

Editorial

Jonathan Reams¹

Welcome to this, the final issue of Integral Review. Yes, you read this correctly, the final issue. After 18 years of holding this space for an eclectic collection of new thought that has aimed to broadly model ‘integral’ ways of thinking, researching, and serving the world we live in, we are going to close the doors. Rest assured, the website and collection of over 300 articles, essays, reviews, reflections and more will continue to be available as an open access collection.

We began this project with much enthusiasm and too much time on our hands to devote to it (at least Sara and I). The original idea for the journal came from Reinhard Fuhr, our first editor-in-chief, as a subcommittee of our publisher, ARINA (<http://www.global-arina.org/>), with the broad intention of publishing all the great action research we would sponsor and engage in. While ARINA itself did not manage to realize the full potential envisioned, it did manage to support some important work, which you can find references to [here](#).

What did happen was that we were able to tap into a loose network of people looking for a venue where their voices could find a home. Whether an academic, practitioner, pracademic, or just a curious thinker and writer, finding a space where you could adequately lay out the multi or even trans-disciplinary considerations related to an issue or topic and dig into the complexity inherent in them was not always easy. Integral Review offered a space where those explorations could be engaged and supported with a review and feedback process that aimed to be helpful as much as gatekeeping. (The record is Jennifer Gidley’s wonderful article on *The Evolution of Consciousness as a Planetary Imperative: An Integration of Integral Views* at 223 pages!).

We began by publishing regular issues twice a year, until 2010, when a year slipped by, and we released ourselves from the obligation to put out issues on a fixed schedule. Regular issues became a collection of submissions that trickled in over time. Some came from us as editors, some from people we invited. Some came from authors who discovered us and found a place to have a voice. Many went through long gestation periods of iterative review and revision. Our intentions to create a space for new thought as well as critical engagement with a wide range of topics were realized in forms we had not imagined but are grateful for.

Around 2010, we also began to publish special issues. Some of these were organized by our own editors, and some by guest editors. We began with Sara Ross putting together a special issue on *Toward Development of Politics and the Political*, followed by one on *Emerging Perspectives of Metatheory and Theory*, put together by Steven Wallis and Mark Edwards. In 2013, Markus Molz, along with Mark Edwards, put out a set of works, *International Symposium: Research Across Boundaries, Part 1* (part 2 never happened for a variety of reasons).

¹ **Jonathan Reams** is Editor-in-Chief of Integral Review, holds a position at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology, is co-founder of the Center for Transformative Leadership and does consulting and leadership development work for a variety of clients around the world.
jonathan@reams.com



From 2011 until 2017, we published five special issues, organized by Bahman Shiraz, from an annual symposium from the California Institute for Integral Studies (CIIS). These ranged from *Integral Consciousness and Education*, through *Spirituality, Religion, Contemplative Practices, and Socially Transformative Service in the 21st Century*, *Integral Consciousness: From Cosmology to Ecology* and *Founders Symposium on Integral Consciousness to Integral Education, Women's Spirituality and Feminist Pedagogies*. We greatly appreciate Bahman's sustained shepherding of this series.

In 2015 we published two special issues, *Studies of Wisdom* edited by Roger Walsh and myself as well as Marc Lucas and Matthew Rich's *European Academic Trends and Contributions to Integral Studies*. In 2019 Tom Murray was extremely busy, putting together a special issue on *Integral Postmetaphysical Spirituality* and as well organizing our last special issue, which came out in 2020 and focused on *STAGES*.

As we now set aside our editorial and publishing roles, we wanted to take a moment to provide some brief reflections from each of us that have been together throughout this long journey.

Thomas Jordan

When we started Integral Review, I still had the hope and maybe expectation that “integral” would become an attractor for scholars that saw the need for using developmental and multiperspectival frameworks in many different disciplines. There is a lot of integral research and practice going on, but most of it doesn't use the label “integral.” That is of course fine, and integrally informed (but otherwise labeled) work will hopefully gain even more momentum in times to come. The world sorely needs it. But maybe the academic world, at least, doesn't have very much use for that label, for a number of reasons. For me personally, IR offered the opportunity to get a couple of articles published that would not have fit well with traditional academic journals and I believe other authors have made the same experience. I am happy that we can point to our colleagues at Integral Leadership Review, even if they now decide to drop “integral” from the title in favor of a broader name. [See more on this below]. There is a need for a journal that welcomes articles that make use of developmental and transdisciplinary frameworks.

Bonnitta Roy

Several years ago, I coined the term IDC: Integral Diaspora Community. My sense was that the integral movement had begun as a kind of gravity wave that pulled people in together in cafes, at conferences, and in workspaces like Integral Review. This was the “nuclear fusion” phase. The language we used mirrored the consciousness we reflected to each other, and we felt seen and heard. The term IDC was meant to signify the second phase of our cultural-intellectual movement – the nuclear fission phase. Like a ripe seed head that pops and splinters, in order to be carried by the wind and traverse the landscape, just when integral seemed to be splintering apart, I came to see it influencing culture from countries around the globe. Sure, the eclectic terms and private lingo we used during the compression phase was “watered down” into more ordinary speech, and applied to more practical, everyday situations, but if you traced some of those conversations down to their key perspectives or core orienting generalizations, you found something that just wasn't prevalent in ordinary life 20 years ago. While the kinds of goals we might have had when we began

to see ourselves as a culture-creating movement have not been realized, in many ways this is a good thing. By failing, we escaped many trappings – like trademarking terms and hierarchically structuring a social architecture that could protect and preserve the scene. In a society such as ours, without such trappings, movements follow the natural order of things – they emerge, they flux, they flow, and they dissipate. For these reasons I am happy to identify as part of its life force. And I am particularly grateful for a seat on this special lifeboat called Integral Review, which helped me surf along with this integral wave.

Tom Murray

It's been an honor and pleasure to serve you all with this amazing editorial board – now my friends for life. IR serves a rather vague community, an integral diaspora (to use Bonnie's term) that has worked its way in many branches of the “liminal web” and leadership / transformational / transdisciplinary studies. It calls no conference, publication, or website its central home. We are a wandering tribe branching across the lands always happy to run into familiar faces and memes; rejoicing the odd convocation. IR issues were gift offerings to a barely seen, even mysterious, audience – they are labors of love, hopeful gestures of gestation. We don't know what seeds have sprouted or who may be watering or tending them still. As this incarnation ends, I trust that our devotion to the types of planetary medicine available in the written word have, and will continue to, nourish good things into fluorescence. Keep in touch. If you have appreciations to share about how IR has touched your life, feel free to send them to us at IReditors@integral-review.org.

Sara Nora Ross

My years of serving IR's authors and readers and collaborating with editors and reviewers and advisory board members have been a privilege and pleasure from beginning to end! I am grateful to everyone and for everyone. I'm proud of the contribution everyone has made to new thought, research, and praxis by these contributions and our efforts to publish them. I hope they continue to bear fruit as people can continue to access IR online going forward.

Jonathan Reams

My experience in this role has been of gratitude for being able to learn from so many diverse, bright and interesting people. My editorial board colleagues, submitting authors, numerous reviewers – all contributed to feeding my curiosity for understanding how people see, experience and reflect on the world. I also am grateful for the opportunity this role has brought to practicing the arts of editorial feedback. The challenges of coordinating diverse complex perspectives on such a diverse range of topics has really enriched me in this way. I know that my many masters' thesis and few doctoral students have also been grateful recipients of the skills this role has helped me develop.

I also echo the sentiments of my colleagues above – one advantage of going last. Before our first issue, we debated whether or not to use the term integral in our title. At times it has brought us submissions and expectations that were not aligned with our goals. At other times it has enabled us to contribute to how the term might be used in the evolving communities of discourse Bonnie references. It did enable us to have a degree of recognition for what we aimed to create space for.

As we bring our work to a close, it is worth making quick mention of some of what we leave behind and point to the hand-off of sorts we are making. In addition to the body of published work that will remain accessible, we put a lot of thought into our [General guidelines](#) and [Self-evaluation process](#). These are resources that can help people think through how they apply the depth, rigor and quality of thought we aimed to nurture and showcase.

What is more difficult to make available is the body of knowledge and practice as editors we have accumulated. We are grateful that Tom Murray opened up a conversation with the publishers of Integral Leadership Review (ILR) that has led to an agreement to provide a transition of some of our resources, (like review forms) as well as processes and general experience of navigating the processes of getting listed in EBSCO and the Directory of Open Access Journals. Given that Russ Volckmann was one of our founding editors, and founder of ILR, this transition seems natural. They are also undergoing a transition, with the addition of a new peer reviewed section and name change to Transdisciplinary Leadership Review (TLR). We will be providing more information and updates about this on our website and through our mailing list as the ILR/TLR team progresses their plans.

Issue Contents

Peer Reviewed

We begin our final issue with two major pieces of work by Doug Marman: *Opening Doors to a Quantum Theory of Life, Parts 1 & 2*. These articles take the foundation laid in his 2018 piece *The Lenses of Perception Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics* and apply the insights from it to the field of biology. Examining life as a quantum process, Marman shows how two essential traits of biological life are present at the quantum level, anticipation and purposeful action. After demonstrating how these can be understood, Marman shows how relationships between sentient agents may be the true foundation for quantum mechanics. These articles show that life is not built on a reductionistic combination of ingredients, but from mutually responsive relationships between sentient agents and their habitats. This groundbreaking work exemplifies the kind of new thought IR has aimed to support.

These articles are followed by Sofia Leite and Michael Common's *Hyper Smart Developmentally Based Stacked Neural Networks and Evidence that Allows for True Androids that Pass the Turing Test*. This article describes how the Model of Hierarchical Complexity can be applied to create more effective and smarter artificial intelligence that is based upon how humans and animals solve problems. Applying this to the idea of creating androids as a computer based organism, it is proposed that the result will be smart enough to pass the Turing test as well as other tests designed specifically for humans.

Pia Andersson contributes her study of *Using a Micro-Developmental Lens to Assess Dynamics of Scaffolding in a Facilitated Group Process*. This article presents a detailed account of a case study where Andersson delved into understanding the process of scaffolding dynamics between a facilitator and a group working through Sara Ross' *The Integral Process of Complex Issues*. A presentation and analysis of moment-to-moment interactions allows her to identify the micro-

developmental moves going on in the process of coactively scaffolding more complex knowledge in the group.

In *The Historical and Ideological Roots of US Voter Exclusion: An Integral Examination of the Myth of US Democracy*, Walter Davis examines voter rights, exclusion and democracy in the US from multiple perspectives. He shows how voter exclusion is a symptom of larger issues such as dominator hierarchies, nationalism, militarism, imperialism and imperial capitalism. He covers four eras and proposes a multi-pronged integral approach for democratizing American society. The paradigm shift required for this is further elaborated on at the end of the article.

Psyche's Score: Music of the Integral Psychodynamic Sphere and Its Orbits is Willow Pearson's contribution to deepening our understanding of integral relational listening and theorizing by delving into how we can position ourselves in relation to four foundational psychological positions and developmental stages. Using Wilber's integral methodological pluralism, she expands these to show the inherent dynamic flux of the socially situated self-in-relation. She also provides a clinical example of this work to illustrate the psyche's ultimate transcendent modes of generating experience.

Anne Rød presents some of her research on using the immunity to change process to explore *Produce to Protect: The Real Reason Why Change Initiatives Fail*. Rød challenges conventional explanations for resistance to change in organizations and using case examples, argues that it is actually our adherence to rational economic theory that is the main hindrance to change. She uses the case studies to show how mental models and adaptive work can collectively increase the flexibility needed to succeed with change efforts.

Our peer reviewed section closes with Albert Erdynast's analysis of the very current topic of sexual harassment with *Domains Theory and the Rawlsian Social Contract View of the Impermissibility of Sexual Harassment: The Case of Sexual Harassment by Harvey Weinstein*. The Weinstein case is examined using a Rawlsian social contract view to analyze the moral issues involved in such cases. He also brings in Kohlberg's stages of moral development to provide a rich and thorough analysis of this important contemporary issue.

Special Section on STAGES Validation Critique and Responses

We have a small special section of this issue that presents a critical dialogue on claims made in the STAGES validation study published in 2020. This section has three pieces. First is Kristian Merckoll's *An Examination of the STAGES Scoring System*. This is followed by Tom Murray's *A Response to "An Examination of the STAGES Scoring System"* and then Kristian's *Final Comments on the STAGES Validation Claim*.

The origins of this began in 2017 when a group of people, including Kristian Merckoll, published a set of initial concerns and critiques about the claims being made by associates of STAGES International about the STAGES developmental model. A response came from STAGES, with Tom Murray as one of the primary authors. The sections of the critique, and associated response, that dealt with the empirical study could be characterized as problematic for various reasons. The primary one being that the validation study had not yet been published, and

while there were attempts made at that time to engage in dialog, these were unsuccessful. These issues can be highly sensitive and when research with commercial interests combine, there are often entangled considerations in play.

Since then, the original validation study has been published, and more recent investigations of the data and claims led Kristian to draft a summary of his concerns. He circulated this to several people to see if they understood his concerns. He got substantial feedback from them which informed early revisions to it. I was approached to have a look and encouraged Kristian to consider going beyond a casual and informal circulation of his paper to allowing editorial feedback from me and publication with Integral Review. I consider Kristian to be in a relatively unique position to comment on such matters, having both practical and professional engagement with an ego development scoring method as a professional statistician.

The process then extended to enabling Tom Murray as well as Terri O’Fallon to have an advanced look at Kristian’s critique and provide feedback that gave Kristian the opportunity to further clarify and revise his critique. Once that was finalized, Tom’s response (with Terri’s involvement) was presented to me and Kristian, and I provided editorial feedback while Kristian provided a set of feedback points that Tom was able to use to make a final version of the response. From there, Kristian wrote a final rebuttal to acknowledge points presented by Tom and clarify certain points.

I present this somewhat detailed description of the process to help readers understand that all the parties involved have made significant efforts to engage in respectful discourse while still being able to dig into concerns and the various stances being taken. We had originally intended to also invite other parties to comment, however time and available energy, plus the desire to focus the conversation in a clear manner, led to a decision to limit the discussion to Kristian and Tom (with Terri’s involvement). We have discussed the possibility to invite further discussion and commentary from a broader set of perspectives on this and related issues with the people involved in Integral Leadership Review (ILR) and the soon to start up Transdisciplinary Leadership Review (TLR), and we look forward to seeing this happen.

Finally, as a non-statistically sophisticated but not totally unfamiliar to statistics reader and editor, this has been a fascinating process to be party to. I can nod my head to points made that are in clear contrast to each other. I can certainly not adjudicate between these arguments – our point in presenting this to readers is to enable you to ask better questions, have a more informed conversation around the issues raised and hopefully have a more robust understanding of the complex sets of considerations that go into the development of any kind of model and assessment that aims to help people navigate their life journeys.

Editorially Reviewed

We begin the editorially reviewed section with *Deepening Our Understanding of Developmental Assessments Use in Developing Leaders’ Capacity for Complexity* my review of Aiden M. A. Thornton’s dissertation, *Facing the Complexity Gap: Developing Leaders’ Reasoning Skills to Meet the Complex Task Demands of their Roles*. Having followed Aiden’s research for a number of years, I was eager to finally get hold of his published work on this highly relevant area

for the ever-growing community of coaches and consultants making use of developmental models and tools to support leaders' growth and development. My aim with this review, as with many of these pieces I write, is to enable a broader audience who might not want to dig through a dissertation to benefit from this thorough piece of work.

Aiden has also provided a response to my review. In my review, I raised a number of points that could be characterized as curious questions, where, as a reasonably informed reader, I needed to raise these questions to invite elaboration and clarification. Aiden has done an excellent job of supplementing and complimenting my review, addressing 12 points from it with succinct and clarifying information. My hope is that this review, Aiden's response and Aiden's dissertation itself, can raise serious questions and stimulate robust dialog for theorists, researchers and practitioners to explore in service of maturing our capacity to be of use to society.

Rainer von Leoprechting presents a brief overview of some very interesting work he and a group of people have been doing, earlier as part of his career development work and more recently through an EU funded Erasmus+ grant. *Digital Orientation for Life Choices: Introducing StoryMatcher* describes the history and exciting initial explorations around using a process of developmentally analyzed narratives being used for people to calibrate their own aspirations for life and career and receive feedback informed by the patterns this body of work has uncovered. There is an invitation for readers to engage in using this tool and deploying it in their own platforms and system.

Tom Bohinc then presents the third iteration of the leader framework he has been working on, in conjunction with numerous contributors, for the past five years, *A Framework to Help Make Leading Clear*. This update on the Prometheus Framework shifts from the original version one (which you can find [here](#)) and updated version two ([here](#)) attempts to define a framework, moving to a more practical and process oriented, dynamic set of lenses for leaders to utilize as an aide to their lived experience rather than a recipe to follow. The ongoing inquiry, through multiple public and private forums, around the challenge of making leading clear and leaders common, while not ever finished, finds a new level of clarity and utility in this third version.

Ian Wight and Ross Mitchell provide us with a dive into the ethics of being professional in *Being Professional Together – Collective Quiet Resolve: Integral Ethics as Ethos-Making*. This is an example of what IR has always aimed for, to publish authors who are unable to find editors elsewhere who value and understand the complex links and considerations authors want to weave together. This piece explores how any given professions' ethics can be viewed as a combined function of personal and professional ethics. Ian and Ross provide an outcome from a workshop on this topic, *Quiet Resolve* as an example of their impulse to raise the quality of 'professing' as a professional.

IR has, over the years, aimed to support authors willing to persevere in taking our feedback and continuing to work on the themes they are passionate about getting published. One such example is the work of La Shun L. Carroll, who presents his exploration of *Concerning the Ethics of Justice, Care, and Personal Responsibility as a Framework for Criteria Selection in Transplant Recipients*. This essay examines multiple considerations related to organ transplants, how priorities are set and

challenges this in light of the concern that a merit-based system cannot adequately address issues related to the freedom to choose among certain demographics.

Over the years, IR has published many articles focusing on the life and work of Sri Aurobindo and it is fitting that in our last issue we have one more. Marco Masi presents *The Integral Cosmology of Sri Aurobindo: An Introduction from the Perspective of Consciousness Studies*, an in-depth examination of Aurobindo's cosmology and the implications it can have for metaphysical speculations in Western views of evolutionary cosmology. Masi presents Aurobindo's integral view of reality that offers a conceptual platform that can complement and incorporate current theoretical approaches in modern philosophy to this topic. It goes beyond the typical application of this work to spiritual practices, and into how consciousness, mind, life, matter and evolution are interpreted in an extended metaphysical framework, uniting Western and Eastern traditions.

Another occasional topic in IR has been the work of Gurdjieff. *Towards Integral Man: Key Indices and Processes of Development in Gurdjieff's "Man Number Five"* by Huw Llyod offer readers a set of indices that help show how Gurdjieff's man number five can be distinguished from the more well-known man number four. Llyod goes beyond this as well, to elaborate on the processes and practices that can be used to support this development, using his personal experience to illustrate and contextualize this work.

Our final offering is a second piece from Albert Erdynast, *The Concepts of Minimum and Maximum in Picasso's Art*. This richly illustrated essay takes the concepts of minimum and maximum and explores how Picasso went beyond other artists of his time. Several of Picasso's paintings are carefully analyzed to educate readers (and viewers) to be able to gain a deeper understanding of this work and its importance. There is also the inclusion of an analysis provided by the renown acting teacher Stella Adler on a set of sketches in the Bull Series.

With that, we sign off and hope that you find ongoing enjoyment from the riches this issue has presented!