Toward a Genealogy and Topology of Western Integrative Thinking

Gary P. Hampson[1]

Abstract: Contemporary integrative thinking such as meta-theorising, integral approaches and transdisciplinarity can be productively contextualised by identifying both a broad genealogy of Western integrative thinking, and also a topology regarding facets of such thought. This paper offers one such genealogical and topological reading. The genealogy involves the historical orientations or moments of Hermetism; Neoplatonism; Renaissancism; the nexus of German classicism, romanticism and idealism; and reconstructive postmodernism. Arising from this, an indication of a general topology of Western integrative thinking is offered (with case studies), one involving objects of integration (such as philosophy and spirituality), macro-integrative entities (such as syncretism), micro-integrative entities (such as creativity and love), integrative "shapes" (such as organicism), and processes of integration (such as intuition).

Key terms: Creativity, Hermeticism, intuition, integral, integrative, love, Neoplatonism, organicism, panosophy, reconstructive postmodernism, Renaissance, spirituality, syncretism.

Introduction

This paper offers indications toward a topology and genealogy[2] of Western integrative thinking.[3] "Integration" here is taken to mean *complex integration* – somewhat analogous to Kelly's (2008) notion of "complex holism" – rather than reductive integration (such as that offered by mathematics in physics). *Topology* points to such aspects as objects of integration, "shapes" of integration and processes of integration, as well as to integrative entities. *Genealogy*[4] connotes a broad thread inclusive of relatively similar thought pertinent to the context-in-hand. In the current instance, this involves five philosophico-historical attractors, orientations, contexts or moments, namely, Hermetism; Neoplatonism; Renaissancism; the nexus of German classicism, romanticism and idealism; and reconstructive postmodernism. Across these five orientations, the

---

[1] **Gary P. Hampson** is Senior Research Fellow at the School for Transformative Leadership, Palacky University, Czech Republic. He has published on global mindset change, history of integrative thought, eco-logical education, and human identity. His Ph.D. on postformal integral theory and education was nominated for the AARE national Australian award in education. With additional background in critical realism, futures studies and geography, he is an editorial board member of *Integral Review*, fellow of the Global Dialogue Institute, Philadelphia, and joint winner of the 2009 IAU / Palgrave Essay Prize for social inclusion in higher education.
g.p.hampson@gmail.com

[2] Genealogy can be regarded either as a peer of topology or as a topological aspect.

[3] An alternative term here might be *Western "panosophy"*— also see Hague (2010)).

[4] "Genealogy" here is to infer a sense of lineage (as broadly defined) rather than in relation to a more Foucauldian (Foucault, 1971/1984) usage of the term. This is not to say, however, that there is no overlap between the two uses.

paper explores six topological cases, namely: creativity, intuition, love, organicism, intimate relations between philosophy and spirituality, and syncretism, respectively.

The paper can be understood as an example of "research across boundaries" in that it addresses integrative entities. By their very nature, integrative entities are boundary-crossing through cohering what might be regarded as disparate parts. The paper's generation of a topology further adds to boundary-crossing in that the topological nodes link various domains. Touching upon a variety of disciplines, the paper also crosses historical time and connects various past perspectives with the present. Of specific note, perhaps, and in line with integral studies generally, is its interest in connections between philosophy and spirituality. Whilst many integral approaches emphasise Eastern spiritualities – including Aurobindo's yogic context and Wilber's emphasis on Buddhism – the paper contributes to a rebalancing in this regard by including focus on aspects of *Western* spirituality. (As it happens, due to the default divorce in Western religion between the exoteric and the mystical, the label "esoteric" is often ascribed to Western mystical spirituality by conventional perspectives).

In addition to the intrinsic value of this exploration, as well as the direct value-adding to integrative theorising of the paper's topological contributions, it is suggested that the genealogical inquiry can help valorise contemporary integrative approaches by indicating that such contemporary sensibilities sit in relation to previously explored notions. The various historical approaches are also able to provide fresh insights for the contemporary circumstance, and to regenerate meaning through novel content and increased contextualisation.

Boyer's (1990) *scholarship of integration* provides the paper's scholarship modality;[5] it also synergies with the paper's object of inquiry (integration). Scholarship of integration involves the quest for "new topologies of knowledge" (p. 19) stretching across boundaries[6] in service of meaning enhancement, among other things (Boyer, 1990).[7] This form of scholarship complements the more conventional *scholarship of discovery*, which focuses on a narrow, tightly-bounded topic. In contrast, the scholarship of integration legitimises a wider, more loosely-bounded area of address.

---

[5] The scholarship of integration is one of four types of scholarship identified by Ernest Boyer as part of his 1990 report from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching entitled *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Boyer, 1990). The other three are the scholarships of discovery, application and teaching respectively. Of all the types, Boyer considered the scholarship of integration the most important (Rice, 2005). Yet it appears to have had the least uptake by the academy as an overarching construct (Braxton, Luckley, & Helland, 2002; Rice, 2005). David Scott (2005) suggests that this is because it requires integrative *epistemologies* such as found in the emerging discourses of integral and holistic studies—a relatively rare occurrence.

[6] Here necessitating a longer-than-usual reference list: it would be judicious for a transdisciplinary or cross-boundary work to (in effect) satisfy the conventional requirements of each discipline etc.. *Ceteris paribus*, multiple disciplines could thus produce a longer list than would be necessary for one discipline.

[7] According to Boyer (1990), a key purpose of the scholarship of integration centres around meaning enhancement. He indicates that scholarship of integration scholars are those "who give meaning to isolated facts" (p. 18) with a view to "illuminating data in a revealing way" (p. 18), effecting the possibility of "more comprehensive understanding" (p. 19). Noting that "specialization, without broader perspective, risks pedantry" (p. 19), Boyer also indicates possible purposes of the scholarship of integration as including the furthering of authenticity and the quest for wisdom.

To achieve balance between breadth and depth, certain "gap diving" (Roy, 2006) is enacted—here, effected by the six case examples. The particular scholarship of integration sensibility enacted in the paper can be understood in relation to Gangadean's (2008) deep dialogue, Montuori's (1998) creative inquiry and Giri's (2002) creative transdisciplinarity. Additionally, in light of the postconventionalities of poststructuralism, reconstructive postmodernism and complexity theory, moves toward due openness, plasticity and complexity are in order—in a variety of ways.

Firstly, the paper acknowledges the wiles of language, both regarding its inevitable limitations (including the paper's restriction vis-à-vis Anglophone discourse), and also its generative delights. Rather than plainly representing the material and noetic worlds, it acknowledges that text *re*-presents them.[8] As Heidegger (1927/1962) indicates, language simultaneously reveals and conceals. Apropos, construct-awareness (Cook-Greuter, 2002, 2005) is important. A danger of "topology," for example, lies in the possibility of undue technicism and simplification: nodes and connections might be imagined as simple, homogenous units in a heterarchical plane; similarly, "genealogy" might carry too strong a sense of sharply-defined "blood line," an undue implication of origin or of progressive development (rather than varied change). In contrast, the paper offers a relatively fuzzy conceptualisation of both topology and genealogy within which rich, complex identities carry their own topologies, topographies, tapestries, tensions. Evolution should also be understood as allowing for regressions and diversions as well as progressions.[9] Similarly, "shapes" encompasses the more agentic idea of *habits* (Küpers, 2011) so as not to fall prey to inapt static conceptions. Even the term-idea, *integration*, has its dialectic: the Other which it implicates involves disintegration, fragmentation—even here one might note that from – Armstrong's (2003) reading of – the integrative perspective of the German Romantic, Friedrich Schlegel: "the fragment embodies the system's dispersal from within" (p. 30). From a different direction, construct-awareness can also offer new possibilities such as the paper's extension of *reconstructive postmodernism* to embrace both contemporary integrative approaches such as Wilberian integral theory and certain insights from deconstructive postmodernism (albeit acknowledging inevitable contestabilities in such gathering) (Hampson, 2007) in addition to its use by Griffin (2002) and Griffin et al. (1993) and closely-related use of *cosmological postmodernism* by Gare (2002).

Secondly, the paper's focus on *Western* thought is not intended to marginalise the non-Western. Quite the reverse. Its explicit identification points to the paper's boundedness in this regard; it implicitly calls for the gamut of non-Western approaches to be given their own expression (and consequent interrelations).[10]

---

[8] The part-novelty of the reiteration signified by "re" here is highlighted by Morin (2005) through his raising of the significance of "re" from prefix to paradigm. The relay of information from signified through signifier is renewed, and is potentially rewarding. Prose's prosaicism begins to lean more toward the poetic, the *poietic* (the made), the as-if *autopoietic* (self-generated), and an acknowledgement of the inevitable play of metaphor/metaphysics (Abbs, 1989) in Reason (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003).

[9] Further, it could be conceived both as rhizomatic (Deleuze, 1980/1987) and also as having a dominant attractor, which might be conceived at the beginning (tale of Hermes), end (reconstructive postmodern narrative) or centre (*art-e-fact* as "re-sounding" the Renaissance).

[10] See, e.g. Hampson (2010c) regarding Native American integral education and the significance of classical Islamic thought to Western thinking.

Thirdly, the genealogy and topology offered is intended to be gesticulative and organic—a "rough guide"—rather than comprehensive and contained—an opening to dialogue, supplement, complement, complexification, seeding ideas for further development. It offers one perspective (emerging from interest in integral approaches); others might be similarly insightful,[11] including those focusing on ecological thought. The rough guide nature of the genealogy also means that only a first level order of relationships are indicated – namely, "positive" harmonics between identified items. This does not imply that these are no further layers. Rather, it should be understood that more nuanced relational levels allow for the numerous contestabilities and involvements of complex systems. It is beyond the scope of the paper to detail such complexities – e.g. the multifaceted relationship between the nexus of German classicism, romanticism and idealism on the one hand, and reconstructive postmodernism on the other.

Fourthly, regarding the identification of an "integrative entity": How might one identify and understand that which exists? Specifically, does the general conceptualisation pertain in the first instance to relatively small objects which (secondarily) have interrelations (i.e. a type of atomism) or, alternatively, in the first instance to the whole shebang which (secondarily) has *intra*relations (a type of holism)? Perhaps it depends upon one's perspective; perhaps the composition is rather that of (different orders of) holons (whole/parts), whereby each holon is understood as integrating lower order aspects of it. In this sense, all entities could be understood as integrative. Within certain contexts, however, it might be useful to conceptualise some things as more integrative than others—whether noetic (such as transdisciplinarity) or material (such as the universe). Such judgment is ultimately an art. The discussion below sits in service of this art. It firstly conceives of "integrative entities," and secondarily suggests these may be pictured as existing at different scales.

Also pertinent is the context from which the paper has arisen, namely, the Research Across Boundaries Symposium, Luxembourg 2010. In this regard, the symposium's influence in shaping the paper's references should be noted. Inversely, such symposia can themselves be aptly contextualised through prior integrative thought—from the radical relationality of the Hermetica to Klein's (1996) work on boundary crossing.

The structure of the paper comprises an introduction to the genealogy, followed by the various topological aspects of objects of integration, macro-integrative entities, micro-integrative entities, shapes of integration, and processes of integration, respectively; for each aspect, case examples stretching across the genealogy are provided.

An Integrative Genealogy

A brief introduction to the five orientations in the Western genealogy of integrative thinking now follows. These comprise Hermetism, Neoplatonism, Renaissancism, German humanism, and reconstructive postmodernism, respectively.

---

[11] See, e.g. Hampson (2010c) and Molz and Hampson (2010) for indications regarding *Aristotelian*—including Thomist/Catholic—integral thought.

Hermetism

The term *Hermetism* is identified by Faivre (1998) as referring to pre-Renaissance address of Hermes Trismegistus, whilst *Hermeticism* more comprehensively includes the broader range of Western esotericism following Renaissance thought (Hanegraaff, 1998). Hermes Trismegistus is a mythologised character involving a fusion of the Ancient Greek god Hermes and the Ancient Egyptian god Thoth. Goodrick-Clarke (2008) describes Hermes-Thoth as "rather like a Bodhisattva who has attained immortality but remains in the human world as a channel for the divine" (p. 18).

Various texts written between the first century BCE and third century CE—notably the *Corpus Hermeticum* of the second and third century CE—were ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus (Faivre, 1998). "Hermetism" refers to this literature (the *Hermetica*).

Key themes include particular relations between human and divine (partnership between humanity and God) that can be described as a form of nonduality (e.g. the world as spiritual), involving holography as meta-phor/ physics ("as above, so below"), a *living* universe, and depth (the world as infused with divine symbolism), such that it is possible for the human individual or collective to (directly) regenerate, redeem or transmute themselves toward the divine (alchemy as transformation toward potential); levels of reality are also posited through the notion of spiritual intermediaries (Goodrick-Clarke, 2008).

Jung (1943 / 1970) indicates that Hermetic understanding includes the assemblage of all conceivable opposites—one might say *an archetype of dialectics* or *nonduality*. This includes that between ego and id, eros (life, creativity, desire, sexuality) and thanatos (death), passion and reason (Faivre, 1995). In contrast to the dominant modern (post-eighteenth-century) *episteme* of "solipsism, atomization, [and] incommunicability," (p. 70) the Hermetic offers "the path of otherness, of living diversity, of communication of souls" (p. 70)—a substantively *relational* template-sensibility that accords with contemporary (post-mid-twentieth century) academic interest in such items as "relativity, pluralism, polarities, [and] polysemiology" (p. 49): *Hermetism as complexly integrative*.

Hermetism proved to be a robust stream of thought, forming part of the prevailing theological paradigm in the Middle Ages in the West (and also in classical Islamic civilisation) (Faivre, 1998), even though it was marginalised by Aristotelian scholasticism. As a *mainstream* interest, it can be evidenced at least as late as Isaac Newton's prolific output of Hermetic and alchemical writings (Linden, 2003a). Somewhat paradoxically, Newton's and Kepler's Hermetic orientation could potentially facilitate a deconstruction of the technicist anti-Hermetic Newtonia*nism* of modernism.

Let us now turn our attention to perhaps an even greater influence in the Western integrative genealogy: that of Neoplatonism.

Neoplatonism

Neoplatonism pertains to spiritual philosophy evolving from the thought of Plotinus (3rd century CE), including the later thinking of such figures as Iamblichus. As the term indicates, a main source of inspiration for Plotinus was Plato, foregrounding Plato's metaphysical and mystical aspects (Bussanich, 1996). However, it is also the case not only that "the Metaphysics of Aristotle is extensively employed" (Gatti, 1996, p. 11) but that Plotinus' understanding *diverges* from Plato's in significant ways. Stamatellos (2007) identifies, for example, that "Plotinus seems to accept Heraclitus' position that the everlastingness of becoming is expressed in the form of an endless cosmic flux" (p. 127). Neoplatonism thus supports theoretical approaches entailing creative becoming. This understanding could be identified as (part of) *radical* Neoplatonism (noting, in this instance, that "radical" etymologically relates to "root") that may be distinguished from (what might be termed) "traditional"[12] Neoplatonic interpretations in which this is not the case.

In terms of its major schema, professor of Western esotericism, Goodrick-Clarke (2008), identifies that:

> Neoplatonic thought is characterized by the idea that there exists a plurality of spheres of being, arranged in a descending hierarchy of degrees of being. The last and lowest sphere of being comprises the universe existing in time and space perceptible to the human senses. Each sphere of being derives from its superior by a process of 'emanation,' by which it reflects and expresses its previous degree. At the same time, these degrees of being are also degrees of unity, whereby each subsequent sphere generates more multiplicity, differentiation, and limitation, tending toward the minimal unity of our material world. (p. 21)[13]

As part of this schema, a key Neoplatonic orientation—in some ways analogous to God—is that of *the One*:[14] O'Meara (1993) describes the Neoplatonic One as "beauty above beauty" (p. 99) whilst Tarnas (1991) identifies that the One "is infinite in being and beyond all description or categories" (pp. 84-5).

---

[12] Noting that traditions can sometimes develop in manners which differ from original impulses.

[13] As indicated above, distinction between traditional and radical Neoplatonic approaches could be envisaged, one differentiating between a "traditional" interest in a *via negativa* ("traditional" Christian) framing (The One as better than The Many, Original Sin, *humanity as fallen*, the concept of temptation, etc.) and a *via positiva* (Hermetic / Renaissance / panentheistic / nondual) framing (The One and The Many as both good, Original Blessing, *humanity as in participatory dialogue with the Divine*, notions regarding freedom and adventurings of the soul, etc.). A dialectic between the two can be seen in the notion that multiplicity leads to both to "the beginning of strife, yet also the possibility of *logos*, the relation of one thing to another" (Gare, 2005, p. 68). As Gangadean indicates, it is this "relational power of Logos that opens the space-time in which the world, reality, and existence may proceed. It is this infinite relational power of Logos that makes discourse possible" (Gangadean, 2008, p. 132).

[14] Gare (2005) traces Neoplatonic interest in *number as archetype* (through its identification of The One) to Pythagoras. Nonetheless, a differentiation can be made between Pythagoreanism and the range of Neoplatonic relationships to this vector (as per previous footnote).

Aspects of this understanding permeate contemporary integrative thought, including Wilber's (1995) valorization of hierarchy, intellect and Spirit. In contrast to the Wilberian orientation, however, Tarnas' (1991) reading also indicates the relevance of archetypes and *anima mundi* for integrative thought. In keeping with Wilberian integral (and Bhaskar's (2002) meta-Reality), however, lies Plotinus' identification of the nondual: that "the soul is one with the One" (Rist, 1967, p. 227). Moreover, the One is paradoxical: it is, as Bussanich (1996) indicates, "everything and nothing, everywhere and nowhere" (p. 38). Indeed, Bussanich continues that "the One is the center of a vibrant conception of reality many of whose facets resist philosophical analysis" (p. 38). This points to the *transrational* aspect of Neoplatonism: "In Plotinus' thought, the rationality of the world and of the philosopher's quest is but the prelude to a more transcendent existent beyond reason" (Tarnas, 1991, p. 84).

As with much Ancient Greek ethical theory, Neoplatonism carries a normativity in the form of well-being or "eudaimonia"—"that which makes life satisfying, successful, complete" (O'Meara, 1993, p. 100): specifically, it holds an interest in spiritual emancipation and its possibility for humanity (Bhaskar, 2002; Tarnas, 1991), notably through "the quest to maintain the integrity of the soul" (Blumenthal, 1996, p. 89). The aim is less to *see* spiritual realities than to *embody* such realisations, as Rist (1967) indicates: "For Plotinus, "the aim of the mystic is not a *seeing*, but a *being*" (p. 221). Such being requires wide awareness, receptivity and trust of *that beyond reason* as Rist observes: "To proceed beyond ⊆|∫⟨ is to take a leap, and in a sense it is a leap into the unknown" (p. 220). It "is a tremendous demand of the self" (p. 220) yet simultaneously "simply" requires substantive *accord* with the One—a (Zen-like) *one*-pointedness or singularity of consciousness (Hines, 2009).

Renaissancism

The greatest regeneration of Hermetism and Neoplatonism took place in fifteenth century Italy. The city state of Florence was the first to witness the self-proclaimed flourishing of a new consciousness—a "radical enlightenment" (Gare, 2005)—which Tarnas (1991) describes as "expansive, rebellious, energetic and creative, individualistic, ambitious and often unscrupulous, curious, self-confident, committed to this life and this world, open-eyed and sceptical, inspired and inspirited" (p. 231). The newfound sense of human dignity and the exalted place of humanity in the cosmos—as straddling the mortal and immortal—was exemplified by Pico della Mirandola's *Oration on the Dignity of Man* (1486/1965). Humanity was now identified to a large degree as self-created—"as a sculptor gives form to a statue" (Miller, 1965, p. xv).

Such Hermetic-Neoplatonic spirit gave rise to the birth of modern science (Tarnas, 1991):[15] "Kepler confessed that his astronomical research was inspired by his search for the celestial 'music of the spheres'" (Tarnas, 1991, pp. 294-5) whilst Newton's law of gravitation was "modelled on the sympathies of Hermetic philosophy" (Tarnas, 1991, p. 295).[16] Paradoxically, Gare (2005) notes that "modern science [simultaneously] developed in reaction to and in opposition to Renaissance culture, both the civic humanism that had developed in the

---

[15] This proved to be a double-edged sword, however. Whilst modern science has achieved many successes, scientism (its excessive, inapt and/or de-contextualised use—in relation to an ecology of approaches)—has been a significant player in the facilitation of the current *global problematique*.
[16] Newton also adopted a *Thomist-Aristotelian* critique of Descartes (Gare, 2005).

Renaissance and the more radical ideas of the 'nature enthusiasts' who had celebrated nature as divine" (p. 57): the legacy of Hermetic-Neoplatonism is a complex yet fertile one. Complicit in such fertility was the radical relationalism and syncreticism in Renaissance thought. Such "determined 'decompartmentalization'" (Tarnas, 1991, p. 230) included the notion of Greek philosophy (including Hermetism and Neoplatonism) and the Judeo-Christian tradition as jointly expressing a single spiritual philosophy (Miller, 1965). Radical relationality also surfaces in Renaissance dialectics with "its simultaneous balance and synthesis of many opposites: Christian and pagan, modern and classical, secular and sacred, art and science, science and religion, poetry and politics" (Tarnas, 1991, p. 229). Abrams (1971) furthers this identification of defragmentation and connectivity, ascribing to the Renaissance

> an integral universe without absolute divisions, in which everything is interrelated by a system of correspondences, and the living is continuous with the inanimate, nature with man, and matter with mind; a universe, moreover, which is activated throughout by a dynamism of opposing forces. (p. 171)

Syncretic integration also fostered the polymathic ideal of *homo universalis* as exemplified by the broad scholarship at Marsilio Ficino's Academy. The general sensibility was one of "a tolerant eclecticism, an open-minded, receptive attitude" (Miller, 1965, p. x) whether with regard to philosophico-spiritual traditions or across the range of scholarly and artistic interests. This united into such singularities as Pico della Mirandola's complex philosophy involving an integral knowledge uniting both spirit and matter in which "a truth about any one part immediately reverberates through the whole, and discloses truth about every other part" (Miller, 1965, p. x). Altogether, in contrast to the perceived stultifications of the scholasticism of the time, the novel infusion of the Platonic and Neoplatonic "offered a richly textured tapestry of imaginative depth and spiritual exaltation. The notion that beauty was an essential component in the search for ultimate reality, that imagination was more significant in that quest than logic and dogma" (Tarnas, 1991, p. 212).

The insights and sensibility of the Italian Renaissance did not remain an isolated occurrence, however: they experienced a recapitulation a few centuries later in Germany.

The Nexus of German Classicism, Romanticism, and Idealism

Inspired by such figures as Böhme[17] and Kant, the German nexus of classicism, romanticism and idealism developed in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (Hanegraaff, 1998). Key figures included Herder, Goethe, Schiller—classicism; Wilhelm and Friedrich Schlegel, Hölderlin, Novalis—romanticism; and Fichte, Hegel, and Schelling—idealism (noting that the

---

[17] In contrast to later thinking, Böhme's "cosmogony entails something that modern minds find particularly hard to imagine: a dynamic process that *unfolds outside of time*" (Hanegraaff, 1998, p. 261): process but not—or not just—material evolution. Here, Hanegraaff (1998) furthers Böhme's thinking that "the full archetypal symbology of esoteric 'transmutation' is definitely not exhausted by…temporal manifestation" (Hanegraaff, 1998, p. 261). The significance of this understanding in relation to modern, Romantic and integral conceptions of temporality and transformation could be fruitfully furthered. In this regard, see Kelly (2008).

three categories are by no means mutually exclusive). In terms of its relationship with the current genealogy, Abrams (1971) states:

> The basic categories of characteristic post-Kantian philosophy, and of the thinking of many philosophical-minded poetics, can be viewed as highly elaborated and sophisticated variations upon the Neoplatonic paradigm. (p. 169)

Specifically, classicism attempted to realise integrative forms at multiple levels in relation to life and culture (Richter, 2005). This drive overlapped with romanticism, which included:

- organic unities in which the whole is more than the sum of the parts;
- the primacy of process, temporal consciousness;
- helixes of development-and-return;
- the value of diversity;
- imagination as a creative force;
- valorisation of the symbolic;
- the significance and liminality of philosophy and literary plot; and
- redemption as self-education (see Abrams, 1971; Hanegraaff, 1998).

Tarnas (1991) observes that "from the Romantic's perspective…the literalism of the modern scientific mind was a form of idolatry" (p. 369). Instead of a fundamentalist science, Goethe's approach involved integrative dialogue between science and art through realising their unity as spiritual manifestations. A valorisation of the genus of art (music, literature, drama etc.) was seen as critical. Indeed, the artistic was elevated to an exalted role—the discipline of imagination facilitating spiritual emancipation (Tarnas, 1991). Despite the Romantic contestation with mechanistic science, the significance of German romanticism nonetheless stretches into modern science. Richards (2002), for example, identifies that "Charles Darwin['s]…conception of nature owed much to German Romantic sources" (p. 10).

In terms of idealism, Beiser (2000) (who interprets idealism widely) identifies that,

> All its various forms—the *transcendental idealism* of Kant, the *ethical idealism* of Fichte, and the *absolute idealism* of the romantics—were so many attempts to resolve [the] aporiaia of the Enlightenment. …what all its forms have in common is the attempt to save criticism from scepticism, and naturalism from materialism. (p. 18)

Of notable inclusion are Schelling's (1800 / 1978) *Transcendental Idealism* and Hegel's (1807 / 1977) *Phenomenology of Spirit*.

From the nexus of German classicism, romanticism and idealism, we now turn our attention to a contemporary nexus: that of reconstructive postmodernism.

Reconstructive Postmodernism

What might be understood by *reconstructive postmodernism*? Griffin (2002), who identifies the term-idea as "a diffuse sentiment…that humanity can and must go beyond the modern" (p.

vii),[18] has promoted the term as an advancement on *constructive postmodernism*. Gare's (2002) *cosmological postmodernism* can also be identified as closely related in that it is similarly identified as forming a binary with poststructualist or deconstructive postmodernism. From a broader angle, all contemporary integrative theorising can be understood as a form of reconstructive postmodernism in that it seeks to go beyond the modern (whilst including appropriate aspects of the modern) in a cohesive manner. From a dialectical perspective, this may even attempt to include *de*constructive postmodern elements (Hampson, 2007) where the deconstruction "is not so totalizing as to prevent reconstruction" (Griffin, 2002, p. ix).

Griffin (2002) identifies the modern worldview in relation to "Galilean-Cartesian-Baconian-Newtonian science" (p. vii). The vector of this reconstruction is toward "a new unity of scientific, ethical, aesthetic, and religious intuitions" (p. ix) involving "a creative synthesis of modern and premodern truths and values" (p. x). It does not reject science per se but rather *scientism*, the overregard for—or overapplication of—science, in relation to other domains or orientations. Cartesian commitment to determinable knowledge (Gill, 2000) and consequential *human as machine* metaphors are problematised (Gunter, 1993, p. 135). Rather, after Gödel's incompleteness theorem (Gill, 2000), life involves "acts that are free and unpredictable" (Gunter, 1993, p. 135). Indeed, on Griffin's (1993) understanding that "we have an individual piece of nature that we know from within as well as without" (p. 203) such "postmodern animism" (p. 201) indicates that the whole of "nature is comprised of creative, experiential events" (p. 202).

Reconstructive postmodernism can be understood as a "broad church" encompassing a plethora of approaches. Figures foregrounded in the current narrative include Whitehead (1979), Jung (Jung, Adler, & Hull, 1981), Morin (1977/1992, 2005, 2007, 2008), Bhaskar (2002) and Wilber (1995, 1997). Nietzsche's ideal of realizing one's life as art (Tarnas, 1991, p. 370) could also be mentioned here. Given the themes arising in the genealogy, it might also be useful to mention discourse addressing wisdom – see, e.g., Hall (2010).

Objects of Integration

From a certain perspective, one may picture objects, entities or topological nodes with which integrative process can be enacted. From such a perspective, one may ask the question: what objects of integration can be identified?[19] There are no doubt many ways of answering this question; different types of identification can be given – see, e.g. Bhaskar & Norrie (1998); Ferrer, Romero, & Albareda (2005); Klein (1990, 2000); Nicolescu & Voss (2002); Wilber (1997). Objects of integration could include:

- non-living phenomena, ranging in size from the quantum to the galactic, cosmogonical periods;
- non-human living phenomena of all kinds, evolutionary periods;
- human evolutionary and historical periods;

---

[18] A range of views could be given regarding the degree and the way the "modern" might be included (if at all) in such a reappraisal.

[19] This question pertains to a conventional-atomistic mindset whereby initial objects-as-atoms are later brought into interrelationship. An alternative starting place—that of initial oneness from which intra-multiplicities could be identified—is equally possible.

- cultural groupings, cultures and sub-cultures;
- noetic domains, disciplines, epistemologies etc.
- perspectives (1st, 2nd, 3rd; emic, etic; holistic; developmental etc.);
- objects of language and other expressive forms.

Philosophy- Spirituality

Two noetic objects of integration which can be identified as being in interrelationship within each of the five historical clusters in question are philosophy and spirituality.[20] From the perspective of modernism, these two term-concepts appear largely distinct from each other, with "philosophy" inferring rational inquiry and "spirituality" tending to indicate something of the non-rational. In contrast, from the perspective of the current genealogy of Western integrative thinking, the two are more intimately connected, such that one could refer to spiritual philosophy, to philosophical spirituality, and to an intimate dialectic between the two ("philosophy~spirituality").

With regard to philosophy~spirituality and Hermetism, Ebeling (2005/2007) distinguishes between "theological-philosophical texts" on the one hand and "technical Hermetica" on the other (p. 9). The former can be understood as involving a fusion between the spiritual and the philosophical as part of a sense of partnership between humanity and God (Goodrick-Clarke, 2008), a fractal connection (as a complexity theorist might say) between microcosmos and macrocosmos (Linden, 2003b). For Neoplatonism, a somewhat different intimacy is identified, namely, that the philosophical intellect—*Nous*—is holarchically embraced by the (Creative) One, spiritual Good or God. Close connectivity between philosophy and spirituality is also evident in the Italian Renaissance. Miller notes that quintessential Renaissance spiritual philosopher, Pico della Mirandola, identifies both "Greek philosophy and the Judeo-Christian scriptural tradition…as unfoldings of a single pious philosophy" (Miller, 1965, p. ix).

Whilst during this pre-modern period it was common for reason and revelation to (variously) be in agreement, the same cannot be said for the modern period. Apropos, the intimate connectivities between philosophy and spirituality in German humanism and, more recently, in reconstructive postmodernism, sit within a context where such synergy is not the norm. With respect to the former cluster, Solomon comments that "against the sometimes-crass materialism of the Enlightenment in France and England, German philosophers had become, virtually all of them, idealists or romantics of one kind or another…[insisting] on spirituality" (Solomon & Higgins, 1996, p. 228-9). Similarly in the more recent period, in contrast to the "atheistic materialism" of mainstream academia (Griffin, 1997), when Whitehead (1967) refers to "the Odyssey of the human spirit" (p. 207), he identifies philosophy—"adventures of thought" (p. 207)—as forming one vector of spiritual adventuring, along with "adventures of passionate feeling [and] adventures of aesthetic experience" (p. 207). Academia as jnana yoga, perhaps?

The following are variously indicative of other reconstructive postmodern relationalities between philosophy and spirituality. Bhaskar's (2002) recent work on meta-Reality deeply integrates the two. Integral approaches of most persuasions partake of close relationships between

---

[20] There is currently a resurgence of interest in spirituality, not only including noetic relations with science and philosophy but also with respect to concrete relations to organizations, see e.g. Edwards (2010).

the two. Griffin (1990) identifies connectivities between spirituality and postmodern philosophy, particularly with regard to the principle of interconnectedness. The work of quantum physicist David Bohm also indicates an intimacy between philosophy and spirituality (Russell, 1985) including the influence of Christian mystic Nicolas of Cusa (Fox, 1990). From a different direction, the connections between spirituality and postmodernism are identified by Benedikter (2005). Additionally, in relation to a holarchical picture of higher order sciences, Murphey and Ellis (1996) identify the need for a yet "higher-level explanation—either metaphysical or theological" (p. 16), a non-reducible order involving ethics… A plethora of other contemporary understandings could contribute to this list.

Macro-integrative Entities

The current section addresses what might be regarded as large integrative entities whilst the following section will explore seemingly smaller scales.[21]

Macro-integrative entities could include such items as universe/kosmos/cosmology, such as including identification of ontological or epistemologico~ontological[22] levels; planet (Gidley, 2007)—whether as ecosphere/ biosphere, multiculturalism (Dussel, 1993/1996)/ transcivilisationism, transmodernism, or indeed, the "cosmo-physico-bio-anthropolog[osphere]" (Morin, 2008) incorporating the bodymind[23] (Dewey, 1928, 1997); history, big history (Christian & McNeill, 2004), macrohistory (Galtung, 1997), genealogy; perspectives; and collective mind—incorporating collective consciousness and the collective unconscious (Jung et al., 1981). Academia itself might be regarded as a macro-integrative entity within which other integrative entities exist—entities such as philosophy, narrative, transdisciplinarity (Brier, 2006; Giri, 2002; Klein, 2004; Nicolescu & Voss, 2002), meta-theory (Edwards, current issue; Wallis, 2010), and integral approaches (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2006; Esbjörn-Hargens & Zimmerman, 2009; Gebser, 1949/1985; Gidley, 2007; Molz, 2010; Reams, 2005; Ryan, 2005; Wilber, 1997).

The case study offered below comprises a broad interpretation of *syncretism*.

Syncretism

The term *syncretism* derives from the Greek *synkretismos* meaning "union of communities." Syncretism can be defined as "the attempted reconciliation or union of different or opposing principles, practices, or parties, as in philosophy or religion."[24] This breadth allows for its connection with the genealogy to vary from syncretic spirituality through syncretic philosophy to syncretic academia—forming, one might say, "the many faces of syncretism" (Sathler & Nascimento, 1997, p. 99). The term-concept has a chequered history, sometimes viewed neutrally or positively (including *syncretism as promoting dialogue* (also see Starkloff (2002)), othertimes negatively (including the idea of *syncretism as a corruption of Truth*) (Veer, 1994). In line with a postmodern perspective (Bertens & Fokkema, 1997; R. Shaw & Stewart, 1994), the current paper

---

[21] Some blurring between scales is inevitable.

[22] Noting dialectic between ontology and epistemology.

[23] Offering such perspectives as *science and art within the self* (Zebrowski, 1999)

[24] Syncretism (n.d.) *Dictionary.com Unabridged*. Retrieved April 15, 2010, from Dictionary.com: http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/syncretism

faciliates the former view, one which problematises the notion that "syncretism" *must* connote the superficial and/or the chaotic, but rather allows for the possibility of a duly complex and/or coherent depth syncretism, "((syncretism))" (to use Gangadean's, 2008, *deep dialogue* syntax) or "a poetic of syncretism" involving vision, panorama, orchestration, integration (Cocozzella, 1990).

With respect to Hermetism, spirituality involves a "syncretic, Hellenistic philosophy of nature, which itself was a conglomeration of Aristotelian, Platonic, Stoic, and Pythagorean doctrines, interspersed with motifs from Egyptian mythology and themes of Jewish and Iranian origin" (Ebeling, 2005/2007, p. 10). Indeed, Hermetism's syncretic nature is such that it could be regarded as involving the assemblage of all conceivable opposites (Jung, 1943 / 1970), an archetype of nonduality, a relational template-sensibility that accords with postmodern interest in such items as "relativity, pluralism, polarities, [and] polysemiology" (Faivre, 1995, p. 49). In contrast, the degree of syncretism in Neoplatonism is debatable. It might well be identified that "the philosophy of Plotinus cannot in fact be considered eclectic or syncretic" (Gatti, 1996, p. 13). Nonetheless, beyond the fact that Plotinus was himself Egyptian (a liminal location between West and East), substantive links can be made with Indian spiritual philosophy (Chattopadhaya, 2002; Harris, 2002); it also "seems undeniable that Philo… [who produced] for the first time in history a fusion of elements of traditional Greek thought with elements of Hebrew culture, was also an influence on Plotinus" (Gatti, 1996, p. 12).

The question of spiritual syncretism of the Renaissance is far less uncertain. Pico della Mirandola, for example, was not only well acquainted with Hermetism, Plato, Aristotle, Neoplatonism, scholasticism and the Christian Church Fathers, but also had "knowledge of Hebrew, and some slight acquaintance with Arabic and Aramaic, which gave him access to Jewish theology, philosophy, and science" (Miller, 1965, p. viii). Against "the charge of 'bad syncretism'" Cassirer (1942) considers that "we must…absolve him" (p. 345). The yet stronger case would be to problematise the default association between "syncretism" and "bad": in this regard, Blum (2003) names the argument as occurring between "modern" philosophy and such worthy syncretism as found in the Hermeticism of the Renaissance.

With respect to German humanism, syncretism appears more in relation to philosophical syncretism rather than that of spiritualities. This includes identification of Kant's syncretic theory or integrative philosophy (Rockmore, 2003), Fichte's philosophical syncretism (Bamforth, 2003), Hölderlin's philosophical syncretism (Hoesterey, 1991) and even Hegel's speculative synthesis as syncretic harmonization (Scarfe, 2006).

In relation to reconstructive postmodernism, syncretism can be identified in a number of ways. Firstly, Whitehead and Jung have been associated with identifications of contemporary "spiritual and mystical religion" (Campbell, 1978, p. 152), one which draws upon such idea-systems as Christian mysticism, "Buddhism, Hinduism, Sufi Islam, Neoplatonism, Gnosticism and Romantic Idealism…Jung, William James [and] Whitehead" (Campbell, 1978, p. 148). In addition to the address above, the syncretic interest of Jung himself is perhaps further indicated by his interest in the Daoist book, *The Secret of the Golden Flower* (Heyong, 2009). Additionally, the contemporary "spiritual and mystical tradition" can be associated with "the generally polymorphous character of truth" (Campbell, 1978, p. 154)—a postmodern conceptualisation whose expression can be understood as including syncretism as postmodern, feminist, "complex

interdisciplinary," "integrative," "transdisciplinary," "bricolage," "jazz" or "dance" (Brown, 1997; Ebbeson, 2006; Hoesterey, 1991)—syncretism as a quality or type of hybridity comprising the "*transversal* relations of disciplines" (Toro, 2007, p. 23, original emphasis). From a different direction, Ascott (2006) syncretically coheres three domains, relating spiritual syncretism with quantum metaphysics and social harmony, asserting that "the development of a truly technoetic art will emerge from the confluence of connectivity, syncretism, and field theory. Connectivity is at the root of cultural coherence, syncretism at the root of spiritual coherence, and field theory at the root of quantum coherence" (p. 75). Such texts allow for the possibility of complex integrative theories (of whatever hue) as sitting in relation to syncretism.

Micro-integrative Entities

In addition to macro-scale integrative items, seemingly smaller scale entities can also be identified such as those identified by particular terms—or noetic nebulae such as clusters of metaphors (Kimmel, 2010)—which might have substantive ecosystems of meaning, such as the polysemy of *creativity* and *love* which are used below as illustrative. Other possibilities include *archetype*—whether of pre-modern (eg. Hermes, Eros) or postmodern (eg. Jungian archetype) variety—and neologisms such as *art-e-fact* (integrating modernistic "fact" with postmodern aesthetic template).

Although "creativity" and "love" comprise *two* terms, they have been chosen as jointly illustrative partly because, in many instances throughout the genealogy, they arrive together such as through the archetype *Eros*.

Creativity

As an introduction to creativity, its polysemous quality is indicated by Bröckling (2006) who identifies vectors of creativity as:

- metaphysical
- human potential
- involving infinite regression
- contingent
- involving historical consideration
- involving a multiplicity of metaphors
- available to all
- capable of being intensified
- economic resource
- the spirit of enterprise
- involving the drawing of distinctions
- both civic responsibility and subversive force
- both spontaneous and able to be facilitated
- paradoxical
- fun
- needing leisure
- requiring freedom

- normative deviance
- collective.

In contrast to Bröckling's negative evaluation of such a situation, however, I would suggest that the complexity[25] in such an ecosystem accords with complex integrative paradigms and is therefore generative.

With respect to the genealogy, creativity is significant not only as an item identified in the material (such as described below for Hermetism and Neoplatonism) but also in terms of the orientations themselves being creative (as exemplified by Renaissancism and German humanism). Regarding Hermetism, Copenhaver (1992) relays the Hermetic view that "the whole of matter's quality…is to be creative" (p. 75), noting "the creative role of the Logos" (Copenhaver, 1992, p. 102). Regarding Neoplatonism, one interpretation of the ultimate (God) for Plotinus is the *Creative One* (Sumi, 2002). Creativity shines through in the Italian Renaissance, a period showing a "high degree of creativity" (Burke, 1999, p. 228) involving "the clustering of so many outstandingly creative individuals" (Burke, 1999, p. 27). These included Ficino and Pico della Mirandola. Regarding the thought of the former, Mason comments that "Ficino unequivocally endorsed human creativity" (Mason, 2003, p. 44), whilst Cassirer (1942) identifies that of Pico ascribes the freedom of humanity to self-reflexive "uninterrupted creativity…which at no point come[s] to a complete cessation" (p. 330).

With respect to humanism, Herder set the tone by praising Shakespeare not only for "his 'divine power' but also for his 'divine grasp', the ability to make a whole out of apparently random parts" (Mason, 2003, p. 163)—the integration of the "amoral" aspects of creativity into the divine whole. From a different direction, Williams refers to "the daunting corpus of Goethe's creative writing" (Williams, 2001, p. xiv). Indeed, Stumpf (1995) identifies German idealism as a whole (i.e., the zeitgeist[26] or "spirit of the times") as a "zenith" in "scientific creativity" with respect to both quality and quantity; this is similar to Collins' (1987) identification of its "outpouring of creativity" (p. 48), specifically as philosophical creativity. Creativity forms an important part in idealism as indicated by Hegel's notion of "creative reason" (Mason, 2003, p. 177). It could be argued, however, that creativity forms an even greater role in German romanticism. Beiser (2003), for example, indicates that "for the romantics, the highest degree of organization and development of the divine force was nothing less than the creativity of the artist, philosopher, or saint" (p. 143). This is attributed to the fact that "the creativity of the artist is nothing less than the *self*-realization and *self*-manifestation of the powers in nature" (p. 86)(original emphasis), noting that the notion of "artist" might include "philosopher," as Barnard and Lester (1978/1988) comment that "Friedrich Schlegel even envisages the completion of philosophy in the work of art" (p. xv). Philosophy as an art toward Self-realisation.

Perspectives on creativity flourished in the twentieth century to such an extent that one could not adequately honour creativity in reconstructive postmodernism with the current overview. A gesture, nonetheless, might run as follows. The identification of creativity *within* individuals can be seen in a wide range of material from the association of Neitzsche's *will to power* with "sheer creativity" (Mason, 2003, 226), through Koestler's (1970) concept of *bisociation* in the triptych

---

[25] Involving intra-contestabilities as well as synergies.
[26] "A term used extensively by Hegel" (Stumpf, 1995, p. 235).

of *the Jester, the Sage and the Artist*, to Sternberg and Lubart's (1999) review of creativity in psychology. Additionally, creativity *within and beyond* individuals not only surfaces in collective creativity (Montuori, 1997) but as a cosmic or universal force (Görnitz & Görnitz, 2006). Ko (2007), for instance, states that for both Whitehead and Jung, opposites such as "subject and object, the conscious and the unconscious, God and the world, good and evil…are not antagonistic but relational and thereby become the conditions of creative transformation" (p. 31), whilst Bhaskar (2002) identifies five cycles of creation/creativity, namely, *calling*, *creation*, *formation*, *making*, *reflexivity*, respectively.

Such transpersonal conceptualisations regarding creativity often involve a close association with love. The following segue on Eros briefly addresses this connection before addressing love in its own right.

Eros

The ancient Greek god Eros embodies (inter alia) a fusion of love and creativity. From contemporary popular understanding, for example, Wikipedia (2010) describes Eros as (in part) embodying "not only the force of love but also the creative urge of ever-flowing nature." Taking into account that "up until the modern age, Eros was seen as central to human life" (Miller, 2009, p. 581), a reconstructive *post*modernism might well wish to regenerate Eros as the harmonic coherence of love and creativity. It might wish to build upon Bhaskar's (2002) "creative, loving, right-acting ground-state activity" (pp. xvi-xvii) and Wilber's (1995) Whitehead-influenced identification of Eros as Kosmic driver. Additionally, in accord with Rabbi Gaffni's (2003) understanding of Eros as (in part) representing the interconnectivity of being, the *integrative* function of Eros in relation to love and creativity (Hart, 1950) might also be identified.[27] At a more local level, the love-creativity connection surfaces in such understandings as "creativity [being] facilitated by *doing what you love and loving what you do*" (Amabile, 1997, original italics) (also see Torrance (1995)).

Love

As a brief introduction to the Western address of love, one might note ecologies of archetypes/types of love such as that of Eros (transpersonal love), Xenia (the love of strangers), Philia (love between friends), Storge (love of family, community, humanity), and Agape (altruistic love or compassion) (Miller, 2009); and that of Platonic erotic love (both homosexual and heterosexual), Christian love, romantic love, moral love (see, e.g., Kant and Kierkegaard), love as power, and mutual love (Wagoner, 1997). Connectivities within such ecologies include that between romantic love (noting Romantic as the valorisation of the passionate as opposed to the prudent life (Wagoner, 1997) and divine love, such as in Emerson's understanding (Miller, 2009).

Let us now regard the genealogy. In Hermetism, humans are identified as "double beings" in that we are understood as being both mortal and immortal; moreover, these two parts are seen not

---

[27] One might note the significance of the play of imagination in each of love, creativity and integration (Singer, 2009b).

as antagonistic but as united in love (Ebeling, 2005/2007). In Hermetism, it is also identified that "love…makes one harmony act in all things" (Copenhaver, 1992, p. 66). Regarding Neoplatonism: for Plotinus, who forwarded Greek ideas about love, philosophic love enables us to recognize the beauty in everything, culminating in a sense of oneness (Singer, 2009b). An iteration of the holarchical Neoplatonic relationship between Reason-within-Love can also be seen in Casanus' understanding that "true love of God is *amor Dei Intellectualis*: it includes knowledge as a necessary element and a necessary condition. …Love by itself, without any admixture of knowledge, would be an impossibility" (Cassirer, 2000, p. 13).

The address of love in the Renaissance exceeds and sometimes contradicts that in Neoplatonism. Singer indicates that "Michelangelo illustrates how the inherent violence within the polar opposites of Neoplatonic love can generate the greatest art" (Singer, 2009a, p. 182) whilst Leonardo extends pantheistic or sensual love. Ficino's doctrine of love should also be mentioned here (Sears, 1952). In general, the Renaissance exhibited "a variety of tensions between sensual love and spiritual love" (Smith, 2010). German humanism continues the interest in both human love and the love of God: Romanticism—based on an understanding regarding the unity of physical and spiritual love (Saul, 2009)—"considers the pursuit of love worthier than any other interest" (Singer, 2009a, p. 285) whilst idealism identifies "the universal importance of love" (Singer, 2009a, p. xv).

When we enter the twentieth century, for both Whitehead and Jung, "God's love is based on the paradoxical combination of the opposites in which love does not mean the massive movement toward goodness, but the transformational and comprehensive whole of the contradictories" (Ko, 2007, p. 31). For Whitehead, the relational self forms the basis of love, whilst for Jung, "divine love is realized in the representation of archetype" (Ko, 2007, p. 38). A later reconstructive iteration of this universal aspect of love is found in such figures as Ghandi, Luther King (Miller, 2009), the Dalai Lama and Fethullah Gülen (2004). It is also seen in Bhaskar's (2002) understanding that "love is the totalising, binding, unifying, healing force in the universe" (p. 175). This includes *self*-love, which, as Giri indicates, has its own genealogy including both Neoplatonic thought and also Foucault's "life as a work of art involv[ing] care of the self" (Giri, 2009, p. 506).

Whilst reconstructive postmodern address includes a continuation of the possibility of universal love, other expressions of postmodernism (which may nonetheless be included within the reconstructive gambit) tend toward address of human love (Illouz, 1997, 1998), particularly with respect to both its desirability and naïveté. Where a greater love is posited, it may take the form of the love of humanity—perhaps based on valuing the Other (see Rempel & Burris (2005))—including "emancipation from oppressive discourses" (Morley & Ife, 2002, abstract). Reconstructive postmodern address should also be given to the seminal work on love by integral sociologist, Sorokin (1954/2002), and more recently, both psychological perspectives on love—such as Sternberg's (1986) triangular theory of love which regards personal love as an integration of intimacy, passion and commitment—and linguistic perspectives including love's polysemous quality via conceptual metaphoric vectors or entailments such as *love involves creativity*, *love creates a reality*, *love is unique in each instance* (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003) and *love is a nutrient* (Gibbs, 1994). In terms of application, love is identified as significant in education (Gidley, 2009; Noddings, 2003). Last but not least, an evolutionary perspective (Loye, 2004) offers the

possibility of non-human love: love as an emergent property in mammals (Porges, 1998) including cetaceans.[28]

Shapes of Integration

Associated with integrative entities can be identified conceptual shapes, templates, sensibilities or habits of integration (and potential typologies thereof). One way of looking at this is to identify a bifurcation between those shapes which interrelate two items with those that interrelate more than two. Shapes between two items include *dialectics* in addition to two-party *balance*, *dialogue*,[29] *holography* and *harmony* (in its more descriptive sense). Shapes involving more than two entities include multi-party dialogue, multi-note harmony, assemblage, juxtaposition, baroque, topology, hierarchy/ holarchy, helix, system, complex system, ecosystem, organism, art-e-fact, perhaps even rhapsody. Degrees of integration in either two or post-two shapes would range from mere *proximity* though *degrees of intimacy* (including the normative resonances of *harmony* and *rhapsody*) to *amalgam/fusion*. In general, integrative shapes move away from atomistic[30] thinking toward relational and contextual thinking (Reich, 2002).

The case study below is that of *organicism*, noting that "organic" can be understood as including not only *entity as organism* but also *entity as ecosystem.*[31]

Organicism

Although there may be "no true story of organicism" (Armstrong, 2003, p. 5), organicism might nonetheless be identified as a shape or habit pertaining to organic metaphors. Organicism includes a certain elasticity, a certain complexity and a notion of "living." Regarding the most common organic metaphor in the genealogy—that of *organism*—Hanegraaff (1998) notes that, "while a mechanism is an aggregate of separate parts, an organism is a whole that cannot be broken up into its elements without killing it; and while a mechanism is static and can only be moved by outside forces, an organism is dynamic and has an inner principle of motion" (p. 257): organism as an open integral system.

Whilst little may be directly said in the philosophical Hermetica in terms of organicism, later iterations of Hermeticism, as indicated below, express a strong relationship to this template or sensibility. In Neoplatonism, the macrocosm is regarded as a Great Living Thing (Coulter, 1997)—and latterly connected to smaller "organisms" including *literature* (Coulter, 1997)—an understanding expanded upon in the Renaissance such as through Giordano Bruno's identification of the universe as an organism (Bialas, 2000). Indeed, "for sixteenth-century Europeans the root metaphor binding together the self, society, and the cosmos was that of an organism" (Merchant, 2010, p. 295). Such a metaphor entailed "subtle ethical controls and

---

[28] Also see Hampson (2005).

[29] As, for example, between *unity and diversity.*

[30] Even material atoms are not simple. Griffin (1997) relays Whitehead's understanding, for example, that "atomic actual occasions, far from being simply the product of their electronic, protonic, and neutronic occasions, not only have their own creativity, but have *more* than any of their constituents" (p. 40).

[31] Notwithstanding ecosystem as "also" involving abiotic elements.

restraints" (Merchant, 2010, p. 297) in contrast to the modernistic metaphor of *dominion over nature*.

German humanism—from Romanticism to the Slavophile tradition (Rabow-Edling, 2006)— saw a yet more bountiful flowering of this perspective. Regarding romantic organicism, Armstrong notes its "underestimated fecundity and complexity" (Armstrong, 2003, p. 2). The Romantic conception is that organicism acts as the "grounding systematics for understanding all holistic structures" (Armstrong, 2003, p. 2). Its complexity is such that it was identified as able to include the apparently *non*-integrative notion of fragments, as exemplified by Friedrich Schlegel's approach alluded to in the introduction. Organicism became an atemporal Absolute Organism in German idealism (Armstrong, 2003).

In terms of reconstructive postmodernism, Whitehead's (1967) organic theory of nature (again through the metaphor of *organism*) is seminal—although note should also be made of Bergson (Antliff, 1993)—seeding, among other things, organicist approaches in postmodern science (Pickering, 1997) involving ecosystems of meaning. In a somewhat different form, Derrida's intertextuality can be understood as a type of organicism (Park & Kayatekin, 2002) or at least in relation to where it "lets itself be touched" by organicism (Armstrong, 2003, p. 176). In another domain, Keynes' theory of economics is organicist (whether through Moore, Hegel or Whitehead) (Park & Kayatekin, 2002); indeed, there is a veritable sociological tradition of society in general being viewed organically (Pasewark, 1997)—including the perspectives of Rousseau, Comte and Durkheim (Arnopoulos, 2005). In biology, Sheldrake's (1981) morphogenetic fields accords with Whitehead's organicism, whilst Lovelock's (Lovelock & Margulis, 1974; Lovelock, 2000) Gaia hypothesis expounds the metaphor *Earth as organism*.

Although most interpretations of organicism involve extensions of *organism*, other possibilities exist, such as in relation to *ecosystem*. Ecosystem can be understood as "a subtle and complex concept" (Pickett & Cadenasso, 2002, p. 1) involving the dimensions of meaning, model and metaphor including the attribute of connectedness (Pickett & Cadenasso, 2002) (Hampson, 2010a, 2010b)—the more baroque "bringing together [of] independent voices" (Kwa, 2002, p. 29). Such multidimensional ecosystems can include arborescent (Davis, 2004) and rhizomatic (Deleuze & Guattari, 1980/1987) structures in addition to the metaphorical multidimensionality of vectors arising from *animal*.[32] Additionally, through the postmodern reconstructivity of complexity theory, both organism and ecosystem can be identified as types of self-organising system (Heylighen, 1999).

Processes of Integration

The perspective of *processes* of integration points toward characterisations regarding enactments or effects which lead to integrations or relationalities. From a large scale perspective, processes of integration might include evolution and societal change. From an individual human perspective, they might entail such overt activities as exploring, environmental scanning and constructing. They might also include less overt, more chthonic processes such as those involved in creative, transformative process—such as Scharmer's (2005) Theory-U—contemplative

---

[32] Also see Hampson (2005).

processes, holistic epistemologies or "gnoseologies" (Hampson, 2010c). The case below explores one of the more *covert* processes (which nonetheless may form part of larger—and/or more overt—processes), namely, intuition.

Intuition

Intuition forms part of Hermetism to the extent that Hermes Trismegistus is said to relay the intuitive way of thinking of the Egyptian archetype Thoth (Ebeling, 2005/2007). For Plotinus, the sphere beyond reason involves intuition and contemplation; Plotinian Intelligence involves the mystical and intuitive (Hadot, 1989/1998) such that, from a Neoplatonic perspective, an ecology of signifiers including Intelligence, Intuition, and Spirit all point to the same signified (Gregory, 1999). This can be understood in various ways. Hines, for instance, concludes, Neoplatonic "intelligence is intuitive" (Hines, 2009, p. 118): intelligence has "a completely natural and unforced quality" (Hines, 2009, p. 120) where "being, knowing, and doing [form] a harmonious union" (Hines, 2009, p. 120)—a fractal reflection, perhaps of the Neoplatonic view of the world as imperfect-yet-harmonious (Tarnas, 1991). In Iamblichus's Neoplatonism, intuition pertains to that part of the soul through which the gods, rather than the person, acted (Shaw, 1995). This view of intelligence reminds one of more recent texts on human potential such as Maslow's (1971) *self-actualisation*, and postconventional thought such as Cook-Greuter's (Cook-Greuter, 2008) *unitive consciousness*. Yet more strongly, Neoplatonic knowing is identified with gnosis *in contrast* to reason: Hines (2009) somewhat controversially indicates that "reason…is only for those who lack intelligence. Intelligence is knowing; reason is an attempt to know" (p. 196).

Intuition was also valorised in the Renaissance. Pearce (1999) identifies that Ficino's *De Sole* "stresses the importance of the intuitive power of man" (p. 99), noting that "an incorporeal Sun presiding over the divine intellect… requires the intuitive faculty" (Pearce, 1999, p. 99). In such understandings, "intuitive certainty…springs…from the specific and vital principle of the Ego" (Cassirer, 2000, p. 191). This might be exemplified by the intuitive proofs of Leonardo da Vinci (Cassirer, 2000; Kemp, 1993).

Intuition was also a strong feature in German humanism. Kant formulated a doctrine of pure intuition (Goudeli, 2002) in which—according to Shaviro (2009, p. 10)—was identified "a fundamental asymmetry between concepts and intuitions, such that each of them exceeds the powers of the other" (p. 10), including the realisation that aesthetic ideas are "inner intuitions to which no concept can be completely adequate" (p. 9). Hegelian idealism, on the other hand, rejects a distinction between intuitional and conceptual elements (Pippin, 1989). A similar fusion between the conceptual and intuitive is also found in Goethe's aesthetic intuition (Stephenson, 2005) and in the early transcendentalism of Schelling through "his notion of Absolute Synthesis occurring in Intellectual Intuition" (Pippin, 1989, p. 96).

With regard to reconstructive postmodernism, the following is indicative. Slusser (1989) identifies both Whitehead and Jung as indicating that reason rests upon imagination and intuition—modalities which "cannot be reduced to formula or be subject to prediction and control" (p. 89). Specifically, he reports Whitehead as understanding that "ultimate notions are inexplicable in terms of higher universals. The sole appeal is to intuition" (p. 84).

Openings to Dialogue and New Lines of Flight

This paper has offered indications toward a genealogy of Western integrative thinking or Western panosophy. It has addressed five philosophico-historical attractors or moments as indicative, namely, Hermetism, Neoplatonism, Renaissancism, German Humanism, and Reconstructive Postmodernism. It has also indicated the efficacy of identifying a topology around such integrative aspects as objects for integration, macro- and micro-integrative entities, shapes of integration, and processes of integration. It has exemplified these through addressing the cases of spirituality~philosophy, syncretism, creativity, love, organicism and intuition—concepts which could be generatively furthered in contemporary integrative agendas. Future research could also explore relations between the genealogy presented here and non-Western genealogies as well as genealogies of ecological thought. Additionally, the topological lens could be further refined.

The sensibility offered is that of openness in that it (both as a whole and with respect to its parts) is open for further additions, refinements, etc.. Poststructuralist considerations might entail deconstructive emphases with regard to integration's Other. Additions could include other aspects of integration such as *purposes of integration*: Is integration seen (in general or in particular) as better in some way than that to which it is contrasted? (An overall normative framing might nonetheless entail neutral identifications *within* the whole.) In the current instance—and in keeping with Nelson's (current issue) association between cross-boundary work and the global problematique—the paper can be normatively located in the understanding that the well-being of that quintessentially integrative entity, *Planet Earth*, *the geo-bio-psycho-socio-culturo-sphere*, is surely facilitated by accordant integrative thinking rather than that offered by modernistic atomistic sensibilities. In composing this paper, I hope I have struck such an integrative chord.

References

Abbs, P. (1989). *A is for aesthetic: Essays on creative and aesthetic education*. Philadelphia, PA: The Falmer Press.

Abrams, M. H. (1971). *Natural supernaturalism: Tradition and revolution in romantic literature*. London: Routledge.

Amabile, T. (1997). Motivating creativity in organizations: On doing what you love and loving what you do. *California Management Review, 40*(1), 39-58.

Antliff, M. (1993). *Inventing Bergson: Cultural politics and the Parisian avant-garde*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Armstrong, C. I. (2003). *Romantic organicism: From idealist origins to ambivalent afterlife*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Arnopoulos, P. (2005). *Sociophysics: Cosmos and chaos in nature and culture*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science.

Ascott, R. (2006). Ontological engineering: Connectivity in the nanofield. In R. Ascott (Ed.), *Engineering nature: Art and consciousness in the post-biological era*. (pp. 69-79). Bristol, UK: Intellect Books.

Bamforth, I. (2003). The age of immunology — conceiving a future in an alienating world. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 81*(10), 770-771.

Barnard, P., & Lester, C. (1988). Translators' introduction: The presentation of romantic literature. In P. Lacoue-Labarthe & J.-L. Nancy (Eds.), *The literary absolute: The theory of literature in German romanticism.* (pp. vii-xx). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. (Original work published 1978)

Beiser, F. C. (2000). The enlightenment and idealism. In K. Ameriks (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to German idealism.* (pp. 18-36). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Beiser, F. C. (2003). *The romantic imperative: Early German romanticism.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Benedikter, R. (2005). *Postmodern spirituality: A dialogue in five parts.* Retrieved 14 Feb 2007, from http://www.integralworld.net/index.html?benedikter1.html

Bertens, H. & Fokkema, D. (Eds.) (2007), *International postmodernism: Theory and literary practice.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Bhaskar, R. (2002). *Meta-reality: The philosophy of meta-reality. Volume 1: Creativity, love and freedom.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Bhaskar, R., & Norrie, A. (1998). Dialectic and dialectical critical realism. In M. Archer, R. Bhaskar, A. Collier, T. Lawson & A. Norrie (Eds.), *Critical realism: Essential readings.* (pp. 561-574). London: Routledge.

Bialas, V. (2000). Die Welt als ein unendlicher Organismus. Zur Kosmologie von Giordano Bruno. *NTM International Journal of History & Ethics of Natural Sciences, Technology & Medicine, 8*(1), 209-221.

Blum, P. R. (2003). Istoriar la figura: Syncretism of theories as a model of philosophy in Frances Yates and Giordano Bruno. *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly, 77*(2), 189-212.

Blumenthal, H. J. (1996). On soul and intellect. In L. P. Gerson (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Plotinus.* (pp. 82-104). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Lawrenceville, NJ, USA: Carnegie foundation for the advancement of teaching; Princeton University Press.

Brier, S. (2006). The necessity of trans-scientific frameworks for doing interdisciplinary research: Developed from a conference paper for paradigms lost and paradigms gained: negotiating interdisciplinarity in the twenty-first century, Calgary, May 2001. *Kybernetes, 35*(3/4), 403-425.

Bröckling, U. (2006). On creativity: A brainstroming session. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 38*(4), 513-521.

Brown, C. (1997). Dancing between hemispheres: negotiating routes for the dancer-academic. In L. Stanley (Ed.), *Knowing Feminisms.* (pp. 132-143). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Burke, P. (1999). *The Italian renaissance: Culture and society in Italy.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bussanich, J. (1996). Plotinus' metaphysics of the one. In L. P. Gerson (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Plotinus.* (pp. 38-65). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Campbell, C. (1978). The secret religion of the educated classes. *Sociological Analysis, 39*(2), 146-156.

Cassirer, E. (1942). Giovanni Pico Della Mirandola: A study in the history of renaissance ideas. *Journal of the History of Ideas, 3*(3), 319-346.

Cassirer, E. (2000). *The individual and the cosmos in renaissance philosophy.* Mineola, NY: Dover Publications.

Chattopadhaya, D. P. (2002). Plato, Neoplatonism and their parallel Indian ideas. In P. M. Gregorios (Ed.), *Neoplatonism and Indian philosophy*. (pp. 31-44). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Christian, D., & McNeill, W. H. (2004). *Maps of time: An introduction to big history*. London: University of California Press.

Cocozzella, P. (1990). Ausiàs March's "Encyclopaedic form": Toward a poetic of syncretism. In B. Lawton & A. J. Tamburri (Eds.), *Romance Languages Annual 1989* (pp. 399-408). West Lafayette, IN: Purdue Research Foundation.

Collins, R. (1987). A micro-macro theory of intellectual creativity: The case of German idealist philosophy. *Sociological Theory, 5*(1), 47-69.

Cook-Greuter, S. R. (2002). *A detailed description of the development of nine action logics in the leadership development framework: Adapted from ego development Theory*. Retrieved 29 May 2007, from www.cook-greuter.com

Cook-Greuter, S. R. (2005). *Ego development: Nine levels of increasing embrace*. Retrieved 29 May 2007, from www.cook-greuter.com

Cook-Greuter, S. R. (2008). *Mature ego development: A gateway to ego transcendence?* Retrieved 5 Jan 2010, from http://www.cook-greuter.com/

Copenhaver, B. P. (1992). *Hermetica: The Greek corpus hermeticum and the Latin asclepius in a new English translation, with notes and introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Coulter, J. A. (1997). *The literary microcosm: Theories of interpretation of the later neoplatonists*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers.

Davis, B. (2004). *Inventions of teaching: A genealogy*. Mahwah, New Jersey; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1980)

Dewey, J. (1928). Body and mind. *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, IV*(1), 3-19.

Dewey, J. (1997). *Experience and nature*. Chicago: Open Court.

Dussel, E. (1996). *The underside of modernity: Apel, Ricoeur, Rorty, Taylor, and the philosophy of liberation*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International. (Original work published 1993)

Ebbeson, J. (2006). *Postmodernism and its others: The fiction of Ishmael Reed, Kathy Acker, and Don DeLillo*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ebeling, F. (2007). *The secret history of Hermes Trismegistus: Hermeticism from ancient to modern times*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. (Original work published 2005)

Edwards, M. (2010). *Organisational transformation for sustainability: An integral metatheory*. New York: Routledge.

Edwards, M. (current issue). Towards an integral meta-Studies: Describing and transcending boundaries in a global holarchy of sense-making. *Integral Review*. 9(2), 173-188.

Esbjorn-Hargens, S. (2006). Integral education by design: How integral theory informs teaching, learning, and curriculum in a graduate program. *ReVision, 28*(3), 21-29.

Esbjörn-Hargens, S., & Zimmerman, M. E. (2009). *Integral ecology: Uniting multiple perspectives on the natural world*. Boston, MA, US: Integral books: Shambhala.

Faivre, A. (1995). *The eternal Hermes: From Greek god to alchemical Magus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Phanes Press.

Faivre, A. (1998). Renaissance Hermeticism and the concept of western esotericism. In R. v. d. Broek & W. J. Hanegraaff (Eds.), *Gnosis and Hermeticism: From antiquity to modern times*. (pp. 109-124). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Ferrer, J. N., Romero, M. T., & Albareda, R. V. (2005). Integral transformative education: A participatory proposal. *Journal of Transformative Education, 3*(4), 306-330.

Foucault, M. (1984). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader*. New York, Toronto: Random House. (Original work published 1971)

Fox, M. (1990). A mystical cosmology: Toward a postmodern spirituality. In D. R. Griffin (Ed.), *Sacred interconnections: Postmodern spirituality, political economy, and art*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gaffni, M. (2003). *The mystery of love*. New York: Atria Books.

Galtung, J. (1997). Macrohistory and macrohistorians: A theoretical framework. In J. Galtung & S. Inayatullah (Eds.), *Macrohistory and macrohistorians: Perspectives on individual, social, and civilizational change*. (pp. 1-10). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Gangadean, A. (2008). *Meditations of global first philosophy: Quest for the missing grammar of logos*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gare, A. (2002). The roots of postmodernism: Schelling, process philosophy and poststructuralism. In C. Keller (Ed.), *Process and difference: Between cosmological and poststructualist postmodernisms*. (pp. 31-54). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gare, A. (2005). Mathematics, explanation and reductionism: Exposing the roots of the Egyptianism of European civilization. *Cosmos and History: The Journal of Natural and Social Philosophy, 1*(1), 54-89.

Gatti, M. L. (1996). Plotinus: The Platonic tradition and the foundation of Neoplatonism. In L. P. Gerson (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Plotinus*. (pp. 10-37). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gebser, J. (1985). *The ever-present origin*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press. (Original work published 1949)

Gibbs, R. W. J. (1994). *The poetics of mind: Figurative thought, language and understanding*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gidley, J. (2007). The evolution of consciousness as a planetary imperative: An *integration* of integral views. *Integral Review, 5*, 4-227.

Gidley, J. (2009). Educating for evolving consciousness: Voicing the emergency for love, life and wisdom. In M. Souza, de, L. J. Francis, J. O'Higgins-Norman & D. Scott (Eds.), *The international handbook of education for spirituality, care and wellbeing* (pp. 533-561). New York: Springer.

Gill, J. H. (2000). *The tacit mode: Michael Polanyi's postmodern philosophy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Giri, A. K. (2002). The calling of a creative transdisciplinarity. *Futures, 34*(1), 103-115.

Giri, A. K. (2009). Power and self-cultivation: Aesthetics, development ethics and the calling of poverty. In A. K. Giri (Ed.), *The modern prince and the modern sage: Transforming power and freedom*. (pp. 504-521). New Delhi: Sage publications.

Goodrick-Clarke, N. (2008). *The western esoteric traditions: A historical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Görnitz, T., & Görnitz, B. (2006). *Der kreative Kosmos: Geist und Materie aus Quanteninformation*. Heidelberg, Germany: Spektrum Akademischer Verlag.

Goudeli, K. (2002). *Challenges to German idealism: Schelling, Fichte, and Kant*. Basingstoke, UK; New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gregory, J. (1999). *The neoplatonists: A reader*. London, New York: Routledge.

Griffin, D. R. (1990). Introduction: Sacred interconnections. In D. R. Griffin (Ed.), *Sacred interconnections: postmodern spirituality, political economy, and art*. (pp. 1-14). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Griffin, D. R. (1993). Charles Hartshorne. In D. R. Griffin, J. B. Cobb, M. P. Ford, P. A. Y. Gunter & P. Ochs (Eds.), *Founders of constructive postmodern philosophy: Pierce, James, Bergson, Whitehead, and Hartshorne*. (pp. 197-241). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Griffin, D. R. (1997). *Parapsychology, philosophy and spirituality: A postmodern exploration*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Griffin, D. R. (2002). Introduction to SUNY Series in constructive postmodern thought. In Keller, C. & Daniell, A. (Eds.), *Process and difference: Between cosmological and poststructuralist postmodernisms*. (pp. vii-xii). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Griffin, D. R., Cobb, J. B., Ford, M. P., Gunter, P. A. Y., & Ochs, P. (Eds.). (1993). *Founders of constructive postmodern philosophy: Pierce, James, Bergson, Whitehead, and Hartshorne*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gülen, M. F. (2004). *Toward a global civilization of love and tolerance*. Somerset, NJ: The Light Inc.

Gunter, P. A. Y. (1993). Henri Bergson. In D. R. Griffin, J. B. Cobb, M. P. Ford, P. A. Y. Gunter & P. Ochs (Eds.), *Founders of constructive postmodern philosophy: Pierce, James, Bergson, Whitehead, and Hartshorne*. (pp. 133-161). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hadot, P. (1989/1998). *Plotinus or the simplicity of vision*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.

Hague, P. (2010). *Wholeness: The union of all opposites or semantic principles of natural philosophy*. Svenshögen, Sweden: Paragonian Publications.

Hall, S. S. (2010). *Wisdom: From philosophy to neuroscience*. New York: Vintage Books.

Hampson, G. P. (2005). Human: Machine, ape or dolphin? *Journal of Futures Studies, 9*(4), 29-44.

Hampson, G. P. (2007). Integral re-views postmodernism: The way out is through. *Integral Review, 4*, 108-173.

Hampson, G. P. (2010a). Facilitating eco-logical futures through postformal poetic ecosophy. 42(10), *Futures. 1064-1072*.

Hampson, G. P. (2010b). *Regenerating integral theory and education: Postconventional explorations.* Unpublished PhD dissertation, Southern Cross University, Lismore, NSW, Australia.

Hampson, G. P. (2010c). Western-Islamic and Native American genealogies of integral education. In S. Esbjörn-Hargens, J. Reams & O. Gunnlaugson (Eds.), *Integral Education: New directions for higher learning*. (pp. 17-34). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hanegraaff, W. J. (1998). Romanticism and the esoteric connection. In R. v. d. Broek & W. J. Hanegraaff (Eds.), *Gnosis and Hermeticism: From antiquity to modern times*. (pp. 237-268). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Harris, R. B. (2002). Preface. In P. M. Gregorios (Ed.), *Neoplatonism and Indian philosophy*. (pp. 5-12). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hart, H. H. (1950). The integrative function in creativity. *Psychiatric Quarterly, 24*(1), 1-16.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1977). *Phenomenology of spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1807)

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time*. New York: Harper and Row. (Original work published 1927)

Heylighen, F. (1999). The science of self-organization and adaptivity. In L. D. Kile (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of life support systems*. (pp. 1-26). Oxford: EOLSS.

Heyong, S. (2009). C. G. Jung and China: A continued dialogue. *Jung Journal: Culture and Psyche, 3*(2), 5-14.

Hines, B. (2009). *Return to the one. Plotinus's guide to god-realization: A modern exposition of an ancient classic, the "Enneads"*. Salem, OR: Adrasteia.

Hoesterey, I. (1991). Postmodern brocoleurs: The new syncretism in German studies. *German Studies Review, 14*(3), 587-596.

Illouz, E. (1997). *Consuming the romantic utopia: Love and the cultural contradictions of capitalism*. (pp. 1-288). Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Illouz, E. (1998). The Lost innocence of love. *Theory, Culture & Society, 15*(3), 161-186.

Jung, C. G. (1943/1970). *Alchemical studies, the collected works, Vol. 13*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Jung, C. G., Adler, G., & Hull, R. F. C. (1981). *The archetypes and the collective unconscious (Collected works of C. G. Jung, Volume 9 Part 1)* (3rd Edition ed.): Princeton University Press.

Kelly, S. (2008). Integral time and the varieties of post-mortem survival. *Integral Review, 4*(1), 5-30.

Kemp, M. (1993). Introduction. In K. a. Clark & M. Kemp (Eds.), *Leonardo da Vinci*. (pp. 17-34). London: Penguin Books.

Kimmel, M. (2010). Why we mix metaphors (and mix them well): Discourse coherence, conceptual metaphor, and beyond. *Journal of Pragmatics, 42*(1), 97-115.

Klein, J. T. (1990). *Interdisciplinarity: History, theory, and practice*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Klein, J. T. (1996). *Crossing boundaries: Knowledge, disciplinarities, and interdisciplinarities*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Klein, J. T. (2000). Integration, evaluation, and disciplinarity. In M. A. Somerville & D. J. Rapport (Eds.), *Transdisciplinarity: reCreating integrated knowledge*. (pp. 49-59). Oxford: EOLSS.

Klein, J. T. (2004). Prospects for transdisciplinarity. *Futures, 36*(4), 515-526.

Ko, Y. W. (2007). Divine paradox and harmony: Whitehead and Jung on the love of God. In T. J. Oord (Ed.), *The Many facets of love: Philosophical explorations*. (pp. 31-40). Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Koestler, A. (1970). *The act of creation*. London: Pan Books.

Küpers, W. (2011). Embodied pheno-pragma-practice: Phenomenological and pragmatic perspectives on creative 'inter-practice' in organisations between habits and improvisation. *Phenomenology & Practice* Vol. 5 (1), pp. 100-139.

Kwa, C. (2002). Romantic and baroque conceptions of complex wholes in the sciences. In J. Law & A. Mol (Eds.), *Complexities: Social studies of knowledge practices*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Linden, S. J. (2003a). *The alchemy reader: From Hermes Trismegistus to Isaac Newton*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Linden, S. J. (2003b). Hermes Trismegistus: The Emerald table (Tabula Smaragdina). In *The alchemy reader: From Hermes Trismegistus to Isaac Newton*. (pp. 27-28). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lovelock, J. E. (2000). *Gaia: A new look at life on earth*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Lovelock, J. E., & Margulis, L. (1974). Atmospheric homeostasis by and for the biosphere- the Gaia hypothesis. *Tellus, 26*(1), 2-10.

Loye, D. (2004). Darwin, Maslow, and the fully human theory of evolution. In D. Loye (Ed.), *The great adventure: Toward a fully human theory of evolution*. (pp. 20-38). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Maslow, A. (1971). *The farther reaches of human nature*. New York: Penguin.

Mason, J. H. (2003). *The value of creativity: The origins and emergence of a modern belief. An essay on intellectual history, from Genesis to Nietzsche*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Merchant, C. (2010). Feminism and the philosophy of nature. In D. R. Keller (Ed.), *Environmental ethics: The big questions*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Miller, J. P. (2009). Education and Eros. In M. Souza, de, L. J. Francis, J. O'Higgins-Norman & D. Scott (Eds.), *The international handbook of education for spirituality, care and wellbeing* (pp. 581-610). (pp. vii-xxviii). New York: Springer.

Miller, P. J. W. (1965). Introduction. In *Pico della Mirandola: On the dignity of man*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

Mirandola, G. P. della. (1486/1965). *On the dignity of man*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.

Molz, M. (2010). *Toward an integral pluralism in sociocultural research*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Luxembourg.

Molz, M., & Hampson, G. P. (2010). Elements of the underacknowledged history of integral education. In J. Reams, S. Esbjorn-Hargens & O. Gunnlaugson (Eds.), *Integral education: New directions for higher learning*. (pp. 35-46). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Montuori, A. (1997). Social creativity, academic discourse, and the improvisation of inquiry. *ReVision, 20*(1), 34-37.

Montuori, A. (1998). Creative inquiry: From instrumental knowing to love of knowledge. In J. Pentrankar (Ed.), *Light of knowledge*. (pp. 173-210). Oakland, CA: Dharma Publishing.

Morin, E. (1977/1992). *Method: Towards a study of humankind. Volume 1. The nature of nature* (J. L. R. Bélanger, Trans.). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Morin, E. (2005). RE: From prefix to paradigm. *World Futures: The Journal of General Evolution, 61*(4), 254-267.

Morin, E. (2007). Restricted complexity, general complexity. In C. Gershenson, D. Aerts & B. Edmonds (Eds.), *Worldviews, science and us: Philosophy and complexity*. (pp. 5-29). Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Co.

Morin, E. (2008). The reform of thought, transdisciplinarity, and the reform of the university. In B. Nicolescu (Ed.), *Transdisciplinarity theory and practice*. (pp. 23-32). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Morley, L., & Ife, J. (2002). Social work and a love of humanity. *Australian Social Work, 55*(1), 69-77.

Murphey, N., & Ellis, G. F. R. (1996). *On the moral nature of the universe: Theology, cosmology, and ethics*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress.

Nelson, R. (current issue). Surprises ahead: What will be special about the 21st century? Why do we need boundary-crossing research? *Integral Review,* 9(2), 18-26.

Nicolescu, B., & Voss, K.-C. (2002). *Manifesto of transdisciplinarity*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA; Los Angeles, CA; London, UK: University of California Press.

O'Meara, D. J. (1993). *Plotinus: An introduction to the Enneads*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Park, M.-S., & Kayatekin, S. (2002). Organicism, uncertainty and 'societal interactionism': A Derridean perspective. In S. C. Dow & J. Hillard (Eds.), *Keynes, uncertainty and the global economy*. (pp. 106-127). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Pasewark, K. A. (1997). The body in ecstasy: Love, difference, and the social organism in Luther's theory of the Lord's supper. *The Journal of Religion, 77*(4), 511-540.

Pearce, G. (1999). Ficino and astrology. In M. Shepherd (Ed.), *Friend to mankind: Marsilio Ficino 1433-1499*. (pp. 88-100). London: Shepheard-Walwyn.

Pickering, J. (1997). Beyond cognitivism: Mutualism and postmodern psychology. In P. Pylkkänen, P. Pylkkö & A. Hautamäki (Eds.), *Brain, Mind and Physics*. (pp. 183-204). Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Pickett, S. T. A., & Cadenasso, M. L. (2002). The ecosystem as a multidimensional concept: meaning, model, and metaphor. *Ecosystems, 5*(1), 1-10.

Pippin, R. B. (1989). *Hegel's idealism: The satisfactions of self-consciousness*. Cambridge, UK; New York, NY; Melbourne, Australia: Cambridge University Press.

Porges, S. W. (1998). Love: An emergent property of the mammalian autonomic nervous system. *Psychoneuroendocrinology, 23*(8), 837-861.

Rabow-Edling, S. (2006). *Slavophile thought and the politics of cultural nationalism*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Reams, J. (2005). What's integral about leadership? A reflection on leadership and integral theory. *Integral Review* (1), 118-133.

Reich, K. H. (2002). *Developing the horizons of the mind: Relational and contextual reasoning and the resolution of cognitive conflict*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rempel, J. K., & Burris, C. T. (2005). Let me count the ways: An integrative theory of love and hate. *Personal Relationships, 12*(2), 297-313.

Richards, R. J. (2002). *The romantic conception of life: Science and philosophy in the age of Goethe*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Richter, S. J. (2005). *The literature of Weimar classicism*. Rochester, NY: Camden House.

Rist, J. M. (1967). *Plotinus: The road to reality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rockmore, T. (2003). *Before and after Hegel: A historical introduction to Hegel's thought*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing.

Roy, B. (2006). The map, the gap, and the territory. *Integral Review: A Transdisciplinary and Transcultural Journal For New Thought, Research, and Praxis,* 3, 25-28.

Russell, R. J. (1985). The physics of David Bohm and its relevance to philosophy and theology. *Zygon, 20*(2), 135-158.

Ryan, J. (2005). The complete yoga: The lineage of integral education. *ReVision, 28*(2), 24-28.

Sathler, J. A., & Nascimento, A. (1997). Black masks on white faces: Liberation theology and the quest for syncretism in the Brazilian context. In D. Batstone, E. Mendieta, L. A.

Lorentzen & D. N. Hopkins (Eds.), *Liberation theologies, postmodernity, and the Americas*. (pp. 95-124). London: Routledge.

Saul, N. (2009). *The Cambridge companion to German romanticism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Scarfe, A. (2006). Hegelian 'absolute idealism' with Yogacara Buddhism on consciousness, concept (Begriff), and co-dependent origination (pratityasamutpada). *Contemporary Buddhism, 7*(1), 47-73.

Scharmer, C. O. (2005). *Theory U: Leading from the emerging future: Presencing as a social technology of freedom*, Retrieved 9 Sept 2010 from http://www.ottoscharmer.com/

Schelling, F. W. J. v. (1800/1978). *System of transcendental idealism* (P. Heath, Trans.). Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.

Sears, J. (1952). Ficino and the platonism of the English renaissance. *Comparative Literature, 4*, 214-238.

Shaviro, S. (2009). *Without criteria: Kant, Whitehead, Deleuze, and aesthetics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Shaw, G. (1995). *Theurgy and the soul: The Neoplatonism of Iamblichus*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Shaw, R., & Stewart, C. (1994). Introduction: problematizing syncretism. In C. Stewart & R. Shaw (Eds.), *Syncretism / anti-syncretism: The politics of religious synthesis*. (pp. 1-26). London, New York: Routledge.

Sheldrake, R. (1981). *A new science of life: The hypothesis of morphic resonance*. Rochester, VT: Blond & Briggs.

Singer, I. (2009a). *The nature of love: Courtly and romantic*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Singer, I. (2009b). *The nature of love: Plato to Luther*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Slusser, G. H. (1989). Inspiration and creativity: an extension. In D. R. Griffin (Ed.), *Archetypal process: Self and divine in Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*. (pp. 105-106). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Smith, A. J. (2010). *The metaphysics of love: Studies in renaissance love poetry from Dante to Milton*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Solomon, R. C., & Higgins, K. M. (1996). *A short history of philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sorokin, P. A. (2002). *The ways and power of love: Types, factors, and techniques of moral transformation*. Radnor, PA: Templeton Foundation Press. (Original work published 1954)

Starkloff, C. F. (2002). *A theology of the in-between: The value of syncretic process*. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press.

Stephenson, R. (2005). Binary synthesis: Goethe's aesthetic intuition in literature and science. *Science in Context, 18*(4), 553-581.

Sternberg, R. J. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review, 93*(2), 119-135.

Sternberg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I. (1999). The concept of creativity: prospects and paradigms. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of creativity*. (pp. 3-15). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Stumpf, H. (1995). Scientific creativity: A short overview. *Educational Psychology Review, 7*(3), 225-241.

Sumi, A. (2002). The psyche, the forms and the creative one: Toward reconstruction of neoplatonic metaphysics. In R. B. Harris (Ed.), *Neoplatonism and contemporary thought*

(Studies in Neoplatonism). Part one. (pp. 221-270). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Tarnas, R. (1991). *The Passion of the western mind: Understanding the ideas that have shaped our world view*. London: Pimlico.

Toro, A. d. (2007). Globalization - new hybridities - transidentities - transnations: Recognition - difference. In F. Heidemann & A. d. Toro (Eds.), *New hybridities: Societies and cultures in transition*. (pp. 19-35). Hildsheim, CH: Georg Olms.

Torrance, E. P. (1995). Insights about creativity: Questioned, rejected, ridiculed, ignored. *Educational Psychology Review, 7*(3), 313-322.

Veer, P. v. d. (1994). Syncretism, multiculturalism and the discourse of tolerance. In C. Stewart & R. Shaw (Eds.), *Syncretism / anti-syncretism: The politics of religious synthesis*. (pp. 196-211). London, New York: Routledge.

Wagoner, R. E. (1997). *The meanings of love: An introduction to philosophy of love*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Wallis, S. E. (2010). Toward a science of metatheory. *Integral Review, 6*(3), 73-120.

Whitehead, A. N. (1967). *Science and the modern world*. New York: The Free Press.

Whitehead, A. N. (1979). *Process and reality (Gifford lectures delivered in the University of Edinburgh during the session 1927-28)*. New York: Free Press.

Wikipedia. (2010). *Eros*. Retrieved 8 Sept 2010, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eros

Wilber, K. (1995). *Sex, ecology, spirituality: The spirit of evolution*. Boston: Shambhala.

Wilber, K. (1997). An integral theory of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies, 4*(1), 71-92.

Williams, J. R. (2001). *The life of Goethe*. Oxford; Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Zebrowski, E. J. (1999). Scientist and artist within the mature self: the integration of two worlds. In M. E. Miller & S. R. Cook-Greuter (Eds.), *Creativity, spirituality, and transcendence: Paths to integrity and wisdom in the mature Self*. (pp. 151-166). Westport, Connecticut, US: Ablex.