

UNIVERSIFIERS:

The Emergence of the Contextive Perspective and
Epistemontological Engagement with the Full-Spectrum of
Cosmological Forms of Consciousness



Fiona Wright

School of Integral Noetic Science
California Institute for Human Science



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Universifiers 04

Contextive Perspective 04

Full Spectrum 05

Universifying Epistemontology 06

Universifying Meta-Epistemology 06

Universifying Meta-Ontology 08

Epistemontology 09

Exo Studies and Complex Integral Realism 11

Exopsychology 11

Hard, Soft, Meta and Unified Universifiers 12

Hard Universifiers: Absorbers 13

Soft Universifiers: Diversifiers 13

Meta Universifiers: Connectors 14

Unified Universifiers: Unifiers 14


Immanent Critique 15

Conclusion 15

References 16

About the Author 22

Other Works by Fionn 23



Humanity finds itself in a liminal epoch—a time between worlds—where the foundations of the old world are fracturing, yet the contours of the new world remain nascent and incomplete (Stein, 2019). In this transitional phase, we face a crisis of crises—a metacrisis—encompassing intertwined ecological, ethical, existential, and epistemic crises (Hedlund, 2023). This paper proposes that, just as the emergence of humanity’s third-person objective perspective has been shaped by our physical place in the cosmos—marked by the explosion of empirical science from the Copernican revolution through Newtonian mechanics, Einsteinian relativity, and quantum mechanics—that the fourth person contextive perspective is emerging to be characterized by our relational place in the cosmos, leading to a Kuhnian paradigm shift (Kuhn, 1962) into contextual perspectives and the emergence of an awareness of, and relationship with, the wider collective of cosmological cultures. Whereas objective empirical science emphasized the external world, the contextive perspective integrates subjective and intersubjective ways of knowing, enabling a more nuanced, context-sensitive understanding of diverse forms of consciousness and our co-evolutionary relationship with them. Framed through the concept of ‘universifiers’—an inclusive umbrella term encompassing both ‘us’ and ‘them’ as diverse natural expressions of cosmological forms of consciousness — we can epistemologically and ontologically open up our collective awareness to relate more fully through the contextive perspective. This paper proposes that the contextive perspective can help lead us through the epistemic crisis to find coherent collective ways of making meaning to effectively engage with, and successfully navigate, the meta-crisis as a whole.

Starting by introducing and defining the term ‘universifiers’, the paper sets the stage for an exploration of what it means to epistemologically know and ontologically be. The second term introduced is the ‘contextive perspective’, which includes both individual and collective perspectives,

exploring the dialectical expansion of human consciousness through the progressive integration of first-person (subjective), second-person (inter-subjective), and third-person (objective) perspectives, pointing toward the collective emergence of a fourth-person, or contextive, perspective. This paper offers this collective contextive perspective not merely as a new way of knowing, but also as a new way of being in participatory relation within a wider cosmological ecology of consciousness. The third term ‘full-spectrum’ sets an epistemological and ontological scaffolding upon which the universifiers stand. The fourth term is developed in detail, by navigating a meta-cultural dialectical synthesis of meta-epistemology and meta-ontology, coining the term ‘epistemontology’.

Following these terms, the meta-meta-theory of ‘complex integral realism’ and meta-discipline of ‘exo studies’ by Esbjörn-Hargens (2020), which includes both Bhaskar’s (2016) critical realism and Wilber’s (2000) integral theory, will be introduced and used as a meta-theoretical underpinning for the speculation on universifiers. Through my own subjective take on the field of exopsychology, by highlighting inter-subjective and objective perspectives I propose an application for the contextive perspective to engage with the diversity of universifiers, and highlight the importance of contextual speculation at this juncture in our evolution as a species. With the terms and meta-theoretical frame set, through the lens of the contextive perspective this paper speculates on humanity’s emerging collective awareness of the full-spectrum of cosmological forms of consciousness, extrapolated through the hard (concrete/gross), soft (subtle), meta (causal) and unified (non-dual) tier-fields. Applying the universifying fractal meta-pattern – absorbing, diversifying, connecting and unifying – universifiers are outlined from an epistemontological frame.

Completing the exploration with an immanent critique of the frame put forth in

the paper, the conclusion reflects back through the paper with a contextive perspective, with an orientation for the possibility of humans absorbing the diverse field of universifiers, connecting through the contextive perspective for an evolutionary leap in cosmological unification. As a reflection of my own subjective first person perspective on the field, the paper integrates insights from my second person intersubjective field of other theorists and third person objective field of research, to meaningfully engage with the collective fourth person contextive awareness of the emerging meta-crisis.

Universifiers

This paper defines ‘universifiers’ as cosmological forms of consciousness that evolve through the dialectical meta-pattern of universifying – absorbing, diversifying, connecting and unifying – through the full-spectrum of the hard, soft, meta and unified tier-fields. Humans are examples of universifiers, as are other intra-dimensional beings such as amoebas, oak trees, bumble bees, and all other biological life forms, whether terrestrial or beyond, as well as potential non-biological intelligences such as artificial, inter-dimensional subtle, meta-dimensional celestial or omni-dimensional absolute beings. These universifiers manifest across a range of ontological and epistemological domains—each expressing diverse forms of intelligence, agency and relationships within a wider cosmological ecology (Kachru, 2021). Unlike the general terms ‘agents’ or ‘beings’, universifiers are defined by their participation in the universifying process and their embodiment of evolving cosmological awareness. This definition provides a foundation to explore how universifiers engage with and shape the dialectics of consciousness within the broader universifying meta-theory.

Contextive Perspective

The ‘contextive perspective’ transcends and includes the first person subjective, second person inter-subjective

and third person objective perspectives, as a fourth person perspective that can integrate them all. Described in an earlier paper as the ‘fourth universifying perspective’ (4UP), the contextive perspective “incorporates a collective of perspectives from multiple third-person viewpoints, which can be an ecosystem of both internal and external collective narratives or cultural understandings, and then see how those evolve or develop over time” (Wright, 2025, p. 3). O’Fallon (2010) shares an example of an individual fourth person perspective: “the fourth-person watcher can see that the third-person watcher is standing in a context that he or she cannot see, and that this context is coloring his or her factual judgments” (p. 49). A related term is the ‘integrative perspective’, which specifically points to the active, latter expression of the fourth person perspective that is ‘context capable’. Contextive perspective is a broader term that more accurately describes the perspective that emerges from the 3UP objective perspective, and leads to the 5UP constructive perspective. Building on previous papers, this paper continues to propose that these perspectives manifest both individually and collectively, transcending the traditional ‘person perspective’ to reveal a spectrum of views that universifiers can hold – ‘universifying perspectives’ – “a term that unifies the full spectrum of diverse perspectives, pointing to the diversity of personal, collective, and non-human viewpoints” (Wright, 2025, p. 9).

It is important to note at this point in the paper that while there have been empirically validated individual expressions from 1UP to 6UP (Cook-Greuter, 2010; O’Fallon et al., 2020), there are only collective expressions reliably observed from 1UP to 4UP. For example, there are national collectives that seem to operate at an early version of 4UP (Andersen & Björkman, 2017; Barrett, 2020), and organizational collectives, given their smaller size, that seem to be able operate at a later version of 4UP (Barrett, 2006; Kegan, et al., 2016; Laloux, 2014). Collective structures are needed to hold collectives at a certain universifying perspective, and while we can speculate that collectives

operating at 5UP or beyond are possible, at our current stage of evolution as a species, humanity's emerging collective leading edge seems to be the 4UP contextive perspective, which is related to Strieber's (2025) concept of the 'Fourth Mind' and Dolan's (2020) notion of 'humanity's fourth stage'. This paper focuses on the contextive perspective, as while more complex perspectives are available to us as individuals, our emerging collective leading edge requires structures, such as those put forth in this paper, that can help create a foundation for our species to hold a contextive perspective.

Full Spectrum

The term 'full spectrum' denotes the complete range of epistemological knowing through 'universifying perspectives' (UPs), from the zeroth universifying perspective (0UP) to the eighth universifying perspective (8UP), organized across four distinct but interconnected ontological universifying tier-fields that collectively map dimensions of existence: hard, soft, meta and unified.

0UP represents the pre-conscious or pre-sentient ground—a generative substratum from which all perspectives emerge, prior to differentiation (Metzinger, 2024; Wright, 2025). The hard tier-field encompasses the subjective (1UP) and intersubjective (2UP) perspectives, grounded in individual and relational realities (O'Fallon, 2020; Wright, 2022). The subjective perspective encapsulates personal, first-person experience and interiority, while the intersubjective perspective highlights the shared, relational, and dialogical spaces where meaning and social reality co-emerge. The soft tier-field embraces the objective (3UP) and contextive (4UP) perspectives, where individual and collective subtle fields rise into awareness. The objective perspective orients towards measurable, empirical phenomena and structural realities, while the contextive perspective integrates dynamic situational, ecological, and systemic contexts, emphasizing relational interdependencies (Cook-Greuter, 2000; Lynam et al., 2020; O'Fallon et al., 2020).

The meta tier-field comprises the constructive (5UP) and wholistic (6UP) perspectives, representing meta-awareness and causal dimensions. The constructive perspective deconstructs the meaning-making processes that generate knowledge and identity, holding the polarities of space-boundlessness and time-timelessness, integrating diverse cross-paradigmatic models to construct meta-models of reality. The wholistic perspective synthesizes these into a cosmological whole—emptiness and fullness, form and formlessness, being and becoming—across nested evolutionary worlds of matter, life, and mind, integrating ontologies and epistemologies into a coherent meta-synthesis (Lynam et al., 2020; O'Fallon et al., 2020; Wright, 2022). The unified tier-field holds the, still speculative, subjective (7UP) and universitive (8UP) perspectives, which transcend and include all tier-fields (O'Fallon, 2012). The subjective perspective offers a dialectical embodied and phenomenological synthesis of subject and object, knower and known, transcending locality and enfolding polarities into dynamic unity. The universitive perspective embodies the fullest cosmic consciousness available to humans at this point in our evolution—which speculatively could be a non-local, omni-dimensional, meta-evolutionary, pure awareness universifying all forms of consciousness, and culminating as the absolute (Aurobindo, 1990; O'Fallon, 2012).

As a whole, the universifying full spectrum maps the dynamic, multidimensional evolution of mind—from the undifferentiated ground, with perspectival expansion of awareness through relational, contextual, and integrative dimensions. The universifying lens on full spectrum is but one of a plurality of constructions of how to divide up consciousness, one which embraces other equally valid constructions such as Angerer's (2023) transcendental pluralism, which orients from firstness to fifthness rather than perspectives. Universifying presents a meta-integrative framework for understanding knowledge, reality, and identity as layered, interwoven, and

continuously co-arising through both knowing (epistemology) and being (ontology).

Universifying Epistemontology

The universifier framework offers a contextive epistemological and ontological orientation that transcends conventional binaries by recognizing that more inclusive forms of knowing arise from inhabiting the creative dialectical tensions between polarities. Universifying proposes an epistemology of epistemologies (meta-epistemology) and ontology of ontologies (meta-ontology), while holding the dialectical polarity of meta-epistemology and meta-ontology as a new term – epistemontology. Expanding on a previous paper, universifying epistemontology seeks to hold the creative tensions between, and within, a diversity of civilizational epistemologies and ontologies— Chinese, Indian, Western, African and Diverse—with a meta-cultural frame, rather than subsuming them under a singular paradigm, holding space for generative dynamic interplay (Wright, 2024).

Universifying Meta-Epistemology

While honoring the contextual sovereignty of a diverse set of epistemologies—without erasing the tensions between them, collapsing them into a singular framework, or claiming to transcend them—universifying meta-epistemology holds these tensions in generative interplay. Universifying opens space for immanent critique and dialectical synthesis—absorbing, diversifying, connecting, and unifying—across all epistemologies, while maintaining the sovereignty of each.

Western epistemologies, grounded in Platonic (Plato, 2008) and Aristotelian (Aristotle, 1998) thought, diverged into a dual path of Christian thought (Aquinas, 1955; Plotinus, 1991) on the one side, which

orients to divine unity, and rationalism and empiricism on the other, which emphasize analytical clarity and the autonomy of reason (Descartes, 1996; Kant, 1998; Locke, 1975). Modern Western epistemologies dialectically synthesize universalism (Hegel, 1977; Plato, 2008) and relativism (Foucault, 1970; Rorty, 1979) in epistemological pluralism (Bhaskar, 2016; James, 1907), rationalism (Descartes, 1996) and empiricism (Hume, 2007), in critical realism (Bhaskar, 2016), objectivism (Popper, 2002) and constructivism (Kuhn, 1962; Piaget, 1970) in participatory epistemologies (Ferrer, 2002; Varela et al., 1991), detached objectivity (Bacon, 2000) and embodied embeddedness (Abram, 1996) in phenomenological epistemology (Merleau-Ponty, 2012), human-centered epistemologies (Descartes, 1996; Kant, 1998) and nonhuman/posthuman epistemologies (Barad, 2007; Bennett, 2010) in posthumanist and ecological epistemologies (Braidotti, 2013; Haraway, 1988; Latour, 2005), tacit knowing (Polanyi, 1966) and discursive reasoning (Habermas, 1984) in transconceptual epistemologies (Ferrer, 2002; Varela et al., 1991), linear-progressive knowledge models (Kant, 1998), and cyclical or mythic temporality, (Eliade, 2005), in meta-temporal epistemology (Gebser, 1985), and scientific positivism (Popper, 2002) and intuitive knowing (Bergson, 1911) in integral epistemology (Gebser, 1985; Wilber, 2000).

Traditional Indian epistemologies, spanning Advaita Vedānta (Śāṅkara, 1973), Nyāya logic (Gautama, 1984), and Buddhist Pramāṇa (Dharmakīrti, 1989) theory, explore multi-modal layers of knowing—from sensory inference to non-dual awareness—and integrate rigorous logic with contemplative insight (Ganeri, 2011; Matilal, 1990; Mohanty, 2000). Modern Indian epistemologies, such as Sri Aurobindo's (1990) Integral Yoga, which I speculate integrated perspectives beyond a 6UP wholistic perspective—from a 7UP subjective or 8UP universitive perspective (O'Fallon 2012)—in a comprehensive body of work integrates a significant portion of the trajectory of Western dialectical thought, from Plato (2008) to Kant (1998) and Hegel's (1977) idealism, to Darwin's (2003) theory of

evolution, and setting the stage for Wilber's (2000) Integral theory and universifying meta-theory, framing rationalism as an earlier phase in epistemic development to be transcended through to supramental levels where epistemology is inseparable from ontological transformation.

Chinese epistemologies, traditionally rooted in Daoist (Laozi, 2003), Confucian (Confucius, 1998), and Chan Buddhist (Huineng, 1998) traditions, foreground harmonious attunement, relational knowing (*guanxi*), and non-dual complementarity (*yin-yang*), privileging wisdom as arising from situational balance and embodied moral cultivation (Cheng, 2009; Lai, 2008). Modern Chinese epistemologies deeply engage with Western philosophical and religious traditions, from Tu's (1985) global humanism which engages with Dewey's (1907) pragmatism, Heidegger's (1962) existentialism, and Christian theology, to Mou's (2015) synthesizing Confucian moral metaphysics with Kant (1998) and Hegel's (1977) epistemologies, to Xu (1958) integrating existential and aesthetic concerns into a Confucian frame, echoing aspects of Bergson (1911) and phenomenologists.

African epistemologies, particularly those embedded in traditions such as Ubuntu and Yoruba philosophy, emphasize relational personhood, narrative forms of knowing, and lived communal wisdom. In these frameworks, knowledge is not merely a cognitive construct but is deeply rooted in ethical interdependence, oral transmission, and the co-becoming of self and community (Gyekye, 1995; Ramose, 1999). Contemporary African philosophers such as Wiredu (1980) have engaged Anglophone analytic philosophy to articulate African concepts in dialogue with rationalist traditions. Oruka's (1990) sage philosophy brings indigenous oral knowledge systems into conversation with Socratic dialectics, legitimizing the philosophical depth of oral traditions. Ramose (1999) engages continental thought, especially Heideggerian ontology (Heidegger, 1962) and post-structuralist critiques, to reinterpret Ubuntu as a dynamic philosophy of becoming—an

onto-epistemology grounded in relationality, temporality, and ethical interconnectedness.

Diverse civilizational epistemologies offer a wide variety of approaches to knowing. Traditional Islamic epistemologies, rooted in Tawhid (the principle of divine unity), *ilm* (knowledge), and the Qur'anic worldview, emphasize the integration of revelation, reason, and intuition in the pursuit of divine truth and ethical living (Nasr, 1981; Al-Attas, 1980). Building upon these foundations, modern Islamic epistemologists have engaged with Western philosophical traditions—such as phenomenology, critical theory, and hermeneutics—to rearticulate Islamic knowledge systems in ways that remain faithful to revelation while addressing contemporary challenges (Al-Jabri, 2009; Sardar, 1998). Traditional Indigenous epistemologies are grounded in place-based knowing, ancestral memory, and relational reciprocity with the more-than-human world, where knowledge emerges through lived experience, oral tradition, and communal practice (Cajete, 2000; Wilson, 2008). Modern Indigenous scholars critically engage with Western discourse to assert epistemic sovereignty, resist reductionist abstraction, and promote decolonial methodologies that center Indigenous views within pluralistic, trans-systemic frameworks (Kovach, 2009).

It is worth noting that historically, when epistemological thinkers engage in integrative efforts beyond their civilizational context, a contextual pattern has emerged: non-Western epistemologies (such as Chinese, Indian, African, and Diverse traditions) most commonly engage Western epistemological frameworks, while Western epistemologists who look beyond the Western tradition most frequently draw on Eastern (particularly Indian and Chinese) epistemologies. This asymmetry may reflect the historical legacy of colonialism, global academic structures, and the widespread diffusion of Western philosophical paradigms. In terms of my own personal context, as someone whose native language is English and who is most academically

immersed in Western thought, yet who has lived, studied and worked extensively in China and Africa, I bring an embodied familiarity with Chinese and African epistemological orientations. Whereas my engagement with Indian philosophy has primarily come through yogic training and practice, textual study, and interpersonal dialogue, and other diverse civilizational and Indigenous epistemologies—Islamic, Native American, Pacific, and beyond—I have largely encountered through scholarly reading and cross-cultural relationships. From a meta-cultural and meta-epistemological perspective, the intention is not to comprehensively represent all epistemologies—a task beyond the scope of any single theorist—but rather to engage in philosophical underlaboring (Bhaskar, 2016), helping to clear and cultivate the conceptual field so that others, especially those authentically rooted in different civilizational contexts, may fill the gaps with epistemic authenticity and contextual groundedness. Indian depth, Chinese balance, Western clarity, African relationality, and Diverse sacredness weave together into a meta-contextive fabric of knowing. This synthesis—of meta-cultural and meta-epistemological insight—co-arises at the intersection of perspective, cosmology, and ontological participation, opening vistas for planetary wisdom to engage the meta-crisis in a multipolar world.

Universifying Meta-Ontology

The Universifier orientation promotes a dynamic contextive frame that honors the wide spectrum of ontological polarities. One foundational polarity is between substance ontology (Aristotle, 1998; Descartes, 1996; Spinoza, 1996)—and process ontology (Bergson, 1911; Heraclitus, 2013), which are dialectically synthesized in a process-relational ontology (Rescher, 1996; Whitehead, 1978). Analogous insights appear in classical Chinese thought, where Daoist cosmology (Laozi, 2003; Zhuangzi, 2009) frames reality as a dynamic, interdependent unfolding of Dao. Similarly, Indian Vedantic

and Buddhist ontologies (Nāgārjuna, 1995; Śaṅkara, 1973) challenge the idea of intrinsic substance, viewing phenomena as empty (śūnya) of fixed essence and arising through interdependent co-origination (pratītyasamutpāda).

A second core polarity lies between materialism/physicalism (Hume, 2007; Locke, 1975) and idealism (Hegel, 1977; Kant, 1998), with dialectical resolutions spanning panpsychism (Goff, 2019), dual-aspect monism (Merleau-Ponty, 2012), and meta-realist ontologies (Bhaskar, 2016). Comparable syntheses emerge in Sufi metaphysics, especially the doctrine of *wahdat al-wujūd* (unity of being), developed by Ibn 'Arabi (1980), which integrates the manifest and unmanifest, within a non-dual ontological ground. In African ontologies, such as in Ubuntu and Yoruba cosmology, reality is not divided between material and immaterial realms but understood as an interwoven field of visible and invisible forces, where consciousness, being, and becoming are co-extensive (Ramosé, 1999; Mbiti, 1969). In Japanese ontology, thinkers like Motoyama (2009) articulated a logic of *basho* (place) and pure experience that transcends subject-object dualism, resonating with both process and non-dual ontologies.

Another polarity between monism (Hegel, 1977; Spinoza, 1996) and pluralism (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; James, 1907; Leibniz, 1989), is reconciled in transcendental, holonic or integral pluralism (Angerer, 2023; Bohm, 1980; Wilber, 2000). Similar integrative views emerge in Yoruba ontology, where the multiplicity of orishas reflects diverse manifestations of a unifying life force (Àṣẹ) (Abimbola, 1976; Ramosé, 1999), and in Daoist metaphysics, where the ten thousand things arise from the Dao without losing their essential interrelatedness (Laozi, 2003). Determinism (Laplace, 1995) and indeterminism (Heisenberg, 1958) are synthesized in probabilistic ontologies (Bohm, 1980; Prigogine, 1984). A parallel is found in Mahāyāna Buddhist thought, where causality (pratītyasamutpāda) is both conditioned and dynamically open, allowing

for compassion and liberation through intentional action (Nāgārjuna, 1995).

The classical split between realism (Putnam, 1981) and anti-realism (van Fraassen, 1980) finds reconciliation in participatory realism (Bhaskar, 2016; Ferrer, 2002). Comparable perspectives appear in Sufi ontology, particularly in Ibn 'Arabi's (1980) notion of imaginal reality (*alam al-mithal*). In Indigenous American ontologies, reality is relational and co-emergent—arising through participatory reciprocity between humans, ancestors, and the more-than-human world (Cajete, 2000; Wilson, 2008). Dualism (Chalmers, 1996; Descartes, 1996) and non-dualism (Nāgārjuna, 1995; Plotinus, 1991; Śaṅkara, 1973) are dialectically held together in meta-dual ontologies (Aurobindo, 1972; Gebser, 1985; Kastrup, 2024), which recognize distinctions without separation. Similar ideas are echoed in Chan Buddhist thought, where form and emptiness are not opposites but mutually defining (Lai, 2008), and in Motoyama's (2009) logic of the *basho* (place), which transcends subject-object dualism through experiential interpenetration. Essentialism (Jung, 1980; Plato, 2008) and anti-essentialism (Butler, 1990; Foucault, 1970) integrate in archetypal process ontologies, where forms emerge, dissolve, and evolve across reality (Hillman, 1975; Tarnas, 1991). This is mirrored in Tibetan Buddhist ontology, where archetypal deities are not static forms but energetic processes guiding transformation (Capriles, 2003).

The ontological split between immanence (Deleuze, 1994) and transcendence (Kant, 1998) is resolved in immanent transcendence (Plotinus, 1991; Schelling, 1800) and evolutionary panentheism (Kelly & Marshall, 2021). This synthesis is echoed in Islamic metaphysics, where *tanzih* (divine transcendence) and *tashbih* (divine immanence) are dialectically held in dynamic unity (Nasr, 1981), and in African metaphysics, where the divine is continuously manifest in lived experience without dichotomy (Mbiti, 1969). Finally, the tension between hierarchical ontologies (Plato, 2008) and flat ontologies (Deleuze,

1987; Harman, 2018; Latour, 2005) can be synthesized into meta-integrative ontopluralism – such as Bhaskar's (2016) dialectical logic, Wilber's (2006) tetra-arising, Morin's (1992) poly-ontology and Esbjörn-Hargens' (2020) complex integral realism – showing how being expresses across nested levels and horizontal networks. In Confucian cosmology cosmic harmony emerges from both hierarchical moral cultivation and horizontal relationality (Tu, 1985).

Rather than collapsing these into a homogenized system, a universifying ontology holds their tensions—substance and process, unity and plurality, transcendence and immanence, being and becoming—in creative, layered synthesis. This results in a meta-ontology that is not a static metaphysical system but a dynamic, relational, and evolving field of ontological insight—where the real is known through co-arising, contextual enactment across civilizational perspectives. Such a synthesis honors the sovereignty and situatedness of each tradition while inviting transversal dialogue and deep mutual learning, cultivating an ontological orientation capable of holding multiplicity in coherence without reduction.

Epistemontology

The term 'onto-epistemology', as developed by scholars like Barad (2007), Haraway (1988), and Braidotti (2013), emphasizes the inseparability of being and knowing by challenging the traditional separation between ontology and epistemology. Related to De Landa's (2006) assemblage theory and Latour's (2005) actor network theory and Harman's (2018) object oriented ontology, while this is a helpful frame in viewing knowledge as an active, relational, and embodied process through which the knower and the known co-emerge within specific material and cultural contexts, it is also framed primarily through a flat ontological lens without clearly integrating hierarchical ontologies. Informed by Bhaskar's (2016) dialectical logic, Wilber's (2006) tetra-arising,

Esbjörn-Hargens' (2020) complex integral realism, and Hedlund's (2023) visionary realism, universifying epistemology dialectically engages flat ontologies with hierarchical ontologies for a more inclusive meta-integrative ontological pluralism as part of a meta-ontological framework.

With a whole meta-ontological orientation dialectically integrated with a meta-epistemological orientation, universifying epistemology seeks to map the dynamic, omni-dimensional unfolding of knowledge and being across a full spectrum of perspectival consciousness, from pre-reflective ground (OUP) to speculative universitive perspective (SUP). While onto-epistemology as developed thus far, focuses primarily on the inseparability of existence and cognition within localized relational matrices, universifying epistemology aligns with and expands this insight by integrating a developmental and meta-integrative trajectory that incorporates diverse civilizational epistemologies and ontologies, and progressively complex modes of consciousness. Adding to Bhaskar (2016), Wilber (2006), Esbjörn-Hargens (2020) and Hedlund's (2023) contributions, universifying epistemology integrates meta-cultural perspectives through the emerging lens of the collective contextive perspective, holding a frame for synthesizing disparate epistemic and ontic meta-cultural traditions as a layered whole.

The dialectical synthesis of ontological and epistemological polarities reveals a deeper interpenetrative principle: that being and knowing are not merely parallel domains, but mutually constitutive dimensions of a larger, unfolding reality. In the universifier framework, the integration of epistemological and ontological dialectics gives rise to what may be termed a epistemontological orientation—a framework wherein epistemology becomes ontogenetic (knowing as generative of being), and ontology becomes noetic (being as inherently intelligible and participatory). At the heart of this meta-dialectic is the insight that the world is not simply there to be known (naive realism), nor entirely

constructed in knowing (radical constructivism), but rather comes-into-being through acts of participatory consciousness. This view draws from and deepens traditions such as participatory realism (Barad, 2007; Ferrer, 2002), enactivism (Varela et al., 1991), and process philosophy (Whitehead, 1978), while infusing them with a cosmological intentionality—recognizing that not only is consciousness implicated in the real, but the cosmos itself is becoming through recursive acts of conscious unfolding, with previously distinct polarities dissolving into higher-order unities. Substance and process, realism and constructivism, immanence and transcendence, objectivism and perspectivism—each polarity becomes a partial lens on a deeper participatory emergence, where the structures of reality and the structures of consciousness mirror, entangle, and catalyze one another. In this view, an ontological claim is also an epistemological stance, and an act of knowing is a performative act of being. The dual is reabsorbed into the non-dual, not by collapsing difference, but by intensifying intimacy. We arrive at a recursive epistemontological process — the layered ontology of emergence with the plural epistemologies of enactment — what Esbjörn-Hargens (2020) calls 'mutual enactment'.

In this synthesis, ontology is never final, and epistemology is never complete. Rather, both are dynamically co-creative: we do not merely know the world, we world it into form, along the lines of Heidegger's (1962) *weltbild*, Gebser's (1985) mutations, and Bhaskar's (2016) ontological depth. Universifiers are precisely those beings, states, or patterns of awareness that perform this synthesis, that generate new ontologies through higher-order epistemic participation, and new ways of knowing through deepening ontological inhabitation. The meta-dialectic therefore yields a contextive view from within the whole, capable of tracking the interplay between perspectives, strata, and ontological fields, without collapsing into abstraction or fragmentation. It is a mode of planetary and cosmological participation where

universifiers operate not just as observers or agents in a world, but as worlding forces—carriers of the cosmos' own recursive desire to know and become itself through the full spectrum of its being. Rather than subsuming these traditions under a totalizing logic, a contextive epistemology affirms their epistemic and ontic sovereignty while fostering a generative space where difference, tension, and resonance are held in dialectical interplay. This meta-integrative framework allows for the emergence of a pluriversal mode of knowing-being: one that is at once embodied and transcendent, immanent and aspirational, locally grounded and cosmically attuned. Knowledge and reality co-arise through dynamic participation across nested ontological strata and culturally situated epistemologies, culminating in a universifying epistemology that honors dynamic multiplicity-in-unity, emergence-in-context, and truth-in-relation.

Exo Studies and Complex Integral Realism

Having set the stage for a universifying epistemology, I now introduce Esbjörn-Hargens' (2020) exo studies which "is a metaphilosophy that draws on multiple integrative metatheories (e.g., Ken Wilber's Integral Theory, Roy Bhaskar's Critical Realism, and Edgar Morin's Complex Thought) to develop a Complex Integral Realism" (p. 2). Filling in the epistemological and ontological gaps left by more widely accepted models of reality, exo studies frames itself as "the metadisciplinary study of all anomalous phenomena that lie outside our current models of explanation and views of reality" (p. 2). This approach helps expand the field of inquiry to include the fringes—often dismissed or considered taboo in academic contexts. As Esbjörn-Hargens (2020) argues:

We need a robust metaview of weirdness that weaves together UFO

sightings, encounters with non-human intelligences (NHIs), paranormal and poltergeist phenomena, anomalous experiences, time and space slips, cryptids, and all legitimate forms of high strangeness into a new compelling story of us living in a multidimensional multiverse populated with a wide range of intelligent inhabitants (p. 2).

Exo studies takes these phenomena seriously, as "an emerging integrative metafield committed to exploring the psychological, sociological, and scientific implications of living in a highly populated, multidimensional multiverse." (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2020, p. 5)

Exopsychology

Exploring the field of exo studies, as I subjectively enter into intersubjective relationships with diverse cosmological forms of consciousness, it becomes apparent that an objective perspective alone is insufficient for making sense of the wild weirdness of the contextual field. To meaningfully engage with this diversity of manifestations, a contextive perspective—one that includes but is not reducible to the subjective, intersubjective, and objective—is required for deeper epistemological access to ontological reality. I have had direct subjective experiences that do not conform to the modernist scientific materialist worldview, and in some cases, these phenomena were co-experienced by others, generating a form of intersubjective credibility. These events, while not empirically verifiable in the narrow positivist sense, seem to align with what Bhaskar (2016) calls the 'actual' domain of ontologically real events that may or may not be observable in a closed system. Hearing or reading accounts from others with similar anomalous experiences, I feel a sense of dismay when experts reduce these phenomena to purely psychosocial interpretations. Such reductionism oversimplifies the inherent complexity of consciousness and fails to account for the possibility of transpersonal or ontologically

novel dimensions of reality. As growing evidence suggests that the materialist paradigm is irreconcilable in terms of explaining many anomalous and noetic experiences (Barušs & Mossbridge, 2016; Kastrup, 2024), I notice in my embodied experience an ethical imperative emerges to take fringe or liminal experiences seriously. As Kuhn (1962) argued, when anomalies accumulate and existing paradigms can no longer accommodate them, it signals the need for a paradigm shift. In this spirit, exo studies and related post-materialist frameworks help lay the groundwork for a new integrative cosmology capable of engaging the full spectrum nature of reality.

There is an emerging collective of scholars who take this field seriously, treating it with a level of philosophical and methodological rigor that often exceeds conventional scientific standards (Barušs & Mossbridge, 2016; Esbjörn-Hargens, 2020; Kastrup, 2024; Kripal, 2010; Radin, 2018; Puthoff, 1996; Sheldrake, 2012; Vallée, 1990). Often facing ridicule, professional marginalization, and even threats, it can require considerable courage to challenge entrenched paradigms. Notably, scholars such as Puthoff (1996) and Sheldrake (2012) have risked their reputations and careers in pursuit of scientific and philosophical truth. This heightened demand for rigor—while at times frustrating for those engaged in anomalous, fringe, or post-materialist inquiry—is a natural and even necessary dynamic. As Kuhn (1962) articulated, the erosion of dominant paradigms is typically accompanied by a crisis of legitimacy that demands increasingly sophisticated explanatory frameworks capable of addressing unresolved anomalies. The intensified scrutiny directed at those operating on the fringe is not merely a defensive reaction from the mainstream, but also a sign of its ossification—which paradoxically helps prepare the intellectual ground for the germination of a new, more encompassing worldview. Rather than resisting this pressure, scholars can engage generatively, demonstrating the emerging paradigm is not a retreat from scientific integrity, but an expansion of it.

Some scholars actively engage in speculation as a legitimate form of inquiry (Dolan, 2020; Flagg, 2024; Strieber, 2025). As Duncan (2015) notes, “speculation is only a danger to trust, however, when it masquerades as something other than it is... speculation, as a means of arriving at possible hypotheses for later rigorous testing, is an entirely proper exercise and cannot be dispensed with” (p. 48). Indeed, within many scientific frameworks, speculation is not only accepted but necessary—particularly as a form of hypothesis formation and theory-building. Every hypothesis and theory is, in essence, speculative; none can be proven with absolute certainty, but some fit the available evidence so well that they become widely accepted until a new theory offers a better fit (Kuhn, 1962). Yet not all hypotheses are subject to empirical verification—especially those concerning anomalous encounters or rare phenomena that resist replication in controlled settings (Bhaskar, 2016). In such cases, speculation becomes indispensable. As Duncan (2015) further elaborates:

“Speculation concerning experiences and encounters, and attempts to find a comprehensible framework of reference, eventually lead to a number of working hypotheses. All working hypotheses must then be subjected to honestly conducted testing, rigorously and perpetually. They must be, honestly and firmly, modified when found wanting.” (p. 61)

This approach strikes a balance between open-minded inquiry and methodological rigor, allowing room for anomalous or fringe data to be taken seriously without abandoning critical standards.

Hard, Soft, Meta and Unified Universifiers

The hard, soft, meta, and unified universifiers represent four primary speculative modalities of how consciousness

participates in the co-constitution of reality. When examined through the lens of the universifying epistemology each class of universifier reveals a distinct pattern of worlding: of how knowing and being generate cosmological form, meaning, and agency.

Hard Universifiers: Absorbers

Hard universifiers operate at the pole of physical structural consolidation, grounded intra-dimensionally in our three dimensional world moving through the fourth dimension of time. They are known through epistemologies grounded in empiricism and rationalism, and ontologies rooted in substance, realism, materialism, and essentialism. In the epistemological synthesis, they serve as ontological stabilizers—entities that anchor the fluidity of becoming by absorbing consciousness into discernible, communicable forms by encoding regularity. Hard universifiers are the least abstract and most concrete of the universifiers. They are embodied in physical systems—biological or synthetic forms of intelligence that are terrestrial or non-terrestrial. On the biological spectrum, this includes organisms with highly conserved structures (carbon or potentially silicon-based life), whose very replication enforces order through genetic fidelity. What Esbjörn-Hargens (2020) calls ‘galactics’, may also include non-terrestrial intelligences, planetary systems, or cosmic-scale attractors that stabilize domains of reality through physical regularities. These entities, whether cellular or stellar, biological or technological, terrestrial or exo-biological, consolidate informational and energetic flux into structural coherence. They are form-givers and preservers of intelligibility—embodied Platonic (2008) operators of order, much like Gödelian systems of formal constraint (Gödel, 1986), or Badiou’s (2005) mathematical ontologies. Techno-biological civilizations that encode universal laws can be seen as collective expressions of this hard universifier impulse. In the dialectic of becoming, hard universifiers hold space for

cosmic embodiment, intelligibility, and continuity across spacetime, manifesting wherever order reasserts itself against entropy, repetition clarifies chaos, and form wins its wager against formlessness.

Soft Universifiers: Diversifiers

Soft universifiers function as inter-dimensional mediators of diversity, ambiguity, and contextual emergence that seem to phase in and out of our three dimensional world. Epistemologically, they can be approached through constructivism, perspectivism, participatory knowing, and indigenous epistemologies. Ontologically, they gravitate toward process, immanence, relational pluralism, and flat or lateral ontologies. Their epistemological role is that of relational proliferation—they amplify multiplicity, emergence, and difference without dissolving into incoherence. They are world-weavers, enabling the generativity of new lifeworlds, symbolic grammars, and transpersonal ecologies. Think of Haraway’s (1988) situated knowledges, Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) rhizome, or indigenous cosmologies that emphasize kinship between human and nonhuman, land and story, knowing and dreaming. Within this relational matrix dwell subtle beings—entities that defy strict categorization as physical or purely imaginary. What Esbjörn-Hargens (2020) categorizes as ‘fae’, these include elemental spirits, nature intelligences, cryptids and ancestral presences found in animist and esoteric traditions across cultures: from Amazonian plant teachers and DMT machine elves to Celtic fae and Chinese mountain spirits (山神) to Polynesian mana-infused ancestors and will-o-wisps. Such beings may be interpreted not only as cultural projections but also as ontologically real within their respective cosmologies—entities that mediate between visible and invisible realms. They contribute to the ontological pluralism that soft universifiers safeguard, reminding us that reality is neither singular nor static, but a shifting nexus of inter-being. In the dialectic of becoming, soft universifiers preserve the

wild relationality and intra-active creativity of the cosmos, resisting premature closure, holding space for ambiguity, co-presence, and the unpredictable flourishing of epistemontological possibility.

Meta Universifiers: Connectors

Meta universifiers are meta-dimensional beings—intelligences that appear to operate fluidly across ontological planes beyond the standard three-dimensional framework, transcending time and space and traversing the boundless and timeless. These intelligences may be epistemontologically understood through meta-frameworks that orient from a causal perspective such as Bhaskar's (2016) meta-reality, Wilber's (2006) integral theory and Esbjörn-Hargens' (2020) exo studies. Ontologically, they operate across layered modalities of being: hierarchical (tracking emergence, depth, and developmental complexity) and lateral or networked (honoring entanglement, feedback, and relational dynamism). Epistemologically, they recognize the necessity of epistemic pluralism, transdisciplinary synthesis, and the recursive interdependence of subject and object. Meta universifiers serve as bridges, connectors, and cartographers of being—mediating across paradigms, systems, and cosmologies. They function as coherence-makers in an ontologically plural and evolving cosmos. As systemic synthesizers, they discern higher-order patterns that bind disparate domains of knowledge. These may include meta-physical entities reported in mystical, near-death, or contact experiences, or archetypal guides that emerge in integrative states of consciousness. What Esbjörn-Hargens (2020) names 'celestials', these forms are higher-order dimensional beings, guardians of planetary or cosmic evolution, associated with cosmogenic functions—aligning with patterns of growth, moral archetypes, or evolutionary attractors. Whether encountered through visionary states, advanced meditative access, or cross-cultural metaphysical traditions — Daoist tian shen (天神),

Christian angels, Buddhist bodhisattvas, Sufi malā'ika, or Vedic devas — they are often experienced as mediators of integration and ascent, entities embodying the universe's self-reflective capacity to know and guide itself. Meta universifiers are the universal grammar of synthesis—holding paradox within coherence, aligning multiplicity with directionality, and offering navigational intelligences for an evolving cosmos in conversation with itself.

Unified Universifiers: Unifiers

Unified universifiers express the omni-dimensional full culmination of epistemontological unification. They do not merely absorb, diversify, or connect the ontological field—they are the unifying ground from which all such modalities arise, embodying the non-duality of knowing and being, not by collapsing polarities but by revealing their ultimate transparency and mutual enactment within an unconditioned field. Epistemontologically, they transcend and include all prior forms: hard, soft and meta—radiating a mode of gnosis that is simultaneously universal and acutely intimate. Ontologically, they operate through and beyond process, essence, material, and form—revealing the unconditioned real: Advaita's Brahman, Mahayana's śūnyatā, Kabbalistic Ain Soph, or Daoist Wuji. Unified universifiers are omni-dimensional, containing, and generating, all dimensions within themselves, beyond spatiotemporal or ontological limitation. These include ultimate referents such as the absolute (Motoyama, 2009), Dao (Fung, 1997), God (Teilhard de Chardin, 1959), Brahman (Aurobindo, 1990), Àṣẹ (Abimbola, 1976) or other absolute terms denoting the all-containing, all-emanating ground of being. These realities are often accessed through deep mystical union, apophatic contemplation, or peak visionary states in which the seer and the seen dissolve into one unified awareness. They are not just integrative; they are meta-differentiative—prior to all differentiation yet generative of all

difference. They are living paradoxes: empty and full, immanent and transcendent, personal and impersonal, form and formlessness. They are not just cosmological entities or theoretical ends—they are the is-ing of being itself, the ontological no-place from which all places arise. Think here of Plotinus' (1991) *One*, Nāgārjuna's (1995) *Middle Way*, Meister Eckhart's (2009) *Godhead*, Sri Aurobindo's (1990) *Supermind*, Nkrumah's (1964) *Consciencism*, Zhang's (2004) *Taiji* or Teilhard de Chardin's (1959) *Omega Point*. In the dialectic of becoming, unified universifiers are not endpoints—they are omni-perspectival openings through which all perspectives become luminous to themselves, not by attaining finality, but by resting in the real as it gives rise to itself.

Immanent Critique

As with meta-theoretical orientations in general, the universifier orientation, while striving to honor the sovereignty of all forms and also dialectically synthesize polarities, may not fully include the deep embodied reality of the wide diversity of forms. The orientation of the universifier may be seen as a privileged meta-standpoint, from which all other standpoints can be coordinated. The contextive perspective, through a human lens, is limited to the evolution of the collective in which it sits, with meta-contextual blindspots from being embedded in cultural, historical, and linguistic assumptions. Given the inherent power relations and infrastructural asymmetries that shape which contexts are visible, valued, or integrated, the contextive perspective may unintentionally privilege those with more capacity to navigate multiple contexts, through a form of epistemic elitism (or subtle meta-colonialism), while masking structural exclusions behind a rhetoric of flexibility and inclusivity. Though universifying epistemology orients towards honoring sovereignty through a dynamic integration of knowing and being across cultures and contexts, the polarity of sovereignty and synthesis — core to the term 'universifying' — risks being seen as idealistic and is

ethically bound to demonstrate pragmatic applicability. Attempting to resolve epistemological and ontological polarities, epistemology can marginalize epistemologies and ontologies that resist synthesis or embrace radical non-integration. The orientation to enact a fluid, evolving synthesis of meta-epistemology and meta-ontology may thus obscure the ethical necessity of letting some alterities remain unassimilated, respecting their right to being folded into a universifying frame.

Conclusion

In the face of the meta-crisis—characterized by fractured worldviews, collapsing sense-making, and epistemic fragmentation—the frames of universifiers, the contextive perspective, and universifying epistemology offer tools for generating coherence without flattening difference. Rather than imposing a single meta-narrative or reverting to relativistic paralysis, these approaches invite us to hold multiple ways of knowing and being in dynamic tension, cultivating the capacity to navigate cultural, epistemic, and ontological boundaries with discernment and humility. The term universifiers holds space for a diversity of cosmological forms of consciousness honoring both the sovereignty of each individual form and the possibility of deeper relational synthesis. Naming the contextive perspective supports us to integrate subjective, inter-subjective and objective perspectives, for a coherent collective orientation towards the meta-crisis. Universifying epistemology provides a scaffolding to understand how being and knowing co-evolve across systems and traditions—offering not a final truth, but an evolving grammar for co-creating futures grounded in pluralistic depth, participatory wisdom, and regenerative complexity. In an age where the conditions for shared understanding are eroding, these frames help humans become stewards of epistemic and ontic ecosystems, capable of holding the many truths needed to navigate a world in transformation. Opening up through the contextive

perspective reveals the possibility for a collective awareness of, and intimacy with, a wide range of cosmological forms, offering an evolutionary leap into a whole new world, where our human family joins our wider family of universifiers in universifying the cosmos itself.

References

- Abimbola, W. (1976). *Ifa: An expository treatise on the religion of the Yoruba*. Nok Publishers.
- Abram, D. (1996). *The spell of the sensuous: Perception and language in a more-than-human world*. Pantheon Books.
- Al-Attas, S. M. N. (1980). *The concept of education in Islam: A framework for an Islamic philosophy of education*. International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization.
- Al-Jabri, M. A. (2009). *The formation of Arab reason: Text, tradition and the construction of modernity in the Arab world* (S. R. Talmon, Trans.). Routledge. (Original work published 1982)
- Ames, R. T. (2011). *Confucian role ethics: A vocabulary*. University of Hawai'i Press.
- Andersen, L. R., & Björkman, T. (Eds.). (2017). *The nordic secret: A European story of beauty and freedom* (2nd ed.). Nordic Bildung / Fri Tanke Förlag.
- Angerer, R. (2023). The New Human University study: Structure-stage growth in a one-year transformational learning program. *International Journal of Psychiatry*, 8(5), 139. <https://doi.org/10.33140/ijp.08.05.05>
- Aquinas, T. (1955). *Summa contra gentiles* (A. C. Pegis, Trans.). University of Notre Dame Press. (Original work published ca. 1259)
- Aristotle. (1998). *Metaphysics* (W. D. Ross, Trans.). In J. Barnes (Ed.), *The complete works of Aristotle* (Vol. 2, pp. 1552–1728). Princeton University Press. (Original work written ca. 350 BCE)
- Aurobindo, S. (1990). *The life divine*. Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press. (Original work published 1914)
- Bacon, F. (2000). *The new organon* (L. Jardine & M. Silverthorne, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1620)
- Badiou, A. (2005). *Being and event* (O. Feltham, Trans.). Continuum. (Original work published 1988)
- Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke University Press.
- Barrett, R. (2006). *Building a values-driven organization: A whole system approach to cultural transformation*. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Barrett, R. (2020). *Worldview dynamics and the well-being of nations*. Lulu Publishing Services.
- Barušs, I., & Mossbridge, J. (2016). *Transcendent mind: Rethinking the science of consciousness*. American Psychological Association.
- Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Duke University Press.
- Bergson, H. (1911). *Creative evolution* (A. Mitchell, Trans.). Henry Holt and Company. (Original work published 1907)
- Bhaskar, R. (2016). *Enlightened common sense: The philosophy of critical realism*. Routledge.

- Bogost, I. (2012). *Alien phenomenology, or what it's like to be a thing*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Bohm, D. (1980). *Wholeness and the implicate order*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. Polity Press.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. Routledge.
- Cajete, G. (2000). *Native Science: Natural Laws of Interdependence*. Clear Light Publishers.
- Capriles, E. (2003). *The Tibetan mandala: Paths to enlightenment*. Shambhala.
- Chalmers, D. J. (1996). *The conscious mind: In search of a fundamental theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Cheng, C.-Y. (2009). *Philosophy of Chinese art*. In C.-Y. Cheng (Ed.), *The development of Chinese philosophy* (pp. 155–182). Chinese University Press.
- Confucius. (1998). *The Analects* (D. C. Lau, Trans.). Penguin Books. (Original work ca. 5th century BCE)
- Cook-Greuter, S. (2000). Mature ego development: A gateway to ego transcendence? *Journal of Adult Development*, 7(4), 227–240.
- Cook-Greuter, S. (2010). *Postautonomous Ego Development: A Study of its Nature and Measurement*. Integral Publishers.
- Darwin, C. (2003). *On the origin of species*. (G. Beer, Ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1859)
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition* (P. Patton, Trans.). Columbia University Press. (Original work published 1968)
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). "Rhizome." In *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia* (B. Massumi, Trans.; pp. 3–25). University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1980)
- De Landa, M. (2006). *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*. Continuum/Bloomsbury Academic.
- Descartes, R. (1996). *Meditations on First Philosophy* (J. Cottingham, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1641)
- Dewey, J. (1907). *The influence of Darwin on philosophy and other essays in contemporary thought*. Henry Holt and Company.
- Dharmakīrti. (1989). *Pramāṇavārttika: A commentary on Dignāga's Compendium of Valid Cognition* (S. H. Tillemans, Ed.). Institute for Buddhist and Asian Studies.
- Dolan, R. M. (2020). *The alien agendas: A speculative analysis of those visiting Earth*. Richard Dolan Press.
- Duncan, A. (2015). *To think without fear: The challenge of the extra-terrestrial*. Skylight Press.
- Eckhart, M. (2009). *Meister Eckhart: The Essential Sermons, Commentaries, Treatises, and Defense* (E. T. Heron-Allen, Trans.). Modern Library. (Original works written c. 1290–1327)
- Eliade, M. (2005). *The myth of the eternal return: Cosmos and history* (W. R. Trask, Trans.). Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1949)
- Esbjörn-Hargens, S. (2020). *Our wild kosmos!: An exo studies exploration of the ontological status of non-human intelligences*. Exo Studies Institute.

- Ferrer, J. N. (2002). *Revisioning transpersonal theory: A participatory vision of human spirituality*. SUNY Press.
- Flagg, S. (2024). *Xenopsychology: Deciphering the minds of the cosmos*. Built With Love.
- Foucault, M. (1970). *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. Pantheon Books.
- Fung, Y.-L. (1997). *A history of Chinese philosophy* (D. Bodde, Trans.). Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1948)
- Ganeri, J. (2011). *The lost age of reason: Philosophy in early modern India 1450–1700*. Oxford University Press.
- Gautama. (1984). *The Nyāya-sūtras of Gotama* (S. C. Vidyabhusana, Trans.). Motilal Banarsidass. (Original work ca. 2nd century BCE)
- Gebser, J. (1985). *The ever-present origin* (N. Barstad & A. Mickunas, Trans.). Ohio University Press. (Original work published 1949)
- Gödel, K. (1986). *On formally undecidable propositions of Principia Mathematica and related systems I* (S. Feferman et al., Eds.). In Kurt Gödel: *Collected Works* (Vol. I). Oxford University Press.
- Goff, P. (2019). *Galileo's error: Foundations for a new science of consciousness*. Pantheon Books.
- Gyekye, K. (1995). *An essay on African philosophical thought: The Akan conceptual scheme* (Rev. ed.). Temple University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action, Vol. 1: Reason and the rationalization of society* (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Beacon Press.
- Haraway, D. J. (1988). *Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective*. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575–599.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066>
- Harman, G. (2018). *Object-oriented ontology: A new theory of everything*. Pelican.
- Hedlund, N. H. (2023). *Visionary realism and the emergence of a eudaimonistic society: Metatheory in a time of metacrisis* (Doctoral dissertation, UCL (University College London)).
- Hegel, G. W. F. (1977). *Phenomenology of spirit* (A. V. Miller, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1807)
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time* (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). Harper & Row.
- Heisenberg, W. (1958). *Physics and philosophy: The revolution in modern science*. Harper & Row.
- Heraclitus. (2013). *Fragments* (T. M. Robinson, Trans.). University of Toronto Press. (Original work published ca. 500 BCE)
- Higgs, P. (2012). African philosophy and the transformation of educational discourse in South Africa. *Journal of Education*, 54, 1–18.
- Hillman, J. (1975). *Re-visioning psychology*. Harper & Row.
- Huineng. (1998). *The platform sutra of the sixth patriarch* (P. Yampolsky, Trans.). Columbia University Press.
- Hume, D. (2007). *A treatise of human nature* (D. Norton & M. Norton, Eds.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1739–1740)
- Husserl, E. (1931). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology* (W. R. Boyce Gibson, Trans.). Allen & Unwin.
- Ibn 'Arabi. (1980). *The bezels of wisdom* (R. W. J. Austin, Trans.). Paulist Press. (Original work published ca. 1240)

- James, W. (1907). *Pragmatism: A new name for some old ways of thinking*. Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Jung, C. G. (1980). *Man and his symbols* (R. F. C. Hull, Ed.). Dell. (Original work published 1959)
- Kant, I. (1998). *Critique of pure reason* (P. Guyer & A. W. Wood, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1781)
- Kachru, S. (2021). *Other lives: Mind and world in Indian Buddhism*. Columbia University Press.
- Kastrup, B. (2024). *Analytic idealism in a nutshell: A straightforward summary of the 21st century's only plausible metaphysics*. Iff Books.
- Kegan, R., Lahey, L. L., Miller, M., Fleming, A., & Helsing, D. (2016). *An Everyone Culture: Becoming a Deliberately Developmental Organization*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Kelly, E. F., & Marshall, P. (Eds.). (2021). *Consciousness unbound: Liberating mind from the tyranny of materialism*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. University of Toronto Press.
- Kripal, J. J. (2010). *Authors of the impossible: The paranormal and the sacred*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lai, K. L. (2008). *An introduction to Chinese philosophy*. Cambridge University Press.
- Laloux, F. (2014). *Reinventing organizations: A guide to creating organizations inspired by the next stage of human consciousness*. Nelson Parker.
- Laozi. (2003). *Dao De Jing: A philosophical translation* (R. T. Ames & D. L. Hall, Trans.). Ballantine Books.
- Laplace, P.-S. (1995). *A philosophical essay on probabilities* (F. W. Truscott & F. L. Emory, Trans.). Dover Publications. (Original work published 1814)
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Locke, J. (1975). *An essay concerning human understanding* (P. H. Nidditch, Ed.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1690)
- Matilal, B. K. (1990). *The word and the world: India's contribution to the study of language*. Oxford University Press.
- Mbiti, J. S. (1969). *African religions and philosophy*. Heinemann.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2012). *Phenomenology of perception* (D. A. Landes, Trans.). Routledge. (Original work published 1945)
- Metzinger, T. (2024). *The elephant and the blind: The experience of pure consciousness*. The MIT Press.
- Mohanty, J. N. (2000). *Classical Indian philosophy: An introductory text*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Morin, E. (1992). *Method I: The nature of nature* (M. E. Lewis, Trans.). Peter Lang. (Original work published 1977)
- Motoyama, H. (2009). *Being and the logic of interactive function* (S. Nagatomo & J. W. M. Krummel, Trans.). Human Science Press.
- Mou, Z. (2015). *Nineteen lectures on Chinese philosophy: A brief outline of Chinese philosophy and the issues it entails* (E. C. Su, Trans.). Foundation for the Study of Chinese Philosophy and Culture.

- Nāgārjuna. (1995). *The fundamental wisdom of the middle way: Nāgārjuna's Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* (J. L. Garfield, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work ca. 2nd century CE)
- Nasr, S. H. (1981). *Knowledge and the sacred*. Crossroad.
- Nkrumah, K. (1964). *Consciencism: Philosophy and ideology for decolonization*. London: Panaf Books.
- O'Fallon, T. (2010). The evolution of the human soul: Developmental practices in spiritual guidance. *Excerpt from Masters in Spiritual Direction*.
- O'Fallon, T. (2012). *STAGES: Growing up is waking up—Interpenetrating quadrants, states and structures*. Pacific Integral.
- O'Fallon, T. (2020). States and STAGES: Waking up developmentally. *Integral Review: A Transdisciplinary & Transcultural Journal for New Thought, Research, and Praxis*, 16(1-2), 318-339.
- O'Fallon, T., Polissar, N., Neradilek, M. B., & Murray, T. (2020). Validation of a new scoring method for assessing ego development in three dimensions of language. *Heliyon*, 6(3), 1-15.
- Oruka, H. O. (1990). *Sage philosophy: Indigenous thinkers and modern debate on African philosophy*. E. J. Brill.
- Piaget, J. (1970). *Psychology and epistemology: Towards a theory of knowledge* (B. Inhelder & H. H. Chipman, Eds. & Trans.). Viking Press.
- Plato. (2008). *The republic* (R. Waterfield, Trans.). Oxford University Press. (Original work published ca. 380 BCE)
- Plotinus. (1991). *The enneads* (A. H. Armstrong, Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. University of Chicago Press.
- Popper, K. (2002). *The logic of scientific discovery* (Routledge Classics ed.). Routledge. (Original work published 1934)
- Puthoff, H. E. (1996). CIA-initiated remote viewing program at Stanford Research Institute. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 10(1), 63-76.
- Putnam, H. (1981). *Reason, truth, and history*. Cambridge University Press.
- Radin, D. (2018). *Real magic: Ancient wisdom, modern science, and a guide to the secret power of the universe*. Harmony Books.
- Ramose, M. B. (1999). *African philosophy through Ubuntu*. Mond Books.
- Rescher, N. (1996). *Process metaphysics: An introduction to process philosophy*. State University of New York Press.
- Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Princeton University Press.
- Śankara. (1973). *Upadeśasāhasrī: A thousand teachings* (M. Hiriyan, Trans.). Motilal Banarsidass. (Original work ca. 8th century CE)
- Sardar, Z. (1998). *Islam, postmodernism and other futures: A text-reader*. Pluto Press.
- Sheldrake, R. (2012). *The science delusion: Freeing the spirit of enquiry*. Coronet.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Zed Books.
- Spinoza, B. (1996). *Ethics* (E. Curley, Trans.). Penguin Books. (Original work published 1677)
- Stein, Z. (2019). *Education in a time between worlds: Essays on the future of*

- schools, technology, and society. Bright Alliance.
- Strieber, W. (2025). *Fourth mind*. Walker & Collier.
- Tu, W. (1985). *Confucian thought: Selfhood as creative transformation*. State University of New York Press.
- Vallée, J. (1990). *Confrontations: A scientist's search for alien contact*. Ballantine Books.
- van Fraassen, B. C. (1980). *The scientific image*. Oxford University Press.
- Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1991). *The embodied mind: Cognitive science and human experience*. MIT Press.
- Waldenfels, B. (2011). *Phenomenology of the alien: Basic concepts*. Northwestern University Press.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1978). *Process and reality: An essay in cosmology* (Corrected ed., D. R. Griffin & D. W. Sherburne, Eds.). Free Press. (Original work published 1929)
- Wilber, K. (2000). *Integral psychology: Consciousness, spirit, psychology, therapy*. Shambhala.
- Wilber, K. (2006). *Integral spirituality: A startling new role for religion in the modern and postmodern world*. Shambhala.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Fernwood Publishing.
- Wiredu, K. (1980). *Philosophy and an African Culture*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, F. (2022). *Universifying: A theory, model & practice to birth our emerging world through the meta-crisis*. [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Antioch University. <https://universifying.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Universifying-Masters-Thesis-by-Fionn-Wright.pdf>
- Wright, F. (2024, December 8). *Meta-cultural civilization: Universifying a full-spectrum multi-polar world through the meta-crisis* (Unpublished manuscript, INS 501: Foundations in Integral Studies). California Institute for Human Science.
- Wright, F. (2025, March 22). *Human-AI universification: An integrative meta-perspectival approach to disruptive and potentially conscious technology* (Unpublished manuscript, INS 502: Consciousness Studies). California Institute for Human Science.
- Xu, F. (1958). 儒学新探 [New interpretation of Confucianism]. 商务印书馆.
- Zhang, X. (2004). *The taiji philosophy: An introduction to the daoist cosmology of wuji and taiji*. *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 31(1), 1-18.
- Zhuangzi. (2009). *The essential Zhuangzi* (B. Ziporyn, Trans.). Hackett Publishing.



About the Author

Fionn Wright was born in 1990 and grew up around the world, spending a quarter of his life in Europe, a quarter in Africa, a quarter in North America and a quarter in Asia. He has become a meta-cultural global citizen who feels a sense of responsibility to support a healthy unification of diverse consciousness on Planet Earth.

Fionn became known on the streets of Shanghai as an expert in personal development, conscious parenting, and innovative education through his livestreaming in fluent Chinese to over a million viewers, with TV appearances reaching over 100 million views. He's also an award winning documentary producer, serial entrepreneur and keynote speaker, named by City Weekend Magazine as one of the "11 Most Influential Movers & Shakers in Shanghai" – a city of 24 million.


Passionate about education and development, he leveraged his media presence to sponsor his family to live off the grid in a camper for a year to worldschool his own children in the mountains of British

Columbia, and presented at hundreds of schools across the world such as the American International School of Mozambique, the Yew Cheng International School and Loreto College and universities such as the London School of Economics, Zhejiang University and University College Dublin, as well as corporations such as Siemens, Roche and Nike. As an integrative coach with an Individualized Masters in Self Design and a PhD candidate in Integral Noetic Science with a specialization in Meta-Theory, he has trained in a variety of modalities including STAGES Coaching, Generating Transformative Change, Leadership Circle Profile, Hakomi Mindfulness-based Somatic Psychotherapy, NLP Master Practitioner, ActionCOACH Business Coaching, Neuroscience for Coaching, Process Facilitation and many more.


He coaches, advises and consults for leaders in Entrepreneur Organization, Young Presidents Organization and Family Business Network, and leads international teams of world-class practitioners to develop personalized programs for these leaders and their families based on their developmental levels, shadow and a wide range of integrative assessments. He is currently exploring the expansion of our collective leading edge, developing global leadership programs integrating real-time developmental AI, biofeedback, psychedelics, shadow-work, epigenetics and meta-funding models.

As the creator of Universifying – an integrative Meta-Model, Theory and Practice to birth our world through the meta-crisis – Fionn is holding space for an ethically-oriented emergence of a wiser young meta-collective to manifest a global technologically-supported evolutionary meta-ecosystem for us to wake up our awareness, grow up our perspectives, light up our wholeness and show up to regenerate our planet.


Other Works by Fionn



[Universifying: A Meta-Theory, Model and Practice](#)




[Fionn's Universifying Keynote at What's The Future Integral Conference](#)



[Universifier: An AI-Supported Full-Spectrum Developmental Ecosystem](#)



[The Soul Of AI: A Conversation with Fionn Wright](#)



[Meta-Cultural Civilization](#)



[The Other Other's Podcast: China Is A Thing - With Fionn Wright](#)

