is more of the kind of way the Bon Dzogchen think. For them, at bedrock, reality is not a categorical relation (emptiness in the form) but a vibrant process. For them, reality, at bedrock is a VERB. This verb-ing, this to-be-ing, has no subject aspect -- you cannot, for example find this verb at the end of Ramana's process of seeking the seeker. This verb-ing is open-ing a- waring (i.e. open awareness) ... and for a signifier as to the spatial metaphor of what the opening awareness opens up or into... that is called unbounded wholeness. A- waring continually opening unbounded wholeness.

The Process Model can help, here.

The PM suggests that Nagarjuna's argument is tethered to the categories in the EF. Not surprisingly, the emptiness-form problem arises from dualistic thinking -- a characteristic of the EF -- and therein lies the problem. The EF first creates these two poles, and then attempts to find resolution between them. We create duality "out there", and then we spend a long time trying to subtly nuance non-duality OUT OF THE SAME CATEGORIES. It's like trying to get "not-A" from "A". I am trying to get the nondual from the field that is nothing BUT the process through which dualistic (complementary) categories arise!

Emptiness and form (radical interiority/ radical exteriority) are not two, because they arise together. They don't exist somehow "out there" in reality, they arise through a cognitive process, in which they are inimical twins of the structure of this cognitive process, through which the perceived world arises. Without realizing the complementary nature of all that arises as emptiness/form, the world arises as a kind of confusion. In trying to resolve this confusion, we work to establish a basis. Some people choose "form" -- naive realism -- some choose "emptiness" -- naive idealism. Some people choose "subject permanence" - - naive solipsism.

If we understand the processes of cognition, how these categories are laid down, then there is no confusion. There is no puzzle to resolve. There is no "non duality" to achieve... we merely don't get snookered by the making of our own dualistic categories. All the innumerable complexities of our non-duality projects, result from not understanding the processes of cognition -- how self-world-other arises -- from not understanding the "instrument" mind.

This process "mind" (Guenther calls it "mentation") was transparent to the Bon Dzogchen and their process-oriented way of inquiring about reality. In addition, the Dzogchen intuited

another dimension of reality -- itself still a process, a verb -- where such categories don't even arise, so there is not even a starting place to argue about such things as emptiness and form. Instead of being inside the puzzle, they just saw themselves as outside the (epistemological) puzzle -- in the ontological dimension. It is there, in the dimensioning, the verb-ing of Being, that of unbounded wholeness

["unbounded" i.e, a kind of wholeness unrelated to the categories "whole/ part" -- which is the meaning of unbounded, without a delimiting boundary, there are no whole-part relations]...

it is this distinction, that the Dzogchen and the Process Model is making -- this flavor that is brewing....

Bonnie

4 Bonnitta Roy

04/12/07 7:58AM



close



OK. Now that I've situated your question "within the literature" -- and you've heard all that before, anyways -- let's take this down a notch or two. Let's try to get some basic clarity out of this. Forget Bon Dzogchen-ists and Nargajuna!

We usually talk about dualistic thinking, in terms of quite sophisticated ways of speaking and writing and talking. I want to talk about something more fundamental. I want to talk about the complementary nature of the most fundamental type of cognition -- the root cause at the very beginning. We consider dualistic thinking a "problem" because it brings up confusion. But at the root cause, there is this complementarity, and a process that is very interesting, and is the process that brings up our world.

Imagine there is a seamless continuum -- an aspectless, vibrant process that is "reality". One of the transformations of this process is called "mentation" -- its what we are familiar with as cognitive potential -- from which we know reality. In order for any "thing" or structure, or category to arise from this seamless continuum, a cognitive transformation has to occur. The seamless continuum transforms into a field of complements, and "things" happen. In order for an object to arise at all, there has to be a transformation of complements "emptiness" "form" -- in a sense, there needs to be a process where they are teased apart. So when an object arises in our perception, we may mistake it for being "only form" when in fact, it is inimically paired with its complement. ...

What we usually call "perceiving" is a cognitive transformation of the seamless continuum, along complementarities -- a subject/object complement beneath which are the layers of interior/exterior and one/many complementarities.

The field is continuously morphing. For the most part, we are habituated to the same relations among the categories ("a subject perceiving an object" and the like). But this is not necessarily so. The field is fluid, flexible, and inexhaustive.

Here is a thought experiment. Try to allow yourself to see the complementary aspect of everything that arises. See that in order for there to be "tree" there is an expansive field of "non tree." In order for there to be object, there is the delimited perceiver, subject. Can I peer into the object in such a way that I see "subject?" Can I peer into the form in such a way as I see its complement "emptiness? necessarily supporting its arising? Am I able to do this in a way that is not a textual, mental exercise, but challenges the way, the very nature of my apperception?

Can I peer into the "other" in a way that I see "self" -- not as an intellectual exercise, but at the very foundation, at the transformational core of cognition, where I sense that I have made this separation, into complements, such that they enrich and aliven my world, but also such that they inimicably adhere in this moment and for all moments?

That is one purpose of the model.

Bonnie

8 Daniel Gustav Anderson

04/22/07 4:58PM



close

I think Jonathan's reference to Gadamer here is very appropriate to this context. I'll take it from the other direction, though--the concept Gadamer borrows from Heidegger, that of the horizon. We can only see so far in any particular direction; some see further in some directions than others. (Nagarjuna, for example, understood the dialectic as well as anyone, and was a great spiritual master--and he believed in the literal existence of Mount Meru.)

Now, this leads me to the very first point Bonnie raised in this thread, regarding the response she often gets to her work: "You know, Wilber already thought of that." Well, so what if Wilber thought of it already? This response to Bonnie's work suggests that the respondent assumes Wilber has all the answers, and that further work is irrelevant, silly, or perhaps even a threat. And that attitude is counterproductive in my opinion. Why assume a certain bald gentleman out of Boulder, one thinker out of many, has all the answers, and foreclose all further discussion? Seems reductive to me. There are other words to describe this tendency...

This is related to the project of theory-building generally. What is the purpose of making a unified field theory? Bonnie's analogy to the Vermeer suggests it's in part aesthetic for her. William Blake found it to be a political gesture, a liberatory gesture (paraphrasing here): I must create a system of my own or be enslaved by another man's. For me, it's about solving problems. I see a set of problems that are nested within one another, causally connected to one another, in a sense eating and feeding one another, and I would like to solve said problems--so I try to think of ways to address the whole bubbling cauldron.

And as Bonnie suggests, this sort of thing can be done beautifully. St. Thomas Aquinas wrote with the beauty of a Baroque fugue. Why did Aquinas do this, however? Why was he trying to synthesize from Scripture and Plato and Aristotle and canon everything into one final answer? I'd like to bracket that question for now, but consider what happened to those who found gaps and misplacements in Aquinas's Final Answer.

Blake's Devil is whispering in my ear: Beware orthodoxies! Conversations solve problems better, get more work done, and benefit everyone more than inquisitions do. Unless you like beaurocracy... which reminds me, did you ever notice that in early texts that hint toward an integral view of things, such as The Divine Comedy or Paradise Lost (encyclopedic in scope, psychological and cosmological at once, etc) the heavens are really beaurocratic and God is not particularly creative?

(I'm not accusing anyone of behaving like the always-already unexpected Spanish Inquisition, or implying that Wilber, who is verifiably bald and based in Boulder, might not have all the answers all the time. This message has been brought to you by the Ass Coverage Department of the Total Administrative Competence Ministry sub-headed by Blake's Angel, who is also very talented legal and administrative council... much as Milton advised Cromwell.)

10 Richard Carlson

04/23/07 11:00AM



close



Bonnie

Congrats on a very nice piece of writing, I will take a linguistic turn in my comments to parse what you call ontological dimensioning and tease out some questions your text poses for me regards what you call a "process view". It may require a bit of patience as I painstakingly attempt to make some rather elementary points. If you are still with me at the end I will applaud your tolerance for following my interpretive improvisations. I will start with a certain quote from the language terrorist himself:

"speaking of the first word of Being (das fruhe Wort des Seins: to khreon), Heidegger writes: "The relation to what is present that rules in the essence of presencing itself is a unique one (ist eine einzige), altogether incomparable to any other relation. It belongs to the uniqueness of Being itself (Sie gehort zur Einzigkeit des Seins selbst). Therefore, in order to name the essential nature of Being (das wesende Seins), language would have to find a single word, the unique word (ein einziges, das einzige Wort). From this we can gather how daring every thoughtful word (denkende Wort) addressed to Being is (das dem Sein zugesprochen wird). Nevertheless such daring is not impossible, since Being speaks always and everywhere throughout language" (p. 52).

Such is the question: the alliance of speech and Being in the unique word, in the finally proper name. And such is the question inscribed in the simulated affirmation of différance. It bears (on) each member of this sentence: "Being / speaks / always and everywhere / throughout / language." (Derrida)

You write: "For example, consider the ontological dimensioning of object constancy. The self "qua self" does not navigate the experience of developing object constancy. Rather, object constancy is part of the constituent development of what we term "self". Therefore, object constancy has a strong ontological component to it, because it preconstitutes the self".

My first question is can we even speak of object constancy without considering the manner in which we name and language the "objective world"?

I am sure you are familiar with the example from the life of Helen Keller in which her awakening to Being is through a process which can be called "an awakening to language". What can be understood from HK's narrative is that the experience of the world prior to her ability to language it, is not defined by object consistency but by chaos which prefigures the creation of worlds. Here is the well known tale of how Helen Keller encountered language:

"We walked down the path to the well-house, attracted by the fragrance of the honey-suckle with which it was covered. Someone was drawing water and my teacher placed my hand under the spout. As the cool stream gushed over one hand she spelled into the other the word water, first slowly, then rapidly. I stood still, my whole attention fixed upon the motions of her fingers. Suddenly I felt a misty consciousness as of something forgotten, a thrill of returning thought, and somehow the mystery of language was revealed to me." (Keller)

And then: "Helen immediately asked Anne for the name of the pump to be spelt on her

hand and then the name of the trellis. All the way back to the house Helen learned the name of everything she touched and also asked for Anne's name. Anne spelled the name "Teacher" on Helen's hand. Within the next few hours Helen learnt the spelling of thirty new words."

HK describes this awakening to language as: "That living word awakened my soul, gave it light, hope, joy, set it free!" It is clear from her account that object consistency and the configuration of one's subjectivity are emergent from a cybernetic epistemology which involves a circuit of language. Language orders chaos (Frye). Once HK understands how language is performed she immediately masters it and with this mastery the object consistency of the world emerges simultaneously with her own narrative.

Here you address the development narrative:

"In his book "Human Development and the Spiritual Life, Ronald Irwin chronicles how in order for consciousness to grow toward transformation into the post conventional, one must move beyond the narrative constructs of self. He is talking exclusively about the external, extra-narratives of self. What the process model adds, is that the self must also render transparent its subliminal pre-constructions, in order to activate further degrees of freedom of view."

If language is fundamental to co-constructing self and world, to render our subliminal pre-constructions transparent would somehow require us to get beyond language to sever the alliance between Speech and Being not only in a single word but with all words.

The question then is how "Gelassenheit", "View" or whatever Signifier one chooses to employ can shift one's orientation toward a supra-narrative perspective or Verition. (Another supra-linguistic approach one could instance here is Goethe's method of gaining access to the presencing of Being through "exact sinnliche phantasie" or the deployment of imagination as an "organ of perception".)

You address post-conventional language issues when you write:

"The challenge of the process view is not only in what our thoughts tend to be but also in the way our language tends to think". You then reference efforts by David Bohm's rheomode verb based language and Hebert Guenther creative synthesis of systems phenomenology with Sanskrit/Tibetan to address the problem. Although I have questions about Guenther's Sanskrit translations - because some seem to vary from those meaning originally ascribed in the Vedic period and appear later adaptations derived from Dzog-chen Tibetan speakers, I find these different ways of constructing speech acts which Bohm and Guenther have authored to be promising new ways to language Being in the current era of its virtual forgetfulness.

These new ways of languaging existential process seem equally suited to mindfulness praxis as they do to sense-making in the current epoch's digital delirium whose ecology of speed is driven by assemblages of code that increasingly displace language (logos) to order a global simulacra.

Bohm writes:"Every language form carries a dominant or prevailing world view which tend to function in our thinking and perception when we use it" . To parse the "doxa" (Bourdieu) which pervades our Life World, you write: "Guenther had to invent an entirely new language..... combining the rigorously hermeneutic language of Heidegger with the mental framework of systems science."

You then use this verbal systems approach to language to describe Being:

"Being is an opening an ongoing activity therefore a verb and not a noun whereas emptiness is that vast space through which form arises. Being is the dynamic operation the tension of open-ing " through which emptiness and form arises apposite"
 The structuring of the world into perceptual categories of presence/absence form/emptiness, figure/ground is contingent on the binary logic of language which authors co-dependent arising. If "process" means anything then, it does so in relationship to the "status" or "structures" which it navigates between. Becoming (verb) expresses itself through a vehicle of Being (noun), one cannot imagine either without positing the other.

I am personally fond of Guether's style - albeit the impenetrable of his Verelan autopoietics, Heideggerian hermeneutics, and rDogzchen guerilla translations almost ensures he will be an author condemned to be savored only by a few connoisseurs of obscure Buddhist schools, Indic-Tibetan scholarship, and fringe Integral Studies.) - but, if one simply switches from a noun based to a verbal language, even though it may seem more expressive of our existential condition than a representational way of orienting being through nouns, one might find oneself simply swapping out oranges for apples, or for that matter "oranging" from "appling".

If Being is ineffable, and cannot be articulated through its alliance with any one word (das einzige Wort). it would be at once both a noun and a verb and something beyond both of them entirely. For its part a pure verbal language would still require referents - although perhaps dissipative ones - and as such would be under similar semiotic constraints as a noun based system of language. The movement of signification is possible only if each element appearing on the scene of presence is related to something other than itself, namely the temporal elements of speech which precede and follow it. Such speech "bears the mark of the past and the future in the present which is neither" (D). In short, there would still be a "trace" lingering. Trace "the essence of Being would still haunt language"(D).

But language is not only haunted by the essence of Being because essence is expressed through a will to exist in time. This "will to be" expresses itself through an uncanny "will to power" which also couches itself in language. And it is here that I think Ed's point should be kept in mind when he writes: "we each have this core "experience," for lack of a better word. So why do we end up competing for the better interpretation? And by "we" I don't just mean you and me but Dzogchen and Nagarjuna, Wilber and Derrida, and on and on and on".<snip>

<snip> Why does it always have to "mean" something? And why do the power brokers always have to dominate and control this meaning? This is just as much, if not more so, the condition of brokers of "reality" as it is brokers of commodities."

If we simply trade the commodification of spatial reality currently brokered by nouns for the commodities of action and space/time disappearance to be brokered by verbs, what would we gain if the valorization of the resultant sign becomes merely a function of its intellectual exchange value for controlling discourse regimes?

(cont)

11 Richard Carlson

04/23/07 11:08AM



notes on process view



close



view

(cont II)

Guenther's study of creativity and reductionism is largely accomplished by drawing comparative examples between the Dzog-chen and the Yogacara Buddhist schools. Some of the problems the Dzog-chen thinkers encountered with the Mahayana Yogacara thinkers were in their fixation on symbols and semiotics which ended in static end states that closed off creativity and play. G writes "it was felt by the Dzog-chen thinkers that attention was too easily riveted on the symbols thus activated and that this constituted an impediment to process itself." (Guenther)

He also writes: "As said by the structural model of the mind proposed by the Vaibhasikas they modified this static model by conceiving of mind/mentation, which for them was sole reality as a process structure, constantly engaged in phenomenal transformation (Polyani) They also noted that living systems tend to optimize themselves and thus introduce the idea of optimizing thrust (self-organization) . Nevertheless the Yogacara thinkers were hampered by their insistence mentation/mind as an ultimate thing..... The goal was radical transformation of an entity called either "pure information" (vijnaptimatra) or pure mind/mentation (vijanamatra)" (G)

The problem which Guenther puts in a nutshell is that the Yogacara thinkers have entangled themselves in co-created ontologies which they have optimized only to become "static end states" totalizing Being in ones of its multiplicity of "triune holomovements"...

The process view advanced in your paper aims at integration of the AQALS model - as I understand it - it aims to re-think the AQALS model in terms of process and not structure. In following this course it posits the AQALS model -however modified it maybe from the model advocated by Ken Wilber- in advance of the process it employs to excavate it. This leads me to think that the AQALS pattern is a pre-given strange attractor of the process model. One of the goals of the theory appears to be to reconcile itself with a pre-existent quaternary ontological structure and rescue it through a re-visioning by "process view". And herein one must ask if a fixation with pre-given holonic models couches similar dangers to those which the Yogacara thinkers encountered when they entangled themselves in Mandela symbols and static end states?

Although Guenther's model is clearly influenced by the myths and narratives of Dzog-chen and second order cybernetic processes he does not impose this type (AQALS) of totalizing structure in advance. His manner of relating the presencing of Being, although through a circular language of systems, poets rather than performs calculus on the phenomena he describes.

In his epilogue he writes: "What Dogzchen thinkers thought of as an unfolding process , a vector feeling tone complementary to and inseparable from Beings resonance..... In the human context this means that my concern for others affects me with a feeling of my own ability to be concerned , but this ability to become effective must become free" (G)

If the living word set Hellen Keller free as a child to partake of cognitive human development, Guenther describes trans-cognitive freedom as resonance with the vector

feeling tone of Being in its self-organizing process which moves us beyond words to "a-waring and Diaphaneity" (Gebser).

Guenther describes this dynamic self-organization of freedom as leading to dimensions in which "information and the pure energy of thought reign supreme" He writes that all requires "a new understanding of reality itself as an undivided individual whole from being or beings to Being as it unfolds in spontaneity" (G). He goes on to say that such an understanding needs new concepts as the Dzogs-chen thinkers realized.

Such concepts seem in tune with how Derrida describes "difference" as unnameable. Even though he has been playing clever Sophist tricks with spelling, he writes: "This unnameable is the play which makes possible nominal effects, the relatively unitary and atomic structures that are called names, the chains of substitutions of names in which, for example, the nominal effect *différance* is itself enmeshed, carried off, reinscribed, just as a false entry or a false exit is skill part of the game, a function of the system." (D)

Derrida does not just assert that the play of *différance* is identical to Being, rather he boldly claims that *Différance* precedes Being. That is if Being is to be seen as always and everyway speaking throughout language, its speech is ordered by *différance*, which is not a thing but rather an absence. By ordering the relationship within the system of signification *différance* disrupts the alliance of Being in any one word (*das einzige Wort*) (btw. I think Derrida errs in subsuming language to writing but in another conversation I would instance several caveats to severing the links so suddenly between the word/the text and Being, where word = mantric poetry and text = natural world)

One should perhaps avoid inserting Derrida into Dzog-chen to evaluate your text on "process view" but it seems to me that *différance* and mind/mentation are processes which engage similar phenomenal transformations which do not result in static end states but rather are the continuous processes of unfolding mental morphologies. These phenomenal transformations are not speech acts but can be viewed as pure play. In Greek this type of play it is called *Pharmakon*. The *pharmakon* acts not only as a bridge between two supposedly opposite elements, but also as a subversive device which erases the difference between the elements it bridges and assumes both their identities in the same instance.

More poetically, Guenther describes the aspect of play in Being's holomovement as "the effulgence of ecstatic intensity it is like the shimmering of the flame in an oil lamp or the dancing of the sun's rays of light." (G)

The real work of process view seems to also involve play and a "tuning into" the unfolding resonance of Being. The play of "tuning in" enables one to cross over the binary oppositions of representational thought and eventually pass into the non-duality of Superthought. But, if play is the work of process view can it both "tune into" Being and move beyond "the sign" to express the epochal moment in which thought is poised to become enfolded in Being?

I'll bring this all to a close starting with a French poet contemporaneous with Derrida who wrote:

"What need this heart which was only silence
But words which are both sign and litany"
(Yves Bonnefoy)

If the process view of mind/mentation converges in a certain way with "difference" it returns us to the problem of language and the alignment of language with thought and thought with Being. Guenther addresses the language problem and writes that these concepts which he describes are obscure because we have yet to enter the epistemological dimensions which would make them recognizable. Nothing short of a radical epistemological reversal is required to enter the non-dual meditative process. To

truly comprehend the presencing of the whole (Being) through its parts (beings), thinking itself must be re-thought. How does "process view" facilitate a re-thinking of thought,- and if thought is aligned with speech - without becoming ensnared in language traps and the totalizations of thinking processes? How does "process view" re-think the context of the whole?

Guenther concludes his Epilogue by clarifying: "In other words rDzog-chen demands that we start learning to think. While all the grandiose Buddhist systems of thought have, quite literally, come to an end, rDzog-chen thought remains a challenge, directing our attention to the thinking of thinking, not in a vacuum, but in the context of the whole". (Guenther 248)

Richard Carlson
4/23/07

14 Bonnitta Roy

05/06/07 8:50AM



In response to Richard Carlson (13)

Hey Richard,

Your notes are overwhelming me.

I've read.

I've sat.

I've written.

Here we are.

When you put the question of Difference before Being, you are trying to foreclose the ontological with an epistemological conjunction ("before", "after"). From a view within the ontological dimensioning of reality, there are the anterior and the posterior aspects -- they are entangled aspects, not related in a direction of time. HK is a perfect example. The experience of first word occurs in time, but it throws itself back to timeless, always already Being. The individual occurs in time, but resonates back to the timeless, always already Being. *This is the experience of the ontological dimensioning of reality* that the PM is pointing to.

The mind/mentation desires to concretize this experience, and seeks to establish a basis. Difference, or Being - which came first? Chicken or Egg - which came first? The depth of your narrative of yours and others explorations into these kinds of conundrums, is overwhelming. There are infinite worlds enfolded in words. But it seems to me not the case that *world* is enfolded in *word* -- and I see HK's awakening to word as being based in world. HK narrates:

"We walked down the path to the well-house, attracted by the fragrance of the honey-suckle with which it was covered. Someone was drawing water and my teacher placed my hand under the spout. As the cool stream gushed over one hand ..."

HK didn't say "there was a blank and then ' ... I stood still, my whole attention fixed upon the motions of her fingers. Suddenly I felt a misty consciousness' " ...

No, there was already a world, a world of perception (of honey-suckle fragrance, the coolness of the stream) a narrative space (path to the well house) .. a sense of otherness (someone was drawing waer my teacher) and a sense of body (placed my hand). My sense of it, is that being an embodied self in a shared world is a requirement for language ... just as much as then language can go on to bring forth new worlds, new types of embodiments, new types of intersubjectively shared spaces.

The question then becomes, not which is prior, *absolutely* , word or world, but what is the condition of their enfoldment in any given experience. In the one case, world is enfolded in the unified self, and the self then works from that basis outward toward language; in the other condition, world is enfolded in the word, and the self has to work through the word to get to the world.

That is a distinction that the PM makes.

What is the condition of their enfoldment in any given experience? If there is a value to a process view (as you ask) it is to slow down our attention such that we can experience the enfoldment and unfoldment in an given experience-- the self enfolded in the world/ the world enfolded in the self; the self enfolded in culture/ culture enfolded in the self; individual identity enfolded in the physical body such that when the body dies, "I" die/ individual identity enfolded in the ethereal soul, such that the body dies when "I" no longer have the compassion, the purpose, or the karmic requirement to occupy it. Which one is correct? Is there a death signifying the end and a death signifying the beginning?

We can go on and on endlessly, trading, commodifying, accomodating, coopting signifiers.... but unless we take the measure of language from actual experience, then we are lost in a grand paronama of puzzles whose contexts endlessly slide. If there is a hypothesis lurking beneath the PM, then it is this: that reality is a seamless continuum. If this is the hypothesis of the PM, then the question is how to explain that reality manifests as things, and categories, and concepts and words? The PM says there is a process -- called for puposes of distinction, the epistemological field-- that is responsible for structural transformations in the seamless continuum. But, unlike Laszlo (and others), this continuum is not another "thing" as a ground through which structures arise, nor a "thing" such as a space-time dimension (since according to the PM, they, too are structural transformation), or a "thing" that is a kind of progenitor of the manifest universe; --- all these interpretations are primarily structural, because they start from the structures themselves, and reason back into the kinds of "things or processes" that relate them.

If there is a gain from a process view, it is to release the dependence on things, and allow one to become aware of the subtle levels of experience where process can be experienced, where the holomovement of enfoldment and unfoldment that *is experience* -- the dance between the anterior aspect and the posterior aspect of experience (the bridge, as it were, for Kant's synthetic a priori, is that dance) ... then we might be able to ground our situatedness (existenz) in the experience of that process of becoming.

Language may have the power to bring forth new worlds, enfolded in words. But will that be the language of our current usage, or a new kind of statement? And if the language of our current usage is one that was intitially grounded in affect(will) enfolded in image (ination), enfolded in body, enfolded in world, enfolded in others and unified in the subject, then in turn enfolded back into otherness, in turn enfolded back into word, in turn enfolded into world ... then perhaps this structuration has gotten to be too recursive to explore new territories of Being. Maybe there are remaining infinite depths of recursion. Or maybe the sequence has been closed, perhaps by Derrida, such that we arre left with only a set of ontic things and signifyers, that have exhausted their potential to stand in for the new. Guenther speaks of self-radiance of the sun. Derrida always seems to me to have the self-radiance of a dying star. Is there a death signifying the end and a death signifying the beginning?

In a sense, we are all Helen Kellers, trying to make contact, to connect with others what has already come up through us, that core encounter. Does our language have the capacity, as you suggest, to pull someone through the tunnel to the awakening of what has been encountered, in the pooly depths of Being? or does shared language depend upon an "us" having shared those pooly depths? or is it even possible that any one is excepted from the pooly depths of which we speak?

Is there a birth signifying the end and a birth signifying the beginning?

much light,

Bonnie

15 Bonnitta Roy

05/06/07 11:58AM



close



How does "process view" facilitate a re-thinking of thought,- and if thought is aligned with speech - without becoming ensnared in language traps and the totalizations of thinking processes? How does "process view" re-think the context of the whole?

I suspect that our way of thinking has exhausted its potential. Although we can theoretically go on forever, creating infinite parcellations of new knowledges, there is something funny that is happening. There is a sense in which all our thinking keeps bumping into limitations -- limitations of language, limitations of resource, limitations of developmental levels, limitations of cultures... Additionally, there seems to be a recursive aspect to all these limitations -- the self is limited by culture, but cultures are limited by the contribution of the individuals; the ego and the ego are limited by each other, language limits experience, and experience limits language, etc.... For me, "limitations" and "recursivity" are like meta-tags to a system of thinking that has exhausted itself, or "thinking" as a system that has exhausted its potential. A system that is both self-limiting and recursive must be a unity, a "whole" -- but it is a bounded whole. It is self-limiting and recursive because it is a bounded whole. The language of a bounded whole is self-referentially tautological, and totalizing.

But is this the whole we seek? Or is there an unbounded whole of which we can be aware through some capacity -- call it a new thinking, a new speech, or call it other -- what capacity do we have to access this unbounded whole? First, we must find some degree of freedom from language traps and the bounded systemics of thinking. Where do we look for some degree of freedom? Do we have *even a tiny inkling of sense where this freedom might await us?*

If we had the cognitive capacity to do so, we could describe the boundary conditions of this system that is thought -- our hall of mirrors. The perspectives within this hall of mirrors are endlessly morphing into worldviews. But the worldviews themselves -- all of them -- are constrained by their self-reflective recursive limitations. All our terms self-define; all objects self-entail subjects; all worldviews entail the relativism of endlessly sliding contexts.

The second law of thermodynamics is a boundary condition in science. It is an inviolable law of the universe that accounts for entropy. The sum total of matter/energy is neither created nor destroyed as they are transformations of each other, but entropic-negentropic processes are irreversable uni-directionals. James Clerk Maxwell argued differently. He said that the limitations of the 2nd law was not an aspect of the universe, but pointed out a limitation in the entire system that is thinking about the physical universe. And that if we could break through this way of thinking about the universe, we could break through the boundary conditions of science. Until then, we cannot even devise an experiment to test a hypothesis.

The same is true for thinking in general. We have come up against the boundary conditions of thought and hence the boundary conditions of languaging. And for the most part, we conceive the hall of mirrors as being "real" and we conceive of ourselves as being limited by those conditions because "we" are in the hall of mirrors.

If in the hall there are worldviews, then the type, size, construction of the hall and how it functions is our current view -- where the ontological is hidden and the epistemological en-bounds our reality. When do the walls of the hall dissolve into transparency?

Bonnie

16 Richard Carlson

05/06/07 1:59PM



close



Bonnie,

Your ability to penetrate to the heart of the matter is inspirational. That you followed my improvisational rant is also impressive since, I was not sure of its outcome. Here are some comments you made that I felt were really enlightening:

"The question then becomes, not which is prior, absolutely, word or world, but what is the condition of their enfoldment in any given experience. In the one case, world is enfolded in the unified self, and the self then works from that basis outward toward language; in the other condition, world is enfolded in the word, and the self has to work through the word to get to the world.

Or maybe the sequence has been closed, perhaps by Derrida, such that we are left with only a set of ontic things and signifiers, that have exhausted their potential to stand in for the new. Gunther speaks of self-radiance of the sun. Derrida always seems to me to have the self-radiance of a dying star. Is there a death signifying the end and a death signifying the beginning?

In a sense, we are all Helen Kellers, trying to make contact, to connect with others what has already come up through us, that core encounter. Does our language have the capacity, as you suggest, to pull someone through the tunnel to the awakening of what has been encountered, in the pooly depths of Being? or does shared language depend upon an "us" having shared those pooly depths? or is it even possible that any one is excepted from the pooly depths of which we speak? "

RC

Yes aren't we all Helen Kellers? Just a short follow up on Keller and in my next post - which will require some in depth contemplation- I will try and respond to the other fabulous questions you raise. I hope I have not sidetracked the conversation so far with HK, but there is just one more clarification I wish to make. I should probably qualify the statement of Keller to say that "human consciousness" and "human subjectivity" is inextricably linked to the word which is its house of being. My intention here is not to make the solipistic argument that the common sense view of the world independent existence is incorrect, the world does exist before the word because she does still play in it, but her "human consciousness" which includes the ability for self-reflection exists only in potential "actus et potentia" to the unfolding of the word in language. -

The next passage follows in the HK autobiography after she has understood W-A-T-E-R:

"I left the well-house eager to learn. Everything had a name, and each name gave birth to a new thought. As we returned to the house every object which I touched seemed to quiver with life. That was because I saw everything with the strange, new sight that had come to me. On entering the door I remembered the doll I had broken. I felt my way to the hearth and picked up the pieces. I tried vainly to put them together. Then my eyes filled with tears; for I realized what I had done, and for the first time I felt repentance and sorrow." (Keller)

If we can universalize Keller's which may be open to question. It seems that without the word to articulate it that there is no inner life besides a pure will to will itself. We seem to require words before a world of emotion and self-reflection can manifest from the subconscious depths of the individual. Without a cognitive or emotional component can we

speak of human consciousness at all?

Here it seems the Buddhist who do not separate a concept of emotion from cognition (and the fact of our samsaric embodiment) are closer to the truth of things here, than is the western understanding of emotion which displaces its proximity to cognition.

rich

19 **Bonnitta Roy**

05/09/07 6:51AM



close



In response to Richard Carlson (18)

I actually have taken your feedback and turned my initial response into an essay on Keller in a consideration of Habermas conventional and post-conventional consciousness/morality. The target of course is Derrida, Differance and the one Word.

I am wondering if what you are thinking here will pertain to Martin's idea of the transversal axis of Kierkegaard's post-conventional morality?

In considering the dying star of language and the infinite recursivity of thought one must re-evaluate the role of Theory in pointing a way out from the gravitational field which define the boundary conditions of the rational.

From a process view, there is no death and no birth. For example, we don't see the child die and the man born-- we see the development of a human being. If you take as your premise "there is no death and no birth", then process thinking encourages you to envision a larger process-whole which can encompass both forms in transformational relation. In this way, process thinking creates larger and larger wholes, without subtending lesser parts. Process thinking understands that the oak is in/from/through the acorn, and the acorn is in/from/through the oak. What kind of larger process-whole can encompass Derrida and a way out/beyond?

I guess this was the main jest of my initial response and it pertains not only to process view but to all theoretical movements toward the integral. Theory can too easily lead to a more or less static end state in which answers become reified in final conclusions whereas integrality IMO is an unending process of clearing a horizon toward Being

Structural based theories always lead to static end states, because such thinking delimitates categories by assigning boundary conditions. In order for language to live, distinctions must be made. But distinctions should be made from within experience, and then given voice. If someone wants to participate, then s/he must return to their own experience and evaluate from there. Evaluating from signifier to signifier is a recursive hall of mirrors. All the novelty is in the experiences, at the core where language discharges and recharges.

I love the way you wrote this

integrality is an unending process of clearing a horizon toward Being

We always try to come up with a succinct definition of integral and we eventually get bound up with notions of meta-meta systemic thinking and levels of development, and then we realize that individuals can be functioning at high cognitive levels, and high developmental levels, but still not feel really "integral." The opening up to, the clearing toward Being ... is an essential aspect of integral. Wilber's earliest work, like No Boundary and Transformations of Consciousness had this promise, too. Now we need to treat all the AQAL-holics in his wake.

This was the impetus behind the following rephrased question, namely if play is the work of process view can it both "tune into" Being and disclose "the sign" which expresses the epochal moment in which thought is poised to become enfolded in Being?

I would say the two primary characteristics of process view are play and aesthetics. Play is sensitive to the role of spontaneity, to the contribution of the accidental, to the nuance of environment, it allows interpenetration (subject-subject/ subject-object) which relaxes boundaries (for example, pretending that a stuffed toy is alive relaxes boundaries); it is goal less and therefore has no duration, it is immediate (not self-conscious). Process view has many potentials to disclose moments, but it requires one to slow down the processes of thought (or alternately, practice attention/ mindful awareness)... such that one can and does *experience* the epochal moment as a transformation of process. For the most part, our thinking/awareness occupies just the surface of thought -- like an oil slick on the surface of the deep blue sea. Deep down inside there is a core upswelling of Being ... one can touch base with that in an experiential way. Then you practice moving from the "interior" out, and from the "exterior" in, until you can apperceive the fluidity of those boundaries that thinking has established. Once that happens, you can apperceive/ feel/ experience the processes of crossing boundaries, and the moments when that is interrupted by the immanent enfolding of thought.

There is an equal an opposite experience one can have, also, and that is the experience of the collapsing of boundaries wherein there is no holomovement, rather, there is a kind of magnanimous equanimity.

Or, does the value of process view and/or other integral theory lie in the Theory itself or in the movements they prescribe which by necessity lead beyond them?

No, the process view is not in any theory, a theory of a process view is only a finger used to point. The pointing finger can be of any form, and is important only for its utility (or not). That is what I was saying in my hitchhiker's introduction -- theory should be measured by its utility; it should be considered as part of the process of human discourse, a play as described as above. Reading theory this way can be liberating (even if the poor authors have a great deal of angst).

Or more specifically how does the discursive methodology of process view find its way into embodied practices?

Interestingly, this is really how I started, with creating these kinds of practices which relax the rigid boundaries of thought, and enable us to experience the fluidity of being. There are all kinds of creative practices one can think of to do this. I happen to hold workshops with horses, and we teach Qi Gong (Chi Kung) and we teach individuals to work with the horses from the inside out, and then from the outside in. Eventually individuals can no longer determine if the "play" is inside-out or outside-in. People experience opening and flow, a slice of Being. We don't talk about the theory. We just do the workshop and have fun.

When I do presentations on the PM, I always start with some embodied practices. The funny thing is all this doesn't have to be so complex. Everyone already has the experiences to draw from. Take dreaming for example. Think how the interior-exterior framework switches from a waking state where I inhabit an exterior world of objects and my mind is in my body, versus dreaming, where objects and actions and an "I" are somehow inside my mind. If you lucid dream, the layers of interior/exterior/body/mind get more complex. If you *pelucid* dream, the sense of will/agency crosses boundaries. If you *pelucid* dream with the past, the sense of time gets really uncanny.

Practicing experiencing the process-moments of layers enfolding and unfolding, can result in embodied perceptions of what the process model is pointing to.