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ABSTRACT

Calling for an expanded framework of EuroAmerican science’s methodology whose perspective acknowledges both quantitative/etic and qualitative/emic orientations is the broad focus of this article. More specifically this article argues that our understanding of shamanic and/or other related states of consciousness has been greatly enhanced through ethnographic methods, yet in their present form these methods fail to provide the means to fully
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comprehend these states. They fail, or are limited, because this approach is only a “cognitive interpretation” or “metanarrative” of the actual experience and not the experience itself. Consequently this perspective is also limited because the researcher continues to assess his or her data through the lens of their symbolic constructs, thereby preventing them from truly experiencing shamanic and psi/spirit approaches to knowing since the data collection process does not “in and of itself” affect the observer. We, therefore, need expanded ethnographic methods that include within their approaches an understanding of methods and techniques to experientially encounter these states of consciousness—and become transformed by them. Our becoming transformed and then recollecting our ethnoautobiographical experiences is the means toward a new kind of science and its methods of inquiry that this article seeks to encourage.

**KEYWORDS:** methodology, shamanism, ethnography, humanistic, transpersonal

---

## INTRODUCTION

Expanding EuroAmerican science’s methodological framework is this article’s focus, the need for which is summed up in an introductory section drawn from Edith Turner’s work, as well as the work of various anthropologists of consciousness and transpersonal psychologists. Making this specific reference to “EuroAmerican” science calls attention to the fact that the way in which our methods of inquiry are framed is limited to the advancement of human knowledge that Europeans and North Americans have developed. Calling for an expanded framework of EuroAmerican science’s methodology elicits comparisons with Thomas Kuhn’s inquiry regarding *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1970), yet this comparison requires a cautionary note as Michael Winkelman points out:

> Kuhn does not explicitly consider methodology or epistemology as particular aspects of the disciplinary matrix [global paradigmatic perspective], in part because they can be seen as subsumed under the metaphysic and values [of EuroAmerican science], and in part because they are essentially universal aspects of scientific activity. [Winkelman 1980:60]

Thus, it will be necessary to examine and propose alternatives to EuroAmerican science’s paradigmatic assumptions of mechanism, materialism, strict objectivity, and so on, before a new kind of science capable of including psi/spirit can be understood. While this article offers some brief commentaries on the metaphysics and values of EuroAmerican science, a thorough examination of these concerns exceeds this article’s focus on methodology.

Second, this article provides a deeper inquiry into the difficult task ahead and various obstacles that will need to be overcome in our quest to create a new
kind of science that can include within it the study of psi/spirit. Third, this article examines more specific reflections on what Daniel Halperin (1996) and Edith Turner (1996) refer to as a “delicate science,” or what I call an “integral/essential science” (Schroll 2005b). Fourth, this article provides a deeper meta-theoretical examination of EuroAmerican science’s paradigmatic parameters that define and limit its methodological inquiry. Fifth, this article provides a few specific examples of the kinds of psi/spirit phenomenon whose authenticity or proper diagnosis/assessment as “genuine” is difficult to ascertain because of two primary misunderstandings: (1) psi/spirits’ close resemblance and misidentification with “magical thinking” and/or “psychosis” and (2) that the ontological reality of psi/spirits’ existence exceeds the parameters of EuroAmerican science. These issues, I argue, support the call for an integral/essential science.

- Expanding Science’s Methodological Framework to Include the Study of PSI/SPRIT

Edith Turner’s (2006a, b) historical tour de force of consciousness studies emergence throughout the last 100 years (focused primarily on examples from the field of anthropology) offers a well-argued thesis that we need a new kind of science. Defiantly, Turner asks: “What right has anthropology’s authority system to dictate in any way whether or not psi exists?” (Turner 2006a, b:53). This kind of ethnocentric bigotry calls into question the very nature of anthropological inquiry, whereas Turner counters that it will not keep new generations of anthropologists from encountering instances of psi/spirit during their field research, even though a smug postmodern countenance continues to dominate mainstream conversations. This question reflects the essence of Turner’s thesis, that our inquiry of psi/spirit,2 liminality, communitas, and experiences of transpersonality3 are only acceptable if we keep quiet about them and/or translate them into recognizable phenomenon that fit the conceptual limits of EuroAmerican science (Schroll 2007a). While this ethnocentric bigotry and postmodern smugness is part of a much broader cover-up, the depth of which exceeds the limits of any single article to reveal, I will sum up the most pertinent details of this cover-up for our present concerns. With the birth of science in the 17th century, the public discussion of philosophers became increasingly skeptical toward theorists that sought to prove the existence of Nonbeing or Spirit-as-ground (Smith 1982). The existence of matter seemed a sure bet, and Newton emphasized this in the public discussions of his theories, hiding the fact that his insight regarding the theory of gravitation came from his study of alchemy (Berman 1981, 1989; Kubrin 1981). Among alchemists it was a commonly held belief that metals had “a life of their own, just like vegetables and animals” (Devereux et al. 1989:24). Grossinger elaborates:
Over the aeons, lead turns to copper, copper to iron, iron to tin, tin to mercury, mercury to silver, and finally silver to gold. The Earth is a loom in which the planets weave their vibrations. The vibrations may be thought of as musical notes that become concretized in the loom, transmutation is thus a changing of the planetary note. [Devereux et al. 1989:24]

Ultimately (like other alchemists before him) Newton was searching for the philosopher’s stone, “alleged to be an agent that changed base metals into gold . . . an agent of astonishing physical healing and spiritual transformation” (Devereux et al. 1989:24). Newton suppressed this aspect of his work, cleverly translating his theories into the language of the materialist philosophy, thereby making them acceptable to the Royal Society.

Initially these thoughts about science, religion, and their relationship to methodology that contributed to this article were framed after I attended a two-day symposium on humanism at the University of Nebraska-Kearney, October 23–24, 1986. A key issue to emerge from this symposium was a clarification of the statement that “man is created in the image of God.” Before continuing with this clarification, it needs to be pointed out that in this statement humankind has been condensed into a single gender that also subsequently genderizes the concept of God as male. While I do not support this view, the necessity for a deeper inquiry of the issue of gender in religion and science exceeds this article’s limits. However, it is a tiny step in this direction to point out that a more neutral concept for “God” is “the divine” (Sharpe 2000). Resuming our examination of the statement “man is created in the image of God,” the usual interpretation of this statement (one that treats “man” as the physical incarnation of God) was shown to be naive in this 1986 symposium. A more inclusive concept was emphasized that the image or essence of God is consciousness. If we can accept this as true, then to study “God” and “his” relationship to “man” is to study consciousness.

A second key issue to emerge from this 1986 symposium was that the study of empirical phenomenon as the central purpose of science or secular humanism. A third key issue to emerge was that the dignity of humankind should be the primary focus of science and religion. It was argued that the problem science and religion face is this: If the dignity of humankind is their primary focus, and “man’s” basic essence is consciousness, how can consciousness be studied empirically? “We must first become aware of the presuppositions being used to investigate the phenomena (i.e., consciousness) in question,” was the general reply during this symposium. I agree we do need to clearly articulate the metaphysical, theoretical, and methodological presuppositions that are used to study consciousness and human dignity. Furthermore, in order to be science, our presuppositions and our truth claims must be verifiable empirically. Therefore (and this is the point that is frequently never examined), before the
presuppositions and truth claims of religion can be taken as science, the core presuppositions of religion must be shown to be empirically verifiable. Likewise, the same empirical examination of our scientific presuppositions is also needed. Humanism and its offspring of humanistic psychology, as well as traditional theosophy, fall short of this goal. Because of this and other limitations of science and religion, Abraham Mallow called for a fourth psychology, a “transpersonal psychology,” where the dialog between science and religion could be researched in a nonantagonistic manner.

Clarifying these initial thoughts regarding the debate on science and religion: first, my ontology is based on holism; and second, my epistemology is based on “empathic understanding”—the incorporation of knowledge beyond rational–intellectual assent as the source of all true understanding. This epistemological stance does not exclude rational–logical thought; rather it expands its parameters of inquiry. Adding further clarity to these views, writing with a sense of hope and optimism regarding the need for a new kind of science, in 1988, I confidently wrote:

Thus we can see that contrary to the present methodology of the social and behavioral sciences stressing value neutrality, predictive power, and a cool disinterested objective stance, the new social and behavioral sciences expand this perspective by including value embeddedness, human freedom, subjective/ethnomethodological interpretation of data, transcendence of enculturation and the cultivation of global attitudes. [Schroll 1988:317]

The optimism I expressed in the previous paragraph heralding the emergence of a new kind of science was premature, which is why I am continuing to clarify my views in the present article. The thesis I am putting forth in this article has no quarrel with secular humanism’s need to promote a model of collective self-conception that potentially empowers us to cope effectively with our complex problems of the everyday phenomenal world. Nor am I seeking to overthrow empiricism in favor of deistic–supernaturalism, occultism, or an ineffable romanticism. Nor do I oppose a healthy skepticism. Rather, I encourage “great doubt” as the beginning of the spiritual path toward transpersonal states of consciousness and transcendence. Nevertheless, I do seek to overthrow scientism, and fully support the efforts of Charles T. Tart to bring greater clarity toward increasing our ability to know and understand psi/spirit (Tart 1992, 2009a, b).

Transpersonal psychologists and related disciplines (Schroll and Schwartz 2005) have criticized EuroAmerican science by arguing that Western science’s strict adherence to materialist philosophy has stifled genuine science, and as a consequence produced scientism (Tart 1992, 2009a, b). In an effort to reclaim genuine science, transpersonal psychology has asked their members to put the normative worldview of EuroAmerican science to the empirical test. To accomplish this task, the Association for Transpersonal Psychology (ATP) has
implicitly made a unique demand, that transpersonal psychologists become practitioners of psychological, contemplative, or energy disciplines that provide direct experiential access to the farther reaches of human nature and cognition (Walsh 1992).

Summing up my criticisms of EuroAmerican science by analogy, the assumptions and methods of science are similar to a voyeur watching two people having sex while looking through a keyhole. The keyhole’s outline constitutes the paradigmatic parameters that define its domain of inquiry (i.e., its ontology), while our noninterfering observations represent its analytic and objective criteria (i.e., its epistemology). Limiting its ontological inquiry, EuroAmerican science has been able to formulate some basic laws that hold—at least within its limited framework. But the whole of reality is larger than what science can see through the ontological parameters of its keyhole; likewise its objective epistemology fails to provide us with an understanding of the subjective qualities that the two people making love are experiencing. This image of the infinite depth of reality, whose basic structure is a dynamic, undivided whole, is the vision of human potential that informs the worldview of transpersonal psychology, the anthropology of consciousness, and related disciplines.9

HOW CAN WE EXPAND SCIENCE’S METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK?

In order to continue my inquiry into the expansion of our scientific parameters, I organized and moderated the panel “Animism, Shamanism and Ethnobotany: Ecopsychology’s Link with the Transpersonal,” at the 16th International Transpersonal Conference, Palm Springs, California on June 16. This panel included John E. Mack, Charles T. Tart, and Peter Russell (Schroll 2004). The following excerpt from our conversation serves to reiterate the questions this article is raising regarding our presently limited methodology, and the line of inquiry that led us to raise these concerns.

Mark A. Schroll: [Recalling our previous discussion about] science’s split with the Church. In 1662, just 12 years after the death of Descartes, the Royal Society was formed at Oxford University, whose charter served to divide the views of religion and science. According to historians of science, this increasing separation of science and religion is often explained as a consequence of the growing influence of rationalism. Perhaps this was the primary influence for this increasing separation of mind and body. But is it worth asking if fear could have been the motivation operating in the minds of the founders of the Royal Society to further separate science and religion? We know the hysteria of hunting for witches continued until around 1790. Thus, avoiding discussions of religion during this time was most likely an act of self-preservation
(Kubrin 1981). Whatever the specific reasons were, the Royal Society became more interested in hard science. I should add that as science became more concerned with material reality, this confirmed Newton’s fears influencing his decision to hide his alchemical investigations.

To drive the message home regarding Newton’s decision to hide the true source of his inspiration (according to Kubrin), Newton performed an elaborate cover-up to conceal that alchemical studies dominated his life up until the acceptance of his book *The Principia Mathematica* (1687) by the Royal Society of London. This cover-up carried over into the scientific exposition of his theory of falling bodies (that he referred to as gravity), which physics textbooks associate with his decision not to frame a hypothesis. Kubrin’s investigation of Newton’s notebooks revealed that no hypothesis for gravity was offered because the idea of gravity related directly to the hermetic belief that the earth is a living organism (Kubrin 1981; Devereux et al. 1989). A similar analysis of Newton can be found in Berman (1981, 1989). In Newton’s day, beliefs such as these would have earned him more than mere sneers and dismay from his colleagues; most likely they would have resulted in him getting burned at the stake. I would say that if someone was going to burn me as a witch because of my belief in psi/spirit, I, too, would be frightened enough to pretend, or actually become, a hard core materialist and/or not say anything about my other interests. Thankfully, we are living in a more tolerant time, at least to some extent.10

Charles T. Tart: Right, at least to some extent.

Peter Russell: [In response to Charley’s comments from earlier in the dialogue] I really liked the way you [summed up your views].11 Often there is confusion when people talk about science, [as opposed to] the process of science, which Charley was just talking about; [by which I mean that] process of how we gain knowledge in life. This can be applied to any area of life; then there is the current scientific paradigm [or] the current belief system science has [arrived at] from that process, this very materialistic paradigm that excludes consciousness or spiritual experiences as part of it. I think people often confuse science as a process . . .

CTT: Right.

PR: . . . with the current scientific paradigm. And as we know [with Kuhn’s concept of] paradigms [that] the process stays the same throughout history, [whereas] the current paradigm [or belief system] is always evolving and changing (Kuhn 1970). We just got stuck with this current materialistic paradigm.

John E. Mack: I want to ask Charley a question about this discussion of science. I think what you mean by science is a way of authentic knowing, whatever that may be. But most, or many of the things that matter to us, are neither outside nor inside. Like the kind of experiences I work with (Mack 1999), they are powerfully internal but have an element from the outside,
and I think this is probably true of most phenomena that matter to us. [My question then is this]: How do we use science to study something that is not simply the inner world, nor is it the outer world, but is a resonance of the whole reality system?

CTT: My response is [this]. Step One: Reactivate your curiosity. A lot of us are not curious enough about a lot of things anymore [and] this is the main reason [science chooses to ignore the kind of phenomena you study, John]. [Step] Two: We need to examine our prejudices. [You, John,] are a fine example of someone that has been criticized by people that did not actually read what you did. Instead, critics say “This guy is out of the paradigm, this stuff he studies cannot be true, he must be wrong.” I empathize, because I’ve had the same response to my studies of psi phenomena. I would welcome critics that did me the courtesy of reading what I did and then suggested some better ways to do it. So it is this throwing stuff out as outside the paradigm and not wanting to look at it at all that is the main problem.

My approach is, let’s get a good idea of what is out there, then we can figure out ways to refine our knowledge about it; whether it is inside, outside, or a combination of the two. I would take poltergeists in parapsychology as another example. Things seem to happen in the external world. Objects get thrown when no one’s near them, et cetera, [so] let’s set up some cameras and see if we can videotape it. Once in a great while we get something. The psychology of the people involved also seems to be very important and this is why we need to examine our prejudices; this is what Peter was referring to as “belief systems.” To overcome this we could do psychological testing, et cetera because I am all for bringing in all we have and finding out everything we can. Is any of this getting at your question, John?

JEM: For starts. I mean I was—well let’s open this discussion up to the audience. I do not want to dominate the conversation.

Man from the audience: I’d like to examine further systems theory, quantum mechanics, and string theory, which calls to mind points that Peter Russell has talked about in his books. Mainly, the idea of how this discussion we’ve been having can unify science and religion, so that in the future these can be brought together again [and enable us to] transcend [our current discussions of] consciousness; and [in facing this problem,] how does this apply to transpersonal psychology and its relationship to ecopsychology?

PR: If you give me about three or four hours I might be able to [fully] answer this question. I’m actually going to touch on parts of this question in my talk on Friday, and I hope to have a whole new book on this (Russell 2002). Thus, I really do not want to start answering this question now. [Still, to say a few words on this,] ultimately I think everything comes back to the question of consciousness. We often give lip service to the idea that everything is consciousness in many metaphysical traditions, and yet we live in a world that is made of real material stuff. I think we are approaching a point—we are not
there yet—but all the indications are that science is inevitably moving toward a point where it is going to realize what the mystics have been saying for centuries about the fundamental nature of consciousness. Still, at the moment science does not want to consider this problem of consciousness. But when it does, I think there is going to be a natural integration of all of modern physics, with everything the mystics have spoken of. Then we will cease to view science and religion as conflicting worldviews, and understand them as part of a bigger umbrella—and I think this reconciliation is going to come from a deeper understanding of the nature of consciousness.

MAS: I agree with Peter that an entirely different panel is needed to answer this question about consciousness. This need to reconcile the divorce between science and spirit is one of the contributions David Bohm made to the transpersonal movement (Schroll 2005c). Still more work needs to be done to bring the work of Bohm, transpersonal psychology, and ecopsychology together (Schroll 2009).

Woman from audience: Dr. Tart, I think that neuroscience has already done the work, telling us our brain’s left hemisphere is analytic, our right is spatial/intuitive, that we have a limbic brain of love and so on. But I do not think we’ll fully realize our understanding of consciousness and neuroscience until we find a way to unify science and religion. . . . So we need a way of integrating Bohm’s work, the holonomic paradigm, neuroscience, and consciousness to help us understand the transpersonal, don’t you think so?

CTT: Partly. I used to be an engineer and my personal bio-computer is of great interest to me, and the more we learn about how it works the better. Speaking as a full-fledged scientist, neurology, et cetera, is vastly incomplete and suffers from considerable arrogance, because it thinks it’s complete. All the neurophysiological studies in mainstream science ignore parapsychology’s data, which has much tighter scientific standards than any other field of science. [To reiterate my point, alluding to what Peter was saying, mainstream science has] without any consideration of experiments in parapsychology, rejected this data because it fails to comply with assumptions about reality in our current materialistic paradigm (Schroll and Schwartz 2005; Schroll and Krippner 2006, Forthcoming; Tart 2004, 2009a, b). These experiments show the mind can do things our current view of brain-science says we are incapable of doing. Until we have a theory of consciousness that takes parapsychological data into account, we will not have a way of integrating science and religion.

Same woman from audience: This is why you want our current paradigm to embrace what you have referred to as essential science (Tart 2000, 2004, 2009b).

CTT: I just want science to expand to cover everything, and as Peter said this integration might be hard to distinguish from mysticism.
MAS: I agree with you, Charley, that current neuroscience does have this arrogance about not including the data of parapsychology. This is why it will be important to more carefully examine the work of Bohm and its relationship to transpersonal psychology—especially his concepts of soma-significance and holoflux. [Schroll 2005c]

ARGUMENTS FOR AN INTEGRAL/ESSENTIAL SCIENCE: CONTRIBUTIONS FROM HUMANISTIC ANTHROPOLOGY AND HUMANISTIC PSYCHOLOGY

The gadfly is the one who is forever pricking the collective conscience and sensibility of the established order—its way of thinking and acting . . . Humanistic anthropology must never become wholly respectable . . . We must, on occasion, risk doing and publishing the outrageous . . . For me, humanistic anthropology is an intensely personal endeavor in which inquiry is intimately related to the conduct of life . . . a spiritual quest . . . We must be courageous and forever treasure the adventure of the spirit. [Grindal 1993:46]

Amedeo Giorgi points out that what eventually became humanistic psychology began as a protest against behaviorism and psychoanalysis’ mechanomorphic limits, arguing that, “The human person was far more complex and self-determining than what mainstream psychology was offering” (Giorgi 2005:205). An obvious criticism would be to ask—is this merely Giorgi’s opinion, or how is it possible to prove this? Giorgi answers this question, telling us:

Theoretically, humanistic psychology certainly did try to change the image of the human person which with psychology had to cope. Maslow . . . expressed the desire that the successful psychological scientist should be more philosophical, more creative, more diverse, more intuitive, and more comprehensive than what he encountered on average (Giorgi 2005:206) . . . He was arguing against what Royce (1964) described as the “encapsulated person,” quite prevalent in those days; the concept referred to those scientists who used one approach and claimed that it was the “only approach.” Royce himself argued for greater flexibility and, for him, such flexibility could only begin after such scientists became aware that they were encapsulated. [Giorgi 2005:206]

In other words, “encapsulated” meant that we are entities whose crust of our skin is a boundary that separates the person from our immediate bio-chemical environment and the physical universe. Our interaction with the bio-chemical–physical domains beyond this encapsulated boundary was limited to our known senses. Transpersonal psychologists and related fields are continuing to challenge this limited view of the person (Schroll 2005c; Schroll and Krippner 2006, 2010). Neuroscientist Roger Sperry, before his death in 1994, summed up the
emerging view of the person as more than just an encapsulated ego, telling us:

The critical key factor was the overthrow of the deeply ingrained deterministic logic of traditional reductive physicalism, with its centuries-old reasoning that previously had succeeded in ruling out any functional, causal, or interactive role for mind or consciousness. [Sperry 1995:12]

Erasing this encapsulated boundary and expanding our knowledge about consciousness and the mind/body problem will assist answering Halperin’s questions about “negotiated reality”:

One occasionally observes Mina dancers, while in the process of becoming possessed, hesitating for a moment when receiving from the center’s assistants the white embroidered apron that officially acknowledges the spirit entity’s “taking” of his horse. Usually, mediums readily allow the apron to be fastened, although sometimes they wave it off, indicating that their spirit has yet to “arrive,” and now and then a dancer pauses as if to decide whether she is indeed “incorporated.” In the latter instance, what is taking place? Is the medium deliberating whether she has become fully possessed? Is a spiritual entity making this decision? Or is some type of complex negotiation process at work? [Halperin 1996:33]

Here is an instance in which expanding our understanding of consciousness and the mind/body problem is not going to offer a complete answer to Halperin’s questions. The only way he is going to be able to conclusively answer these questions is to allow himself to incorporate spirits and then tell us about his experience. This points to the conundrum we variously refer to as the etic/emic, subject/object, qualitative/quantitative, ideographic/nomothetic methodological problem that we will examine in the next section. Before addressing this problem, it is worth pointing out another significant insight to assist us in breaking away from the grip of the mechanomorphic worldview—which is humanistic psychologists’ ability to clearly articulate the argument. As Giorgi sums it up:

However important external forces were in helping to determine the nature of persons, they could never be wholly explanatory because humans were also self-determining. Humans responded to situations that were meaningful, sometimes constituted by others and sometimes constituted by themselves. They were not completely determined because they were capable of self-transcendence. [Giorgi 2005:207]

These arguments for self-transcendence beyond the limits of our skin-encapsulated egos are at best acknowledged with derision by mainstream science, as Turner points out:
At the present time, the reaction of one mainstream old-school anthropologist to spirit studies has been to concede place to the new ethos with a kind of shrug—“We’re not supposed to call spirits ‘metaphors’ anymore”. [Turner 2006a:45]

Here again, Giorgi neatly sums up what we are up against:

It seems that psychology’s troubles began with psychology’s commitment to become a natural science and only after that idea has been properly overcome might psychology find its authentic voice. So if we are to understand humanistic psychology’s minority status, we have to understand the tensions that exist between the demands of being scientific, as understood by psychology and the essential characteristics of being human. Humanistic psychology is very good with humans; it has more trouble with changing science (Giorgi 2005:208). The question is whether it is possible to integrate the interpretive and explanatory traditions at the present time without first articulating a new philosophy of science that would show how one could mediate between two such diverse traditions. [Giorgi 2000:49]

Edith Turner echoes Giorgi’s concern:

It is wonderful what the hard sciences do; and it is true that no one could exist without practical, objective, “etic” thinking, where it is appropriate. . . . However, scholars of spirit systems seeking the “emic” have to work in ways that may make those unfamiliar with these ways feel embarrassed. Therefore those who have had odd experiences should never force their views down a hard scientist’s throat. And we who study matters of spirits can claim that ours is indeed a “delicate kind of science”; a human science for all that. [Turner 1996:188]

These concerns led me to champion the term integral science—what Tart has referred to as essential science (Tart 2000, 2004, 2009a, b):

What I think of as the most essential aspect of science (as opposed to scientism) is this insistence on direct experience—on observation, data, and facts—as having the ultimate priority in understanding, even though supplemented and interpreted by reason (Tart 2009a:42). [Clarifying this point, he adds the following.] The social, interactive aspects of science, then, make it much more powerful and, in the long run, self-correcting of errors . . . The “long run,” though, can sometimes be very long—dozens or hundreds of years—when implicit, deep-seated attitudes affect the thinking and work of most scientists, as they often do. I’ve oversimplified the process of human beings actually practicing science, of course, but the process I’ve described is the ideal model of essential science. [Tart 2009a:50–51]

Scientism continues to limit the actual practice of science. I use this idea to frame my argument that EuroAmerican science has become an incoherent,
dissociated system of unexamined contradictions that resembles the personality characteristics of schizoid behavior, adding that:

Integral/essential science embraces a revolution of ethics, the re-emergence of shamanic practitioners, indigenous traditions of knowledge, the use of sacred visionary plants, and the growing edges of a more inclusive worldview. [Schroll 2005b:3]

In sum, finding this authentic voice as well as articulating this “delicate science” (a new philosophy of science that will assist us in breaking away from the mechanomorphic worldview and the limitations of its methods of inquiry) is a concern to which we now turn.

 Reflections on Subjectivity and Objectivity: A Review of Euroamerican Science’s Paradigmatic Parameters That Define Its Domains of Inquiry

Few anthropologists have addressed the issue of a “normative science of culture.” By contrast, the field of humanistic psychology has given considerable attention to basic human needs and the relative effectiveness of societies in satisfying these needs. [Grindal 1993:47]

Over the past 26 years I have spent a significant amount of time considering how to reconcile the emic/etic, subject/object, ideographic/nomothetic methodological problem. Within social science, this has been expressed as the problem of reconciling quantitative and qualitative methods of inquiry. My interest in reconciling this problem initially focused on the limits of quantitative methods. This encouraged me to champion participant observation, ethnomethodology, and ethnography as methods that could balance quantitative or objective methodologies by providing qualitative or subjective narratives. I continue to encourage this balanced view.

Summarizing this approach, even though our current science is empirical, researchers “collect data” in an objective way. I later realized that this limitation of quantitative methods is also true of ethnographic methods that rely on our “vicarious identification with informants,” as well as “phenomenological participant observation.” This, too, is the problem of “reification” that Ernst Cassier (Krippner 2000:301) sought to address, because even though ethnography and other narrative heuristic approaches are improvements on strict quantitative methods, “participant–observers” continue to collect data in an objective way. In other words, the data is treated as an “ontological other” or as a thing that is separate from the observer. This approach is not an I/Thou, Dasein (there-being) or wu-wei (actionless action) orientation, which are perspectives that would allow the researcher to truly become a participant
observer. Instead, similar to quantitative methods of research, participant observation merely collects, analyzes, and eventually interprets data as an I/it relationship and fails to grasp the beingness of the experience and the “meaning of particular gestures and symbolic actions of lived experience” (May 1977:60).

This I/it process of analysis may eventually change the observer’s point of view, or the way the observer thinks about the data. In other words, this intellectual process of analysis has the potential to eventually change the observer’s opinion and, as a result, change their behavior. Still, this approach is only a “cognitive interpretation” or “metanarrative” of the actual experience and not the actual experience itself. Consequently, this perspective is also limited because researchers continue to assess their data through the lens of their cultural symbolic constructs, thereby preventing them from truly experiencing the I/Thou, Dasein, wu-wei approach to knowing, since the data collection process does not “in and of itself” affect the observer.

Ian Prattis has come to a similar conclusion, telling us:

*What is needed is a language that reflects the dialectics of experience, subsumes emic and etic distinctions, and moves both to a new language of experience. This is the missing component in anthropology. In this essay and volume (see also Prattis 1997), I advocate poetry as a language form that closes the epistemological gap between observer and cultural other. For me, poetry functions as a missing component in anthropological field reporting. It is a new signifying process that alters the observer’s perception of self and cultural other in such a way that the observer’s own perception of society is influenced and changed.* [Prattis 1997:58]

Contrary to this approach, the “experiential methodology” of becoming a shamanic practitioner (which includes the critique of eco/green psychology [Schroll 2007b, 2009]) allows the observer to become transformed during the process of data collection. The fundamental difference here is that the observer is not only directly affected during the process of data collection, but that becoming affected is the whole point of collecting the data in the first place. Granted, this *verstehenden* (or insider’s approach) suffers the limitations of its own bias. However, as Krippner has pointed out:

*Multiple case-studies and other types of experience-near research attempt to “intimately elucidate clients” lived or subjective realities . . . from the verbal to the pre-verbal, and from the personal to the social.* [Krippner 2000:297]

Chaotic systems analysis may also prove to be another useful tool in stepping outside of our verstehenden experience to offer “objective analysis” of the I/Thou, Dasein, wu-wei encounter with lived beingness as well as encounters with transpersonal states of consciousness and shamanic initiation. My continued examination of this problem led me to conclude that both objective and
subjective methods are limited. What we need instead is an integral/essential approach to scientific knowledge that incorporates quantitative and qualitative methods. Within the broader anthropological framework, this methodological division represents the difference between nomothetic and ideographic methods.13

Anthropologists (and most social scientists) prefer etic, nomothetic, or quantitative analysis to emic, ideographic, or qualitative methods. Carlos Castaneda challenged this division, claiming that the only way to truly understand shamanism is to become a practitioner (Williams 2007:66). My deepening understanding toward reconciling objectivity and subjectivity has benefited from Castaneda’s contributions to the research methodology of social science. Specifically, Castaneda’s claim that the only way to truly understand shamanism is to become a practitioner supports the need for subjective narratives as the starting point of all social science research (Schroll and Schwartz 2005). Sarah Williams extensively cites, discusses, and agrees with the conclusions made in Schroll and Schwartz (2005) (Williams 2007).

Contemplating these concerns (which involved a cognitive reiteration of our previous discussion) led me to the hypothesis that becoming a shamanic practitioner transcends our most far-reaching nomothetic and ideographic methods. This is why shamans use precise objective methods when teaching initiates, because initiates must first liberate themselves from their enculturation, erasing the parameters of our culture that frame the symbolic construction of our worldview. Controversies as to the legitimacy of Castaneda’s research do not diminish this challenge, unless we avoid discussing a somatic tradition of mystical experience (Schroll 2005c). Joseph Long’s interest in psi phenomena, and the many students and colleagues he inspired, support the importance of understanding this core religious experience (Long 1977). Without this, a science of consciousness would have no reason to exist. This thesis (which will require additional experimental and field research to evaluate) rests on two essential points:

1. The necessity of drawing the empirical line; that researchers need to have a personal encounter with alternate states of consciousness, anomalous cognition, and/or practice a form of energy or infomedicine, like shamanism, before they can be considered adequately prepared to assess these states of consciousness.

2. Researchers need to then initiate the process of integrating their somatic religious experience with their personal mythology of how the world works and what their place in it is (Feinstein et al. 1988; Krippner 2004).

Again, to sum up the point that I am making regarding methodology, my thesis rests on the argument that even though ethnography and other narrative heuristic approaches are improvements on strict quantitative methods, ideographic methods also collect data in an objective way. Data is treated as an
“ontological other” or thing that is separate from the observer. This approach is not an I/Thou, Dasiens, or wu-wei orientation, which are perspectives that allow the researcher to truly become a participant observer. Similar to nomothetic methods of research, participant observation collects, analyzes, and interprets data as an I/it relationship, failing to grasp the “beingness” of the experience. Ultimately therefore, none of this is doing any good.

Mainstream science has wisely avoided this discussion, because addressing it invites serious questions regarding the limits of reason and the nature of physical reality. In sum, my overall concern is that before science proceeds any further in investigating the differences in epistemological understanding of the “shamanic” vis-à-vis EuroAmerican science, what needs to happen is an evolution in humankind’s ethical responsibility toward this kind of knowledge and its application, especially with regard to the potential dangers associated with “a science of consciousness.” Within the last 50 years this has been expressed as the need for “humanistic ethics,” “humanistic science,” and/or “a science of transcendence.” Likewise, the methodological inadequacies of anthropology (and science in general) are, for Constantine Hriskos, a central concern (Hriskos 2007).

In Green Psychology (1999), Metzner points out the shadow side of this well-meaning agenda has produced an “arrogance of humanism” that leaves out the full spectrum of our evolutionary heritage—specifically humankind’s lost connection with Gaia consciousness or our indigenous (shamanic) pathways to knowing. This is why I continue to encourage the development of an integral/essential science. Recalling my previous definition of integral/essential science, I mean to suggest a science that embraces a revolution of ethics, the re-emergence of shamanic practices, indigenous traditions of knowledge, the use of sacred visionary plants, and the growing edges of a more inclusive worldview (Schroll 2005b).

---

**Fantastic Tales of Psi/Spirit Phenomenon: Beyond the Veil of Euroamerican Science’s Limits**

This reference to “fantastic tales of psi/spirit phenomenon” resembles a flashing neon sign for what is frequently referred to in anthropology as “magical thinking” (Winkelman 1982, 1992). Likewise, magical thinking resembles what the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual-IV (DSM-IV) refers to as forms of psychosis, in particular schizophrenia (Laing 1967; Podvoll 1979/80a, 1980b; Lukoff 1985; Villoldo and Krippner 1987:180–186; Lukoff et al. 1992; Walsh 2007:87–105). The frequent misdiagnosis of persons telling these so-called “fantastic tales” as schizophrenia has been greatly reduced in light of Lukoff’s diagnostic category “Religious or Spiritual Problem” (V62.89), in which transpersonal experiences
are viewed not as a mental disorder but as a condition contributing to the maintenance of a healthy personality. Sara Lewis has discussed Lukoff’s diagnostic category as a means of understanding spiritual crisis and personal growth associated with ayahuasca use (Lewis 2008:112–113). Roger Walsh (2007:107–113) provides an even more detailed discussion than Lewis, pointing out: “If correctly diagnosed and appropriately supported, then spiritual emergencies can be valuable growth experiences: hence their other name of ‘spiritual emergences’” (Walsh 2007:113).

In addition to all the concerns raised in this article regarding methodology, expanding EuroAmerican science’s limits of inquiry dovetails with a journey of personal discovery that I will say more about later in this section. This consideration in fact raises a central point concerning our need for emic methodologies. Etic methodologies not only provide no place for this journey of personal discovery, they invalidate it as data. To support telling some details from this journey as field data Jean-Guy A. Goulet and Bruce Granville Miller have argued that “autobiography is a condition of ethnographic objectivity” (Goulet and Miller 2007:13). Jurgen W. Kremer elaborates on this same point by referring to ethnoautobiography:

I define ethnoautobiography as creative self exploratory (or oral presentation) that grounds itself in the ethnic, cultural, historical, ecological, and gender background of the author. Part of such writing is the investigation of hybridity, categorical borderlands and transgressions, and the multiplicity of (hi)stories carried outside and inside the definitions and discourses of the dominant society of a particular place and time. As creative and evocative writing and storytelling, ethnoautobiography explores consciousness as the network of representations held by individuals from a subjective perspective and brings those representations into inquiring conversation with objective factors related to identity construction. [Kremer 2003:9]

Likewise, Millie Creighton supports this ethnoautobiographical perspective (citing the work of Wolcott) who tells us:

That ethnography is, and should be, about something other than getting the facts. Ethnography is about life, human life. . . . Rather than emerging from pinning down the facts about people, “ethnographical accounts arise not from the facts accumulated during fieldwork but from ruminating about the meanings to be derived from the experience” [Creighton 2007:387–388]

Joan D. Koss-Chioino echoes this ethnoautobiographical and/or transpersonal view of field research, suggesting that:

The emergence of a deeply felt empathy ([is] at its fullest extent, the experience and practice of what I call radical empathy) [which] develops from the
initial stages of spiritual transformation and leads healers to respond altruistically to persons in distress seeking their help. [Koss-Chioino 2006:878]

Elaborating further on what she means by radical empathy, Koss-Chioino explains that

Radical empathy takes empathic behavior to a further degree, in that the wounded healer actually enters into the feelings of suffering and distress of those persons who attend the sessions and whom a spirit indicates need help.

[Adding that] Spirit-mediums report that they feel a great deal of tension during spirit contacts—an “electric charge” that starts in the fingertips and goes through the body as well as an accelerated heart rate that can be very loud or violent. [Koss-Chioino 2006:884, 885]

This reference to an “electric charge” accords with Turner’s experiences of healers in Zambia that take “the patient’s trouble entirely into her own body, along with sensations of distress like those of the patient—a sense something like an electric current” (Turner 2006b:936).

To provide us with some specific examples of these worldviews in collision regarding the assessment of genuine experiences of transpersonality and journeys of personal discovery, I will offer some extensive quoted material both from my own files and from an account provided by C.G. Jung. Turning first to some data I obtained during a peer review or seminar session with several graduates from the Center for Humanistic Studies in Detroit, Michigan on May 16, 1989. Our conversation was recorded with everyone present aware that it was being recorded and giving their permission for me to later transcribe it. These graduates were completing doctoral requirements in clinical psychology at The Union Institute and trained to think in terms of EuroAmerican science; Maria Carrera was the one exception, whose home country was Puerto Rico. Discussing the difference between psychotic breaks from consensus reality and transpersonality, Carrera related the following experience about a group of healers with whom she works:

I remember the last time that I was home in Puerto Rico. We were working and this guy comes in and he was really experiencing all this phenomena and immediately everyone knew he had a lot of material (psychological disturbance) in his body. It is difficult to say if it was an authentic experience or that it was not “natural.” I do not know the proper words. But almost immediately it comes to the perception of all of us (most of the time there are five or six of us, so it is not only my perception) that the person coming to us has a problem. It also depends on the particular place, also there are people coming from different backgrounds; you do not only rely on your own experience, perhaps an intuitive kind of knowing or perception is closer to what I am talking about . . . It is information that does not belong to Maria Carrera. It is a perception that goes beyond who I am, that is why it is called
transpersonal, because it goes beyond you as a person . . . There is also the physical knowledge or objective knowledge or, I really cannot tell you what to call it. We call them Guia’s [which is the word for guide in the sense of spirit guide], we call them “shamans.” Well, we do not actually use the word “shaman.” We use the word santero sometimes. [Maria Carrera, unpublished interview, May 16, 1989]16

Carrera adds a bit more on these assessment techniques of transpersonality, saying:

It also depends on how the level of functioning of that person is being affected. You do not lose contact with other areas of your reality and other needs—physical needs or even spiritual needs . . . It is understood in our Latin culture that a majority of mental illness is related to this, and is kept there and we are unable to channel this knowledge in a proper way. This is not to say that all mental illness is merely of the transpersonal, spiritual, or cosmic realm, or whatever you wish to call it . . . I am always with someone that has a lot more experience, because sometimes I do not clearly understand what is going on. I think that you get more understanding the more you experience it, the more you are open to it, and the more clear you have your life together. Whereas if I do not attend to other needs in my life, I know how hard it is for me to get in touch with these kinds of transpersonal phenomena we have been discussing. If I do not rest well or if I have some other concerns or some other things—personal, interpersonal problems—these problems get in the way of my ability to work in this way. Psychological health is very important toward one’s ability to see clearly. Moreover, these people [in the healing group I work with in Puerto Rico] are really committed to doing good work—promoting psychological health—within themselves and their communities. They live in accordance with certain values and a certain level of consciousness, a vision of the world that is much different than the modern scientific worldview that Mark referred to earlier. [Maria Carrera, unpublished interview, May 16, 1989]

These references to healing experiences by Koss-Chioino, Turner, and Carrera remind me of an experience that is not about psychological or physical healing. It may, however, have contributed to the philosophical healing of Freud and Jung’s respective worldviews; it is a similar kind of psi/spirit phenomenon described by Jung sitting in Freud’s office in 1909, that Jung describes in his autobiography Memories, Dreams, Reflections (1965):

It is interesting for me to hear Freud’s views on precognition and on parapsychology in general. When I visited him in Vienna in 1909 I asked him what he thought of these matters. Because of his materialistic prejudice, he rejected this entire complex of questions as nonsensical, and did so in terms of so shallow a positivism that I had difficulty in checking the sharp retort on the tip of my tongue. It was some years before he recognized the
seriousness of parapsychology and acknowledged the factuality of “occult” phenomena. While Freud was going on this way, I had a curious sensation. It was as if my diaphragm were made of iron and were becoming red-hot—a glowing vault. And at that moment there was such a loud report in the bookcase, which stood right next to us, that we both started up in alarm, fearing the thing was going to topple over on us. I said to Freud: “There, that is an example of a so-called catalytic exteriorization phenomena.”

“Oh come,” he exclaimed. “That is sheer bosh.”

“It is not,” I replied. “You are mistaken, Herr Professor. And to prove my point I now predict that in a moment there will be another such loud report!” Sure enough, no sooner had I said the words than the same detonation went off in the bookcase.

To this day I do not know what gave me this certainty. But I knew beyond all doubt that the report would come again. Freud only stared aghast at me. I do not know what was in his mind, or what his look meant. In any case, this incident aroused his mistrust of me, and I had the feeling that I had done something against him. I never afterward discussed the incident with him. [Jung:155–156, 1963, italics added]

This kind of anomalous experience, this kind of sensation and/or energy (if we can assume that it is a kind of energy we are talking about here that describes the kind of phenomena Jung demonstrated for Freud), cannot currently be accepted within the framework of EuroAmerican science for it violates the concept of action-at-a-distance. How can there be a physical manifestation of “energy” beyond what is referred to as “localized” events in physics? What is the medium, the means of transmitting this kind of energy? This is the real scientific problem of accepting these kinds of phenomena. Either you have to say that the type of energy Jung demonstrated for Freud has no connection with the material world, or you have to postulate some kind of energy, some means of signal transmission that is not now known.

Like Jung and Carrera, I have experienced fantastic tales of psi/spirit phenomenon, which is why I began this section saying that expanding EuroAmerican science’s limits of inquiry dovetails with a journey of personal discovery. Nevertheless, I continue to be reluctant to discuss my experiences of psi/spirit because they are so fantastic and beyond the veil of EuroAmerican science that they often seem unbelievable even to me. Recently I was coaxed by Don Eulert to tell some of these experiences in his forthcoming edited book Ritual and Healing: Ordinary and Extraordinary Transformation (Schroll in press). I hope my public discussion of these experiences will help to further our understanding of these frequently misunderstood phenomena.
CONCLUSION

Writing this article has provided an opportunity to reflect on the problem of validating psi/spirit/transpersonal experience. In particular, this focus has encouraged me to ask deeper questions about the philosophy of science and its particular application by the current champions of a science of consciousness. I discussed a variety of these concerns throughout this article. Likewise, this article addressed the concern regarding the validity of psi/spirit/transpersonal experiences and Euro-American science’s failure to resolve the problem of their authenticity and assessment, which has kept humankind from reaping the benefits of this knowledge.

Speaking personally and professionally, this concern regarding the authenticity and assessment of psi/spirit/transpersonal experiences has consumed an enormous amount of time throughout my life. Specifically, this doubt regarding the authenticity/assessment of psi/spirit/transpersonal experiences has taken precedence and prevented my professional opportunity to ask questions about the experiences themselves. Clarifying this argument and the concerns or paradigmatic obstacles I have sought to resolve in writing this article, proving the validity of psi/spirit/transpersonal experiences prevented me from engaging in what most social science professionals take for granted: the ability to earn a degree conducting research on basic questions. For example: What are the affects of psi/spirit/transpersonal experiences on our physical health and psychological well being? What are the affects of psi/spirit/transpersonal experiences on aggression? What are the affects of psi/spirit/transpersonal experiences on our ability to commune with nature? What are the affects of psi/spirit/transpersonal experiences on our habits of consumption?

To this day, EuroAmerican science has no definitive answer (but it does have some partial answers) (Targ 2004; Schroll 2008b) regarding whether or not psi/spirit/transpersonal experience possess any social or psychological benefits.

Krippner, Tart, Turner, Walsh, Winkelman, and others involved in the investigation of psi/spirit and transpersonal psychology have provided us with some glimpses into the variety of anomalous experience and their potential benefits (Schroll 2001, 2008). But the jury of scientific inquiry as a whole is still deliberating the “thing-in-itself,” and as a consequence continues to be restrained by the straightjacket of a dualistic paradigm that refuses to acknowledge the existence of psi/spirit. This restraint has kept us from achieving the necessary paradigm shift whose conceptual transformation would allow EuroAmerican science to envision a comprehensive theoretical understanding of psi/spirit/transpersonal experience. Thus we still have further to go. Nevertheless, with individuals in the fields of humanistic, transpersonal psychology, and the anthropology of consciousness working together, we are coming closer to envisioning a new kind of science and its methods of inquiry.
NOTES

1. Likewise, this framework has been the creation of men. Indeed, the long-range goal of this inquiry is to encourage the contributions of other cultures and women to envision the creation of a new multicultural, gender-balanced kind of science and its methods of inquiry. This inquiry will include more precise examinations of both EuroAmerican science’s metaphysics and its values.

2. The definition of psi/spirit is summed up in Schroll and Schwartz:

   “Psi,” according to Stanley Krippner, “is used by parapsychologists to encompass so-called ‘extra-sensory perception,’ ‘psychokinesis,’ and the purported postdeath survival of parts of one’s personality” (Kierulf and Krippner 2004:30); anthropologists refer to psi as “spirits” (Turner 1993) (Schroll and Schwartz 2005:8).

3. “Transpersonality,” rather than transpersonal, is a more accurate way of referring to the conscious perception of co-evolution. “Transpersonality” is also a more accurate way of describing what David Bohm refers to as “structuration” (Bohm 1980:120). It could be a misspelling by Bohm, as there is the word “structuration.” But Bohm indicates that “structuration” is a new verb and one of his new ways of using language that he calls the “rheomode” or flowing mode. Structuration is a dynamic verb-centered process that resists becoming objectified or reified as the noun “structure” suggests; the word “ura” means “to work” and “to organize,” thereby suggesting multiple levels of intention and multiple levels of meaning. Structuration reflects the dynamic process of growth and personality development characterized by Maslow’s hierarchy of needs model. When referring to transpersonal states (which includes liminality and communitas) the word “transpersonal” is also a noun. Thus what we should really be talking about is “transpersonality,” which is a verb- or process-centered state of consciousness that more precisely reflects the concept of personal growth, evolution, or metamorphosis within us and in our interactions with others.

4. A thorough examination of Newton’s foray into alchemy and the political climate in England during the formation of the Royal Society can be found in Kubrin (1981).

5. Contrary to the frequent misunderstanding that the philosopher’s stone and alchemy provide us with the ability to change lead into gold, Metzner explains:

   A popular misconception is that alchemy was solely and futilely concerned with the transmutation of base metals to gold. In actuality, it is clear from alchemical writings that the main focus of most alchemical practitioners was transformative insight and healing: the transmutation of the physical and psychic condition of the human being—starting with oneself. [Metzner 2009:11].

6. I sought to be very specific about the need to empirically verify religious experience in the section “Organized Religion Versus Core Religious Experience: An Exercise In Proving Smith’s Primordial Tradition” in (Schroll 2005c:62–65). Thus, I am
not referring here to religion as a metaphysical belief system or its value for social coherence. I am referring to the core religious experience (see also Rao 1995).

7. In past publications the relationship between the Society for the Anthropology of Consciousness (SAC) and transpersonal psychology has been examined (Schroll 2005a; Schroll and Schwartz 2005).

8. Tart clarifies this point, telling us:

   Our ability to step back from the immediacy of experience, emotion, and bodily agitation to take a broader, more logical view of a situation is one of the greatest powers of the human mind. But considering it as always being the "highest" ability, or using it compulsively (or, too often, being used by it) in all situations for all knowledge seeking, is maladaptive. [Tart 2009a:59]

9. One of the most promising examples of how far consciousness studies has evolved since I began my own inquiry in the mid-1980s is examined by Francis X. Charet and Hillary S. Webb (2007). Reading this article was an act of reminiscence on my own path: In 1982–1983, I considered matriculating into the Individualized Masters program at Goddard College. The cost of tuition influenced my decision not to matriculate, and I instead created my own independent interdisciplinary study program through the University of Nebraska-Kearney (formerly Kearney State College): 1983–1986. Later I created a similar independent study program in philosophy of science at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln working with Werner Leinfellner (1985–1988) before I matriculated into the doctoral program at The Union Institute (1988–1997).

10. See note #4.

11. Russell’s reference to Tart’s summary of the “process of science” can now be found in Tart (2009a:38–42), with other parts influencing Tart’s discussion of spirituality on pages 5–9, and especially his comments on “essential science” (Tart 2009a). See also Tart (2009b).

12. Tart suggests creating a Consumer Reports’ or index of belief systems and personality traits that would allow us to match belief systems with our psychological orientation.

13. R. Lee Lyman and Michael J. O’Brien tell us that word was coined in 1894 by German philosopher Wilhelm Widelband to signify “those disciplines seeking to formulate general laws” (Carneiro, 2000:149). In the same context he also coined “ideographic” to signify that events are “unique and specific, and therefore ungeneralizable” (Carneiro, 2000:149; Lyman & O’Brien 2004:77).

   Nomothetic’s definition is equivalent with objectivity. Ideographic’s definition is not an exact equivalent with the view of subjective experience this article is advancing, because I agree that subjectivity is unique and specific; but I also believe that subjective experience can be translated into generalizable statements and laws.

14. This point has been taken up in my interview with Krippner on the physics of psi (Schroll and Krippner 2006, Forthcoming).
15. Echoing my own concerns about the potential dangers associated with the shadow consequences of consciousness studies (Schroll 2005c:7), Chris Hables Gray asks:

What are the military interested in? Functional Magnetic Resonance imaging (fMRI) to “correlated neural activity with specific tasks or experiences.” To read minds. And there is work “on replacing old-fashioned lie detectors with systems based on neuroscience” (Moreno 2006a:B7). Mind reading of a different sort. This is just a continuation of long standing efforts to rationalize war in a specifically cybernetic way with information as the organizing trope . . . Pilots are becoming subsystems and soldiers complex human–machine nodes in larger cyborgian webs. Not that it always wins wars, but it does produce new waves of neuro-scientific innovations. [Gray 2007:5](See also Mentor for an even more horrific and gore filled account of the “rhetorics of control in the history of brain research” [Mentor 2007:20].

16. When I first wrote this account for my dissertation (Schroll 1997), and later began its revision, I was unaware that Carrera’s example of transpersonality represented her own experiences with the religious movement known as Santeria. I sent an early draft of this manuscript to Theresa, a woman I met on a chat line. Theresa responded to this draft by telling me about her experiences with Santeria in New Orleans, encouraging me to investigate this movement. I am grateful to Theresa for her suggestions to investigate Santeria. Coincidentally, during this same period of time Lerner (1999) published an article in Shaman’s Drum. Lerner’s article supports Carrera’s comments, and elaborates on the history and current practice of Santeria.
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