



**California Institute
of Integral Studies**

**International Journal of
Transpersonal Studies**

Volume 36 | Issue 2

Article 8

9-1-2017

Introduction to the Special Topic Section: The Taylor-Hartelius Debate on Psychology and Spirituality

Brian Les Lancaster

Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, UK

Harris L. Friedman

University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.ciis.edu/ijts-transpersonalstudies>



Part of the [Philosophy of Science Commons](#), and the [Transpersonal Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lancaster, B., & Friedman, H. (2017). Introduction to the special topic section: The Taylor-Hartelius debate on psychology and spirituality. *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 36 (2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.24972/ijts.2017.36.2.72>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

This Special Topic 2 Introduction is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals and Newsletters at Digital Commons @ CIIS. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Journal of Transpersonal Studies by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ CIIS. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@ciis.edu.

Introduction to the Special Topic Section: The Taylor-Hartelius Debate on Psychology and Spirituality

This special topic section of *IJTS* comprises what we would term, after Kahneman (e.g., see Kahneman & Klein, 2009) an “adversarial collaboration.” Kahneman introduced this term in the context of the controversy over replicability in psychology, given that many of the most revered studies within much of scientific psychology (e.g., Nosek & Errington, 2017) are now suspect due to failures to replicate. Kahneman had in mind that those who held different views on an empirical issue could collaboratively design a proper replication study together that would beforehand satisfy both adversarial parties as to its fairness. In the context of the *adversarial collaboration* in this special issue, it is not so much replicability that is the focus; rather the confrontation centers more on the *interpretation of data*, especially when the metaphysical assumptions underlying the interpretations are forced to the surface.

More specifically, the question at the core of the following Taylor-Hartelius debate concerns the overarching framework within which key topics in transpersonal psychology—especially that of individual transformation to states viewed by the transformed individuals as in some sense enriched by comparison to the previous state of being—should be viewed. In brief, Taylor argues for a modified version of the *perennialism* that seems to have been central to many in the early transpersonal movement, and which was elaborated considerably by Wilber starting with his 1975 paper in the *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology* entitled, “Psychologia Perennis: The Spectrum of Consciousness,” and continuing through much of the reformulations of what is now termed his integral view. Hartelius builds on critiques of perennialism that many scholars of religion have advanced, and that have contributed to the transpersonal field through the work of Ferrer (2000, 2002) as well as Hartelius and Ferrer (2013).

As editors of this journal, we regard the dialogue in these pages as collaborative inasmuch as both players are seeking ways to advance transpersonal psychology. The adversarial edge is evident in the tenacity with

which each argues their corner. We believe that such adversarial collaborations are crucial to the further development of our discipline. Disputational and confrontational methods have proved their worth in the history of ideas—from Greek oratory, through Talmudic argument, to the peer-review orthodoxy of our day. Too much “coziness” never led to soaring wisdom! Of course, disputations have had their bitter taste—with, for example, medieval disputations being dominated by polemical hatred and character assassinations (Maccoby, 2001). One learns from history, then, the importance of respecting the opponent whilst pursuing the debate with rigor and intellectual honesty. We look forward to future adversarial collaborations conducted in this spirit.

As a guide to the reader there is offered here a brief summary of the dialogue that comprises this special issue. The dialogue began with the publication of Taylor’s (2016) paper on his *soft perennialism*, and Hartelius’ (2016) critical response. The follow-up consists of three papers by each participant, offering detailed presentations of their respective views and ripostes to the other’s arguments. The positions may be summarized as follows, beginning with Taylor’s case for a soft perennialism.

Taylor's Soft Perennialism

In Taylor's view, there is an important type of personal transformation, that many characterize as “awakening,” which happens both within and outside of spiritual contexts. Because it occurs in secular contexts as well as spiritual ones, and because the same fundamental themes and characteristics occur across different spiritual traditions, it appears to be a universal human potential. For Taylor, the most parsimonious non-reductive interpretation of data pertaining to the form of transformation characterized as “awakening” entails some version of perennialism, the term used to capture the cross-cultural commonalities in the transformational process. Doctrinal and ontological claims that exclude the study of perennialism from scientific psychology may

be bracketed off from the phenomenological data that support this notion of a universal human transformative potential.

Given that the phenomenology of these experiences is publicly accessible, this can be studied and tested empirically as evidence for perennialism or essentialism—in particular through engagement with spiritual practices that have given rise to cross-cultural mystical experiences with common characteristics. On this basis, perennialism and essentialism constitute legitimate interpretive frameworks for a transpersonal psychology. While essentialist interpretations of empirical data about spiritual experiences or states inevitably involve metaphysical assumptions, the reductive frame of science is also metaphysically based, and therefore is not in a position to reject other metaphysical positions as uncritical. For all of these reasons, transpersonal psychology should not align itself with a vision of science that rigidly excludes metaphysical positions. A more balanced approach would incorporate nuanced and phenomenologically based forms of perennialism, and consider metaphysical claims that challenge traditional scientific views, where these may be supported by reasonable evidence.

Hartelius' Critique

Hartelius, in turn, recognizes the importance of the potentially cross-cultural transformative process described by Taylor, but raises the following issues. In his view, claims that phenomenological studies provide evidence for a perennialist model employ circular reasoning in a critically unsound effort to bolster metaphysical speculations. This problem is confounded when a researcher such as Taylor, who appears to hold strong metaphysical beliefs, claims to discover evidence for these beliefs by conducting studies of the phenomenology of transformative processes in which his biases do not appear to be adequately bracketed.

Hartelius acknowledges that phenomenology and other empirical data may be interpreted within metaphysical frameworks in religious contexts, but holds that such an approach is out of place in scientific psychology. The fact that all inquiry, including science, requires some unavoidable metaphysical assumptions does not place every speculative metaphysical system on par with the well-demonstrated methods of science. Some of the limitations of a scientific approach may perhaps be avoided by bracketing simplistic Western

Introduction: Taylor-Hartelius Debate

materialist assumptions so the scientific study of spiritual phenomena might be less reductive, less shaped by the metaphysics of Western philosophy, and thereby more empirical and more productive. Perennialism and essentialism may have a place within the philosophy of spirituality, and may have hermeneutical value as a New Age religious notion, but these uncritical approaches have no valid role within psychology, transpersonal or otherwise.

Import for the Future of Transpersonal Psychology

The subject of this dialogue is not a trivial one, but can be seen to address the very heart and nature of transpersonal psychology. It concerns both the methodological criteria that facilitate meaningful gathering of data within the discipline and the metaphysical assumptions that impact on the explanatory frameworks it employs. The significance of the debate for the shape of transpersonal psychology moving forward, as well as the relationship of this branch to other branches of psychology, should be evident. Given this significance, it is the journal's position that debate on the role of perennialism, and associated issues, within the field should not be restricted to a few prominent voices such as those of Wilber, Ferrer, Taylor, and Hartelius, but should include the participation of a wide range of scholars. Accordingly, the journal invites participation in this conversation by interested parties, for publication in a future issue.

Brian Les Lancaster, Editor

Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, UK

Harris L. Friedman, Editor

University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

References

- Ferrer, J. N. (2000). The perennial philosophy revisited. *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 32(1), 7–30.
- Ferrer, J. N. (2002). *Revisioning transpersonal theory: A participatory vision of human spirituality*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hartelius, G. (2016). Taylor's soft perennialism: A primer of perennial flaws in transpersonal scholarship. *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 35(2), 42–47. <https://doi.org/10.24972/ijts.2016.35.2.42>

- Hartelius, G., & Ferrer, J. N. (2013). Transpersonal philosophy: The participatory turn. In H. L. Friedman & G. Hartelius (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of transpersonal psychology* (pp. 187–202). Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118591277.ch10>
- Kahneman, D., & Klein, G. (2009). Conditions for intuitive expertise: A failure to disagree. *American Psychologist*, 64(6), 515-526. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0016755>
- Maccoby, H. (Ed.). (1993). *Judaism on trial. Jewish-Christian disputations in the middle ages*. Liverpool, UK: Liverpool University Press.
- Nosek, B. A., & Errington, T. M. (2017). Making sense of replications. *eLife*, 6(23383), n.p. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7554/eLife.23383>
- Taylor, S. (2016). From philosophy to phenomenology: The argument for a “soft” perennialism. *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 35(2), 17–41. <https://doi.org/10.24972/ijts.2016.35.2.17>
- Wilber, K. (1975). Psychologia perennis: The spectrum of consciousness. *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology* 7(2), 105-132.

About the Authors

Brian Les Lancaster, PhD, is Professor of Transpersonal Psychology at Liverpool John Moores University, UK, Associated Distinguished Professor of Integral and Transpersonal Psychology at the California Institute of Integral Studies, US, and an Honorary Research Fellow in the Centre for Jewish Studies at Manchester University, UK. He is currently a Board member of the Association for Transpersonal Psychology, and has previously been Chair of the Transpersonal Psychology Section of the British Psychological Society and President of the International Transpersonal Association. Les’ research interests focus on the cognitive neuroscience of consciousness and the connections between this topic and mysticism, specifically focusing on Kabbalistic Psychology. Les is Co-Founder and Co-Director of the Sacred Science Circle, and a Founding Director of the Alef Trust, through which he runs online postgraduate Masters and Doctoral programs in consciousness, spirituality and transpersonal psychology. Website: www.les.lancaster.com.

Harris Friedman, PhD, is Research Professor of Psychology (Retired) at University of Florida and

Professor Emeritus at Saybrook University. He is a Florida licensed psychologist, holds the Diploma in both Clinical Psychology and also Organizational and Business Consulting Psychology from the American Board of Professional Psychology, and practices as a clinical and organizational psychologist. He is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association and has published more than 200 scholarly books, chapters, and articles, as well as serves as Senior Editor of this journal and Associate Editor of *The Humanistic Psychologist*. He is co-editor of *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of Transpersonal Psychology* (2013). His doctorate in clinical psychology included additional doctoral specialization in sociology (Georgia State University), and his master’s degree was in sociology (Emory University). He has taught both psychology and sociology at many colleges and universities, and his scholarship and practice straddles both disciplines.

About the Journal

The *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies* is a peer-reviewed academic journal in print since 1981. It is sponsored by the California Institute of Integral Studies, published by Floragrades Foundation, and serves as the official publication of the International Transpersonal Association. The journal is available online at www.transpersonalstudies.org, and in print through www.lulu.com (search for IJTS).