(This comment is in relation to "Though AQAL Eyes - Part 1" by Mark Edwards on Integral World).

Peter Collins· Nov 13, 2020

Mark,

Congratulations on a truly excellent article which should be required reading for anyone truly concerned with holonic theory.

You have indeed identified so many fundamental problems with the Wilber-Hofman typology of holons (which anyone following your arguments will surely realise is untenable).

So where William Blake could see a world in a grain of sand, Wilber and Hofman now find an insentient heap!

What gives interiority to holons is simply their spiritual essence. In this sense all holons whether in an individual or social context are clearly sentient.

The deeper issue however as to why this misleading division as between sentient and insentient holons has arisen is due to the very definition of a holon i.e. as a whole that is part of another whole. So its very wholeness is immediately identified with its individual (rather than social nature).

Quite amazingly the complementary notion of a holon i.e. as a part that is whole (in the context) of other parts is to all intents and purposes completely ignored which then leads to a considerable lack of balance and consistency with respect to subsequent developmental findings.

A true integral theory of holons can only emerge when its dynamic complementary nature both with respect to its interior/exterior and whole/part nature is properly recognised.

What we have at present is the application of limited asymmetrical notions of development (properly suited for a differentiated understanding) in the misleading attempt to provide a consistent integral account of development.

In this fundamental respect, therefore we do not yet have an integral theory. So in this crucial respect, I am not in agreement with you Mark!