(The following discussion on Integral World is in relation to "The Third Eye Fallacy" by David Lane)

cz· Oct 4, 2020

If you reframe the statement thusly . . . :

Lilly argued for their distinct objectivity [in every case] whereas Feynman dismissed them as hallucinations that [in every instance] had no real import.

. . . you see that both are equally wrong/right.

Anonymous· Oct 5, 2020

@JK, much appreciation for your courage to call out the dangers of the fundamentalist method of discourse. I thank my lucky stars that I was able to extricate myself from the grip of such a system after 24 years of immersion. And bravo to David for this essay.

JK· Oct 5, 2020

I think you are too kind to Brad, DL, and not recognizing how his method of discourse can be very harmful to many people without your level of intellectual maturity and discriminating judgment by locking them into a dogmatic system from which it can be very difficult to extract oneself once caught up in it. It's not just a stimulating play of ideas for many but a quite emotionally fraught salvo fix schema that is not necessarily harmless (like all fundamentalisms). For some one barely escapes with one's life.

JK· Oct 5, 2020
FWIW "salvo fix" should read "salvific".

David Christopher Lane· Oct 5, 2020
Hi JK,

You make an astute point when you write, "locking them into a dogmatic system from which it can e bvery difficult to extract oneself once caught up in it." Yes, I have seen this kind of thinking in almost every spiritual tradition I have encountered, including my own. It is dangerous since we give up too much sometimes.... including our own authority and best judgment.

thanks!

Joseph Dillard· Oct 5, 2020

Hi David.

Another thoughtful, helpful essay on a core issue for anyone interested in Integral anything. I have attempted to make some of the some points in a recent essay, "Is Integral Spiritual?" Which argues that the terms "spirit," "spiritual" and "spirituality" cause more problems for Integral than they solve. But you make many of the same points, but much better than I do! Thank you!

Peter Collins· Oct 6, 2020

It was a pleasure to read such a well written article and I found myself in general agreement with most of the points raised.

My chief misgiving however is not with what the article states but rather in one very important context what it omits to state.

In discussing the three eyes i.e. eye of flesh, eye of mind and eye of contemplation, David makes the valid point that these are not separate and distinct modalities. However with respect to science, he mentions only the first two eyes of flesh (empiricism) and mind (rationality). However, for completion he should perhaps also have included the third eye of contemplation (intuition). So scientific understanding therefore entails empirical, rational and intuitive modes corresponding to the three eyes.

In a recent essay, I was at pains to demonstrate how, as used in science, intuition is inherently of a spiritual nature and the basis of all holistic type understanding. Though it is especially relevant where original scientific work is concerned, even at a lesser level it is intrinsic to all science, providing the means to properly distinguish the qualitative nature of wholes from the quantitative nature of parts.

The reason why I see David's omission of the eye of contemplation (in a scientific context), whether deliberate or otherwise as significant, can be demonstrated with reference to his interpretation of Darwinian evolution which strikes me as somewhat reduced in nature.

For example in a recent essay in replying to John White he states:
Ironically, White's very thesis—that "God's intelligent will is behind life's complexity and emergence" is (sorry for the bad pun) the very antithesis of Darwinian evolution, since the latter's explanatory power is derived by showing how purely physical forces can and do give rise to increased complexity within certain environmental niches."

But of course, if we properly allow for the three eyes in interpretation then we cannot speak of Darwinian evolution in terms of purely physical forces.

Now we could attempt to explain such evolution in the most reduced fashion as relating to just the empirical eye of flesh.

Then we could provide a more refined – though still reduced – interpretation combining the eyes of flesh (empiricism) and mind (reason) by explaining Darwin's theory as a rational interpretation of empirical reality.

This is important as it reminds us that objective reality does not exist in itself and that scientific understanding entails the relationship between a particular type of (internal) mental interpretation and (external) material reality. So when the interpretation changes the observed world likewise changes.

But, because of an assumed correspondence between mental interpretation and empirical facts, scientists would still view reality here in strictly material terms.

However once one additionally includes the eye of contemplation through spiritual intuition, it is no longer tenable to interpret reality in a strictly material fashion.

And this is where I would have considerable problems with David's attempts to explain Darwinian evolution (with its associated natural selection principle) in a reduced fashion as if it thereby somehow excludes the need for a spiritual dimension.

Though I would go some way in accepting David's assertion of the value of reduced thinking as an important means of discovery, at some stage I would then see it as necessary to integrate such findings in a manner that can properly incorporate the spiritual eye of contemplation.
And this patently has not yet been achieved with respect to the accepted scientific interpretation of Darwinian evolution.

It seems to me a double problem exists here. Coming from above, as it were, those such as Brad Reynolds and John White on this site who accept the primacy of the spiritual worldview, are experiencing difficulties in establishing an acceptable interface with which to communicate this dimension in scientific discourse. And I believe they are expressing a valid concern as the spiritual dimension should indeed be included.

However coming from the below, scientists equally are experiencing a significant problem in recognising the relevance of the spiritual dimension, especially for example where the principle of natural selection is concerned.

And in this respect, David who clearly does recognise in other respects the importance of spirit, seemingly is happy to side with the "materialists" when discussing evolution.

In an attempt to avoid such problems from both directions, I have long believed that a different type of language other than the use of terms such as God, religion, the Divine or spirit-in-action is required when addressing the problem. It seems to me that the key issue here is the nature of holistic as opposed to analytic type appreciation.

Alternatively this can be phrased as the nature of qualitative as opposed to quantitative appreciation or indeed the nature of integration as opposed to

differentiation and at its very simplest the nature of interdependence as opposed to independence.

Coming from the integral viewpoint, the use of this more neutral language might prove acceptable in dialogue with practising scientists. And in then eventually accepting the relevance of holistic notions the most agnostic scientist might be led to see how a spiritual dimension pervades all reality.

With a different orientation and language of communication, integral studies could play a significant role in clarifying the reduced nature of current science (while also recognising its great practical value).

Also integral studies could be to the forefront in developing a full spectrum approach to science (and mathematics) as I have been attempting in my recent articles. And I might add that new types of science, based on the more advanced bands of the spectrum, are now of urgent significance for our age.

However perhaps because of undue attachment to Wilberian notions, which do not satisfactorily address the issue, little or no progress has yet been made by the integral community in this critically important endeavour.

Frank· Oct 8, 2020
@Peter Collins,

To reiterate a point I made earlier: what if it was Wallace's intuition that it takes God to create human beings, but it was Darwin's intuition that it doesn't? And how can we decide which view is more true? By using our intuition?

I think it is a slippery slope to go from holistic = intuitive = spiritual = transcendent = divine.

Peter Collins· Oct 10, 2020

Frank,

I dealt in part with this in the reply to your comments in response to my first article. However as it is a very interesting point it is worth addressing in more detail.

Though everyone possesses both rational and intuitive capacities, it would certainly appear to me that both Matthew and Wallace were inherently more intuitive than Darwin and thereby better attuned to accepting a spiritual explanation of reality.

Though Matthew ruled out direct divine intervention in evolution, he would have accepted scientific laws as God given.

Then Wallace as we know did subsequently allow for a significant degree of direct intervention by God.

I would agree that Darwin's scientific investigations increasingly led him to a strictly materialist explanation of evolution. However, even here the position is not completely clear. Though agnostic, Darwin maintained that even in his most extreme moments he was never led to deny the existence of God.

So this begs the question as to what role, if any, would he have allowed for God. For example, did he believe that fundamental physical laws are already inherent in matter? And if so how would he have explained this important fact?

Though not a historian of ideas, I imagine that he had no definite position on the issue. He was keenly aware that his materialist interpretation of evolution through natural selection would come into sharp conflict with the accepted religious explanations of the time (which he no longer accepted). So his hands were already more than full dealing with this problem.

However there is a subtler issue here that needs addressing which is the distinctive nature of intuition as opposed to reason.

I would strongly contend, as in my recent reply to David, that intuition is of an inherent spiritual nature.

Now if we want to appreciate what this fully developed intuitive capacity entails, we need to look at the more advanced contemplative levels of awareness where the very notion of wholeness is understood in a qualitatively distinct manner, which reveals its intrinsic spiritual nature.

So again we can have transcendent wholeness which is seen as going beyond any notion of material phenomena (as quantitative parts) and the complementary aspect of immanent wholeness which is seen as already spiritually inherent within each individual part (and thereby not confused with its quantitative nature).

Andrew Wiles' revelation in solving Fermat's Last Theorem represents a good example of transcendent wholeness (even though he would probably not have defined it in this manner).

One need not be a religious contemplative in the accepted sense, to have an exalted spiritual experience of the ineffable whole nature of reality. However one who is trained in contemplative awareness is likely to experience this on a more regular sustained basis.

From my perspective such a qualitative experience of wholeness is clearly holistic; it is also spiritual in an intuitive manner. And it can be transcendent or immanent (and even simultaneously both at a more advanced level of awareness).

I would have some reservations, as you do, in referring to it as divine and indeed even accept to a degree the point that all the terms that you list, which would be equivalent from my standpoint, might seem otherwise from another person's perspective.

Now someone who is religious in the conventional sense would have no difficulty in considering such an experience as divine. However an agnostic or indeed atheist could have a deep spiritual experience, while perhaps attempting to express it in a very different manner.

And David's article, which has already generated much favourable comment, highlights this point very well.

Now I think it best in discussing these issues to speak from the perspective with which one most readily identifies, while letting others in turn do the same from their perspectives. Then hopefully in this process we can all learn something valuable from each other.

And what I would strongly maintain is that intuition relates to a qualitatively distinct holistic manner of understanding that ultimately is purely spiritual in nature. Furthermore such intuition – even when of an undeveloped nature – is necessary to properly distinguish whole from part notions.

Therefore scientific materialism in all its shapes and forms is based on the reduced notion that (qualitative) wholes, in every context, can be formally identified as (quantitative) parts. And this is true of Darwinian evolution, which thereby creates the impression that a strictly material interpretation suffices.

However, even when one attempts to deny it, the intuitive spiritual aspect is always involved in understanding. As without it, quite simply we would be unable to distinguish wholes from parts.

Just as there is a necessary distinction in understanding as between wholes and parts, in a corresponding external manner this equally applies in objective terms to all nature.

In other words interpretation of the natural world always entails both material and spiritual aspects, which thereby includes evolution.

Now science has spent the last 450 years attempting to differentiate itself from mythical notions. Therefore I would fully understand the reluctance of scientists to embrace spiritual terminology that they might equate as an attempt to restore unacceptable religious notions.

Thus I would favour a more neutral approach to discussion, concentrating on the distinction between quantitative and qualitative meaning and the relationship of these two aspects in turn to analytic and holistic type understanding respectively.

Then proceeding in this manner, science might eventually be led to accept two complementary aspects of interpretation i.e. analytic and holistic, rather than the sole analytic aspect that is currently the case.

Ultimately this would lead to the restoration of a spiritual worldview in science related directly to our interpretation of reality, where we literally see ourselves as co-creators, with everything else that exists, of the universe we inhabit. Though in a sense this would amount to a restoration of God within science, it would be a very different God indeed from what was accepted before the modern scientific era.

In direct answer to your original question Frank, in a valid sense I would say that Matthew and Darwin were to a degree both correct.
Because he would have interpreted physical laws as built by God into creation, Matthew would have seen natural selection as consistent with this viewpoint.

Meanwhile Darwin was not attempting to deny the existence of God as such, but rather attempting to get rid of what he saw as mythical notions of God as the designer in evolution.

However insofar as our understanding of the God notion undergoes continual change, both views could be likewise considered as representing limited aspects of the emerging thinking of the times.

What is true to one might seem quite different to a later generation. I would suspect for example that a far more nuanced interpretation of natural selection, which properly allows for a spiritual aspect, will be accepted by future generations.
So with regards to scientific truth, as everything in life, there are no absolute answers.

David Christopher Lane· Oct 6, 2020
Hi Peter,

I very much liked your post. I quite agree with you that intuition is definitely part and parcel of being a good scientist. However, I don't regard intuition has being part of what is generally regarded as the "spiritual" or "contemplative" eye, though I certainly can understand how one may view such that way.

I think when we have intuitions or hunches that often come unexpectedly, I see them as a synthesis of mental operations not divorced from rationality/empiricism. In this context, I view intuition as a higher order confluence of different simulations played out consciously and unconsciously in our mind. Suggestive analyses along these lines comes from a few different quarters. As Tobias Gertensberg and Joshua Tenenbaum, M.I.T. elaborate in an interesting paper,

"Focusing on people's intuitive theory of physics and psychology, we have shown how people's causal judgments can be understood in terms of counterfactual contrasts defined over their intuitive understanding of the domain. Conceptualizing causal judgments in this way provides a bridge between process and dependency accounts of

causation. Our proposed counterfactual simulation model accurately captures people's causal judgments about colliding billiard balls for a host of different situations, including interactions between two and three billiard balls with additional objects such as bricks. People's inferences about another agent's goals or intentions can be explained by assuming that we have an intuitive theory that others plan and make decisions in a rational manner. The process of mental simulation plays a central role in this framework (Barsalou, 2009; Hegarty, 1992; Hegarty, 2004; Johnson-Laird & Khemlani, this volume; Kahneman & Tversky, 1982; Wells & Gavanski, 1989; Yates et al., 1988). It provides the glue between people's abstract intuitive theories and the concrete inferences that are supported in a given situation through conditioning on what was observed (Battaglia et al., 2013) and imagining how things might have turned out differently (Gerstenberg et al., 2012; Gerstenberg, Goodman, et al., 2014, 2015). In the domain of intuitive physics, we have seen that people's predictions are consistent with a noisy Newtonian framework that captures people's uncertainty by assuming that our mental simulations are guided by the laws of physics but that we are often uncertain about some aspects of the situation. Future research needs to study the process of mental simulation more closely and investigate what determines the quality and resolution of people's mental simulations (Crespi et al., 2012; Hamrick & Griffiths, 2014; Hamrick et al., 2015; Marcus & Davis, 2013; Schwartz & Black, 1996; Smith, Dechter, et al., 2013)."

So, in terms of explaining evolution, I would quite agree that Darwin and Wallace and certainly anyone working in the field today does indeed use their intuitions at various times and often they play out successfully. But, of course, these need to be tested and grounded in the empirical arena for verification to see how well they contain predictive models that others can ascertain.

But I don't see such intuition as being part of a "third eye" but as a deep aspect of cognition which relies on a variety of simulations or counter-factuals that allow one to see a particular problem in a different light.

Peter, I particularly liked your last few paragraphs since they contain a deep insight into the problem when you point out how we may be hampered by linguistics and in particular a language too often employing Wilberian terminology. I think you are right on the mark here and I wonder if Ludwig Wittgenstein and John Searle would nod their heads in agreement. What you write here is wise indeed,

"Perhaps because of undue attachment to Wilberian notions, which do not satisfactorily address the issue, little or no progress has yet been made by the integral community in this critically important endeavour."

Excellent points. I appreciate the input.

Peter Collins· Oct 8, 2020

I appreciate David's cordial response. And this is what I believe good debate should be about, where two people coming from differing perspectives coherently articulate

their respective viewpoints, hopefully leading in both cases to greater clarity with respect to the issues under discussion.

In this spirit I will attempt to respond now to the points that he has made.

While admitting that he sees intuition as part and parcel of being a good scientist David maintains that he does not see it as related to the "spiritual" or "contemplative" eye.

I must say I find this contention very surprising.

Newton and Einstein are perhaps the best examples we have of "good scientists" and it is quite clear in both cases that their intuitions related directly to the "spiritual" or "contemplative" eye.
Though not adopting orthodox religious beliefs, Newton devoted a considerable amount of time and energy to biblical interpretation, which arguably he considered of even greater importance than his scientific discoveries. So there is little doubt that he would certainly have seen his intuitions as directly coming from God (which is spiritual in anyone's language).

Likewise Einstein, though not a believer in the conventional sense, was very much alive to the true mystery of reality. His greatest intuitions therefore came from the deep manner in which he was able to contemplate the nature of the universe.
He himself has left us many quotes showing appreciation of the spiritual nature of his intuitions. I even used one of these quotes to highlight the first article in my recent scientific trilogy.

It might also be helpful in this regard with respect to Andrew Wiles – who I also referred to in that article – to relate his own words when speaking in a TV documentary about the insight that enabled him to solve Fermat's Last Theorem.

"In September I was sitting at this task when suddenly, totally unexpectedly I had this incredible revelation. It was the most important moment of my working life. It was so indescribably beautiful, so simple, so elegant, I just stared in disbelief."

Now I know nothing regarding Andrew Wiles' religious beliefs but this represents a vivid account of a life changing spiritual experience which transcended conventional mathematical notions of truth. In an earlier attempt to film this moment he broke down with emotion after continuing with the words nothing will …In all probability he intended to say something on the lines that nothing ever in his life will match this experience.

I have mentioned Newton, Einstein and Andrew Wiles in this regard. To illustrate this point further I will mention just two more.

The first is the Irish physicist William Rowan Hamilton, who discovered quarternions (a 4-dimensional number system that is very important in quantum mechanics). He came from my home town of Dublin and the year of his discovery 1843, marks him

therefore as a contemporary of Matthew, Darwin and Wallace. Hamilton described the discovery of his famous quaternions equation in a letter later written to his son in the following words:

“Although your mother talked with me now and then, yet an undercurrent of thought was going on in my mind, which gave at last a result, whereof it is not too much to say that I felt at once an importance. An electric current seemed to close; and a spark flashed forth, the herald (as I foresaw, immediately) of many long years to come of definitely directed thought and work . . . Nor could I resist the impulse—unphilosophical as it may have been—to cut with a knife on a stone of Brougham Bridge as we passed it, the fundamental formula”

Sadly the inscription on that stone has long since been removed.

This was clearly a defining moment for Hamilton as the letter was written some 20 years after the original discovery. In fact his very description reminds me of the famous conversion of St. Paul as if he had been struck by interior lightning.
We also see clearly here the holistic nature of intuition which is instantaneous in the present moment (because of its inherent spiritual nature) as opposed to analytic type investigation which takes place in a phenomenal framework of space and time. So Hamilton could holistically discover in an instant a key truth that what would then engage him analytically over the next 20 years.

The other relates to Ramanujan who was active in the early part of the 20th century and though living a short life was undoubtedly one of the most remarkable mathematicians who ever lived. He possessed the extraordinary ability to intuitively pluck mathematical results seemingly out of thin air.

Ramanujan famously stated:

"An equation for me has no meaning, unless it represents a thought of God."

So this directly represents the spiritual holistic aspect of mathematical understanding that I have been at pains to emphasise.
He credited all of his results (some 3900) to a female Hindu Goddess Mahalakshmi of Namakkal who inspired him in his dreams. Apparently scrolls of complicated formulae would then appear before his eyes.

This also interestingly points to intuition as representing the feminine as opposed to reason that represents the corresponding masculine principle.

However again the key point that I wish to make is that though admittedly of much lesser quality, this holistic aspect is necessarily also involved in the most mundane mathematical and scientific work, where it is not explicitly interpreted in a spiritual manner. It is then totally screened out from formal interpretation.

At its simplest, all scientific and mathematical phenomena possess both an analytic (quantitative) and holistic (qualitative) meaning. However in what represents the

essence of reductionism, the holistic aspect (which is of a very distinctive nature) is then formally reduced to the independent quantitative aspect. And this reductionism is then accepted without question by scientific and especially mathematical practitioners.

In the end it is irrelevant whether we use accepted spiritual terminology to describe its nature. The important requirement is to recognise its distinctive qualitative identity and this patently is not the case in present science.

David then goes on to describe his take on intuition which from my perspective only serves to obscure rather than reveal its essential nature.

Of course I have no difficulty in accepting that in practice “hunches or intuition come unexpectedly” or that they “represent a synthesis of mental operations not divorced from rationality/empiricism”.
However I am not sure that this says very much about the nature of intuition as opposed for example to empirical facts or reason.

In fact the very point that I would make. that because of an undue degree of specialisation of the empirical and rational eyes in our scientific based culture, latent intuitive capacity thereby remains undeveloped and undifferentiated from reason. Therefore it is frequently projected into experience in an immature instinctive manner where its contribution to understanding cannot be properly distinguished.

In this regard scientists could learn a great deal from the contemplative traditions, where this distinctive holistic intuitive capacity, which remains untrained and undeveloped at earlier levels of understanding, undergoes its own specialised development.

So from the transcendent spiritual perspective, where intuition is distinguished from reason, one gradually comes to realise that the whole (which is qualitatively different from the dualistic phenomena of nature) ultimately goes beyond any collective notion of quantitatively distinct parts in an infinite ineffable experience.
Equally from the complementary immanent perspective (where developed spiritual instinct is now clearly distinguished from its primitive counterpart) one equally comes to realise that the whole is already inherent in each individual part (again in an infinite ineffable manner).

So when Blake was enabled “to see a world in a grain of sand” this thereby indicated a deep awareness of the spiritually immanent aspect of the whole in an infinite manner (that was not confused in his understanding with the finite quantitative nature of a sand particle). And the very use of the word “see” as opposed to understand or know, points to its spiritual intuitive nature. So just as we see in empirical terms, phenomena through an exterior natural light, likewise we see interior phenomena through a spiritual light, thereby literally acquiring insight.

Of course ultimately this mature type of spiritual intuitive type awareness should be combined with rational and empirical appreciation (in what I refer to as radial

understanding) but for truly coherent integration, the development of both reason and intuition initially should undergo specialised training in a relatively distinct manner.

Thus though the advanced stages of contemplative development may not appear of immediate concern to scientists, yet they are very relevant in properly clarifying the nature of reductionism in science especially where the relationship between wholes and parts is concerned. And I believe that the integral community should be much more to the fore in properly discussing these issues with philosophical minded scientists.

So contemplative spiritual development can greatly help in the process of distinguishing the (infinite) qualitative nature of wholeness in both an individual and collective context, from the (finite) quantitative nature of separate parts.

And this distinction is certainly not made in the conventional interpretation of science, where the whole is continually reduced to parts in a merely quantitative manner.

Again this is directly relevant to interpretation of the scientific material view of evolution, which clearly fails to properly distinguish wholes from parts.

So once more, from my perspective, the notion that somehow science can explain evolution in a material manner, without the need for a spiritual dimension, is based on a significant confusion (where once more whole are not properly distinguished from part notions).

And from a historical perspective I can well appreciate why this has happened. Just as in normal psychological development one must learn to differentiate rational understanding from earlier magical and mythical type explanations, equally it is true of science which has reached a stage of extreme specialisation in this regard.

But just as mature development requires the further development of stages beyond the rational, likewise I believe it is now true of science which needs to start recovering its holistic dimension – not in the mythological manner of the past – but in a new contemporary manner related to modern understanding of our position in the world. And given the global nature of the many problems that we face on our planet, I would see this as a matter of the greatest urgency.

David quotes a section from a paper by two MIT researchers relating largely to the nature of decision-making where intuition can play a role. Though this is an interesting area in its own right for investigation it does not help us much in elucidating the distinctive nature of intuition as opposed to reason.

And for me this remains the key issue to be addressed. There are other contexts which I would find in more fruitful in this regard. For example, the Chinese Taoist notions of masculine and feminine principles highlight the complementarity as between reason (masculine) and intuition (feminine). Indeed, I sometimes wonder if the lack of women contributors to Integral World is due to the undue dominance of the masculine principle with respect to the articles and discussions appearing on the site. AsThen the

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator that is still widely used in personality tests is built around a similar distinction as between S (sense) and N (intuitive) categories (with 8 of each). So empirical and rational thinkers would belong to the S while the intuitives would comprise the N category.

One notable distinction here as between both is that S (conscious) types would tend to deal with actual form with respect to events, whereas the N (unconscious) types focus more on the potential for transformation within such events.

However remarkably, while the value of intuition may indeed be admitted within science, in formal terms the scientific paradigm totally excludes intuition.

It thereby creates the illusion that reality can be successfully viewed in a merely rational manner, whereas in truth both reason (conscious) and intuition (unconscious) are necessarily involved in all scientific understanding.

And this is the same illusion that characterises the scientific material interpretation of evolution where the potential for transformation within form is reduced to the actual interpretation of form, or as I customarily express it where the distinctive qualitative nature of wholes (in every context) is reduced to the quantitative nature of parts. And this again clearly represents but a reduced interpretation of reality.

In referring to Wallace and Darwin, David makes the point that intuitions must be tested against empirical evidence. As I stated before I have no issue with this.

However as I mentioned in my first article once one takes the nature of intuition seriously this raises a problem that is not addressed in conventional scientific interpretation. Thus when one recognises that intuition and reason relate to distinctive modes of understanding (as qualitative and quantitative respectively) it raises the key issue as to the compatibility of both modes.

So we need to coherently relate these two modes while recognising their distinctive nature. And my three recent articles are devoted precisely to this issue.

Therefore I define two levels of science i.e. analytic and holistic where the distinctive nature of each is explicitly recognised. Then the third level i.e. radial is designed to represent the coherent integration of these other two levels. And my third article deals specifically with the fundamental axiom required to ensure compatibility of both modes.

And this then leads to an ability to freely embrace all the wonderful detailed knowledge arising now in so many scientific disciplines as part of a numinous worldview where the spiritual and material are seamlessly integrated with each other.

I would agree with David that in terms of conventional interpretation that intuition would not be customarily interpreted in spiritual or contemplative terms. Here it remains merely implicit in experience and mixed up in very ways with other elements of understanding. So again I would maintain that it requires the mature training in

spiritual contemplative development to properly understand the distinctive nature of intuition, relating to the qualitative whole notion of interdependence as opposed to the quantitative notion of independent parts.
This is even implicit in the commonly used term of “gut instinct”. This implies that rather than using analytic reason with respect to a number of different factors affecting a decision that one attempts to holistically intuit the collective impact of a wide number of possible factors (many of which one may not even be consciously aware).

Now gut instinct does prove in many instances quite unreliable but this may well relate to the fact that one’s intuitive capacity is not sufficiently developed and still operating at a somewhat primitive instinctive level,

By contrast the “gut instinct”- say - of a well grounded mystic would likely prove highly reliable in relation to any key decisions to be taken.
So intuition as I would see it always relates to an inherent spiritual capacity. Though this capacity normally remains implicit and thereby not properly recognised it still betrays a spiritual – though primitive – origin.

One can have a third eye which remains undeveloped (which is the typical situation). In a minority of cases a third eye does indeed undergo prolonged mature training (through advanced contemplative awareness) so that the true nature of intuition is thereby explicitly recognised.

However the important point is that in either case, primitive or developed, intuition is inherently holistic in nature.

Once again I thank David for his courteous response to my contribution which in turn was in response to his excellent article.

I should perhaps also additionally thank him for providing me with some welcome intellectual diversion during what is effectively a lockdown here again in Ireland due to Covid-19 restrictions.

bjm· Oct 6, 2020

Enjoyed this a lot David. And also many of the comments below. "Eyes" as gateways or openings seems more accurate and generative than taking them as declaring dogmatic conclusions. "Process" science, psychology, spirituality, etc seems more experimental, dynamic, and flexible (and less fraught with fundamentalisms) than metpahysical/epistemological approaches.

*And language/symbols and how and *why* we use them seems to be at heart of the issue. "God" can be seen as way to dominate others, an a priori ontological entity, a posteriori synthesis, a psychocultural process, a paradoxical koan (both real and not real), and so on. This is the challenge and complexity and richness of the noosphere.*

David Christopher Lane· Oct 8, 2020

Hi Peter,

Thanks for continuing the conversation and also for providing us with some rich food for thought. There are many gems here, but here is one that I particularly liked,

"So we need to coherently relate these two modes while recognising their distinctive nature. And my three recent articles are devoted precisely to this issue. Therefore I define two levels of science i.e. analytic and holistic where the distinctive nature of each is explicitly recognised. Then the third level i.e. radial is designed to represent the coherent integration of these other two levels. And my third article deals specifically with the fundamental axiom required to ensure compatibility of both modes."

Nice!

John Abramson· Oct 9, 2020

Brad Reynolds says love is foundational to the universe. David Lane similarly finishes his essay with a passage from 'Bliss Land'; the final sentence of which reads " ... the foundation principle of the world is what we call love ...". Although David 'hits the pause button' on this, it is interesting to note that an argument supporting the proposition that love pervades the universe can be constructed from what Sam Harris and Donald Hoffman (both of whom David mentions in his essay) have said.

At first this proposition of love pervading the universe seems to be contradicted by Sam Harris i.e.

"Nor does it [personal experience] suggest that the "energy" of love somehow pervades the cosmos. These are historical and metaphysical claims that personal experience cannot justify." (in Harris's book "Waking Up: A Guide to Spirituality Without Religion)

But elsewhere in that book, Harris says:

"Our minds are all we have. They are all we have ever had" and
"It was simply obvious that love, compassion, and joy in the joy of others extended without limit .... I discovered that this epiphany about the universality of love could be readily communicated..... for some states of consciousness, a phrase like "boundless love" does not seem overblown."

Thus, Harris does appear to think that love permeates our mind in 'deeper' stages of consciousness. And since he states mind is all we have then we can deduce that when our state of consciousness is sufficiently discriminating, it discovers love permeating our experience. Nevertheless, even if this is indeed Harris's view, he does not

countenance such discriminating consciousness as indicative of love as an ontological fact somehow pervading the universe.

But let's bring Donald Hoffman's view in at this point: that consciousness (or mind) is foundational to reality i.e. "Consciousness is fundamental" (Hoffman, 2015, Consciousness and the Interface Theory of Perception) and "I believe that consciousness and its contents are all that exists" (see David Lane's quote by Hoffman in "The Scaffolding of Reality" on this site).

Thus like Harris, Hoffman thinks mind is all we have but unlike Harris, Hoffman postulates consciousness (mind) as foundational and as an ontological fact. It follows that if we combine Hoffman's view that consciousness (or mind) pervades the universe with Harris's view that love permeates the mind that we apparently come close to Brad Reynolds view that love is foundational to the universe.

David Christopher Lane· Oct 10, 2020

Hi John,

Thanks for your comments. I think the reason I would hit the pause button here is that it would be premature to pontificate about the ultimate nature of the universe and whether love is foundational. Clearly, one must accept the very obvious fact that the world is a torture chamber for innumerable beings since it is unimaginable to think even for a second how much suffering is endured here moment to moment. So much pain, so much suffering.... and then death. So, naturally, we would have to recalibrate terms such as god or love, since whatever is the ontological nature of the universe it cannot be captured by the human tongue, try as we might. Opening the third eye, I would suggest, is just the beginning, not an end, and certainly not a closure to our speculations. Thanks!
JK· Oct 11, 2020
@DL

I'd like to say that this little basket of essays you've penned in dialogue with and response to Brad have been among (if not definitively) your finest efforts here, - truly on target and very insightful, - this coming from someone who hasn't in every case resonated with your ideas and approach. I do here. Thanks for the effort.

David Christopher Lane· Oct 12, 2020

Thanks JK.