INTEGRAL FUTURES – A NEW MODEL FOR FUTURES ENQUIRY AND PRACTICE

Richard A. Slaughter

There are at least four main phases, or traditions, of futures work. First was the empirical tradition, most strongly developed in the USA. Second was a more culturally based approach (or rather a series of them) mainly originating in Europe and eventually leading to the critical tradition. The third is a more diffuse, international and multicultural tradition that is still developing. Finally we are witnessing the emergence of integral futures work. This chapter provides an overview of the latter as it has emerged from the work of Ken Wilber and other colleagues around the world. The central feature of the integral approach is to honor all truths and acknowledge the value of many different ways of knowing across all significant fields.

The American empirical tradition developed in post WW2 military contexts and, by the 1980s, became generalized into corporate and other contexts. Its main contribution was that it was a formative tradition in which new tools, new ways of thinking and operating were developed. While its focus was almost exclusively on changes in the external world it nevertheless developed a range of useful strategies for exploring the dynamics, trajectories and possible futures of that world. The most well known of these included trend analysis, technology assessment, forecasting and scenarios. Later, as systems theory, chaos theory and other sub-disciplines developed, along with the development of modelling and computing, so more sophisticated insights were incorporated. By the mid 1980s, however, this line of development was in decline.

Futures work outside the USA began in many places, including the old Soviet Union and many Eastern European countries, especially Hungary. In Western Europe, and in the UK, Scandinavia, Italy, Belgium and France in particular, a more culturally oriented tradition became established. The latter was more open to the realms of society, culture and individual or group values. It was more introspective than the American approach and more interested in questions of value and meaning. Hence its analysis of the outer world was moderated by its awareness of the mediating role of multiple inner worlds. The social context was important in another way too. In the US political scene there was not then, nor is there now, any equivalent to ‘left wing’ or ‘labour’ parties, nor to that of the ‘green’ parties that began to grow across Europe in the 1980s. Notions of critique and critical practice were suppressed in the US context in part due to the strong preference of business for stability. By contrast, they thrived in other parts of the world. Thus while American futures work remained closely linked to government and business agendas, such culturally conservative influences were much weaker in some parts of Europe. (In other parts, of course, centralized planning persisted for some decades.)

A number of European pioneers opened up the social, cultural and political aspects of futures work and began working out the implications in civil society, education, politics and so on. The names of Bertrand de Jouvenel, Fred Polak, Robert Jungk and Eleonora Masini evoke strong associations with that time. Their collective impacts meant that

futures enquiry was broadened, deepened and applied to a wide range of social concerns. It was less preoccupied with new technologies per se and more concerned with notions of 'the good life', with social innovations and with contributing back to society as a whole. The fulfilment of this approach, in some ways, was the development of the critical tradition outlined elsewhere. [1] This opened out a rich panorama of possibilities based, to no small extent, on a deep appreciation of the 'social constructedness' of the human world and the many ways that traditions, perceptions, interests and so on actively shape both what exists and what is felt to be possible at different times and in different places.

At the same time the work of other pioneers around the world steadily opened up a broader frame of enquiry and wider set of practices. The international and multicultural expansion of the field saw the emergence of new centres of excellence in futures enquiry. Moreover, it positively welcomed into the developing futures discourse as many 'new voices' as could be induced to take it seriously. The contribution of this stream of futures work was to take FS beyond the confines of Europe and America and to both generalize it across other regions and, at the same time, actively explore a much wider set of human and cultural possibilities.

Finally we are witnessing the emergence of integral futures work that offers a yet broader, wider and deeper view of what futures enquiry is and may yet be. From this perspective many things become clearer. For example, if we consider the three futures traditions outlined above, it is evident that each is grounded at a particular location on Wilber's four quadrant model. Empirical work is almost exclusively external, ie, right hand quadrant. Social, cultural and critical work is predominantly left hand quadrant. Multicultural work tends to be grounded in the lower left hand quadrant. Integral work, of course, considers phenomena across all four. With this review in mind it is now possible to consider some recent elaborations of the integral model and to explore some of the implications for futures enquiry.

Applying an integral perspective to futures enquiry

The intention here is to open up futures enquiry through the expanded frame provided by an integral approach. If successful, this will help the field in a number of ways. For example, purposes, methods, paradigms and the like can be reinterpreted. The aim is to honor enduring insights while, at the same time, avoiding some of the confusions and limitations of earlier views. Similarly, new spaces will be opened out for futures work. While from the FS and integral viewpoints futures per se are obviously unpredictable, new insights and understandings will begin to emerge. Finally there can be a steady 'flowing together' of the streams of human energy, inspiration, study and practice that are embodied in these two relatively new traditions.

The four quadrant model reflects the interconnected worlds of I, you/we and it, or, art, morals and science, or, the Beautiful, the Good and the True. Thus, to cover all four quadrants means that we are addressing the intentional, cultural, behavioural and social dimensions of existence. Taken alone, these distinctions could merely re-inscribe a more elaborate version of 'flatland', ie, one dimensional empirical enquiry. In order to move

beyond this a set of 'vertical' descriptors are needed that will begin to do justice to the depth of structures within and around us.

The notion of holons is central to this view. A holon is both an entity in its own right and a part of a larger one. Thus a cell is part of an organ, an organ is part of a body, a body is part of a person etc. In other words, there is a hierarchy of relationships around us. In a holonic universe all of reality, both inner and outer, is structured and has depth. The terms 'depth' and 'span' represent the vertical 'layers' of existence and the horizontal extension of elements respectively. We now turn to a brief review of some of the implications of an integral futures view.

It is common knowledge that human beings experience various stages of growth in many aspects of their development. Broadly speaking they move through different *waves* of existence. Three simple descriptors (among many more complex ones) for this process are: pre-conventional, conventional and post-conventional. The former is characterized by an instinct for survival and self protection. Here 'the future' (to the limited extent it can be considered at all) is singular and the main interests are those of routine prediction and avoidance of death. One might call this an 'X-files' view of the world.

The conventional stage is one in which individuals have been successfully socialized. They have adopted standard, largely passive, ways of thinking. It is the norm to operate unreflectively and people tend to put their energies into maintaining the status quo. In futures terms this corresponds fairly closely to what has been termed 'pop' and 'problem oriented' FS. Categories are static and reified (taken as more 'real' than they are). There is a tendency to be preoccupied with instrumental power, especially via the products of science and technology. Dualistic ('us and them') thinking is common.

The post-conventional stage is obviously more complex and sophisticated. It looks beyond simple dualisms (right/wrong) to deal more successfully with ambiguities, contractions and paradox. It embraces reflexivity. It readily transcends rules and regulations, in part because it sees them as socially constructed and therefore to some extent provisional. Post-conventional thinking and behaviour is open to complexity and oriented to change. It may well involve systemic thinking and support extended perceptions and novel behaviour. The latter may be perceived as disruptive. In futures terms this corresponds to critical and epistemological FS and integral work in general.

Within each of these generalized waves of existence, human beings develop a number of *lines* that reflect innate capacities and functions. There are thought to be over 20 of these lines and they include cognition, moral development, affect, psychosexual function and so on. The lines appear to develop relatively independently. The ego (or self sense) can be thought of both as the means of holding together these separate lines as well as the 'navigator' that allows the individual to maintain an integrated outlook on the world. Each individual's character and outlook are formed by the ways these lines develop in different combinations and also to different *levels*. In Western contexts what might be called an 'enlightenment perspective' has conveyed a near-exclusive focus on cognitive development. This, in turn, has meant that other, equally vital, characteristics (such as

moral and interpersonal development) have been overlooked. This comment applies within FS as well. In future, futures practitioners will find it useful to begin to consider development lines beyond that of cognition. [2]

An integral view also considers *types* and *states*. Types broadly refer to 'ways of knowing'. One example is that between 'masculine' and 'feminine' possibilities. But there are many other options that derive from different social interests (eg, conservative, entrepreneurial, socialist etc) and different knowledge interests (eg, Habermas' distinctions between the practical, communicative and emancipatory interest). *States* refers to the different states of awareness available to human beings. These include: gross/waking states, subtle/dreaming states, causal/deep sleep states and formless/non-dual states. It is fair to say that such factors have been widely overlooked in mainstream FS.

Hence, the essentials of what has been called the Integral Operating System (IOS) can be summarized as follows. There are four *quadrants*: intentional, behavioural, cultural and social system. There are developmental *lines* and *streams* (eg, cognitive, moral, affective, linguistic, somatic, interpersonal etc). These lines unfold in various *waves, levels and stages*. Waves and lines are relatively independent and develop at their own rate and in their own ways. Finally there are *states* of consciousness and *types* of ways of knowing. The integral approach looks for solutions to human and cultural problems that acknowledge and incorporate all these factors.

Implications for Futures Studies

Drawing consciously on the software/hardware metaphor, Wilber explains some of the implications of the IOS. He writes:

> once an individual downloads and installs IOS in their own worldviews, they begin more conscientiously attempting to include all views, all approaches, all potentials in their own sweep of the Kosmos. IOS initiates a self-correcting, self-organizing outreach to all aspects of the universe previously marginalized by worldviews that were too narrow, too shallow, too self-enclosing to serve as more transparent vehicles of Kosmic consciousness. [3]

Elsewhere he writes:

> IOS, when mastered, combines the strengths of all the major types of human enquiry in order to produce an approach to any occasion that 'touches all the bases', that refuses to leave some dimension untouched or ignored, that honors all of the important aspects of holons in all of their richness and fullness. [4]

While not everyone will favour Wilber's nomenclature (eg, Kosmos) his account provides access to the essentials of a powerful 'meta framework' for futures enquiry and

practice. For example, by applying the IOS to FS per se we can see both where it has been deficient and also identify new areas where it can continue to expand and develop.

As noted, the four general approaches to futures enquiry mentioned above can be correlated with the pre-conventional, conventional and post-conventional waves of existence. This clearly reflects the progress of successive traditions of enquiry. Next, with the sole exception of cognitive development, it is evident that the lines and streams that help to characterize human existence have not been seen as significant within FS. Clearly this needs to change and a much more broad examination of the role(s) of different lines and streams needs to be undertaken. What, for example, are the roles of moral and interpersonal lines?

The types of ways of knowing have been part and parcel of critical and epistemological futures work for some time. But in the light of the above it seems obvious that they need to be integrated into all forms of futures enquiry. They cannot be dismissed as marginal and esoteric but, rather, as central and increasingly accessible. Much the same applies to the issue of states of awareness and ways of knowing in general. At present there is, as Joseph Voros points out, a strong tendency toward what is termed ‘state absolutism’, ie, to the privileging of normal waking states. Yet it now becomes clear that the worlds of reference evoked by different states powerfully affect the nature and conduct of futures work across the board. (For example, the ‘subtle realm’, as accessed through images and visions, is perhaps both misunderstood and marginally employed in this context at present.)

Overall, the implication of this approach for futures enquiry is that, with a much richer view of reality, the field can move on beyond its earlier limitations. It can take the next steps toward the world-spanning meta-discipline that it always aspired to be. We turn now to another of those steps.

Integral methodological pluralism

There are many aspects of this methodology that must be passed over in favour of original accounts. What needs to be emphasized here, however, are some of the ways that the structural differences of the four quadrants necessarily involve, and incorporate, different modes of enquiry. Some of these are summarized in Figure 1. Here it can be seen that many hitherto separate lines and forms of enquiry can be brought into alignment. In the UR quadrant, for example, we see the work of empiricism, behaviourism and positivism. These evoke what Wilber calls ‘the third-person dimensions of being-in-the-world’. Each of these forms of enquiry makes sense in its own terms. Difficulties arise when partial truths from these domains are ‘read upon’ other areas where they do symbolic violence to quite different truths. For example a purely empirical and behaviourist approach to education would, and often does, empty it of much of its human and social significance.

As has been emphasized before, UL enquiry concerns the unique inner world of each individual. Indeed, it is here that many of the previously mentioned structures arise: lines, streams, states and so on. Disciplines involved here include introspection, psychology and phenomenology. Understood and used correctly they 'activate' the first-person dimensions of our existence. It is here that the detailed character of self-understanding, self-awareness, is involved in virtually every activity that human beings engage in. Or to put it more precisely, what people *can* perceive and understand proceeds directly from the level of subjective development of each individual agent. This reminds us of the notion of 'adequateo', an idea first articulated by the Greek philosopher Plotinus and much later popularized by Fritz Schumacher. [5] What this means, in essence, is that there must be a capacity within the knower that is adequate to that which is to be known. This principle obviously has wide implications for all fields, including FS.

LR enquiry concerns the objective features of the external world. It reminds us that we are embedded in webs of external physical relationships and systems. Indeed, systems thinking, along with fields such as structural functionalism (in sociology), geology, urban geography and the ecological sciences are a few of the many that are called into play here. They inform us about the nature and operation of the wider physical world. The rich inner worlds of people and cultures are all-but invisible here. Rather we see an overlapping panorama of physical phenomena that, in fact, forms the physical basis, the infrastructure, of this and any other civilization. In Wilber's terms, enquiry in this non-human domain reveals the 'third-person plural' aspects of existence.

Finally LL enquiry embraces the shared inner dimensions of social and cultural life. This is the realm of language, culture, tradition, disciplines and the like. It is illuminated by fields such as hermeneutics (the art and science of interpretation), collaborative enquiry, action research and certain forms of anthropology, each of which focuses on some aspect or other of the human intersubjective realm. One could say that the LL is the ground from which UL interpretations arise. In Wilber's terms such forms of enquiry illuminate both 'second-person' and 'first-person plural' aspects of existence.

Within each of these domains are found appropriate truth criteria or what Wilber calls 'selection pressures'. That is, forms of knowledge adjudication that allow qualified and properly equipped practitioners to tell truth from falsity and good work from bad. A sample of these criteria is given in Figure 2. In the UL, for example, what matters most is *truthfulness*, the ability to register the internal world accurately. In the UR the key is *truth*, the ability to register and respond to the external world accurately. In the LL what counts here is *meaning*, or *justness*, the ability to negotiate a cultural milieu and to enact shared ways of knowing and being. Finally in the LR the key is that of *functional fit* with the natural and man-made systems that support life in general.

These categories and distinctions form a basis for integral methodological pluralism. We now briefly consider the central issue of social legitimation and some implications for paradigm and other conflicts.

Conflict and legitimation

The question of social legitimation is a vital one in a futures context. In Wilber's terms *legitimacy* describes how well a worldview functions at a particular level and *authenticity* is a measure of its depth or height. In these terms 'a legitimation crisis, in the broadest sense, is a crisis of faith in the prevailing worldview and in the governing bodies representing that worldview.' [6] Until now social and cultural conflicts have often been seen rather simplistically and from limited viewpoints. With the help of the IOS and its all-level, all-quadrant (AQAL) matrix a far richer picture emerges. For example, it is often said that technological developments (LR) out-run social and cultural capacities (LL). But Wilber takes the argument several steps further. He writes:

> It is not that each society has a single monolithic technological mode and a single monolithic worldview, and that the two somehow have to match up. Rather, each society is a spectrum of AQAL actualities: there are individuals at every level of the spectrum of consciousness, at least up to the average level of that culture… And there are pockets of every mode of techno-production up to the leading edge, even in industrial societies…

He then adds:

> In the modern West, the major culture wars involve not just traditional versus modern versus postmodern values, but techno-economic modes of farming, industrialization , and informational sectors, with worldviews of mythic, rational, and pluralistic… In the non-Western world, the major conflicts are between tribal-foraging and mythic-agrarian at war with modern-industrial and postmodern-pluralistic modes. [7]

Hence, ' the socio-cultural tensions (and legitimation crises) span the spectrum, with various cultures and sub-cultures in various mixtures of stable and unstable mesh'. [8] This means that paradigm and culture wars are neither as clear nor as monolithic as they may once have appeared. They involve complex, cross-cutting 'depth' differences (authenticity) related to waves and stages of cultural development as well as tensions across the four quadrants (legitimacy).

This analysis clearly has the potential to illuminate paradigm issues within futures contexts as well as wider conflicts now writ large around the world. The distinctions made previously regarding different approaches to futures work can now be further elaborated. The forecasting paradigm of early American futurism was clearly emergent from rational/intellectual thinking in the UL quadrant. It was expressed through a culture of capitalist expansionism and libertarian freedom (LL) and mapped the dynamics of change in the external (LR) world. At its best the move toward scenario planning, with its world of options and alternatives, drew on higher order capacities in the UL quadrant, perhaps to what has been termed the 'integral / aperspectival' level. While in practice scenario building tended to remain strongly linked with business interests in the LL it could also imagine alternatives to them. It also saw people as active participants in the

process, both in terms of values and choices (UL) as well as actions (UR). Finally scenarios are embodiments of different LR worlds.

Critical futures work pushed the boundaries further still. It intuited sources of understanding and inspiration beyond rational cognitive capacity in the UL quadrant and drew upon transpersonal and other insights available via extended awareness (eventually tending toward what Wilber calls 'vision logic'). Its focus on social construction suggested a new balance between human agency in the LH quadrants and the products of that agency in the RH quadrants. Hence, from this viewpoint, 'the main game' in futures work shifted from a near-exclusive preoccupation with externals to processes of 'meaning making' and self-constitution. It is for such reasons that friction sometimes arose between different camps. So long as those tensions were expressed in monolithic terms such as 'Europe' and 'America', or 'critical' and 'empirical', there was really no solution. But, when viewed from an AQAL perspective different approaches can each be seen to occupy their own place on the wider integral map. As Wilber has frequently pointed out, everyone has part of the truth. He writes:

> It is not that there is one level of reality, and … other views are all primitive and incorrect versions of that one level. Each of those views is a correct view of a lower but fundamentally important level of reality… The notion of development allows us to recognize nested truths, not primitive superstitions. [9]

Overall, therefore, the IOS and an all-quadrant, all-level view provide new tools for futures enquiry and bring new definition to what is being attempted. The fact is that people speak from different positions on the AQAL map. They bring different cultural assumptions from contexts that stand in a *developmental* relationship to each other, not a static horizontal one. Thus most centrally *the IOS focuses attention on the developmental level of the observer*. As the discussion of pre-conventional, conventional and post-conventional development suggests, a whole 'way of seeing' and modus operandi is involved. And this is, perhaps, the very simplest scheme of 'vertical' differentiation available. Many have found the Spiral Dynamics model (based on the prior work of Graves) useful. Peter Hayward has drawn on Loevinger's developmental stages to make a similar point. [10]

Greater clarity can therefore be brought to bear on real world problems as well on the disciplines (such as FS) that have developed to study and attempt to resolve them. It turns out that the focus on 'solving' what are seen as purely 'external' problems is not merely mis-conceived, it is also fundamentally misleading. For example, 'most of the nightmares of the twentieth century-from Auschwitz to the Gulag – which have been wrongly blamed on modernity, are actually the product of pre-modern consciousness attaining modern weapons.' [11] World problems cannot be solved without reference to the developmental structures that created them in the first place. Thus problems of famine, war, environmental degradation etc refer directly back to questions of interior human and social development. Or as Wilber puts it 'an increase in exterior or social development

can only be sustained with a corresponding increase in interior development in consciousness and culture'. [12]

Deep patterns and the 'calculus of uncomfort'

In Wilber's account future potentials in each of the quadrants unfold from previous structures. The deep patterns of higher waves of consciousness are, even now, being formed. Nothing is pre-given. Everything is in a state of emergence. It 'tetra evolves' from the deep patterns of the past and present, moment by moment. Thus inescapable novelty will always defeat rational attempts to 'capture' the future through forecasts, models, trend analysis and the like. Enquiry into future potentials is truly multi-level and multi-disciplinary, as the following passage suggests.

> Future potentials…includes inquiry into the frothy edge of today's evolutionary unfolding; inquiry into events that are just emerging; inquiry into the limitless number of different forms of translation that arise moment to moment; inquiry into the transcendental components of any prehension; inquiry into realities that are co-created by the mode of enquiry itself; inquiry into higher states that are already present as general realms – such as waking, dreaming, sleeping – but have not yet emerged at large and take on specific forms as Kosmic habits and specific stages; and enquiry into any items that might be called involuntary givens, or realities that seem to be present from the very start of evolution. [13]

Clearly this is demanding work that challenges the self-understanding, and the capacity, of everyone involved. It is always useful to recall that the essence of this 'integral metatheory' is simply that 'everyone is right'. This leads to three principles: those of nonexclusion, unfoldment and enactment. Very briefly, nonexclusion suggests that 'we can accept the valid truth claims … insofar as they make statements about the existence of their own enacted and disclosed phenomena, but not when they make statements about the existence of phenomena enacted by other paradigms.' [14] Unfoldment refers to the fact that 'all paradigms … are in themselves true and adequate; but some paradigms can be more encompassing, more inclusive, more holistic than others… They are true but partial.' [15] This 'display of unfoldment' transcends and includes all that went before. This means that no one truth is completely wrong. It may be partial but, in its own frame, it remains true. Therefore what is at stake is 'relative adequacy'.

The final principle is that of enactment. What this means is simply that 'phenomena are enacted, brought forth, disclosed, and illumined by a series of behaviours of a perceiving subject.' [16] Hence, 'phenomena brought forth by various types of human enquiry will be different depending on the quadrants, levels, lines, states and types of the subjects bringing forth the phenomena.' [17] One implication is that what any of us perceive arises from the character of enacted behaviours that we have mastered, not from objectively observed entities in the world. Another is that phenomena from different fields that have often been considered to be 'incommensurable' can in fact be compared *if* those involved have acquired competence in both. In both cases there is a great deal of 'us' (UL) involved.

It is not surprising that, when confronted with the magnitude of what is being proposed, one often senses a kind of psychic backlash. Wilber is keenly aware of this and refers to it as the 'calculus of uncomfort'. The fact is that although 'everyone is right' to some degree, some truths are 'more right' than others and that difference can be felt very deeply. Wilber suggests that 'the principle of unfoldment can help (because) it is basically a calculus for reducing the … torment inflicted by categorically unavoidable ranking.' [18] He then concludes that 'we must forgive each other our arising, for our existence always torments others. The golden rule in the midst of this mutual misery has always been, not to do no harm, but as little as possible; and not to love one another, but as much as you can.' [19]

From theory to integral futures practice

An integral framework

An integral framework recognizes the complexity of systems, contexts and interconnected webs of awareness and activity. These all influence the behaviour of individuals and groups. They also shape structures and events in the physical, social and psychological worlds. The framework incorporates a developmental perspective that recognizes individual and collective access to different structures of consciousness. Thus human development is seen as multidimensional, following interrelated, discoverable, and integrated flows and forms. In this view there are specific ways of understanding and working with different dimensions of development, including how these different dimensions (such as 'streams' or 'lines') interact.

In this perspective successful problem solving actively acknowledges phenomena from each of the four quadrants. Hence they include:

- the specific ways that stakeholders construct meaning and significance;
- culturally derived perspectives, rules and systems of meaning;
- the social infrastructure, including people's concrete skills, behaviours and actions; and
- the nature and dynamics of the relevant societal structures and systems.

To be successful integral futures practitioners will seek to understand the nature, structure and limitations of their own perspective. They will also become proficient in exploring different perspectives in order to find approaches that are appropriate to different situations. Finally they will understand and grasp the nature of the relationships between different perspectives. They will avoid being attached to any single view and be open to a wide range of perspectives and interpretations. [20]

Integral futures work

What broad conclusions can be drawn from the above? As we have seen the 'map' available to practitioners has become broader, deeper and more complex. It will therefore take longer to understand and master then previously. Not everyone will be willing to accept the challenge. Nor will everyone will want to take on board the assumptions underlying an AQAL view. Some react against it seeing not a structure for enlightened practice but a totalizing scheme that they reject as oppressive and unwelcome.

Those to choose to train for integral foresight practice will obviously realize that it involves much more than old-fashioned cognitive and operational mastery. Clearly more is demanded of the practitioner in personal terms than ever before. It is still too early to say exactly what features of the AQAL matrix will serve to qualify a person for integral foresight practice. But, in any event, questions of professional standards will certainly arise in this context. It must be expected that not everyone will be ready or willing to turn the clear light of this penetrating analysis upon themselves and fully consider the implications.

On the other hand developments in this area constitute both a challenge to conventional futures orthodoxy and an opportunity to move forward into challenging new territory. As Joseph Voros notes, integral futures is an approach to Futures Studies that 'makes use of a meta-paradigmatic perspective. (It)… attempts to take the broadest possible view of the human knowledge quest, and of how this knowledge can be used to generate interpretive frameworks to help us understand what potential futures may lie ahead.' He adds, 'because Futures Studies is, by its very nature, a broadly inter-, trans-, multi-, and meta-disciplinary activity, it is well suited to the conscious use of a more inclusive and integral frameworks'. [21] He concludes that:

> Integral Futures, thus, does not take a singular perspective; rather it recognizes a plurality of perspectives. It is not confined to a single tool or methodology; rather it is aware of the existence of an entire (indeed, infinite) tool kit. It recognizes that there are many ways of knowing – many paradigms, practices and methodologies of knowledge seeking – and that no single paradigm can be assigned pre-eminence… Integral Futures Studies welcomes, embraces and values all careful and sincere approaches to knowledge-seeking in all spheres of human activity to which they are both appropriate and adequate – including analytical rationality, intuitive insight and spiritual inspiration. [22]

What is perhaps most new and innovative about the perspective is the way it sheds new light upon the role of human development and awareness. What is commonly seen as occurring 'out there' in the world is conditioned by what is going on 'in here' in our own inner world of reference. To again quote Voros, 'ontology and epistemology - being and knowing, existing and thinking - are merely two sides of the same coin'. He adds, 'an integral approach to Futures Studies takes this simple but profound recognition as central

to its program for understanding how the past was laid down, how the present came to be, and what futures may yet come to pass'. [23]

Integral futures work therefore reaches across previously separate realms. It regards developments in the LR with the 'eye' of perception that it *consciously* adopts in the UL. It will participate in shared social processes in the LL and take due note of the interobjective realities in the UR. In other words the invitation to consider integral futures work is an invitation to move and act in a deeper, richer and infinitely more subtly interconnected world.

Notes

1. For a fine overview, see J. Ramos, *From critique to cultural recovery: critical futures studies and causal layered analysis*, AFI Monograph # 3, Australian Foresight Institute, Melbourne, 2003.
2. Notable exceptions have been W. Harman, *Global Mind Change*, Knowledge Systems, Indianapolis, 1988. Also W. Ziegler, *Ways of Enspiriting*, FIA International, Denver, 1994. Also see K. Wilber, *Integral Psychology*, Shambhala, Colorado, 2000.
3. K. Wilber, Excerpt A, from vol 2 of *The Kosmos Trilogy*, 2002, p 11.
4. K. Wilber, Excerpt B, *The many ways we touch*, 2002, p 25.
5. E. F. Schumacher, *A Guide for the Perplexed*, Cape, London, 1997.
6. Wilber op cit 2002 (a) p 6.
7. Ibid p 19.
8. Ibid p 19.
9. K. Wilber, *A Theory of Everything*, Shambhala, Colorado, 2000, p 112.
10. D. Beck and C. Cowan, Sp*iral Dynamics*, Blackwell, Maldon, Mass, 1996. P. Hayward, Resolving the moral impediments to foresight action, forthcoming, Foresight 6, 1, 2003.
11. Wilber op cit 2002 (a) p 25.
12. Ibid p 24.
13. Ibid p 35.
14. Wilber op cit 2002 (b) p 11.
15. Ibid p 15.
16. Wilber op cit 2002 (a) p 17.
17. Wilber op cit 2002 (b) p 18.
18. Ibid p 23.
19. Ibid p 29.
20. Parts of this account are loosely based on a summary written by T. Jordan and J. Turner and summarised in the Post-Conventional-Politics discussion group on Yahoo!, post-con-pol (http://groups.yahoo.com/search?query=post-con-pol) Accessed 12th January 2003.
21. J. Voros, AFI web site http://www.swin.edu.au/afi accessed 1st Feb 2003
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.

Prof. Richard Alan Slaughter

Richard A. Slaughter is Foundation Professor of Foresight at Swinburne University of Technology in Melbourne, Australia. He is a consulting Foresight practitioner who has worked with a wide range of organizations in many countries and at all educational levels. He completed a PhD in Futures Studies at the University of Lancaster in 1982. He has since built a solid international reputation through futures scholarship, educational innovation, strategic foresight and the identification of a knowledge base for futures studies. He is a fellow of the World Futures Studies Federation (WFSF) and a professional member of the World Future Society. In 1997 he was elected to the executive council of the WFSF. In 2001 he was elected president.

This paper is drawn from chapter 11 of *Futures Beyond Dystopia – Creating Social Foresight*, Routledge, London, forthcoming November 2003.

Figure 11.1 Integral Methodological Pluralism:

Methods of Enquiry

Introspection **Psychology** **Phenomenology**	**Empiricism** **Behaviourism** **Positivism**
Hermeneutics **Collaborative enquiry** **Action research** **Anthropology**	**Ecological sciences** **Geography** **Systems theory** **Structural functionalism**

Figure 11.2 Types of Selection Pressures

Truthfulness **Registers internal world accurately**	**Truth** **Registers external world accurately**
Meaning/Justness **Negotiates internal cultural milieu**	**Functional Fit** **Fit with communal/social system**