
The Death of Psychology: Integral & Fifth Force Psychologies



R. Michael Fisher, Ph.D.
© 2010

Technical Paper No. 36
In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute

The Death of Psychology:
Integral and the Fifth Force Psychologies

R. Michael Fisher, Ph.D.

Copyright 2010

All rights reserved . No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, without permission in writing from the publisher/author. No permission is necessary in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews, or other educational or research purposes. For information and permission address correspondence to:

In Search of Fearlessness Research Institute
507 S. James St., Carbondale, IL
62901

Contact author:

rmichaelfisher@gmail.com
www.feareducation.com

First Edition 2010

Cover and layout by R. Michael Fisher
ISOF Logo (original 1989) designed by RMF

Printed in USA

The Death of Psychology: Integral & Fifth Force Psychologies

- R. Michael Fisher, Ph.D.
©2010

Technical Paper No. 36

Abstract:

The purpose here is to translate the Fifth Force Psychologies movement through an integral (Wilberian) lens. One of the most significant impacts of doing this comes from the integral initiative, which has led to Ken Wilber arguing “Psychology is dead.” Concomitantly, his view is that the “integral approach” is its replacement. This move characterizes Wilber’s unique integral philosophy in a deconstructionist postmodern style of Nietzsche’s “God is dead.” Yet, Wilber, unlike Nietzsche, and more like Rank, reconstructs a post-postmodern vision of a new critical analysis and critical theory. In the author’s view, the best of Wilberian thought and critique is his social politics of knowledge (re: his dealing with the Four Forces). It is what makes a foundational postmodern critical (conflict) theory of Integral (at least, in the Wilberian view, of which the author finds most compelling and useful to the problems of the 21st century overall—that is, ideological conflict, violence, fear, terror, wars, etc.).¹ The very understanding of “psychology” and the field of Psychology is put into question by Wilber’s challenge, just as God was more fully put into question by more and more people after Nietzsche. This technical paper puts Psychology into question, not for the first time, but in a way the author thinks is truly a first 21st century vision and profound in its potential as critique. The author offers nine reasons for naming and reclaiming “Integral-Transpersonal” as the Fourth Force of Psychology.

Introduction: 20-1st Century Critical Social Movements

[**Note:** for brevity sake, this technical paper will not cite all of my prior writing and publications on aspects behind this topic, including my writing on Ken Wilber, integral theory, fear and fearlessness, education, etc.; readers can search this writing from a search of downloadable free documents online via Google Scholar and other indexes and at my website and/or blog: <http://www.feareducation.com>, <http://fearlessnesssteach.blogspot.com>, and in my new book *The World’s Fearlessness Teachings* (Fisher, 2010)]

Psychology is a new god for many moderns, say some critics. There are many reasons to kill God, that is, Psychology. Some reasons are better

¹ I have argued all along that Wilber’s work is a great potential solution (theoretically) to “paradigm wars,” and “Culture Wars”—albeit, it is a bit philosophical (epistemological) and beyond what most people can easily read, understand and integrate. That’s why we need better methods of interpreting his work pedagogically (from a conflict perspective). I have also written in many places that Wilber’s pre-1997 writing is his best conflict perspective work and likely his most important in the future.

than others, no doubt. Or maybe we don't have to kill it, but merely claim it is decaying and dying. Whatever the case, it is part of the postmodern temperament, it seems, to call the "end" of this, or the "death" of that--in a hyper-cultural trope of existential zeal, if not fetish. My interest is not overly about this cultural movement to call out ends to things, in fact, I would prefer we "divorce" our relationships to things--and then see if there is something to salvage after that separation (or differentiation).

My interest in Ken Wilber's articulation of the death of psychology is subtle. It is interesting, well thought out and researched, and his ideas duly important. Unlike Wilber, there are other critics of Psychology that have a case to be made for a new industry become god and become a whole lot of other unhealthy things. Here is one such critic's ascerbic view, much of which I agree with and some of which I don't:

Psychology is Dead, or is that God?

Psychology is clearly the substitute for both faith and reason. If you have no ability in hard science and no love of actual wisdom yet want to impress yourself with a pseudo-doctorate, say a PsyD. Be a shrink. Profit off the helpless, the sad, the superstitious. Use the DSM [Diagnostic Statistical Manual of Disorders] and become a sudden sage. ADHD yet again! My word it seems to be a regular plague. Why do we believe in such scurrilous nonsense? Why do we refuse individual moral agency in exchange for sighing victimhood? Does some neo-profession profit off this? Well of course they do. The APA [American Psychological Association] is stunningly fraudulent and all real scientists, those who engage in say, falsifiable empirical evidence, know this. So, yes help the world. Fire your therapist. Help yourself. Learn a material skill. Psychology is a growth industry built on our superstitious acceptance of an infantile notion of a new god. But this one is dead too.²

I am reminded of two authors from within the field of Psychology and therapy, who called out the same desperation in a world seeking answers, and suggest that humans really ought to consider another alternative. The authors, well-respected internationally, titled their book appropriately: *We've Had a Hundred Years of Psychotherapy—And the World's Getting Worse*.³ I consider this the pivotal nail-in-the-coffin for Psychology today. It's a thoughtful and worthwhile book to read. Be prepared to be shaken.

² Anonymous (n.d.). Retrieved June 1, 2010 from <http://blogcritics.org/culture/article/psychology-is-dead-or-is-that/>

³ Hillman & Ventura (1993).

One thing, as a fearologist, I believe worthy to hold along-side this conversation about the nature and role and future of psychology as icon that is falling, is the issue of what are we going to replace it with? First of all, we'll replace it with grief, and disappointment if not despair. Another promise of "salvation" and "freedom" and self-control and self-esteem is about to be booted-to-the-bottom. Some critics say it has already hit bottom in regard to its capacities and its reality as a "pseudo-science." In essence, I am reading a lot of critics who are aware that the biological and neurological sciences (i.e., Cognitive Sciences) have taken over and left all of us with a sense that the "self is a fiction." Isn't that our biggest fear? I like how Shaun Gallagher (1998) summarizes Michael Gazzaniga's work and book entitled *The Mind's Past*:

Psychology is dead. The self is a fiction invented by the brain [and exploited by Psychology]. Brain plasticity isn't all it's cracked up to be. Our conscious learning is an observation post factum, a recollection of something already accomplished by the brain. We don't learn to speak; speech is generated when the brain is ready to say something. False memories are more prevalent than one might think, and they aren't all that bad. We think we're in charge [as a self] of our lives, but actually we are not. On top of all this, the common belief that reading to a young child will make her brain more attuned to reading is simply untrue. These are the theses that Michael Gazzaniga defends in his book... a report on some recent research in brain science. Although Gazzaniga's book is not without rhetorical and dramatic flourishes, his conclusions are based on hard science, much of it conducted in connection with his own research into the experiences of split-brain patients.⁴

It makes me wonder if a "hard" God is not replacing the "soft" God—and we all know it is Science that is really the 21st century God. The debate is whether it is dead or not. Psychology, arguably, as these critics suggest just couldn't get it up—hard enough, long enough, fast enough. It couldn't keep up. Or, maybe it didn't want to. Maybe it ought not try so hard to be a hard science. These are questions I'll leave alone, they not for this paper.

Moving on... "*Integral*" is a term that can mean a lot of things to different people (its definitions sometimes contradictory from author to author), and that includes people who aren't part of the "Integral Movement" (see McIntosh, 2007 for a good historical review of the Integral Movement that I am interested in) but also those within the Integral Movement, sometimes called the "Integral Revolution" (Reynolds, 2006, 46, 341, 350-54). For my

⁴ Gazzaniga & Gallagher (1998).

focus of research, I'll analyze another movement, the Fifth Force Psychology (really *psychologies* as there are many types) in this paper, from the perspective of integral philosophy and theory (*a la* Ken Wilber). This Wilberian integral approach is based (in part) on what various theorists have labeled "integral-aperspectival worldview" (*a la* Jean Gebser)—a next step or level in the evolution of consciousness (thinking and values) beyond pluralism, humanism, and existentialism.

The *Fifth Force movement* has to my knowledge not been systematically studied before. I'll describe a brief skeletal history of this movement through an autobiographical-historical beginning to this technical paper. The purpose is to translate this movement and one of its significant impacts; which has led to Ken Wilber arguing "Psychology [as a discipline] is dead." Concomitantly, thus, his view is that the "integral approach" is its replacement—even though, he has written a whole book called *Integral Psychology* (Wilber, 2000). This move characterizes, I think, Wilber's unique integral philosophy in a deconstructionist postmodern style and echoing of Nietzsche's "God is dead."

Yet, Wilber, unlike Nietzsche, reconstructs a post-postmodern vision of a new critical analysis and critical theory which I believe is truly bedazzling. Indeed, the very understanding of "psychology" and the field of Psychology is put into question by Wilber's challenge, just as God was more fully put into question by more and more people after Nietzsche. This technical paper is putting Psychology into question, not for the first time, but in a way I think that is truly a first in its profoundness of critique. In researching "psychology is dead" I was amazed how many other people, and academics, have suggested this. It is a social phenomenon of import itself.⁵

I am particularly interested in understanding this social phenomenon I'll call Fifth Force Psychologies and its emergent evolution from First, Second, Third, and Fourth Force Psychology-- as hierarchical and development yet concurrent waves of evolutionary ideas--in our modern Age of Psychology. I am also interested to pursue this brief and initial study because of its relationship to Education as a field and discipline and my study of Fear Management/Education. I have published often on how "fear" studies are overly dominated, *via* discourse regimes, by the "psychology of fear."

⁵ One academic in a 1960 issue, *Journal of the Canadian Psychologist*, 1-4, published by the Canadian Psychological Association, wrote: "Modern psychology is dead; but post-modern psychology is not yet born. But it has already been conceived!" (p. 40). Often the call in literature is the death of a particular kind of psychology (e.g., faculty psychology, comparative psychology, clinical psychology, evolutionary psychology, positive psychology). A good deal of this comes from psychologists, who rightfully, are dismayed at how their own field has declined and been usurped by neurosciences, biology, and other harder sciences in explaining the human psyche.

My background as a liberation educator, in the Freirean tradition and beyond to Foucauldian social analysis, has led me to “divorce” Education proper, at least back in 2003 after finishing my dissertation in Curriculum and Instruction.⁶ That was my second “divorce,” as my first divorce was from “Philosophy” as a discipline just prior in 2002. My doctoral degree is in Philosophy of Education (Ph.D.) though I never well got along with it either—albeit, I would call myself to this day an “amateur philosopher.” Now, this technical paper is my third “divorce” and it is from Psychology. How could I have missed this one? Why did it take me so long to see the dysfunctional relationship I had as an educator with Psychology?

Autobiographical-Historical Overview

It is not like I have never felt critical of psychology and Psychology (as a discipline). I did. However, I was more in love with it than not—and that was for a long time. Let me explain. I am still very enraged at Psychology’s ability to dominate so much of my own perception and thinking, values and worldview. It’s a cultural phenomenon as well. It is true of most every other “modern” person in the world (I’ll speak for Westerners, at least, as I am

⁶ The complexity of this “divorce” has many roots and routes, not the least of which is because of my training as a licenced school teacher in the late-70s and my short two year career as a middle-junior public school teacher (all in Canada). I loved teaching but couldn’t stand schools. More recently, I gained a new awareness that teachers are like soldiers—both are constructed in modern societies by the State. They are regulated by the State, and ultimately, more or less, paid by the State, to serve the State (i.e., Nation and nationalism, if not Empire-building). In a nation like the USA, it is particularly profound to see this similarity in how teachers are recruited, used, and discarded—with the military soldiers in the US Forces. I’ve watched several documentaries on American vets and how many are resisting, getting out, and then teaching everyone about what the military really is all about. The lies and betrayal the vets experience, and the powerful negative impact it has on their lives and their families, are the same narratives (more or less) that any honest teacher in the the public system would also speak out about if they were encouraged. For a good sample of this vet experience, see *Soldiers Speak Out* (2008), by Oscar-winning directors David Kasper and Barbara Trent (@ www.empowermentproject.org). If you think of the analogy, it is all about the State creating a “war zone” (a school system, an occupation in a foreign country)—all for Empire—all for power and control. The sacrifice of young people as teachers and soldiers is a tragedy of immense proportion. Of course, not all teachers or soliders will admit this. They have a big ‘story’ of pride and honor to defend—a story that has always been constructed (bribed) by the State (and before that it was constructed by the Church). It is all about conversion, using fear-tactics, to create ideological hegemonic values and prejudices of Blue v-meme dynamics (i.e., State-Church-Military complex). That’s one side of it anyways. I won’t even go into the Industiral complex (Orange v-meme) that colludes with Blue (I’m using the colors of Spiral Dynamics Theory). It is not all bad or unethical. I’m seeing in the vets speaking out now, more and more, that the hypocrisy and abuse of people is devastating and hardly appears. The silence must be broken and that is why I divorced ‘Education’ just as the vets are more and more divorcing the ‘Military’ (i.e., the State).

one). I was born in the Age of Psychology, what contemporary psychologists of the history of modern psychology call the post-WW-II “Golden Age of Psychology” (Pickren & Rutherford, 2010, p. 213). You could also call it the Age of the self.

I was born in 1952 in Canada. No one warned me of the particular characteristics, historically speaking, in which I was growing and blossoming simultaneously within. In North America a public large scale interest was developing rapidly in what psychology is and what it could do (or promised it might do). According to Pickren & Rutherford (2010), the 1950s was the rise of the “psychological expert” and people more and more were going to psychotherapists. Why? It was the end of WW-II and there were lots of studies on the psychology of war and its after-effects being funded by governments and post-traumatic were important to document and understand. The psychology of propaganda and mass communications was also on the rise connected to the Industrial-Military Complex. But this was also the rise of Cold War fear(s) and the shaking of the foundations of ideals social security and a challenge to a stable predictable future. Beneath the surface of some fragile optimism in the post-WW-II boom, I am sure was an eerie repressed fear of a world of wars of an even greater horror yet to come. We may have espoused “no more ever again” after WW-I and WW-II, but we all can count and know what comes next. I think 9/11, 2001, was the catalyst for the postmodern War of Empires—the War on Terror—‘the forever war’--WW-III by any other name. Isn’t it interesting how particularly psychological the name of this post-9/11 war is? Terror. Fear.⁷ These are psychological wars, aren’t they? Much of my prior research and writing is all about this rather bizarre but understandable hegemony of Psychology in global politics and cultural evolutionary dynamics.

I don’t think the Age of Psychology or self (psyche) is only predicated upon the rise of wars and trauma, violence and crime, fear and terror. Arguably, developmentally and evolutionarily, there was (in still is) a ‘turn’ or correction of consciousness itself (as Wilber might say) to incorporate more than “objective” and “scientific” elements to reality--that is, a return to subjective (psyche) and to introspect, to inquire into the subjective experience deeper than before. I’ll not pursue that motivating impulse in this paper.

⁷ There’s a plethora of books coming out in a post-9/11 critical analysis that show that America is a “culture of fear.” Again, note that an entire culture (nation) is being classified by a particular psychological construct. That’s the Age of Psychology and its powerful way of coloring everything, individually and collectively.

Many philosophers and social theorists believe this was the same time of a “postmodern” mood, social climate and new way of thinking. Postmodern⁸ is not easy to define and I’ll not attempt it here other than to say it is a new skepticism and deconstructionist attitude to the past, tradition, authority and the Modernism dreams of ever-progress. The other major influence on this public interest in psychology came with the rise of the human potential movement at roughly the same time and it highly impacted mental health and human services as a “humanistic” (more psychological) model was growing in popularity—and the 1960s-70s counterculture movement took off with this and the psychology of consciousness itself came over the continent and much of the modern world with drug and love cultures of “freedom.” The psychology of these years, in which I cut my teeth on, never left me. The “self” was in. To search for and study the self⁹ that we were attracted to required the tools of psychology, right? Many a times in my career-searching life I have fantasized of becoming a *psychologist*—a nice respectable profession. I mean, a profession with a good deal of socio-political and cultural power, with or without the white (doctor) lab coat.

I won’t give you the list of all the psychology courses I took, of the experimental psychology labs, and other groups exploring consciousness I became deeply involved in as communities of practioners of the new r(evolution) of self and society. I won’t look behind me in my library right now to see how many “psychology books” I have on the dusty shelves. It’s embarrassing. Yet, for many reasons, some of which I’ll ferret out in the following text of this paper, I was not to become a psychologist. I chose to become an *integralist*. Philosophically and ethically that was imperative. Financially, that was disaster. Then again, I’ve never made a lot of my major life-decisions based on the real American Dream –that is, “security”, as Artress, 1995, p. 39, identified it so poignantly.¹⁰

I have to mention two books on psychology in my library that stand out, in particular as they relate to the topic here. At some point in the 1990s I

⁸ Albeit, I highly recommend Wilber’s (1998, p. 121) definition of “three core assumptions” of postmodernity (based on a constructivist, constextualist and integral-aperstivalist approach combined).

⁹ Granted this notion of “self” is highly diverse and complicated, I prefer Wilber’s integral (postmodernist and relational) view of a “self-System” (or self-Other system) that is evolving along a spectrum of various perspective/interpretations and realities, ever-changing, not “one self” or “one Self” (the latter which many people in the Human Potential/New Age believe is the case).

¹⁰ I’ve argued, since the “culture of fear” phenomenon has taken-over (prior to and after 9/11) (see also Furedi, 1997), “safety” is number one value, and moral and social is far down the line. Freedom is seen as “security” unfortunately, it is sort of the opposite in a culture of fear controlled by a Military-Industrial-Academic complex [respectively, in v-memes, as Blue-Orange-Green = 1st-tier = ‘Fear’ Matrix].

picked up Fox & Prilletsensky's (1997) *Critical Psychology: An Introduction*. This was a Marxist and Foucauldian and critical theory evaluation of the limits and abuses of the field of Psychology as a discipline. Parker's (1997) chapter on "Discursive Psychology" stood out for me as he identified (with other theorists) a definition of the "*psy-complex*" as a unit for critical political analysis of the way Psychology dominates our Western world. This was a good text for me to begin to get a more critical handle on the field I was most in love with at the time. I wasn't in love with the politics of Psychology and most of the serving psychologists (especially of the mainstream).¹¹ This nuance is developed in a paper on "The Silence of Psychologists" (Bar-On, 2001) in Israel (but with applications to other nations).¹²

Remember, however that I was also breeding a subversive ploy to undermine the powerful impact of Psychology in the field of Education. Recently, social educator Wexler (2009) said it well:

Why do we need a book on social theory in education? First, because Education as a practical activity and as a field of academic study is dominated by Psychology. The isolated individual is studied, and individual traits are measured and compared. (p. 1).

Wowwwwah! If you look at the construction of the No Child Left Behind Act, 2001, in the USA, you'll really get a sense of how true this measurement paradigm (called "assessment" or called "accountability" is more "accountancy" than anything¹³) is being mis-used by an entire nation (thanks to Bush's administration and a strong conservative element in America's citizens). Paulo Freire's surviving wife (Ana Maria Araújo Freire) wrote in Freire's (2000) book that "privatizing and globalizing neoliberalism" as politics-of-the-day in so much of the modern world makes it "impossible to integrate the excluded [oppressed] into this system [which is] so highly individualistic [psychology-based] and declined [in value-bias] toward social causes" (p. 111). I have written works elsewhere about the way

¹¹ I cut my teeth in my late-20s and early 30s on the radical anti-psychiatry (really anti-psychology) movements coming out of Europe (e.g., R. D. Laing et al.).

¹² Bar-On (2001, p. 331) argues that some significant number of Israeli historians and sociologists have been outspoken in what they call a "post-Zionist" approach of criticality and research. However, this has not been the case with Israel psychologists. The explanations are that the psychologists are more "State-controlled" in direct ways than other disciplines and thus politically mainstream—at the same time they try to be more scientific, neutral and objective (i.e., they are colluding in scientism, and objectivism to pretend to be politically-neutral, which they are not).

¹³ This useful distinction was made by MacDonald & Shirley (2009).

psychologism (= psychology + ideology) has created a science of measurement of people to the point of oppression.

The second book in psychology on my shelf is the most important and germane—that is, Progroff's (1973) *The Death and Rebirth of Psychology*. I bought and read it in the early 1980s. There isn't space to give due credit to the depth of Progroff's analysis of the evolution of Freud's, Adler's, Jung's, and Rank's psychologies and analysis and their relationship to the loss of religion as the center of coping tools for people to deal with reality. It is a brilliant analysis as I recall. I've not looked at it much since I bought it, except in pieces. The title is enough—enough to tell you that the call of the *death of psychology* is not new, and in fact, is inevitable as Progroff, Wilber, and others (myself included) would argue. The back page of his book, describes Progroff “as critic of the old and as originator of new conceptions ... [he's] long been in the vanguard of those who have worked toward a dynamic humanistic [holistic] psychology.” This is from his early work done in the 1960-70s. In the late 1970s another non-mainstream psychology theorist, Ken Wilber, was emerging in the USA to promote his “spectrum psychology” model (Wilber, 1977/82)—and that was a powerful theoretical innovation (East-West approach) of which I'll focus on (in part) here. It led to his view of “integral” that *is* the rebirth of Psychology in a similar but very different way than Progroff's analysis. It deserves mention that chapter VII in Progroff (1973), “Otto Rank's Two Steps Beyond Psychology” was the real clincher for me as I recall, of even beginning to imagine Psychology was not the ‘new God’ (savior) of humanity.¹⁴ For some reason, I never put this all together until preparing to write this technical paper today.

¹⁴ Progroff (1973) summarized: “... Otto Rank [the brightest star of Freud's pupils, who also left Freud behind] took his two steps beyond psychology, going first beyond a psychology of consciousness and individualism, and then beyond a social psychology that studied the depths of history. By means of his historical depth psychology, Rank reached the irrational ground of man's existence. He saw then that the individual life is irreducible, and that there is no rational substitute for each man's experience of his own soul in the light of immortality. This was Rank's own experience in the few years immediately before he died.... The fundamental significance of Rank's work lies in his perception of the fact that *psychology leads beyond* [p. 252] *itself*. He understood that the role of psychology is as an intermediary by means of which the modern [hu]man can make the transition from his old spiritual beliefs [values, traditions, worldviews] to the experience of a ‘new soul’ still to come. Rank's later writings represent the culmination of the classic period of depth psychology. He marked off the historical limits [like a postmodern deconstructionist would, asy like Derrida] of the psychological view of man, and by doing so he opened larger vistas for the future in which psychology can play a new and creative role” (p. 253). Wilber's integral deconstruction of Psychology is much like this with the added layer that Wilber re-contextualizes Psychology by replacing it with the “integral approach” to psychology and he is harsher than Rank (apparently) in saying “Psychology is dead.” Though, both theorists were looking for the same movement of growth and evolution of psychology and its role in the future, in order for it to be more effective, than inhibitory in the true and deeper advance of human development.

I have a definite meta-theoretical bent when it comes to understanding knowledge and theories. I like to take a macro (universal), stand-back, evolutionary and developmental view (sometimes called Kosmocentric, *via* Wilber). How do different approaches, schools, and ideas develop historically? That is fascinating to me and allows for a critical analysis over a larger period of time as reference. It allows discernment of appropriate developments and ideas, schools of thought, within the contexts of which they arose and served as useful (but only to a point).

All the psychologies became interesting to me, both through studying Wilber, who ordered them in his spectrum (integral) analysis, and in what had appeared in the academic literature of Psychology. I recall long ago opening an encyclopedia of psychology (Corsini) and seeing the notion that there were four waves or “forces” identified by theorists in the field of Psychology (Tart). The First Force was **Psychoanalysis**,¹⁵ the Second was **Behaviorism** (with its Cognitivist spin-offs later on), and the third was **Humanistic** (with its Existentialist spin-offs). The Fourth was **Transpersonal**, and this was the category which Ken Wilber was situated. He was one of the ‘fathers’ of this Transpersonal Movement of scholarship and practices. Wilber was among transpersonalists the likes of William James, Abraham Maslow, Carl Jung, Roberto Assagioli—and depending on who you read there are a lot of other transpersonal psychology theorists included in this list of “biggies.” That all is rather common knowledge, not meaning that it is particularly taught in your mainstream university psychology courses, for it actually usually isn’t. The meta-theoretical view isn’t popular with professors in psychology, or so it seems. Why not? Because it shows a grand progression and development, of which Wilber would say is a maturing of sorts (and expanding embrace of consciousness) as you go from one level, wave, or force to the next. Each including the other before it but going beyond (or transcending) it. Each solving one set of problems in psychology and creating new problems and questions it cannot solve (see for example, any of Wilber’s first books on this). Such a neo-Hegelian type of grand narrative, universal, meta-theory was (and still is) quite unpopular in poststructuralist (postmodern) academic circles.

The story of the Four Forces of Psychology made a lot of sense to me intuitively. I had studied them all and more or less was continually attracted to the next Force, as I grew and matured myself. Then something surprising happened. Wilber pulled out of this location and identity, he

¹⁵ Note, there isn’t total consistency in which is the First Force (see Visser’s revision later in this paper). I go with Tart’s assessment/classification based on several grounds, which I articulate later as well.

more or less declared he was no longer a “transpersonal” psychologist or philosopher and dis-identified from the movement. In his own words:

[by 1983] I began instead to think of the work that I was doing was “integrative” or “integral.” I therefore began writing a textbook of integral psychology called *System, Self, and Structure*, a two-volume work that, for various reasons, has never been published.¹⁶

I’d heard of the “pull out” in the late 1990s. Having been quite consistent in reading most everything Wilber had written since 1982, when I read Wilber, reflecting on his past, saying he had pulled out in 1983, that didn’t fit with my understanding. He may have thought it, but didn’t really declare it publicly in print, that I know of, until well into the mid- to late-90s. Regardless, it fascinated me why. Further quoting his reflection on the past:

But it is true that integral psychology fits none of the existing four forces (behavioristic, psychoanalytic, humanistic, or transpersonal). The claim of integral psychology is that it “transcends and includes” those four forces, but that claim is exactly what the four forces all sharply dispute. In any event, my own opinion is that integral psychology is not a transpersonal psychology; it appears to be more encompassing than anything that today calls itself transpersonal. Nor do I believe that transpersonal can or will become truly integral; all of its many factions are rooted in models that seem demonstrably less than integral. I believe that the field of transpersonal psychology in this country has become a rather specialized field, confined largely (but not totally) to the Bay Area, and that as such it is very important but [a] restricted endeavor. Some critics have said that it has become a California fad, like hot tubs and psychedelics, but I think that is too harsh.¹⁷

Later, I’ll interpret why Wilber has refused to call his work “Fifth Force Psychology,” when some say it should be. I’ll share that I’m not convinced of his rationale and that perhaps there is a good case to be made for claiming “Integral” as Fifth Force.

¹⁶ Excerpt from Wilber, K. (n.d.) “Appendix C: The Death of Psychology and the Birth of the Integral.” Retrieved May 11, 2010 from [http://wilber.shambhala.com/html/books/psych_model8.cfm/Ken Wilber](http://wilber.shambhala.com/html/books/psych_model8.cfm/Ken%20Wilber). He noted he did write and publish *Integral Psychology: Consciousness, Spirit, Psychology, Therapy* (2000) as a condensed version of the original manuscript.

¹⁷ *ibid.* Wilber (n.d.)

I didn't think Wilber was totally transparent (in the quote above) in his formal explanation of his "pull-out" from the Forth Force: Transpersonal. It wasn't just intellectual and emotionally-neutral, in my interpretation. I had formulated the hypothesis that it had to do with an immense disappointment (and hurt), based on where the field of Transpersonal Studies and Psychology was going and the education and communities around that knowledge-power.¹⁸ It had formed various (often competing) regimes that Wilber couldn't seem to influence much at all, and basically most of them disagreed with Wilber and/or rejected him and his work. The schools of thought in Transpersonal were at logger-heads competing for superior status, like every other numbers of schools of thought in other psychology waves and in history of ideas at-large. The dominant transpersonal schools weren't interested in his "integration" or "spectrum approach" much at all. Wilber believed he could "help" the transpersonal schools and other schools in Psychology unite. Few took him seriously or few wanted to leave their favorite biases behind.

He was on his own, in a way, and a veritable outcast (pioneer of pioneers). Undoubtedly, he was going to eventually 'get back at them all' through his Nietzschean tactic (Psychology is dead). Understandably, as a professional and Zen practitioners, he didn't want to play-up his own sense of victimization; yet, he was mad—he'd like say, exasperated (I'd be, if I were in his shoes at the time. He saw a way out of all the conflict, if not epistemic violence and territoriality among the waves or Forces of Psychology but they didn't want to yield from it). Forging on his own,¹⁹ and building his more integrative view and a small following of students and colleagues, Wilber would set out with a vision that I believe is liberative and outstanding among the thinkers of his day.

Wilber didn't call his own movement "Integral" in print until the mid-1990s or so—but even then it was minor. By 2000, with more allies than ever, he came out swinging his sword full-force in Samurai fashion²⁰ with his plans for the Integral Institute and University and a whole on-line Integral Matrix Network of learning. He was going to create his own Integral Empire and leave the Transpersonal Movement in the dust! Undeniably, he had become very popular (more than other transpersonalist in circles beyond

¹⁸ At risk of projection, a lot of my own experience developing transpersonal psychology theory (later, integral theory) has led to an empathy with being a radical outsider from the main power blocs of knowledge in any field or discipline.

¹⁹ He had allies, the transpersonal psychiatrist-academic Dr. Roger Walsh and Walsh's wife Dr. Francis Vaughan, a transpersonal psychotherapist (both in California), as two major ones, among others.

²⁰ Guy (1995, p. 78) argued Wilber is an archetypal expression of the "Samurai warrior" of which Wilber admitted he has a task as "an articulator and defender of the dharma, an intellectual samurai" (Wilber, 1995a, p. 21)

California and around the world). Indeed, he had accomplished a great feat and had become the radical transpersonal psychology theorist break-away (just as so many great psychological theorist broke-away from Freud). His power was growing. In my view and Visser's (2003), Wilber is still a transpersonal theorist, with a strong variation (advance). I'll return to that point later.

I think Wilber also picked out the California-phenomenon as a dig because he saw too many "transpersonalists" as less than scholarly and rigorous and more hyped on W. coast altered states of experience (i.e., caught in a conflation of states vs. stages). But for him that was not the worst of his growing criticism of that movement. I believe, as informed-speculation, he saw that there was so little real deep integration in people who were making all kinds of transpersonal claims of truths and wisdom. He saw a lot of abuse (and pathologies) of "spiritual-types" connected to the transpersonal movement and he saw that their theory was unable to help provide the integration of the complex parts (AQAL)²¹ of the self. So, you ended up with a lot of (to be blunt)--arrogant and ignore-ant 'spiritual assholes.' Wilber can't stand that.

Wilber knew a better transpersonal theory was needed, and he had insights of how that could be, but he had to make a radical separation (divorce) in order to stay clear from the shadow (down-side) of the Transpersonal Movement (in California). He also has been accused more than a few times by critics of being one of those arrogant assholes and a supporter of abusive gurus, etc.. He was horribly exasperated by the way the transpersonal (so-called "spiritual") critics (and academics) had come after him and his work (see Wilber, 1997),²² especially in light of the postmodern and poststructuralist influences that were coming into Transpersonal Studies, like feminism, postcolonialism, cultural studies, and postmodernism in general. His integral theory was developing a whole critique of that (see, for example, Wilber, 1995, 1996). Of course, he was criticized by a lot of people outside the transpersonal movement as well. You either loved him or hated him, is the norm sense of his relationship to the rest of the world.²³

²¹ AQAL, in Wilber's lexicon, standing for "all quadrants all levels" but also all lines, types, etc. Wilber's view of "structures" and his close adherence to developmental psychology and other fields that had uncovered deep universal structures, was not where a lot of the postmodern transpersonal theorists were comfortable.

²² Much of which I have documented in detail in Fisher (1997).

²³ See my lengthy critique of him and his work (and his critics) in Fisher (1997).

Fourth Force Psychology: Contested Territory

To continue my autobiographic-historical narrative, I want to shift focus on the specific reason that I recently got into studying the “Forces” phenomenon in Psychology and then lead this into the next session on Fifth Force Psychologies (and the movement behind them)—as that will give readers the perspective to understand Wilber’s project and my own ideas about Integral: A Fifth Force Psychology.

Several months ago in doing research for a book proposal on integral multiculturalism and praxis, I came across the writing of an important postmodern multicultural theorist in the field of counseling and psychotherapy—Paul B. Pedersen. Overall, I found the multicultural literature in this field rather predictable Green v-meme discourse,²⁴ but then I saw a “Multiculturalism as a Fourth Force,”—a concept Pedersen (1998) had written a whole book on. He had suggested Multiculturalism was a fourth force in psychology, not Transpersonal, as I had previously read about (e.g., Tart, 1975).

The search by Pedersen and others in the field of counseling and psychotherapy was to address the paradigm shift from “monocultural to a multicultural basis” (Mahoney & Patterson, 1992 cited in Pedersen, Crethar & Carlson, 2008, p. 224). It was a postmodern age and “Cultural” was all important²⁵ context for most everyone in the academy and a lot of the helping professions. Pedersen, Crethar & Carlson wrote:

[transpersonal psychology, called “Fourth Force” by Tart (1975) was] based on the spiritual revolution in modern society. Since that time, many of the principles of transpersonal psychology have been subsumed into the larger and more diffuse multicultural movement. (p. 224)

The postmodern Multicultural theorists here were using complexity and chaos theory, and cultural theory, as well as multicultural theory, to forge a new paradigm for counseling and psychotherapy that better fit the nature of the diverse societies we were living in, especially in urban centers in North America. “Culture becomes the perfect metaphor for understanding this new complex concept of self and its [post-]modern applications to psychology” (Pedersen, Crethar & Carlson, 2008, p. 225). In Pedersen (1998) he argued that multiculturalism changes not merely the content of

²⁴ I’m using Beck & Cowan’s (1996) Spiral Dynamic colors for identifying value-memes.

²⁵ Thompson, Ellis & Wildavsky, 1990 argued for the prevalence of cultural theory, in general, and that it provided the basis of a new perspective or dimension or force in psychology and counseling, and Pedersen, Crethar & Carlson wrote they were “making culture central” (p. 226).

the field but the way of thinking itself.²⁶ Pedersen, Crethar & Carlson's own view was oriented to calling it a "fourth dimension" rather than a fourth force (p. 226). Nonetheless, Pedersen is known for, and his book title validated it, Multiculturalism as a replacement of Transpersonal as a Fourth Force in Psychology. I've not researched on this to see how many folks, in the transpersonal studies movements or psychology otherwise, were in agreement with Pedersen's re-translation and re-naming of the fourth wave in the evolution of psychology.

Schwarzbaum & Thomas (2008), in this same field agreed that "Multicultural Theory (MCT) is a meta-theory of psychotherapy" (p. 8) and is a "Fourth Force" (p. 5) in Psychology in general. These authors suggested that the training for multicultural competency in clinicians changed in the mental health field as a "fourth force" in the 1980s—when oppression theory (ethnicity, race, identity formations, gender) were all coming into the field as important. I point out the notion of meta-theory in connection with Multicultural because Wilber's Integral is also a *meta-theory*.²⁷ However, Transpersonal was not. The issue left to debate, as this paper unfolds here, is the way in which Multicultural and Integral as meta-theories (paradigms) are alike and different and which deserves Fourth or Fifth Force titles.

I wrote Pedersen, as I was curious to see what his view was in usurping Tart's accepted classification of "Fourth Force." Here is our correspondence:

In a recent day in the university library, updating my mind re: multicultural theory and counseling and psychotherapy, I found a lot of familiar discourses with some new nuance; but frankly, the only thing I found particularly intriguing was your concept (claim) of a "fourth force" psychology, which is multiculturalism. I read only references you and others made (I have not read your 1998 book on this). My own background is transpersonal psychology and more integral psychology. The debates of what is "fourth" and even "fifth" in psychology are interesting and complex. My question for you is, what happened to your "fourth force" (or "fourth dimension") claim? I see multicultural folks pick-up on it but did your claim ever get into the broader debates in psychology/counseling theory? (I don't see this latter). You seem to have usurped Tart's "fourth force"

²⁶ As much as I agree with this in part, I smell an ideological postmodern inflation of Culturalism as hegemonic. A point I'll make later as I critique the multiculturalists (and as Wilber (2002), e.g., pp. 2, 27-8, 35-6, 92, has also done so).

²⁷ Reynolds (2006) calls it "meta-paradigm", pp. 229-286, but the "meta" nature of Integral (*a la* Wilber) is indisputable.

psychology with multiculturalism (diminishing transpersonal)?
 Could you fill me in a bit on this, as it would be useful to my
 getting a quick sense of your initiative and potentially its
 relevance to the integral perspective that Markley and I are
 planning for our book in the Sage series. Thanks ahead...

[Pedersen emailed back] Thanks for your good email. The
 claim by Transpersonal Psych and by Tart is consistent with
 a broad definition of Multiculturalism. I don't feel that I have
 any argument about who comes first. I merely enlarged their
 definition a bit more. There is a lot of confusion about the
 meaning of "multiculturalism." Warm regards, Paul.
 (pers. comm., March 1, 2010).

Two main points are worth bringing out from Pedersen's view. First, he has
 a very broad view of Multiculturalism and what it embraces, not unlike
 Wilber's view of Integral—in that sense of a broad (wide) inclusivity of other
 theories, views, paradigms, and approaches. However, unlike Wilber's
 Integral, Pedersen's Multiculturalism avoids any kind of developmental or
 evolutionary perspective to its claims and capabilities. It is non-hierarchical
 (or holarchical, as Wilber prefers to call it). Pedersen, like a good Green v-
 meme theorist (pluralist) wants nothing to do with a politics or discernment
 of maturation in developments of the waves or "forces" in psychology. He
 says he doesn't have any argument about "who comes first," although, it
 does seem he wants Multiculturalism to come last (as "Fourth Force").
 Wilber's Integral, like Maslow's "transpersonal" or "transhuman"
 psychology, is more discerning developmentally in regard to the
 hierarchical²⁸ (or holarchical) levels of consciousness that each of the

²⁸ "Among American transpersonal psychologists the discipline of transpersonal
 psychology is generally regarded as the fourth great school of psychology, following
 behaviorism, psychoanalysis, and humanistic psychology. Sensing that these first three
 schools were too limited, psychologists set out in search of a vision of the individual that
 was deliberately rooted in the spiritual dimension. Transpersonal psychology essentially
 evolved out of humanistic psychology. Abraham Maslow stood at the cradle of both
 schools. In 1968 he wrote, 'I consider humanistic, Third Force psychology, to be
 transitional, a preparation for a still 'higher' Fourth psychology, transpersonal, transhuman,
 centered in the cosmos rather than in human needs and interests, going beyond humanness,
 identity, self-actualization and the like.'" (Visser, 2003, p. 43). Visser also noted here that
 because "psychoanalysis predates behaviorism historically, it should really be seen as the
 first school of psychology. It is listed second in this sequence because behaviorism was
 already well established as a school of psychology in its own right when [p. 43]
 psychoanalysis was first introduced in the United States. Yet, from a didactic point of view,
 it is more logical to start with behaviorism on the account of the fact that it denies the
 subjective inner life of the individual... while the other three schools all accept the existence
 of and attach increasing importance to the subjective dimension" (p. 44). Visser notes that
 an American listing of the Four Forces may have a slight variation from a European
 perspective, of which Visser takes).

major waves or “forces” address (and represents) on the full-spectrum—I’ll get to that later.

Fifth Force Psychologies: Contested Territory

If you do a Google Book search “Fifth Force Psychology” only has one hit (June 4, 2010). The author (writing in *The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, Vol. 36-7, p. 226) mentions that Visser (2003, p. 45, 48) suggested “Integral psychology” (a la Wilber) ought to be Fifth Force. Visser (2003) wrote,

Some transpersonal psychologists now wish to extend the domain of transpersonal psychology to cover the whole field of psychology, based on the reasoning that the transpersonal not only transcends but also encompasses the personal. In my opinion this would simply lead to a hopeless confusion of terminology. In this case it would be better to use the term *integral psychology* to refer to this all-encompassing psychology as Wilber has done consistently in recent years. This integral psychology might well be seen as the ‘Fifth Force’ within the field of psychology [p. 48] in view of the fact that it attempts to describe all of the aspects of human consciousness within a single integral model. (p. 49)

To make things more complex, because they are, I read a book chapter in a counseling book where the authors (Bieschke et al., 2004) wrote:

Pedersen (1988) proclaimed that multiculturalism is the Fourth Force in Counseling and Psychology.... We suggest that Social Justice and advocacy could become the Fifth Force. (p. 220)

Pack-Brown, Thomas & Seymour (2008), writing within the field of Counseling suggest it is useful to use Ratt’s (2007) five theoretical forces as foundational to good counseling curriculum in post-secondary education: “the psychodynamic (first force), cognitive-behavioral (second force), humanistic-existential (third force), multicultural (fourth force), and social justice (fifth force)...” (p. 300). In the *Textbook of Cultural Psychiatry*, there is an entry on “Reconstruction of the Culture of Mainstream Psychology” which further locates the Fifth Force:

While the contested cultural reconstruction... can be traced to the early 1960s, the call for the cultural makeover... intensified in the 1970s and 1980s such that a mainstream psychology that was grounded in multiculturalism and diversity perspectives assumed revolutionary proportions in the 1990s and represented a Fifth Force or a paradigm shift in the contemporary science

and practice of the field of Psychology. (p. 429).²⁹

More research showed me more citations of people like Ponterotto et al. and Ratts et al., publishing many documents on justification for a “fifth force” in qualitative research methods, counseling and psychotherapy (i.e., Psychology).³⁰ However, that is not the least of the interests in utilizing the label “Fifth Force” in this field of Psychology. There is also a number of authors who focus less on the sociocultural and political aspects of counseling and rather focus on “spiritual” as what makes the “Fifth Force.” For example, a dissertation by Lawrence (1989), looks at Christian psychology as “the Fifth Force” and Morgan (2002) aligns the advent of spirituality in addiction counseling and psychotherapy as “Fifth Force”; while similarly, Gunnell’s (2008) dissertation recognizes spirituality and social justice making up the Fifth Force (relying on Ratts et al. for some part of that conceptualization). Gunnell was attempting to, as I interpret her abstract, integrate social justice with spirituality, rather than having them apart as much of the “Fifth Force” theorists in her field seem to reinforce (my observation of the literature). Indeed, spirituality is down-played in my experience in both Pedersen’s “Fourth Force” and the “Fifth Force” in counseling and psychotherapy literatures I have read so far. Again, this is preliminary evaluation on my part. I am looking for how the newer converted views of “Fourth Force” and “Fifth Force” in counseling and psychotherapy literature integrates the Transpersonal (old “Fourth Force”). At this point, I seeing it doesn’t do a great job of integrating the best findings, methods, paradigms of the Transpersonal (and certainly not Integral). I won’t review the literature, but it is of interest here, that focuses almost exclusively on a “Fifth Force” of a “more ‘purely spiritual’ psychology” (e.g., Boucouvalas, 2000, p. 215) of a “meta-transcendentalism” and so on.³¹ This latter theorizing and categorizing is not typically

²⁹ This book was accessed online, *Textbook of Cultural Psychiatry* (eds. D. Bhugra & K. Bhui, Cambridge University Press, 2007).

³⁰ See Coleman, Liu, Toporek (2003, p. 151), who link with Ponterotto et al.’s call for researchers to adopt intensive constructivist and critical theory paradigms into counseling research (away from more purely modernist-objectivist methods and paradigms)—Ponterotto (2002); see also Ratts & D’Andrea (2004)—Ratts (2009); see White & Parham (2009, p. 33), who talked about “White psychology” [colonialist psychology] and how it has been questioned (as racist) as part of the transition from a “fourth force” (a la Pedersen) to a now emerging “fifth force” movement (a la Ponterotto, Ratts, etc.), of which is perhaps, a post-colonial psychology (my words). Although I have not read all this work in detail, it seems all very pragmatic (practitioner-based) and less theoretically (or philosophically) articulated or self-critical (self-reflexive). And in no cases, within this literature, am I seeing any mention of Integral (i.e., integral theory) and/or Wilber and his work.

³¹ This trace would lead to a huge field of literature on Spiritual Psychology and Esoteric Psychology (again, really a plethora of psychologies)—all arguably, “Fifth Force” by some, and “Fourth Force” by some. I tend to call them all Transpersonal (Fourth Force), for a lot

engaged with the “Fifth Force” discourses in the multicultural field (and counseling and psychotherapy as I have cited so far). It ought to be remembered that even in the early 1970s Abraham Maslow was suggesting a future “Fifth Force” (“transhuman” psychology). These different streams, discourses, and their history would require a substantial study to make sense of and I am unable to do that here, though readers ought to have enough threads to get a ‘big picture’ of what has been unfolding and of interest to many theorists in Psychology in the last four decades or so.

Wilber’s Problematizing “Fifth Force”: Where is Integral At?

Not only are “Fifth” and “Fourth” Force psychologies highly contested, and sometimes even dissociated where they don’t know about each other (and/or ignore each other), there is the problematic of what to do with *all* the “Forces” of Psychologies. As I suggested earlier, Wilber’s exasperation (anger)³² at the epistemic violence between the schools (and his search for an integrative mediational solution) has some basis. Wilber is less optimistic nowadays. In a fairly recent interview (Wilber, n.d.) on Shambhala’s website he said:

Each school [wave, Force of Psychology] has its own approach and its own theory. In fact, the various schools are basically anchored in different levels of consciousness [along the full-spectrum], which is why they will likely never be able to agree with each other.... they simply ignore that which does not fit their school’s prevailing paradigm, which is anchored primarily in their own personal level of development. Instead of trying to integrate the various approaches and the different paradigms --which would require a larger awakening to their own full potentials represented by all the paradigms taken as a whole --they tend to dismiss the others as being ‘old paradigms’ or ‘patriarchal’ or ‘worthless’ or whatnot. So very little integrative systems have come out of this ideological warfare.³³

of different reasons — mainly, because I think they don’t deserve separation from Transpersonal Psychology (although, I’m open to arguments to challenge my view).

³² Remember, Wilber “resigned as consulting editor at the Journal of Transpersonal Psychology” (Shambhala interviewer, in “Part 1: The Demise of Transpersonal Psychology” from Shambhala’s website). Wilber wouldn’t clarify directly his anger or exasperation directly with JTP and that community, but he does say in this interview how they are so hurtful and cause suffering to each other, including all the schools, and he wanted no part of it. Such a situation, if Wilber is accurate, would make anyone angry, who is attempting to tell the public that Psychology is an answer to hurt, suffering, etc.

³³ Taken from “Part I: The Demise of Transpersonal Psychology.” Retrieved January 19, 2005 from <http://wilber.shambhala.com/html/interviews/interview1220.cfm/>

Here is the core, in my view, of the best of Wilberian thought and critique and social politics of knowledge.³⁴ It is what makes a foundational postmodern critical (conflict) theory of Integral (at least, in the Wilberian view, of which I find the most compelling and useful to the problems of the 21st century overall—that is, ideological conflict, violence, fear, terror, wars, etc.).³⁵

In the above interview Shambhala (publisher-anonymous-interviewer) asks: “You think **psychology is dead...**” and Wilber replies: “As a discipline, yes. Has been for almost a decade. It’s just not taken seriously outside of its own diminishing circles.” Wilber refers to cognitive sciences (and biological and neurological sciences could be included here) as well as postmodern and poststructuralist critiques have both, from different angles of usurpation, pretty much gutted Psychology’s value to people and funders as well. Then Wilber goes into talking about the suffering and hurting (his words) between the “schools” and Shambhala asks: “So what’s the solution?” Wilber responds:

Well, for starters, I think that each of the four groups [waves, Forces] ought to simply go their own way. The reason I believe this is that, by their own accounts, each of them is professionally hurt by its association with the others. If you are trying to reach the mainstream, for example, you cannot go into Harvard with a psychology [background] that includes New-Age crystals—you will definitely be dead meat. If, on the other hand, your aim is to reach the New-Age individuals, then having Harvard professors along who demand empirical evidence will ruin the whole experience, because their ‘skepticism’ and ‘non-faith’ will prevent a certain group enthusiasm. You cannot believably take the results of psychedelic drug experiences to the mainstream.... This is all very unfortunate... but it is a reality, and a reality that the field has persistently ignored, which has finally brought it to the graveyard. Each of these schools is hurt by the others, so I say, let the hurting stop. It is time for a healthy differentiation (on the way to a higher integration, or a more truly integral approach). Instead of trying to put all four of these camps into the same tent—where all they do is snipe at each other—let them get

³⁴ I think this is nicely complemented by the Foucauldians, and “social epistemology” (e.g., Popkewitz, 1998) analysis, especially in Education.

³⁵ I have argued all along that Wilber’s work is a great potential solution (theoretically) to “paradigm wars,” and “Culture Wars”—albeit, it is a bit philosophical (epistemological) and beyond what most people can easily read, understand and integrate. That’s why we need better methods of interpreting his work pedagogically.

four different tents, so that each can begin to focus and concentrate on what they do best, without heckling from the others. This would be a much healthier approach.... I truly wish the field well, but I have no desire to participate in this self-demolition.

Wilber's stand-back, almost parental or camp leader, view is so apparent in his analysis of Psychology—and witness of its death. It is a little hard to believe he is emotionally invested in them doing well but maybe he is—more likely, he sees they likely won't do it—that is, differentiate as he suggests. The tone is one of Wilber seeing it all as rather immature and sado-masochistic (self-abusive). He's the therapist of Psychology. None of the others want his counsel. He then presents his mature view. This is what gets Wilber in big trouble with critics—his trumping them with the 'better card.' Wilber continues:

In my opinion, Integral Psychology³⁶ [he means his own, version particularly] is **more inclusive** than any of the traditional schools of Transpersonal Psychology [and he also means, including all the other three Forces].... at some point, as a more genuinely [mature, better] integral approach emerges, systematic ways to include all of them might suggest themselves.... I have offered one such inclusive approach in Integral Psychology, but there could be many others. We shall see.

One hears Wilber's gentle approach to mediate, with the underneath emphasis of usurping Psychology (psychologies) less integrative than his own. Remember, he capitalized Integral Psychology for his own version. In another interview (Appendix C: "The Death of Psychology and the Birth of the Integral") Wilber is explicit of his hope:

My hope is that integral psychology [no caps], in moving outside of transpersonal psychology [Fourth Force] and building more bridges to the conventional world [a major aim of Wilber's project], will provide a complementary approach to move consciousness studies forward, while maintaining a respectful and mutually beneficial dialogue with the four forces. I have long been a strong supporter of all four forces of psychology, and I will continue to do so.

³⁶ In Wilber (2006) he announces in print forthright that he accepts many versions of "integral theory" and philosophy and that is good for everyone, however, he asserts his own for convention-sake to be identified in publications with capital letters only (as differentiation). That must really piss a lot of other integralists off big time.

One cannot deny Wilber's hope and intention, good—sounding, reasonable, and in integrity with his own integral theory. Yet, a good case could be made he is not (and many of his followers included) able to actually have that dialogue, or if so, only minimally with very few in the Four Forces. In Fisher (1997) I documented the conflicts he has and his ways of dealing with them (i.e., the Four Forces)—and I wasn't overly impressed with his un-skillful means often in published critiques and battles he has had with many psychologists.

He is explicit, in this same Appendix C, of his belief:

... that psychology as a discipline—referring to any of the four traditional major forces (behavioristic, psychoanalytic, humanistic/existential, and transpersonal)—is slowly decaying and will never again, in any of its major forms, be a dominant influence in culture or academia.

He outlines in this Appendix C the social and theoretical factors bringing about this decay from outside of Psychology proper,³⁷ but it is important he also has pointed out the inner-conflict within that has torn this field and discipline asunder. What about calling Integral the “Fifth Force”? He wrote in this same piece:

Some critics [e.g., Visser, 2003] have called integral psychology a fifth force, but I don't think that is a useful way to proceed (and it can also become an unfortunate game: okay, then I have the sixth force...).

Basically, Wilber isn't interested in the game, and rightfully so. He also thinks the game (for Psychologies anyway) is a dying game. Why bother? Indeed, on the first point, there are a fair number of “Fifth Force” popular notions (“movements”?) out there on the Internet which are into the game of who can name “Fifth Force” for their particular cause (nevermind, “Sixth Force,” which I haven't researched). For one disturbing example, there is a “leadership coach”³⁸ who has written about “business psychology” (there is an actual Club). The club's

³⁷ One of the many forces is empiricism (a world of “its”) linked to insurance policies—as he remarks, that in “this culture” such things that are not “its” (objective, empirical) “basically do not exist” (for insurance companies)—so, no one wants to take them seriously. The economic conservative climate of our times, he thinks is really mad but it is real and so all the inner soft I-stuff, isn't real, as far as the “hard” world of science, funders, insurance policies is concerned. This has really hurt Psychology and psychology.

³⁸ Jesvir Mahil (n.d.). Business Psychology (Mission Statement). Retrieved June 1, 2010 from <http://www.ecademy.com/module.php?mod=club&c=1253>.

mission is to promote the use of psychology in business. They have invented the Fifth Force. Here is there list:

First Force: Freudianism
 Second Force: Behaviourism
 Third Force: Humanistic
 Fourth Force: Transpersonal
 Fifth Force: Coaching

Oh my, they actually think coaching is of the same categorical level as the previous four forces in psychology. Astounding. Yet, it really gets to look more flakey once the Club of business people actually define it: “Fifth Force: Coaching to create synergy, synchronicity, empowerment, creativity and of course a whole lot more! smile smile.” They continue “Fifth Force: Coaching is a form of kaizen (continous improvement) of the human spirit in order to express more creativity and manifest life and work goals ecologically. They call this doing “business in a new dimension.” Okay, their intention is well, but to call this the Fifth Force, with no self-criticality and no engagement with the other literature on Fifth Force Psychologies, is a sign the movement is about sales-hype not academic rigor.

There is mistaken knowledge floating around in the psychological community. On a recent scan of websites of college courses, I found a course outline³⁹ that the professor claims to his students: “Recently he [Wilber] has proposed a possible fifth force, integral psychology (2000).” This simply isn’t true. Wilber, unlike Visser, wants nothing to do with his integral approach being reduced to a discipline called Psychology per se, nor does he want to label it a “Fifth Force.” When Wilber wrote *Integral Psychology* (2000), he was only showing how his integral approach (Integral Theory) could be applied to a field like Psychology to renew (and help⁴⁰) it—to show that all the psychologies can be validated under a larger umbrella view of psychology (*a la* Integral⁴¹)—at least that is my hypothesis of his aim. He would have

³⁹ PSYC1001/1010:Lecture “Humanistic Psychology, Counselling, Psychotherapy.” Retrieved June 1, 2010 from <http://www.psy.dmu.ac.uk/drhiles/P1010.htm>

⁴⁰ Wilber (in Appendix C) wrote: “... an integral framework thus stands available to help them [four forces in psychology] make the leap to a more comprehensive approach.”

⁴¹ Wilber has offered an *integral approach* (his preferred label) as a form of postmodern epistemological method (i.e., philosophy and practice). Integral is not a type of psychology as are the others (e.g., humanistic psychology). This integral approach can, and is being applied by Wilber and many of his followers to all kinds of disciplines and professions—an endless series of applications (e.g., Integral Education, Integral Psychotherapy, Integral Politics, even Integral Feminism, etc.; See Wilber, 1997, 2000a, for overviews of how he sees this application to all fields and domains). It is this distinction, that makes Wilber’s contribution to history, philosophy, kosmology, and the world so internationally powerful

saved us trouble and confusion if he would have entitled the book *An Integral Approach to Psychology* because that is what he actually meant.⁴² He clarifies, (in Appendix C):

[referring to his unique AQAL (All Level All Quadrant) developmental integral approach as “more adequate to reality” than others] If the only psychologies that will survive [in the future] are psychologies [i.e., Four Forces] that are plugged into an ‘all-quadrant-all-level’ framework [approach] (which includes behavioral, intentional, cultural, and social dimensions, all of which stretch from matter to body to mind to spirit)—such a psychology is not really psychology as we have known it. That is, a four-quadrant psychology is no longer psychology (which is why integral psychology is not actually a fifth force, although many people will continue to call it such). Rather, integral psychology is an inherent feature of a Kosmology, and its practice is a movement of the Kosmos itself.... any truly integral psychology will ‘transcend and include’ all of the important truths of the four forces.... Of course, this is a daunting challenge, perhaps forever unreachable; but as of today we know too much to ever settle for less.

Wilber’s ethical and epistemological approach to psychology (*via* four-quadrants, integral) is both embracing of all the psychologies but it is also very critical of them (e.g., his evolutionary ontological critique of “Flatland”). The label “integral psychology” itself has long been claimed prior to Wilber, by the integral (yogic) Indian philosopher Sri Aurobindo (1872-1950) and his students.⁴³ Wilber embraces the Aurobindoian view of integral psychology, though he has taken it

and likely long-lasting. Unfortunately, it is continually misunderstood by less serious readers and often misapplied (reductionistically) by those who think they understand it.

⁴² In parallel to, or an echo of, Wilber’s declaration of the death of Psychology and the emphasis on “approach” can be found in the rather ‘radical’ move made by one of the leaders of the “positive psychology” movement. In a recent address (2007), Martin Seligman (speaking at the Gallup International Positive Psychology Summit), says the important epistemological and methodological shift that’s needed in the field of Psychology is to incorporate “practice of positive approaches” in all fields and disciplines; Seligman more or less said Psychology is dead, without such an epistemological re-orientation (posted by Steven Dahlberg at <http://appliedimagination.blogspot.com/2007/20/positive-psychology-is-dead.html>). As well Boucouvalas (2000), is an example of someone promoting a “transpersonal orientation” and “framework” rather than mere psychology. It appears Wilber’s approach to “Integral” is not alone.

⁴³ Indra Sen, a student of the Indian philosopher-sage (Aurobindo) actually coined it and in 1986 published a book in India entitled *Integral Psychology: The Psychological System of Sri Aurobindo* (Esbjörn-Hargens & Wilber, 2010).

much further and created his own upgraded version for the contemporary world.

My Resolution(?): Integral-Transpersonal Psychology as Fourth Force

As I conclude this technical paper on a large topic that one can barely do justice to in a short study, I'll suggest an alternative way to keep "Integral" classified as "Integral-Transpersonal Psychology"—a Fourth Force. The routes of classifications and new labels of Fifth Force psychologies I find all wanting, including Wilber's own rationale against it (although, I agree with his overall arguments). I'll give ten reasons for the label "Integral-Transpersonal" as Fourth Force Psychology—that is, a *rebirth* after the 'death of Psychology.' My alternative will displace the less than scholarly rigorous attempts I have seen in the literature (e.g., from multicultural counseling and psychotherapy, business psychology, New Age, and Visser's integral suggestion). My alternative is based (roughly) on the following, not in any particular order:

1) *rebirth* after *death* is the way of evolution/development, of which Wilber's integral theory is premised on (it also is supported by Progroff's (1973) proclamation)—it is a systems, postmodern and process-oriented view,

2) it will replace the silly or less-scholarly and rigorous accounts in the game of one-upmanship (e.g., who can name "Fifth" and "Sixth" Force for themselves and their own clique),

3) it will follow the line of development of Four Forces classifications in Psychology that has already evolved from the original Sutichian (1969), and Tartian (1975) schema, but it includes and transcends that schema; the latter, of which has already been seen in newer often hyphenated versions of the Four Forces: *First Force*: Psychoanalytic (Freudian, post-Freudian, Lacanian, post-Lacanian), *Second Force*: Behaviorism-Cognitivism, *Third Force*: Humanistic-Existential; of which Integral-Transpersonal is *Fourth Force*

4) following Wilber's own evolutionary schema of developmental levels in his full-spectrum, it makes sense that psychology is always a "study" (formal or not) and a representation of a phenomenological reality of existence—with multiple (holarchical) interpretations of the self-System (or self-Other), from adual, dual, to non-dual, from pre-self, self, to no self, pre-egoic, egoic, to trans-egoic (i.e., with appropriate psychologies as "Forces" that deal with the levels—as Wilber articulates from psychodynamic and psychoanalytical interpretations, through behavioral and cognitive, through

humanistic to existential, from integral to transpersonal; thus, that is why Integral-Transpersonal Fourth Force is chosen not the other way around),

5) Integral goes well as hyphenated with Transpersonal because both are metaperspectives⁴⁴ and overly separating integral psychology (as Wilber does) misses this connectivity and tradition of the best (often original) definitions of “transpersonal psychology” (e.g., Sundberg & Keutzer, 1985, p. 441); the hyphenation keeps their commonality but allows for distinction and unique growth and offerings,

6) we don't need more fragmentation of psychologies, and Wilber's approach to dis-identify was likely more emotionally-based, rash, and justified with good ideas but not fully thought out as in implications—that is, probably pissed other psychologies off more than made them feel the connection

7) we need “unity” (with diversity) in Psychology—the best of Psychology can deal with its “shadow-side” (as Wilber has given the critique best of that—and offered solutions), so keeping “Transpersonal-Integral” has some strategic advantages, even if as Wilber says there may be some disadvantages; the former may outweigh the latter,

8) the Age of Psychology is not over, and won't be for a long time, if ever—psychological discourses will trump philosophical ones anyday as a whole (in public spaces), and I think Wilber's rationale for ‘pulling out’ of Psychology (so to speak) and Transpersonal Psychology (overtly) is primarily philosophically-based for him—unfortunately, no one is much interested in integral philosophy as I have found, but lots are interested in integral psychology

9) “Fifth Force” Psychology has resonance in contemporary culture (e.g., new forces in physics) but more importantly it resonates with other developmental models (somewhat integral) out there that a somewhat popular; for example, the psychology of levels by Robert Kegan,⁴⁵ among

⁴⁴ “One of the premises of the transpersonal perspective is the necessity to examine belief systems [worldviews and ways of knowing within them]. In fact, the transpersonal perspective is a metaperspective that suggests looking at the relative merits of different belief systems rather than becoming so identified with them that they are imposed on others (Walsh & Vaughan, 1980)” (from Sundberg & Keutzer, 1985, p. 441). That sounds an awful lot like the integral approach (*a la* Wilber)—at least, it is enough similarity to keep them hyphenated. See also Boucouvalas (2000) who forefronts the “transpersonal orientation as a framework” for understanding and applications. Also, note in Fisher (1993) that I have long been a critic of “transpersonal psychology” (become ideology) myself—of course, equally applicable to “integral.”

⁴⁵ “5th Level: Post-Modernism, dialectical, trans-ideological, trans-system/complex [i.e., postmodern] mental competency and complexity]” Taken from an excerpt from Kegan's *In*

others. That said, “Fourth Force” (Integral-Transpersonal) is good enough to cover the territory.

I don't have space to deal with the nuances and counter-arguments. Perhaps I have mis- or over-interpreted Wilber's views. This is meant to stir the dialogue and may we all make the necessary critiques and improvements. I know I am going to be out there 'marketing' Integral-Transpersonal Psychology as the way to teach (first door way into) “Integral” (a *la* Wilber). I admit, I haven't yet tried this. So, this piece is all theoretical at this point.

References

- Artress, L. (1995). *Walking a sacred path: Rediscovering the labyrinth as a spiritual tool*. NY: Riverhead Books.
- Bar-On, D. (2001). The silence of psychologists. *Political Psychology*, 22(2), 331-345.
- Beck, D., & Cowan, C. (1996). *Spiral dynamics: Mastering values, leadership, and change*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Bieschke, K. J., Croteau, J. M., Lark, J. S., & Vandiver, B. J. (2004). Toward a discourse of sexual orientation equity in the counseling professions. In J. M. Croteau, J. S. Lark, M. A. Lidderdale, & Y. B. Chung (eds.), *Deconstructing heterosexism in the counseling professions: A narrative approach* (pp. 189-226). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Boucouvalas, M. (2000). The transpersonal orientation as a framework for understanding adult development and creative processes. In M. E. Miller, & S. Cook-Greuter (eds.), *Creativity, spirituality, and transcendence: Paths to integrity and wisdom in the mature self*. Elsevier Science.
- Esjborn-Hargens, S., & Wilber, K. (2010). Integral psychology. In *The Corsini encyclopedia of psychology*. Retrieved June 1, 2010 from <http://mrw.interscience.wiley.com/emrw/9780470479216/corpsy/article/corpsy0447/current/abstract>
- Fisher, R. M. (1993). Toward a bicentric theory of the Love-Fear paradox: Addressing the critical limitations of transpersonal psychology and the human potential movement. Unpublished paper.
- Fisher, R. M. (1997). A guide to Wilberland: Some common misunderstandings of the critics of Ken Wilber and his work on transpersonal theory prior to 1995. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 37(4), 30-73.
- Fisher, R. M. (2010). *The world's fearlessness teachings: A critical integral approach to fear management/education for the 21st century*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Over Our Heads: The Mental Dilemmas of Modern Life. Retrieved June 2, 2010 from <http://integralvisioning.org/article.php?story=rk-inoverourheads>. See also David C. Korten's “Fifth Order” (spiritual consciousness) related to the “Great Turning” etc.

- Fox, D., & Prilleltensky, I. (eds.) (1997). *Critical psychology: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Freire, A. M. A. (2000). Notes. In Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the heart* (pp. 109-141). NY: Continuum.
- Furedi, F. (1997). *Culture of fear; Risk and the morality of low expectations*. London: Cassell.
- Gazzaniga, M. (interviewed by S. Gallagher). (1998). The neuronal platonist. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 5(5-6), 706-717.
- Gunnells, T. A. H. (2008). An exploration of the relationship between spirituality and social justice work of counselors and counselor educators. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 69(6-A), 2155.
- Guy, D. (1995, July/Aug). The world according to Wilber. *New Age Journal*, pp. 77-79, 93-96.
- Hillman, J., & Ventura, M. (1993). *We've had a hundred years of psychotherapy—and the world's getting worse*. NY: HarperOne.
- Lawrence, C. L. (1989). The Fifth Force: Christian psychology illustrated by a Christian/psychoanalytic integration. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 49(10-B), 4548.
- MacDonald, E., & Shirley, D. (2009). *The mindful teacher*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Morgan, O. J. (2002). Alcohol problems, alcoholism and spirituality: An overview of management and scales. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, 20(1), 1-18.
- Pack-Brown, S. P., Thomas, T. L., & Seymour, J. M. (2008, Summer). Infusing professional ethics into counselor education programs: A multicultural/social justice perspective. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 86, 296-302.
- Parker, I. (1997). Discursive psychology. In D. Fox, & I. Prilleltensky (eds.), *Critical psychology: An introduction* (pp. 284-298). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pedersen, P. B. (1998). *Multiculturalism as a Fourth Force*. Philadelphia, PA: Brunner/Mazel.
- Pedersen, P. B., Crethar, H. C., & Carlson, J. (2008). *Inclusive cultural empathy: Making relationships central in counseling and psychotherapy*. Washington, DC: APA.
- Pickren, W., & Rutherford, A. (2010). *A history of modern psychology*. NY: Wiley.
- Ponterotto, J. G. (2002). Qualitative research methods: The fifth force in psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 30, 394-406.
- Ponterotto, J. G., & Ptere, J. C. (2003). The Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS): Validity, reliability, and user guidelines. In D. B. Pope-Davis, H. L. K. Coleman, W. M. Liu, & R. L. Toporek (eds.), *Handbook of multicultural competencies in counseling and psychology* (pp. 131-182). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Popkewitz, T. (1998). *Struggle for the soul; The politics of schooling and the construction of the teacher*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Progoff, I. (1973). *The death and rebirth of psychology: An integrative evaluation of Freud, Adler, Jung and Rank and the impact of their insights on modern*

- man. NY: Mc-Graw-Hill.
- Ratts, M. J. (2009, Fall). Social justice counseling: Toward the development of a Fifth Force among counseling paradigms. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development*, 48(2), 160-172.
- Ratts, M. J., D'Andrea, M., & Arrendondo, P. (2004, July). Social justice counseling: 'Fifth Force' in field. *Counseling Today*, 28-30.
- Ratts, M. J., Lewis, J. A., & Toporek, R. L. (2010). Advocacy and social justice: A helping paradigm for the 21st century. In M. J. Ratts, R. L. Toporek, & J. A. Lewis (eds.), *ACA advocacy competencies: A social justice framework for counselors* (pp. 3-10). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Reynolds, B. (2006). *Where's Wilber at?: Ken Wilber's integral vision in the new millennium*. St. Paul, MN: Paragon House.
- Schwarzbaum, S. E., & Thomas, A. J. (2008). *Dimensions of multicultural counseling: A life story approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sundberg, N., & Keutzer, C. (1985). Transpersonal psychology (1). In R. J. Corsini (ed.), *Encyclopedia of psychology* (pp. 441-442). NY: Wiley-Interscience.
- Thompson, M., Ellis, R., & Wildavsky, A. (1990). *Cultural theory*. San Francisco, CA: Westview Press.
- Visser, F. (2003). *Ken Wilber: Thought as passion*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Wexler, P. (2009). *Social theory in education*. NY: Peter Lang.
- White, J. L. (interviewed by T. A. Parham) (2009). Transformative adaptations to linear pathways. In J. G. Ponterotto, Casas, J. M., Suzuki, L. A., & Alexander, C. M. (eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 25-36). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage [3rd ed.].
- Wilber, K. (1977/82). *The spectrum of consciousness*. Wheaton, IL: The Theosophical Publishing House.
- Wilber, K. (1995). *Sex, ecology and spirituality: The spirit of evolution (Vol. 1)*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.
- Wilber, K. (1995a, Winter). Mind and the heart of emptiness: Reflections on intellect and the spiritual path. *The Quest*, 15-22.
- Wilber, K. (1996). *A brief history of everything*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.
- Wilber, K. (1997). *The eye of spirit: An integral vision for a world gone slightly mad*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.
- Wilber, K. (1998). *The marriage of sense and soul: Integrating science and religion*. NY: Random House.
- Wilber, K. (2000). *Integral psychology: Consciousness, spirit, psychology, therapy*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.
- Wilber, K. (2000a). *A theory of everything: An integral vision for business, politics, science, and spirituality*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.
- Wilber, K. (2002). *Boomeritis: A novel that will set you free*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.
- Wilber, K. (2006). *Integral spirituality: A startling new role for religion in the modern and postmodern world*. Boston, MA: Integral Books/Shambhala.