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The purpose of this article is to introduce the thoughts of Ken Wilber to the disciplines of criminology and criminal justice. There are two central messages from the work of Wilber that are emphasized in this article. The first message is that the current view of most phenomena, including crime and justice, is imbalanced or skewed toward focusing on exterior aspects. Interior components like awareness, intention, and meaning get the short shrift in contemporary descriptive and explanatory models. The second message is that there are levels of understanding beyond those reflected in our contemporary models and that there are methods that make these advanced levels accessible.

Ken Wilber (e.g., 1990, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998a, 1998b, 1999) has been recognized as one of the most innovative and influential thinkers of our time. One of Ken Wilber’s many contributions has been to synthesize the perennial wisdom of the East with the developmental psychology of the West to present a map of the human mind, or consciousness, that shows where we have been, where we are now, and where we can go. If criminal justice/criminology is truly interdisciplinary and its purpose is to understand crime and justice issues in the broadest context, then the work of Wilber is an important addition to our disciplinary knowledge.

An earlier version of this article was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology in San Diego, California on November 20, 1997.
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As Wilber sees it, many of the personal and social problems that we face currently are grounded in our current average level of social, cultural, and individual development. Solving problems faced at the current level requires that we evolve or develop to the next level. This, in turn, requires that we recognize that there is a next level and that we can attain it.

Wilber’s view is similar to Albert Einstein’s observation that the challenges and problems that emerge at one level of thinking or seeing cannot be solved at that level. At a higher and more inclusive level, problems are reframed, and we see them differently. Whereas before we were stymied or locked in a conceptual bind, we can now see new possibilities with new eyes. A move to the next level of consciousness will give us new eyes to reframe our current problems.

This article is an attempt to summarize and present some of Wilber’s central ideas and to explore, in a preliminary way, how they apply to criminology, criminal justice, and education. We will begin with a presentation of Wilber’s ideas on the evolution of consciousness and the four quadrants of knowledge. We will discuss problems associated with our current level of mind, examine the next level, and finally, explore the implications for criminology and criminal justice.

**THE GREAT CHAIN OF BEING AND THE SPECTRUM OF CONSCIOUSNESS**

The central method that characterizes Wilber’s work is the search for orienting generalizations or sturdy conclusions. He has perused the literature of several disciplines in search of broad themes, findings, or conclusions that consistently emerge. His central inquiry is to ascertain if there is enough convergent validity across disciplines, traditions, and time to integrate human knowledge into a general framework.

One stable finding is the Great Chain of Being, which has been recognized in a variety of cultures and is the centerpiece of the perennial philosophy. It recognizes that there are levels of existence or being that reflect increasing levels of consciousness or awareness. Existence emerges in several hierarchical dimensions, ranging from the physical to the spiritual. Wilber presents the following five levels to adequately capture and illustrate differences in dimensions of existence, being, or knowing: matter, body, mind, soul, and spirit. These levels, along with the disciplines developed to investigate them, are presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1 illustrates that the Great Chain of Being is a hierarchy. Consciousness increases as we move up from matter to life to mind to soul to spirit. The higher levels of being transcend and include the levels below them. They also depend on the levels below them. Without matter, for example, there is no
life, and without life, there is no mind. However, life is matter with something added, and mind is life and then some. The emergence or creation of life from matter represents a synergistic leap, emergent quality, or transcendence. Life includes and depends on matter. It cannot exist without matter, but it is something different and better than matter. It can do more. It can know more.

The existence of the levels of existence or the Great Chain of Being is the result of evolution. Matter evolved into life, which formed the basis of mind, and so on. A more detailed version of the interior aspect of existence or levels of consciousness experienced by the individual is depicted in Figure 2. This represents what Wilber calls the “spectrum of consciousness.” It can be used to chart the evolution of humankind and the development of individual human beings.

Movement up the spectrum of consciousness is characterized by decreasing narcissism and egocentrism and by increasing awareness. The process of development is such that each higher level or stage is based on a lower stage, which constitutes a necessary but not sufficient condition for moving on to a higher stage, and each higher stage includes and transcends its predecessor.
Figure 2: The Spectrum of Consciousness

The transition from one stage to the next, also known as a fulcrum of development, is described by Wilber (1996) as a “1-2-3 process” (p. 158). The individual self initially identifies or fuses with a particular level of consciousness, awareness, or perspective. The self then differentiates or transcends that level, and includes, incorporates, or integrates it into the higher level with which it now identifies.

At the lowest stage of consciousness, the individual does not see beyond the material world (sensorophysical). The infant cannot distinguish between itself and the material world. The individual is fused with his or her physical environment. They are undifferentiated. There is no sense or experience of a person-physical environment distinction. A transition typically occurs during the 1st year of life that allows the individual to experience the self as something separate from the physical surroundings. The infant has, in a sense, taken a step up from the physical world to realize a differentiation between the person and the physical surroundings. This stage culminates when the infant achieves object permanence or the realization that there is independence between the existence of objects and the existence of the person (Wilber, 1995, p. 211).
As shown in Figure 2, the individual can develop by the same general process from the sensoriphysical (i.e., the material world) through several stages to the causal, which is a high level of spirituality. Most individuals in our culture do not develop beyond the formal operational or formal reflexive level (i.e., the rational mind). This is considered the highest level in Western culture. At this stage, you go beyond the rote application of rules and uncritical acceptance of roles that characterizes the stage below (i.e., concrete operational mind and mythic worldview). You step out of the social myths and the rules and roles to think about them. You can think about thought. You adopt a rational worldview and test the rules (myths, customs, and norms) and roles of your group, culture, and/or society from this new perspective. For example, you can examine the reasonableness of myths given the evidence available to you. At the concrete operational level, you accept. At the formal operation level, you question and explore.

At the rational stage, the individual can ask for the first time, “Who am I?” Identity is no longer written in the roles, customs, rituals, and myths of the concrete operational stage. With the power of rational inquiry, new possibilities emerge beyond the mythic worldspace. It is a place where psychological introspection, scientific method, and philosophical inquiry come into being. At the sociopolitical level, it allows for the possibility of going beyond the limitations of group exclusiveness and introduces the potential of democratic pluralism. Here there is a possibility for all members of society or the world to have the same rights, because to the rational mind, there is no reason for limitations or exclusiveness. It appears unreasonable.

If everything goes well, the rational mind or formal operational consciousness appears between the ages of 11 and 15 in our culture (Wilber, 1996, p. 187). In human development, this stage emerged around 1000 B.C.E., “but reached its fruition with the rise of the modern state, roughly the sixteenth century in Europe” (Wilber, 1995, p. 179). The rational worldview is expressed in the principles of the Enlightenment, especially in democratic pluralism, the dignity of the individual, and the scientific method. Reason is the basis of modernity, and in most of the Western world, the rational mind is considered the highest stage of human development. It is the ideal.

Just because the rational mind emerges for most of us as early as age 11 and rationality emerged for humankind 3,000 years ago, it neither means that most of us have adopted a worldcentric view nor that reason or rationality is evident for most of us in most aspects of our daily lives. The rational mind is available to us because we have adequately, and usually partially, transcended the concrete operational stage and the corresponding mythic worldview. However, most of us neither consistently and broadly use rational principles nor routinely adopt a worldcentric or global perspective on problems (Wilber, 1995, 1996).
It is important to note that, although most individual have not reached the highest levels of the rational stage in all ways (cognitive, moral, interpersonal, and affective, for example), this does not mean that the rational level has not had a tremendous impact on individual, cultural, social, and world development. As we will see, modernity itself is a result of rationality, and most of us live in the modern world.

The first five stages or fulcrums of development in Figure 2 have been the main focus of Western psychology and philosophy. Although some Western philosophers and transpersonal psychologists have given considerable attention to higher stages of development (existential or vision-logic and above), by and large, the higher levels of awareness have had relatively little influence on Western thought. In the East, on the other hand, there has been a great deal of attention given to the higher stages of consciousness, but the lower stages have gotten the short shrift. Much of Eastern thought deals with matters of the soul and spirit, whereas Western thought deals primarily with matters of the mind. One of Wilber’s contributions has been to integrate the contributions of the East and the West to our understanding of consciousness by recognizing the importance of all levels in his spectrum of consciousness.

Wilber argues that development does not culminate with the rational stage, as many in the West believe. If humans have evolved this far, why would they stop? There is evidence from the East and, to a lesser extent, from the West that there are levels of human awareness beyond the rational. If humans have evolved in the direction of increasing awareness or interior depth, and if they are to continue to evolve, would they not evolve in the direction of increased awareness? The East provides us not only with a description of these higher levels of consciousness to which some humans have developed but also furnishes methods or techniques to get there. We will discuss higher stages of consciousness at various places throughout the remainder of this article. But first, we will turn our attention to another of Wilber’s contributions, the idea of quadrants or domains of reality.

THE FOUR QUADRANTS OR DOMAINS OF REALITY

As shown in Figure 3, each level of consciousness for the individual (e.g., concrete operational) has a corresponding cultural manifestation or worldview (e.g., mythic). The individual level of consciousness is how the individual experiences the world. It is an interior dimension of reality. The worldview is the shared interior or how groups at a certain level of development characteristically see the world. It is the collective interior. However, the internal or interior dimensions (individual and collective) represent only half of reality. They represent the view from the inside or the subjective view. There is an external or exterior dimension at both the individual and collec-
Figure 3: The Four Quadrants
NOTE: The levels of consciousness represented in the upper left quadrant stop at vision-logic (13), which is the existential level (6) in Figure 2. Some of the lower levels in Figure 2 are represented by more than one level in Figure 3. Representational mind in Figure 2 is equivalent to Symbols (9) and Concepts (10) in Figure 3. Wilber (1998b) explains the notations SF1, SF2, and SF3 below.
In the Upper-Right quadrant, as evolution moves into the human domain, I have indicated states marked by SF1, SF2, and SF3. These are the structure-functions of the human brain that correspond with concrete operation, formal operational, and vision-logic. These are currently being mapped using PET and other sophisticated instruments, and I am simply indicating the correlation, whatever it turns out to be, with these symbols. Everybody agrees that mental states and structures have some sort of correlates in brain physiology, and this is all I mean by the symbols SF1, etc. (pp. 63-64)

tive dimensions for each level of development. This dimension represents the objective aspects of reality or the view from the outside. The result is four quadrants: interior-individual, interior-collective, exterior-individual, and exterior-collective. As can be seen in Figure 3, hierarchical levels of development can take place within each quadrant.
Each quadrant represents separable, but mutually influential, aspects of reality. Wilber points out that, although there is mutual influence, one quadrant cannot be reduced into another. For example, my mind, which is repre-
sented in the interior-individual quadrant, cannot be reduced to my brain, which is located in the exterior-individual quadrant. There may be objectively measurable brain activity that is correlated with the quality of my mind. For instance, mental states and thought can influence brain-wave activity. However, I can look at a brain activity forever, and it will not provide me with much information on the mind, that is, the quality of the mental state and the content of thought. These require that I look at the mind, and the mind is an interior or subject experience. It is not an activity or behavior that can be objectively measured, even if it can be influenced by, and influence, brain activity. Directly exploring the mind requires that you enter the subjective mental arena of the individual.

One of Wilber’s simplest examples of the relationship between quadrants is his description of the influence of problems in one quadrant on the other quadrants.

A malformation—a pathology, as “sickness”—in any quadrant will reverberate through all four quadrants. . . . So a society with an alienating mode of production (Lower Right)—such as slave wages for dehumanizing labor—will reflect a low self-esteem for laborers (Upper Left) and out-of-wack brain chemistry (Upper Right) that might, for example, institutionalize alcohol abuse as self-medication. (Wilber, 1996, p. 138)

The Validity Claims of the Four Quadrants

Each quadrant or aspect of any phenomenon features a different validity claim or a different kind of truth. We will begin with the upper right (UR) quadrant because here validity issues are addressed by the scientific method or a positivistic approach with which most of us are familiar. Here objective or empirical truth is the validity criterion. If our ideas about how the world operates are valid, then we should find correspondence between our ideas and our empirical observations. We develop models of the way things work then examine the fit between our model and the empirical facts.

We see in Figure 4 that the validity standard for investigating individual consciousness (upper left [UL]) is truthfulness. Here the question is not whether the objective facts mesh with the hypothetical model as in the UR quadrant, the question is, “Does my self-inquiry or probes into the mind of another produce a genuine or trustworthy expression of subjective experience?” Subjective truthfulness, not objective truth, is the standard. The validity of data about the interior states of an individual is a matter of the access of the individual to his or her mental states or consciousness, the individual’s ability to express what he or she is experiencing, the person’s sincerity and honesty in the expression of subjective experience, and the ability of the per-
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERIOR Left Hand Paths</th>
<th>EXTERIOR Right Hand Paths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECTIVE</td>
<td>OBJECTIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>truthfulness</strong></td>
<td><strong>truth</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sincerity</td>
<td>correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrity</td>
<td>representational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trustworthiness</td>
<td>propositional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td><strong>it</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>we</strong></td>
<td><strong>it</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>justness</strong></td>
<td><strong>functional fit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural fit</td>
<td>systems theory web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutual understanding</td>
<td>structural-functionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rightness</td>
<td>social systems mesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERSUBJECTIVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTEROBJECTIVE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Validity Claims in the Four Quadrants

son making the inquiry to make a meaningful interpretation of the data presented.

The standard of validity for the lower right (LR) quadrant or the social aspect of reality is functional fit. The question is, “Does information make sense in the context of the larger system, for example, a social, economic, or political system?” How the part fits in with the whole is the central concern.

Whereas the validity concern of the LR quadrant (social) is functional fit, the validity concern of the lower left (LL) quadrant (culture) is cultural fit or how individuals fit together in “cultural, moral, and ethical space” (Wilber, 1997, p. 17). This is a shared interior space that is required for mutual understanding and communication within groups. As with the individual interior, the central question with the collective interior is one of meaning. The investigator must ask if his or her interpretation of mutual understanding between subjects is accurate.

Although the criteria for establishing validity in each quadrant differ, the process is the same. It consists of what Wilber refer to as “the three strands of any valid knowledge quest” (Wilber, 1995, p. 273). We are most familiar with
this process in the form of empiricism or positivism, which is a way of exploring the validity of objective knowledge about the individual (UR quadrant). The first step is to generate data using a method, paradigm, or injunction (Wilber, 1997, p. 86). For example, to test Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) general theory of crime, we would have to use a method (e.g., a self-report survey) to generate data on child-rearing practices, self-control, and criminal behavior.

The second step is apprehension or illumination. You must have the capacity to grasp the data, to understand it. You have to have eyes that can see the data and comprehend its significance. For example, apprehension of the self-report data intended to test Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) theory would require an understanding of measurement theory, measurement methods, and techniques of quantitative analysis. You have to be able to see with quantitative eyes, otherwise, the data are useless, or worse, they would be misused.

The final strand is communal confirmation or refutation. According to Wilber (1997), “this is a checking of the result—the data, the evidence—with others who have adequately completed the inductive and apprehensive strands” (p. 85). In our example of empirically testing Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) general theory, the community of scholars who are experts in social science theory and methods would judge your use of data generation methods (injunction) vis-à-vis the theory, and they would evaluate your analysis and interpretation (apprehension) of the data. If they found, for example, that the reliability coefficient for your self-report measure of self-control was extremely low, but you disregarded it in interpreting and reporting your results, they would discount your study. If your data generation methods and apprehension are poor, then your conclusions are suspect. You have not generated valid knowledge that helps to confirm or disconfirm Gottfredson and Hirschi’s theory.

Wilber argues, as noted above, that the strands of valid knowledge can be applied to knowledge in each of the four quadrants. Wilber uses familiar Christian terms to describe different ways of knowing that result in different kinds of knowledge and validity criteria. The spectrum of different modes of knowing, which roughly corresponds to the spectrum of consciousness, include the eye of the flesh, the eye of the mind, and the eye of contemplation (Wilber, 1990). The familiar shapes of these ways of knowing are empiricism (the eye of the flesh), rationalism (the eye of the mind), and mysticism (the eye of contemplation or the eye of the spirit).

The validity of knowing through the eye of the flesh and the eye of the mind is generally accepted in our culture. Empirical studies in the natural and social sciences (the eye of the flesh) and mathematical proof and evaluation of the logic of social theories (the eye of the mind) are familiar to most edu-
cated people. The eye of contemplation or the eye of the spirit is not generally used as a way of knowing, and its claims to validity are suspect in our society. However, Wilber argues that the validity of spiritual or contemplative knowledge can be assessed in the same way as empirical and rational knowledge.

Various forms of meditative and contemplative practices are the injunctions, paradigms, or data-generating practices associated with the eye of the spirit. The Buddhist practices of zazen and vipassana and Christian contemplative traditions represent exemplars for producing spiritual data (Wilber, 1995, p. 275). The next strand, apprehension of the spiritual data, or understanding the meaning of the spiritual experience, emerges from practice usually with the help of a knowledgeable spiritual guide. Finally, the quality of the spiritual seeker’s practice and his or her comprehension of the experience are evaluated by one or more representatives of the community of adepts. They confirm or disconfirm that the student is seeing with the eye of contemplation or the eye of the spirit. The process is the same as that of the community of scholars confirming that the methods used and conclusion drawn from an empirical study are correct.

The argument made so far suggests that there are domains of consciousness beyond the rational (i.e., the eye of the mind). These higher levels (i.e., the eye of the spirit) in the spectrum of conscious transcend and include the rational mind. You see farther and deeper at these levels of consciousness. Awareness increases as you go higher in the spectrum of consciousness.

The validity of knowledge at the higher levels of consciousness is determined by following the same general procedure as for the lower levels. The genuineness of a meditative experience is validated or confirmed in the same way as the truth of an empirical proposition, that is, through injunction, apprehension, and communal confirmation.

**THE COLLAPSE OF THE INTERIOR TO THE EXTERIOR OR THE BIG THREE TO THE BIG ONE**

Humankind has evolved, and human beings have developed in the direction of increasing consciousness. Evolution and development have followed the Great Chain of Being, and the spectrum of consciousness provides a map of the unfolding of human consciousness. There is a tremendous amount of evidence from Western psychology that consistently shows that development proceeds from lower to higher stages of awareness, that is, from the sensori-physical (archaic) to the formal reflexive (rational), or from the eye of the flesh to the eye of the mind. There is an equally impressive amount of evidence from contemplative traditions, especially from the East and more recently from the West's transpersonal psychology, that there are levels of
being or consciousness beyond the rational. The amount and consistency of
the evidence have led Wilber to conclude that the spectrum of consciousness
is a orienting generalization or sturdy conclusion.

The following questions are raised: If Wilber's conclusion is right, why do
most of us think that we have reached, as individuals and as a species, the
highest level of development possible, that is, the rational or the eye of the
mind? If we have evolved as a group and developed as individuals this far,
what stops us from going beyond? Why would we want to go beyond?

To answer these questions, we have to return to the four quadrants repre-
senting the different aspects of any phenomenon. The four quadrants can be
collapsed into three categories that Wilber calls the "I" (UL quadrant), the
"We" (LL quadrant), and the "It" (UR and LR quadrants). The I and the We
are the subjective dimensions of the individual and the collective, respec-
tively. They represent the interior of any phenomenon. The It is the objective
dimension of reality for the individual and the collective combined. The It
represents the exterior. Wilber refers to the I, the We, and the It as the Big
Three. They also represent the realms of the beautiful, the good, and the true,
or art, morals, and science.

As described in the last section, generating and understanding data to test
validity in each of these realms follows the same general process but requires
different methods or, according to Wilber, a different language. Separate lan-
guages or criteria for validity in the domains of the I, the We, and the It did not
emerge until humans attained the rational stage of development. At the
archaic, magic, and mythic stages (see LL quadrant in Figure 3), different
aspects of the world were either so undifferentiated or poorly differentiated
that the domains, aspects, or spheres of reality were fused. For example, at the
level of the representational mind and magic worldview, the whole world is
seen as an extension of the self, which is a very egocentric self. Young chil-
dren think that the moon follows them around and that thunder means that the
sky is angry with them. They attribute subjective qualities of the I to the
objective world of the It, blurring the distinction between the interior and the
exterior parts of reality.

Wilber uses the church during the Middle Ages, a representation of
mythic-level development, as an example of fusion or poor differentiation of
the Big Three.

The church during the Middle Ages is a classic example that is repeated
around the world and in every premodern societal type as a variation on a
common theme. Because art/aesthetics, empiricism/science, and religion/morals
were not clearly differentiated, what happened in one sphere could
dominate and control what happened in other spheres. Thus, a scientist such as
Galileo could be prevented from pursuing the sphere of science because it
clashed with the prevailing sphere of religion/morals. An artist such as
Michelangelo was in constant conflict with Pope Julius II about the types of figures that he was allowed to represent in his art because expressive art and religion/morals were not clearly differentiated, and thus, oppression in one sphere was oppression in the other (Wilber, 1998b, p. 48).

One of the benefits of the rational worldview of the formal operational level is that you are capable of the kind of analytical thinking that allows for the differentiation of the Big Three. Moving from the mythic to the rational liberates the individual from the rules, roles, structure, and perspective that limit inquiry. It frees the individuals from the cognitive bind of the mythic and allows them to see the world in other than mythic terms. The world is no longer unidimensional. Everything is no longer mythic. Myth is no longer the sole definer of self, culture, nature, and society. Once the worldview expands from the mythic to the rational, we get a wider perspective in which the I, We, and It can be seen as separate domains. Art, morals, and science can be explored independently. Developments in one realm are no longer dependent on those of another. All are free to progress.

Wilber calls the differentiation of the I, We, and It the "dignity of modernity." The great breakthrough or breakaway of modernity, which is based on the attainment of a formal operational thinking and a rational worldview, is that different domains of reality or aspects of the world (i.e., art, morals, and science) can now be pursued separately (i.e., by different methods with different criteria for validity). This resulted in tremendous progress in each realm, but especially in the It, the scientific study of the natural and social worlds.

Modernity, which started with the Renaissance, was fully developed in the Enlightenment, and still has a profound influence today (Wilber, 1998b, p. 41), is characterized by reason and empiricism. Modernity combines the eye of the flesh with the eye of the mind or reason. Among other things, it allows for the kind of hypothetical-deductive reasoning used to test theories in the sciences and social sciences. The example of testing Gottfredson and Hirschi's (1990) general theory, which was previously presented, is an illustration of this kind of thinking. Freed from the constraints of the mythic worldview, modernity embraced the rational-empirical investigation of areas that previously were not opened to questioning. New questions pursued by new methods generated new data, and a new world was born. Guided by the light of reason, we found our way out of the Middle Ages by transcending its limiting, but developmentally necessary, mythic structure. With the I and the It untethered from the mythic We, a new view of self, nature, and society emerged.

Humankind benefited tremendously from modernity. Wilber observes that, although there are limits and drawbacks to the rational-empirical perspective, great positive contributions to the quality of life were made by view-
ing the world from the modern perspective. The change in worldview or in the way of seeing things had profound implications. Rationality allowed for that which was unthinkable to the concrete operational mind of the mythic world. The differentiation of the Big Three that was allowed by reason resulted in liberal democracy, the abolition of slavery, and advances in the empirical sciences, including medicine, physics, biology, and chemistry (Wilber, 1996, p. 125).

Modernity or the rational worldview also resulted in some liabilities for humankind. After the important step of differentiating the Big Three, an imbalance developed. Similar to the dominance of the We in the mythic world, the It became dominant in the rational world. In the mythic world, nothing was ever known but the We. Modernity or the rational world separated the I, We, and It. However, the differentiation turned into dissociation. Instead of recognizing that the I, We, and It were all different but mutually related aspects of one reality, proponents of art, morals, and science each claimed that they were the only reality. Science won the war, and eventually, the I and the We were collapsed into the It. The approach that combined the eye of reason with the eye of the flesh, the rational-empirical method, resulted in stunning discoveries in biology, chemistry, physics, ecology, economics, management, and other disciplines that focused on exterior aspects of the world. The rational mind was also responsible for advances in technology and material development. Eventually, the validity criterion of the It domain, objective empirical truth, became the standard for all quadrants or each of the Big Three. The I and the We were judged in terms of the It. The interior became inferior. Ultimately, the interior, the I and the We, was reduced to the exterior, the It. It became the only reality. It was assumed that the interior was caused by and secondary to the exterior. Consciousness and culture, the interior subjective world, lost their intrinsic value. They had value only as they were manifested in the exterior objective world. The language of the It became the only language spoken. The result is what Wilber (1996) refers to as the “disaster of modernity” (p. 126).

Some of the most blatant examples of the disaster of modernity come from economics, an aspect of the It domain (LR quadrant). As the economy has become more and more dominant in our society, many aspects of the I and the We, the Beautiful and the Good, are reduced and judged in economic terms (i.e., money). The worth of art and culture are converted into a dollar value. If they do not fetch much on the market, they are not worth much. If it does not sell for much or produce something of economic value, it is of negligible worth. Once money becomes the measure of worth, quantity alone matters. Money has no quality. Art and culture become disqualified when they are seen strictly in economic terms.
One of the results of the disqualification of the universe or the reduction of the I and the We into the It is the loss of most of the Great Chain of Being. This central element of the great wisdom traditions or perennial philosophy is no longer relevant because the interior or subjective world has been devalued. Rationality, which allowed humankind to progress from the mythic and resulted in advances in the exterior objective world, is the only stage of consciousness that is prized. In addition, it is only valued when it is linked with empiricism to make advances in the exterior world. Levels beyond the rational, which transcend and include the rational (i.e., vision-logic and above), are assumed not to exist.

RESUSCITATING THE INTERIOR DOMAINS

Wilber points out that the failure to recognize postrational or transpersonal levels of consciousness (interior states) restricts us. Just as humankind and individuals have to evolve or develop from the mythic to the rational to redress some of the harms inherent in the mythic and enjoy the benefits of rationality, we must transcend the rational and attain postrational levels of awareness to solve some of the problems associated with rationality and experience the advantages (and challenges) of increased awareness. However, it is unlikely that a substantial number of people will reach these higher levels if they are not recognized as real.

Wilber’s (1998b) solution, which is presented in The Marriage of Sense and Soul: Integrating Science and Religion, is to work toward correcting the imbalance of the I, We, and It domains and to integrate them. Wilber argues that, although progress in each domain required differentiation, which was the great benefit of the Enlightenment, further advances require integration. We must find a way to honor all domains of reality (i.e., the I, We, and It) and synthesize them into a new level of understanding.

Wilber suggests that one way to do this is through strands of valid knowledge that are common to all quadrants. This framework, which we described earlier in the article, is a way of showing that the process of validating knowledge in each quadrant is the same: paradigm or injunction, apprehension or appreciation, and confirmation. The criteria for validity, however, differ by quadrant: truthfulness for intentional, justness or goodness for cultural, truth for behavioral, and functional-fit for social. We must recognize the unique nature of each quadrant as well as the common process. We must recognize that an adequate understanding requires a consideration of levels or hierarchical stages of development as well as all quadrants. This is what Wilber calls an all-level, all-quadrant approach. This integrated approach requires that the four quadrants or Big Three are central, mutually influential aspects
of reality. Each must be given its due (Wilber, 1998b, p. 141). This requires that we requalify the universe by reintroducing the interior dimensions. Because the It is currently the dominator dimension, the adherents and adepts of the It must be convinced that the I and the We exist and have integrity. The objections of the It must be met.

Wilber argues that one way to show science (the It) that the I and the We are real and useful is to point out that the It (the exterior world) not only shares a process of validation with the I and the We (the interior world) but also that validation in the exterior quadrants cannot occur without interior participation. You will recall that hypothetical-deductive reasoning, which we illustrated using the example of testing Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) general theory, is rational/empirical. It combines the eye of the mind or reason with the eye of the flesh. The mind is an interior dimension. “If empirical science rejects the validity of any and all forms of interior apprehension and knowledge, then it rejects it own validity as well, a great deal of which rests on interior structures and apprehensions” (Wilber, 1998b, p. 144).

Wilber warns that to honor each of the aspects of reality—the four quadrants or the Big Three—we must not judge the knowledge in one realm by the validity standard of another realm. The fact that you cannot find direct sensory empirical evidence of the insights that result from meditation, a spiritual injunction, does not mean that the realm of the spiritual does not exist. Similarly, because there is no spiritual evidence (i.e., no direct contemplative insight) that antibiotics are an effective treatment for some diseases caused by bacteria does not mean that Western medicine is debunked. The validity of medicine is grounded in clinical experience and experiments, that is, sensory empiricism or objective measures. The validity of contemplation is based on spiritual experience, that is, spiritual empiricism or subjective insights.

On the other hand, when one realm ventures into the other, it should be judged by the validity criterion of that realm. For example, when religion makes claims that can be confirmed or disconfirmed by scientific evidence in the empirical world, it should be held up to the sensory empirical standard. Evolution can be tested empirically in the narrow scientific sense. It is not a matter of spiritual insight. If it exists and if it is a true model of development in the biological world, for example, then we should find biological evidence of its existence. In this example, religion is not honoring science. It is a case of the interior world of spirit making claims about the exterior world of science. Its claims must thus be assessed in terms of the validity criterion of the UR quadrant (i.e., sensory experience or truth) rather than in terms of truthfulness, which is the validity criterion of the UL quadrant.

To reopen the eye of the spirit, we must recognize that there are parts of reality that can be seen with the eye of the mind and the eye of the flesh that cannot be seen with the eye of the spirit. This will turn the eye of the spirit in
the right direction (i.e., inward) and get it properly focused on these interior matters (i.e., authentic spirituality). This is what is required for further development in the UL quadrant.

The integration of the four quadrants will mean a rediscovery of the Great Chain of Being, with its higher levels of consciousness. The Great Chain of Being is part of the perennial philosophy that was part of many cultures over many years up to the modern West. However, traditions based on the Great Chain of Being recognized only the interior individual quadrant at its higher levels. The contributions of modernity were (a) the investigation of the lower levels of individual development or consciousness, a contribution of Western psychology; and (b) the recognition of domains of reality—the cultural, social, and behavioral—in addition to the intentional or individual interior.

Modernity expanded our view of reality, but in the process, lost the interior. Wilber suggests that adding the Great Chain of Being to the UL quadrant and honoring all four quadrants will give us the broadest understanding of our universe and the opportunity to advance to higher stages of development. This is an integrated approach or an all-level, all-quadrant approach (Wilber, 1998b, p. 207).

Correcting the balance between the Big Three or the four quadrants and reintroducing the higher stages of interior awareness or consciousness contained in the perennial wisdom traditions will get us unstuck and give us a chance to move. The fact that human evolution and development has been in the direction of increasing levels of consciousness suggests that growth in awareness is the telos or omega point of human existence. Meditative or contemplative practices, which are the exemplars, injunctions, or paradigms of spiritual traditions, provide us with the methods of reaching and validating higher levels of awareness. The questions now posed are what is the next stage of awareness and what are the implications of all this for criminal justice and criminology?

VISION-LOGIC AND BEYOND

We have seen that modernity, in all its dignity and disaster, was a product of the rational stage of consciousness. Formal operational thinking allowed us to transcend the concrete operational mode and the mythic worldview, thereby differentiating the Big Three and enabling tremendous advances, especially in the It domain. The next stage is called “vision-logic” (UL quadrant in Figure 3), and it is represented in the centauric worldview (LL quadrant).

Vision-logic or integrative logic represents a transitional stage from the rational to the postrational (i.e., various spiritual levels). It is a stage of mature rationality or early postrationality. It is a widening of perspective that occurs
when the person who has been seeing with the eye of the mind begins to see
with the eye of the spirit. It differs from the previous rational stage in that,
rather than categorizing and analyzing, its purpose is to integrate and synthe-
size. It is a state that transcends and includes the prerational stages (archaic,
magic, and mythic) and the rational stage as expressed in formal operational
thinking (Wilber, 1995, p. 189). When the self moves beyond the formal
operational stage to identify with the vision-logic stage, it adopts a new
morality, cognitive style, and affective expression among other things.

Vision-logic has the capacity to integrate different perspectives. It is more
than the recognition and differentiation that occur at the rational stage.
“Rationality means perspective; vision-logic means integrating or coordinat-
ing different perspectives” (Wilber, 1998a, p. 93). Vision-logic is the capac-
ity to see what is common in many perspectives, even when they do not agree,
and it allows for their synthesis. “Vision-logic can hold in mind contradic-
tion, it can unify opposites, it is dialectical and nonlinear, and weaves
together what otherwise appear to be incompatible notions” (Wilber, 1995,
p. 185).

Both the rational mind and vision-logic are capable of the worldcentric or
global perspective; however, whereas the rational mind can recognize, clas-
sify, analyze, and assume different perspectives, vision-logic represents a
broader and deeper worldcentric perspective that is integrated into one’s per-
sonality and actually put into operation in one’s daily life. Wilber describes
the vision-logic stage as “a self that can actually inhabit a global perspective,
and not merely mouth it” (Wilber, 1995, p. 191). The rights and dignity of
others in centauric workspace are more than a reasonable conclusion that is
drawn from the application of formal operational reasoning. It is more than
the analysis of parts. It moves toward the grasp of the whole through insight
and intuition.

Currently, there are not many individuals in our society or another society
who have reached the level of vision-logic, and the centaur as a cultural
workspace is yet to be developed. The development of a critical mass of indi-
viduals who can influence the development of global cultural values, which
in turn can have an influence on our society (nation) and its relation to another
society, will be done one person at a time in the interior-individual domain.
Wilber (1995) observes, “at this point, aside from the inner work that each of
us individually can do, I personally see no obvious collective bearers of the
new and deeper within” (p. 197).

Although the critical mass of individuals operating at the vision-logic level
needed to establish a solid planetary or global worldview has not yet been
developed, the problems that require a move to a worldcentric perspective to
be solved are clearly in evidence.
The advances in science and technology resulting from modernity have enabled the tremendous growth of the global economy and the recognition of the interdependence of nation states. However, the exchange of goods and services between countries is often exploitive because poorly controlled production causes environmental degradation. In addition, there is considerable tension and open conflict between nations. A worldcentric or global perspective is necessary for the growth and maintenance of global economic and political structures without conflict and without the destruction of the physical and biological environment on which we depend.

In addition to being the key to solving many global problems that cannot be solved at lower levels of interior development, vision-logic is the doorway to the transpersonal or spiritual levels of interior development. Vision-logic requires that the self have the capacity to observe both the body and the mind to integrate them. The self can no longer identify exclusively with the body or the mind. It must be at a higher perspective to observe them.

The spiritual or higher levels in the spectrum of consciousness, which follow the same process of development as was described for the lower stages (differentiation, inclusion, and identification), simply represent the further development of the observing self or the capacity to witness.

There is nothing occult or spooky about any of this . . . by the time of the centaur, consciousness is simply continuing this process and starting to dis-identify with the mind itself, which is precisely why it can witness the mind, see the mind experience the mind. (Wilber, 1996, p. 198)

Solving the problems and dealing with the limitations of modernity require the reintroduction of the left-hand path, which was subordinated to the right-hand path when reason took a wrong turn. Moving on to the next level of consciousness, which is necessary to attain a higher and more inclusive perspective, can only be done by a return to the individual-interior dimension and by the recognition that interior stages above the rational exist. Moving to levels of consciousness beyond the rational requires that we follow the practices, injunctions, or paradigms that have been proven to increase consciousness or awareness.

We have presented a fairly detailed, but hardly complete, summary of the thoughts of Ken Wilber. The question that must now be addressed is what does all this mean for criminology and criminal justice? In the remaining sections, we will outline some of the central implications of Wilber's all-level, all-quadrant approach for our discipline. For the most part, our discussion will be at a general level, with concrete examples when they apply. Specific applications of Wilber's framework will be the topic of further detailed investigations into the areas covered in this general review.
WHERE WE ARE NOW IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND CRIMINOLOGY

Wilber's approach can be used to explore and understand our current situation. The criminal justice system can be seen as part of our larger set of social and economic arrangements (LR quadrant). Indeed, it can be seen as an enabling system for these larger systems in that it serves the social control function that is a necessary condition for the operation of the social and economic systems. As with the larger social system, which is in the exterior-collective domain, the criminal justice system (LR quadrant) exists in a relationship of mutual influence with the other three quadrants of the four-quadrant universe (intentional, behavioral, cultural, and social) or the Big Three (the I, We, and It).

As with our larger social and economic systems, our criminal justice system can be seen as a product of the Enlightenment, the rational mind, and modernity. The movement from the mythic to the rational brought advances in criminal justice and law that are too numerous to mention, especially in the areas of individual rights and procedural safeguards. There is no doubt that the modern criminal justice system is a more just and humane system than was its mythic-level predecessor. It took the rational level, with its differentiation of the I, We, and It, to see the individual as having dignity and to allow for the development of individual rights. Despite its many positive contributions, the rational mind and modernity have their limits and have created problems that are insoluble at the level at which they were created.

Many critics have noted that our current social and economic arrangements, which include the criminal justice system, have resulted in some pernicious consequences (e.g., Pepinsky & Quinney, 1991; Reiman, 1998). One harmful crime control strategy is the war on crime, which has made certain segments of our population the enemy. We continually expand the war by expending more resources and making technological advances. We increase the size of police forces, build more prisons, and develop more technologically advanced ways to investigate crimes and control offenders. Yet our efforts to control crime have been ineffective, and these efforts have resulted in harm to a substantial proportion of our population.

A part of the problem is that, as products of modernity stuck at the rational level in the right-hand domains, we are limited in the ways that we frame problems and in the solutions that we see. Most of our control efforts, theories, and studies of crime are grounded in the empirical-rational model. Their goal is objective truth. We look at the problems objectively with the eye of the mind linked to the eye of the flesh. Although this approach has made important contributions to our understanding of crime and criminal justice and, to a much lesser extent, to our control of crime, criminal justice policy, and the
operation of the criminal justice system, it does have some drawbacks from the all-level, all quadrant perspective.

The obvious shortcoming is that our understanding of crime and criminal justice is mostly limited to the objective or external domains (the It or the UR and LR quadrants). Without knowledge from the interior-individual (UL quadrant) and interior-collective (LL quadrant) domains, our understanding is incomplete. We do not mean to suggest that there has been no inquiry in our discipline into the interior quadrants. Hermeneutic and phenomenological inquiries into culture and the subjective experiences of individuals using qualitative methods have contributed to our understanding. Although these methods have grown in popularity in recent years, there is still an imbalance. Positivistic approaches and systems approaches using quantitative methods and models are still the most influential in our discipline and in the social sciences in general.

Another consequence of the overemphasis on the It in relation to the I and the We is the dehumanization of crime, criminals, and criminal justice. Once again, we do not want to diminish the contributions of rational-empirical and systems approaches. However, inquiries into the It domain take an objective approach. When people become objects only, because we have discounted the subjective dimension, we treat them differently than we do when we take their subjective experiences into consideration. The loss of the subjective leads to alienation between people and reduces understanding. It builds separation and distance.

Emphasis on the objective or the external is a condition that contributes to our ability to declare war on parts of our population. Objective approaches require distance, and distance or separation is required to have enemies. They have to be seen as the other. Mutual understanding is a requirement of obtaining valid knowledge from inquiries into the interior or subjective domains. Once you slip into other peoples’ shoes and experience the world as they walk in it, it is hard to maintain the kind of separation and distance that allow you to consider them an enemy and declare war on them.

Separation leads to our viewing of people who do not share our characteristics as the other. Social distance and a focus on the objective at the expense of the subjective build an information gap between classes of people. Stereotypes develop with the loss of contact and mutual understanding. People are judged only by external measures, and in our society, with its emphasis on the economy and consumption, the measures are of material wealth or success. People who are not successful in economic terms are assumed to have all kinds of undesirable characteristics. They are seen as losers and dangerous people. They are seen as threats to the status quo, which benefits those who have made it. In the disqualified universe where the economy is the major
social institution, market value becomes the measure of all things. If you do not possess it, you are a loser, maybe even a dangerous loser.

SEEING THE SUBJECTIVE AND STOPPING THE WAR

Adopting Wilber’s all-level, all-quadrant framework can get us headed in the direction of requalifying our world by taking the subjective dimensions of human experience into consideration. Expanding the subjective space that was reduced by modernity may make declaring war on sizeable segments of our population more difficult. It can also increase our understanding of our collective intentions and values as expressed in the declaration of war on crime. Exploring the subjective contexts for our strategy of social control (i.e., the war model) can disclose that there are self-serving and even immoral factors that contribute to our approach. It may make it harder to continue the war and move us toward more peaceful and less harmful approaches to crime and criminal justice.

VISION-LOGIC AND PRISON POPULATIONS

Our response to crime has resulted in the confinement of a considerable proportion of our population in jails and in prisons. In addition, a disproportionate number of those who are incarcerated are poor, urban, young, minority males. Prison construction is a growth industry, and there seems to be no end in sight.

Conservative, tough-on-crime advocates of incarceration and liberal critics square off over issues like cost-effectiveness, justice, and societal protection. Their arguments are often presented in rational-empirical terms. It’s a tug-of-war. Conservatives pull for more prisons, whereas liberals pull for less. Right now, the conservatives are winning. It looks like the trends in incarceration rates and prison construction will continue. The suffering of those incarcerated and their families will continue to rise.

The arguments between conservatives and liberals about imprisonment and related issues will go on forever. The strength of the evidence might shift slightly from side to side over time and political currents will change, resulting in more or less prisons and jails. However, until something radical happens, we will have a large number of prisons and jails confining a relatively large proportion of our population.

A radical policy solution is unlikely to emerge without a change in the level of consciousness. If a substantial number of people reach the level of vision-logic or above and establish a cultural worldview that embraces all others, it will be difficult to continue a war on crime and harshly punish those who are
defined as enemies. Vision-logic will require alternatives to the war model and to punishment by confinement. Vision-logic, which Wilber (1998b) also calls "creative vision" (p. 69), will see solutions to our prison problem that we do not see from the rational level and lower. It will create a space where protection of society can be reconciled with the reduction of suffering for those who are in need of some form of external control or intervention. New possibilities will emerge from the vision-logic perspective. Of course, as Wilber points out, new problems and challenges will emerge at each new level, which will require a move (transcendence) to the next level for a solution.

Wilber does not provide a detailed description of what he thinks the criminal justice system will look like from the centaur's worldview. However, his discussion of vision-logic suggests that areas of criminology such as peacemaking, restorative justice and postmodern or poststructural analysis in criminology represent the emergence of creative vision in criminology and criminal justice.

It is important to keep in mind that vision-logic is more than adopting a new perspective for intellectual analysis and debate. It is a different way of seeing the world and experiencing the world. It is a shift in the seat of consciousness that happens at the interior-individual level.

As noted previously, doing this inner work requires that we reclaim the interior or the spectrum of consciousness that was diminished by modernity in the collapse of the left-hand path into the right-hand path. The methods for doing inner work are part of the perennial wisdom traditions that were all but lost in the West when science and systems became the dominant ways of knowing.

THE FOUR QUADRANTS AS A FRAMEWORK FOR ORGANIZING KNOWLEDGE IN THE DISCIPLINE

Wilber's all-level, all-quadrant approach may provide a way to organize our knowledge in criminology and criminal justice to take stock of where we are now, suggest areas that should be developed in the future, and begin the enormous task of synthesizing or integrating our knowledge. For instance, we could classify criminological theories and research in terms of the four quadrants. Like all other social sciences, most of our theories and research would be classified in the UR and LR quadrants. There are strong traditions of positivism and structural functionalism in criminology. Most of our theories and tests of them are hypothetical-deductive enterprises that seek theoretical-empirical fit, or they are systems analyses used to determine where components fit in terms of the purpose of the system. According to Wilber, these kinds of theories and research focus on exteriors or surfaces. Objective measures are of central interest. Most biological, psychological,
and social-psychological theories and studies of crime would be classified in the UR quadrant. For example, Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) general theory, which we introduced previously, is an example of a theory that would fit the exterior-individual quadrant.

Most sociological and economic theories of crime and their related research would be classified into the LR quadrant. Their focus is on systems-level activities (e.g., national wealth, unemployment rates, racial distribution in neighborhoods, and level of neighborhood integration). Messner and Rosenfeld’s theory (1994), which focuses on the role of the dominance of the economy as a social institution in the production of crime, would be classified in the exterior-collective quadrant.

Some subcultural and cultural theories of crime that are developed from a grounded theoretical perspective are representatives of the LL quadrant. Here the approach to research is qualitative. The researcher, by means of participant observation or interview, enters the worldview of the group to understand their worldview. Walter Miller’s (1958) classic study of lower class culture, in which he uncovered lower class focal concerns as promoting delinquency, is an example of theory and research that would fit the interior-collective category.

As with the interior-collective, exploring and understanding the interior-individual requires that we enter the subjective worldview. Here we are entering the world of the individual. We want to see with his or her eyes and experience the world as he or she experiences it. We want to understand the world, or an aspect of it, from the individual’s subjective perspective. This usually requires that we talk to the person. Qualitative interviews are the central method to exploring the interior-individual domain. Hans Toch’s (1992) seminal work in the area of violence described in Violent Men fits the UL quadrant.

Wilber argues that we have to honor all four quadrants and recognize their mutual influence to get a complete understanding of any phenomenon. The consideration of the level or stage of development within a quadrant is also important. Our theoretical and research efforts, as well as our interventions, can be classified by the level within the quadrant.

Most criminological work that takes level into consideration is based on developmental psychology and is focused on the individual. The work of Warren (1983) on interpersonal maturity levels (I-levels) comes to mind as a specific instance. However, there are many criminological theories, especially those that center on individual socialization (e.g., Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), that see the level of development as essential to understanding crime and developing interventions. These theories suggest that many of those who engage in crime are at the level of representational mind and lower, which is a preconventional level of moral development. These are egocentric
individuals focused on the satisfaction of their personal needs. Helping them to move up the spectrum of consciousness or develop cognitively and morally to conventional and even postconventional levels is done primarily through techniques developed by Western psychologist.

Classifying criminological and criminal justice theory, research, and practice by Wilber’s all-level, all-quadrant approach is a step in developing an integrated approach to crime and criminal justice. Use of Wilber’s approach requires that we recognize and honor each aspect or domain of reality and that we see their connectedness. Anything less will result in a partial understanding.

Using Wilber’s all-level, all-quadrant approach to classify criminological knowledge can lead to orientating generalizations or sturdy conclusions. As we noted earlier in this article, the process is similar to that for finding convergent validity. When we view theories and research from Wilber’s broad framework, we may find that certain themes and findings emerge again and again. Although the details of the theories and research may differ, they may still share much in common. The all-quadrant, all-level approach may help us find commonality.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Wilber’s work has some obvious implications for education. The effort to classify criminological knowledge and identify orienting generalizations can be featured in the content of undergraduate courses and provide direction for graduate-level research. These are contributions to education as it traditionally operates.

A more controversial application of Wilber’s framework is to introduce students not only to the idea of higher stages of development (i.e., beyond the rational) but also to the practices of higher levels of development (i.e., contemplative and meditative methods). The suggestion will bring sharp criticism and strong resistance in academia.

At least in their academic lives, most professors are securely ensconced in the level of the rational mind. They are high-functioning formal operational thinkers whose teaching goal is to help their students perform at a higher level of formal operational thinking. Indeed, from the perspectives of many disciplines, rationality is seen as the purpose of the university.

More than a quarter of a century ago, Robert Pirsig (1974) referred to the university as the “church of reason.” His point was that higher education limited learning and experience to a single level of consciousness, the rational. Of course, as we see it, rationality is not the problem. There are many advantages to this way of thinking. Indeed, a liberal education, which we consider desirable, is a product of rationality. However, we do not see any benefit to limiting education only to the rational level. Recent developments in educa-
tion, which we have mentioned previously in this article, have limited higher education even more. The collapse of interior domains of knowledge into exterior domains and the further reduction into one aspect of the external world have transformed universities from churches of reason into centers for economic opportunity, enterprise, and employment. This was recognized by Michael Novak (1998) three decades ago when he wrote the first edition of *The Experience of Nothingness*. Today, we have university presidents who are corporate executive officers, faculty who are cost centers and profit centers, and students who are customers. University administrators encourage the faculty to adopt a business model in operating their academic departments and to be consumer oriented. The worth of a degree is seen in terms of its value in the marketplace.

We are not arguing here that the economy is unimportant. We are not suggesting that education should not enhance marketability or that job enrichment is unrelated to education. We think, however, that limiting education to the rational-economic dimension diminishes education. Education should be more than job preparation or training. As Charles Handy (1989) points out in *The Age of Unreason*, education should not prepare students narrowly for today’s world but should prepare students broadly for the world of tomorrow. We cannot forecast the future with much accuracy, especially with the world changing so rapidly. A freshman in college today may enter a very different world in 4 years. How can we prepare our students for such a world?

One of Wilber’s central messages is that reason, as we know it, which is a central feature of higher education, is not the end of the line. There is something greater beyond. Although it is not without its dangers, and indeed new problems do emerge, it holds the potential for great benefit to the individual and the collective. Going deeper into the interior, or increasing awareness or consciousness, is the direction of our evolution. The history of humankind and the development of individuals suggest that we should be evolving toward higher levels of consciousness. The question is, “How can we stay on the evolutionary track and avoid delay or getting stuck or regressing?” A partial answer is higher education.

Education, going back to the Latin root, means to lead out of. The purpose of a liberal education is to lead students out of a narrow perspective and provide them with the opportunity to develop a broader, deeper perspective from which to experience the world. Students should see the world differently after their education. If they do not, we have failed and they have failed.

The more broadly and deeply that we see the world, the more meaning it will hold for us. A true liberal education should contribute to the meaning of peoples’ lives no matter what they do after college. The way to see the world from a broader and deeper perspective is by moving up the spectrum of consciousness. If we want our students to have the opportunity to increase their
level of consciousness or awareness, introducing them to Wilber’s framework is a start. We can introduce them to the collapse of the left-hand path into the right-hand path and the loss of the higher levels of development. We can show them that the existence of higher levels of awareness beyond the rational are an orientating generalization drawn from the perennial philosophy. We can introduce them to the contemplative methods and meditative practices that are the injunctions, exemplars, or paradigms used to make the transcendence to higher levels of awareness without mixing religion and spirituality. Religion as it is commonly understood is belief based and often at the mythic level. Spirituality goes beyond belief. It is a form of inquiry into the interior—not faith in otherworldly powers. If enough students choose to follow the path to increasing their level of interior depth or increasing their level of consciousness, we may see the emergence of the critical mass of individuals necessary to create a higher level worldview in cultural space (LL quadrant), which in turn can influence the social system (LR quadrant).

THE SEEDS OF INTERIOR GROWTH

Does the introduction of contemplative and meditative practices into the higher education enterprise of today sound unlikely or even bizarre? Well, consider this: The American Council of Learned Societies, with funding from the Nathan Cummings Foundation and the Fetzer Institute, is sponsoring their 3rd year of fellowships to college and university faculty to introduce contemplative methods into their courses (Contemplative Practice Fellowships). These same organizations support The Center for Contemplative Mind, which promotes meditative and contemplative practices and hosts academic conferences. Increasingly, academics are suggesting combining contemplation and meditation with more traditional academic activities. Examples are Dancing With Your Books: The Zen Way of Studying (Gibbs, 1990) and Reclaiming The Tacit Dimension: Symbolic Form in the Rhetoric of Silence (Kalamaras, 1994). As we have mentioned, in our discipline there is an emerging area of interest and study that has become known as “criminology as peacemaking,” which is the title of a book edited by Harold Pepinsky and Richard Quinney (1991). Some of the contributors to Criminology as Peacemaking recommend socially engaged spirituality as a way to help remedy some of the problems created by our current criminal justice system. There are a growing number of postmodern criminologists who view crime and justice in a broader social and cultural context than traditional approaches and include subjective aspects in their investigations (Henry & Milovanovic, 1996, 1999; Milovanovic, 1997).

Meditative practices have appeared in criminal justice practice. In Inner Corrections (1989), Lozoff and Braswell introduce spiritual methods as a
way to help prisoners deal with prison and life in general. In the fall of 1999, a conference sponsored by the Nathan Cummings Foundation and the Threshold Foundation will be held at Upaya, a meditation center in Santa Fe. The purpose of the meeting is to bring together a group of individuals "who have made important contributions to bringing a reflective or contemplative perspective and practice into the prison system" (J. Halifax, personal communication, July 11, 1999).

We noted that, according to some theorists and researchers, those involved in crime may operate at a fairly low level of consciousness development. It may be that the privations of prison push even those who operate at a higher level of consciousness to regress. However, Wilber suggests that meditation can help even those who operate at lower levels of consciousness. "Meditation is one of the single strongest antidotes to egocentrism and narcissism (and geocentrism and anthropocentrism and sociocentrism)" (Wilber, 1995, p. 257).

Even in cases in which meditation does not result in a radical transformation to the higher stages in the spectrum of consciousness, there are benefits associated with the practice of meditation. For example, meditation can help people deal with frustration and respond to situations rather than react or overreact in habitual ways. This may be an especially important quality of the mind that should be developed to help ameliorate the stresses associated with confinement in prison. Meditation may not only help prisoners deal with stress but can also help the staff deal with the stresses of working in prison. Indeed, many criminal justice agents in corrections and policing face considerable job stress. If both criminal justice agents and clients can increase their capacity to deal with the stress and frustration of their daily round, the frequency and seriousness of problems will be reduced.
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