Double Indemnity: Integral Analysis of the Culture of Fear Inside Academia and How It Fails Its Members and Its Greater Community

Veronika Bohac Clarke
University of Calgary
bohac@ucalgary.ca

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to reflect on two growing trends in academia, particularly in the humanities, which separately contribute to self-censorship, doublespeak, obsessive crafting of personal brands, egocentrism, and sanitized discourse and publication output. Using Wilber's Integral metatheory, these trends are linked to two developmental levels within academic populations that exist alongside each other in the contexts that support and perpetuate them. One is the corporate university context, which is competitive and brand driven, supporting the formal operational "Orange" developmental level. The other is the pluralistic "Green" level, which is characterized by relativism and political correctness. Both developmental levels are currently gravitating toward their pathological expressions, resulting in extreme self-censorship within both populations. This self-censorship in turn often results in publication output that is neutered: trivial in content, extremely politically correct, not leading, not risking, not asking significant questions, and thus not making meaningful contributions to the wider community.

Keywords: Integral theory, academic censorship, academic competition, resisting academic surveillance policies, free speech in universities, fear in academia

Introduction

Integral Theory is used in this paper to analyze current maladaptive trends, particularly in the humanities, which make authentic work inside academia difficult and its products questionable in their usefulness (Alvesson & Spicer, 2016). In addition to using Integral Theory as framework for analysis of these trends, it is also used as a map at the conclusion of this article, to suggest some ways out of the current situation. The Integral model, developed by Wilber (2000a), consists of 5 elements, whereby the ontological "Quadrants" and the "Developmental Levels" are the backbone of the model. This article is primarily concerned with the two most influential developmental levels commonly found in academia, particularly in the humanities, and their pathological expressions. The **Formal Operational Level**, which Wilber calls "Orange", is vastly influential in the lives of academics, and is expressed by **technological advances, logic, and striving for excellence**. The **Pluralistic Level**, called "Green" by Wilber, is expressed widely within the student population, and is characterized by **relativism, pluralism, concern for human rights, and empathy for others**. Each level has been increasingly exhibiting evidence of devolving into its pathological form. The pathology of each level exerts a degree of fear in the context of its members within academia. Each pathology also exerts an expectation of perfection from its members, as measured by informal behavioural and formal measurable norms.

This pressure and fear in turn leads to survival-based behaviour and self-centered goals. In the context of students, this fear is expressed in the transactional approach to learning – I pay my fees, I am a customer, I will fulfill exactly the course rubric, and therefore I expect an A in the course. The rubric is a safe alternative to the personal risk of exposing new or original ideas to public scrutiny. The content of student work exhibits close adherence to the political norms and expression of the social groups that the students belong to. This may be a sensible course of action, given that “public scrutiny” has replaced “public discussion” in social media and online communications.

In the case of faculty members, much of the onboarding of new faculty focuses on strategies to secure grants and establish a publication track record, thereby indoctrinating the newcomers into the culture of fear. The Faculty’s field of vision is thus reduced, resulting in collective myopia and tight focus on satisfying teaching evaluations and artificial publication quota – resulting in teaching to rubrics and producing trivial publications (Alvesson, Gabriel & Paulsen, 2017). Research with practical application is disparaged – if it is not highly theoretical, difficult to read, and worthy of “top tier journals” – it “doesn’t count”. Thus, the distance between academic output and its usefulness in the real-world is widening. The number of issues considered worthy of investigation are limited by grant application strategies, organizationally defined importance, and political correctness. Real-life issues, that are considered too trivial or too complex by the organizational or national granting and publication systems, are not strategically wise to address. Resisting this pressure requires conscious effort on the part of faculty members, and often comes at a cost to career progress.

Missing the big picture is not simply an academic failing, it is an ethical failing, in the sense that academics ought to be leaders in looking ahead and assessing what might be, and what the impacts on the greater community could be. Here again, engagement with the immediate, perhaps “trivial” issues of everyday life would be required. In a context where human problems are ranked in terms of how conducive they are to publication, there is often a curious detachment even when academics contemplate pressing issues such as the rapidly changing human context in relation to technology and climate, for example.

While there has been considerable discussion about guaranteed income (Leonardi & Pisani, 2017) as a possible answer to job displacement by robots or artificial intelligence (Danaher, 2017; Gregg, 2018), and some recognition of the emotional impact of the loss of purpose for many people, there has not been much connection made to the possibility of concurrent loss of land and displacement of large numbers of people, due to both climate and economic factors. So, the intense preoccupation with survival in the academy has blinded some academics and many academic leaders to the current and future survival issues in the real-world.

It is unclear whether this detachment is reflective solely of the overwhelming absorption with the current system of academic production and accountability, or whether it also still reflects disciplinary boundaries, but the overall publication output in the humanities today would not be generally characterized by empathy and recognition of the shared experience of human suffering inside and outside of the academy.

A Very Brief Introduction to Integral Theory

As the name implies, Integral Theory is a metatheory that integrates many perspectives and ways of knowing in a systematic and logical fashion. At the core of the theory is Wilber's Integral Model (2006), which provides an auditable map of paradigms, developmental capacities and ways of knowing.

UL: Interior Individual SUBJECTIVE What <i>I</i> feel, experience Contents of my mind - invisible	UR: Exterior Individual OBJECTIVE What <i>one (it)</i> does Behavioral, observable, measurable
LL: Interior Collective INTER-SUBJECTIVE How <i>we (you and I)</i> understand each other Cultural	LR: Exterior Collective INTER-OBJECTIVE What <i>they (its, systems)</i> do Social

Figure 1. *The Quadrants of the Integral Model* (Bohac Clarke, 2019, p. 49).

The five components of the model are: Quadrants, Levels, Lines, States and Types. The quadrants (**Figure 1**) represent the worldviews or ontologies. Applied to research, they represent research paradigms. Wilber derived the quadrants from two basic dichotomies through which humans perceive the world: inside/outside and singular/plural. Thus, the 4 quadrants include the Subjective, Objective, Intersubjective, and Interobjective world views. The second fundamental component of the model is represented by developmental levels. Wilber arrived at these by extracting the common characteristics from major developmental theories (2000b). Next, Wilber included Developmental Lines in the model, which represent various intelligences, but each intelligence/talent/ability, also can be measured by developmental levels or "altitudes". The Lines have a very useful explanatory capacity, since they explain how and why people can be highly functioning in some aspects and not in others. Finally, the model addresses mental/psychological/spiritual States, as well as Types, which could be psychological or biological. For the purpose of this paper, the Developmental Levels will be discussed in the quadrant contexts of academia.

The Integral model is a helpful map for identifying and locating the influences which simultaneously act on academics throughout the course of the work day. In the UL (Subjective) quadrant, the individual brings their own feelings, perceptions, needs, past baggage into work every day. Their perspective on the world will orient them in particular ways to the context, relationships and problems they encounter. In the LL (Intersubjective) quadrant, they engage with colleagues, students and subject matter by injecting their subjective perspective and are being influenced by the perspectives of others in the negotiation of collective meaning. At the same time, the faculty member is also doing observable and measurable work such as teaching and grading student work (UR Objective quadrant). At all times, in visible and invisible ways,

the faculty member is acted upon by policies and regulations from the LR (Interobjective) quadrant. The faculty member is responding to these simultaneous factors from the four quadrants according to the epistemological perspective of their overall developmental level, and using the specific skills and altitudes of their various developmental lines (intelligences).

Two Developmental Levels, Two Pathologies on Campuses

The developmental levels, according to Wilber, represent capacities for thinking in increasing levels of complexity. While in the general population, about 60% of people are believed to operate at the Level 4 Concrete Operational level of rules, roles and absolutist certainty (Wilber, 2000b), at universities, because of self-selected participation, the predominant levels would be the Level 5 Formal Operational and the Level 6 Pluralistic levels, as described in **Figure 2** below. Wilber is quick to agree with critics such as Cook-Greuter (2013) to point out that “higher” developmental levels are not to be equated with “enlightenment”, but rather adaptations to the levels of complexity characterized by the contexts within which individuals and populations exist and function.

Level 6 Green <i>Meta-systemic/Pluralistic</i>	Worldcentric, informational, relativistic, individualistic, human rights, pluralism, tolerance, sensitive self.
Level 5 Orange <i>Formal operational/Rational</i>	Sociocentric, multiplistic, conscientious, competition, reason, science, democracy, capitalism, strive-drive, achiever self.

Figure 2. Developmental Levels 5 and 6 (Adapted from Bohac Clarke, 2019, p. 50)

The Pluralistic Green: Pathologies and Consequences

While the Pluralistic Green should currently be the most highly developed level in terms of capacity for complexity - which is expressed in its embrace of plural perspectives, inclusivity of difference, and individual uniqueness – its pathological expression is characterized by extreme relativism, often vicious criticism of “lower” developmental levels, egocentrism, and nihilism (Wilber, 2017).

In practice, this pathological expression has been notable in the use of trigger warnings and general muzzling of classroom discussions (sometimes by a single individual who feels uncomfortable) about difficult but nevertheless pertinent issues that inhabit the real-world. The Green level culture of fear extends beyond the classroom to impose extreme political correctness on members of the various interest groups, dictating who can speak about which issue, and forcing group members to adopt the uniform and brand of the group, whether they actually agree or not. The rhetoric directed outside of the groups is generally that people or groups that are deemed oppressed must have their truths defended against the oppressors. Critical thinking in this pathological case is also seen as an act of oppression. Faculty and instructors who address sensitive or politically charged issues from a critical perspective are cast as Monty Python’s *Knights Who Say Ni* (**Figure 3**).

Figure 3. *Green pathology: Academics as the Knights Who Say Ni*

The pathological expression of Green is not 100% pervasive, of course, but it is present in sufficient magnitude to trigger self-censorship in the general discourse in the humanities – both on the part of students and instructors. This self-censorship generally inhabits the left-hand quadrants, although it is also supported by the pervasive anonymity of online communications systems (Lower Right quadrant) and the related lack of civility and often vicious forms of criticism (which are not to be confused with critical analysis).

The Rational Orange: Pathologies and Consequences

The Orange Formal Operational Level, in its healthy form is achievement oriented, contributing individual excellence in science and technology, and promoting critical thinking. In its pathological form, it is expressed in academia in terms of extreme competition, algorithmic surveillance of faculty members' activities and achievements, expectations of perfection in all areas of performance, and exaggerated drive for self-promotion.

The performance assessment process pits faculty members against each other, faculties against each other, and universities against each other. This preoccupation with obsessive

comparisons is focused on the numbers of articles produced, and the amount of grant money obtained. The targets are increasing to levels that are difficult to achieve, and the pressure is augmented by public shaming through public ranking of achievement algorithms. Faculty members now are assigned an ORCID number, for example, which tracks their publication output. The ORC ID# is an interesting metaphor for current day academics. J. R. Tolkien would have been alarmed – academics now call themselves Orcs, and are given ID numbers to better keep track of their activities (**Figure 4**).

“What are we fighting for again?”

Figure 4. Orange pathology: Academics as Orcs

Much time is devoted to the writing of many reports using these numbers to support the brands of faculties and universities, boasting publications in top tier journals whenever possible. Nowhere is there evidence of any usefulness of these articles to the real-world, nor whether members of real-world communities read these articles (Alvesson, Gabriel & Paulsen, 2017). The Orange level pathology primarily inhabits the right-hand quadrants.

The Culture of Fear and Collective Myopia

The combination of the influences of these two pathologies creates a situation where self-censorship and distraction from real-life problems work synergistically to amplify each other's impact on the work in academia today, particularly in the humanities. The Green pathology pushes people into extreme political correctness and insincere posturing, while the Orange pathology does much the same – the posturing being self-promotion and avoidance of controversial or “unproductive” issues. Productive issues tend to be those that lead to securing research grants rather than actually implementing socially relevant solutions.

Adding to the constant Orange level demands for production of publications, and the fear of not having enough to meet the targets for the next performance assessment, is the anxiety about the time and demands of the increasing teaching loads. Not only has teaching become a liability in terms of anonymous student ratings negatively affecting faculty performance assessments, but the increasing class sizes and increasing teaching loads also diminish time available for grant applications, research and writing. Teaching has thus come to be seen as punishment, and most reasonably thinking faculty members therefore try to secure teaching releases.

This preoccupation with basic survival, which pervades all levels of academia (**Figure 5**), is beginning to notably restrict many faculty members' vision of research as leadership, research as looking ahead of current social trends, and research as contribution to the community at all levels (in spite of voluminous rhetoric to the contrary).

Figure 5. Effect of the twin pathologies: Myopia in the Academy

Meanwhile Back In the Real-World

There are a number of issues in our real-world context that are poised to become very serious problems, which are acknowledged and sometimes discussed, but in a rather hollow, distracted or theoretical way. I am reminded of a bobble-head figurine of the Queen, with her characteristic waving hand, that I saw in a shop window recently. While some of these issues - such as: the environment and climate change, guaranteed income, and post-humanism - do appear in academic discussion fora, the treatment of these topics is generally bloodless, bland and theoretical. I am not advocating shouting matches or fist fights, but I would like to see some recognition that these topics are about factors that affect real people's lives. Instead of seeing the discussion as just another item to add to the CV and performance report, or congratulating

ourselves on the politically correct Green level performance of erudition, we ought to remind ourselves of what the underlying reality on the ground might actually be.

A specific example of trying to address a real-world problem is the scholarly effort of Jem Bendell, and the negative feedback he has received from fellow academics. Bendell did an extensive review of current climate research, and concluded that the changes in the environment could cause mass displacement of populations (Bendell, 2018), which would most certainly involve incredible human suffering at the physical as well as emotional level. As Bendell points out in his article, the responses from peer reviewers to his article about these possible catastrophic effects of climate change, aside from outright denial, included the admonition that academics should not frighten the general populace with bad news. The bad news, such as shifting populations or potential global financial crises, which would make the recent European migration crisis look trivial in comparison, are not merely addressed by Bendell, but appear in the discussions that are however occurring parallel to, or outside of academia (Harari 2016, 2018; Weisman, 2008). The global political and financial systems, current and future, appear to be fundamentally implicated in these crises (Griffin, 2010; Klein, 2017; Harari 2016, 2018), yet not much of this is discussed inside of academia or economics classrooms. So, with the entirely plausible situation of a deeply suffering human population in crisis and in need of direction and guidance, the current advice from academia is a dispassionate discussion of post-humanism. (Bogost, 2012; Snaza et al., 2014).

In the less extreme variation on the futures theme – the end of work – there is again the need for academia to take serious, practical leadership in addressing the issue of the loss of purpose that end of work would imply for a large sector of the population (Harari, 2018). In view of possible future crises, a sensitive and authentic examination of what it means to be human, and under what conditions human trust and solidarity might exist or flourish, might be a fruitful focus of academic inquiry in the humanities. It is interesting to note that the American Educational Research Association is also realizing the importance of useful research. Their announcement for the AERA 2020 Conference theme is as follows:

The 2020 theme is “[The Power and Possibilities for the Public Good When Researchers and Organizational Stakeholders Collaborate](#).” Our ambition is to consider the knowledge-base across contexts and forms of education and interrogate the possibilities for influencing educational change if we take seriously including the perspectives of diverse public and private sector organizations.

So What: Integral Map Toward (Some) Liberation

The mystic Bernadette Roberts defined fear as the absence of love (1993). While most academics would agree that the concepts of “love” and “academy” have very little in common, as human beings in community, we actually do need love, if only in the Varelian sense as the fuel for autopoiesis (Varela, Rosch & Thompson, 1991). We also need trust. In the current system in academia, trust tends to be confined to very small and carefully guarded enclaves where two or three are gathered together.

Presently, academics appear to enact one of the following options for action:

***Option 1:* Run in the hamster wheel as fast as you can**

Option 2: Game the system**Option 3: Opt out and disengage**

I have not observed much evidence of anyone trying to change the system, at least not in overt ways. So, what would be the way to go forward toward a healthier and more productive/contributive academic life? Option 3, whereby faculty members decide that life is elsewhere, and often contribute by writing and publishing excellent work in presses that “don’t count”, is one way to avoid supporting an unhealthy system – however, their absence deprives the collective of valuable personal contributions.

In a previous article (Bohac Clarke, 2018), I suggested a variation on Option 3 – a compromise where the small enclave would be officially recognized and allowed to self-organize within the overall context of the organization of the Faculty – at a price – being a semi-marginalized, but tolerated, group. In view of the continuing escalating developments in the Faculties of education particularly, with the runaway oppression of the Orange pathology, I am forced to agree with Slavoj Žižek that “decaf resistance” of this sort is not good enough. Mapping the situation on the Integral map in **Figure 6**, we see the following factors interacting:

UL: Subjective – interior individual (I)	UR: Objective – exterior individual (It)
Personal – my purpose, my motivation, my fears, my emotions, my self-concept, my confidence, my history, my capacity to reflect, my capacity to introspect	Behavioural/measurable – my intellectual capacity, my skills, my teaching performance, my writing capacity, my communication skills, my financial status, my health, my family obligations, my time availability, my ability to publish, my stress level
LL: Intersubjective – interior collective (We)	LR: Interobjective – exterior collective (They/Its)
Cultural – my social position, my position in the peer group, my power position in the group and organization, my social network, my family and social supports, my reputation, my political security or vulnerability in the organization	Systems – my status in the system, my publication standing, my performance evaluation, my place on the pay scale, my pension, my grants, my workload, curriculum requirements, workplace policies, university, provincial and federal policies, university ratings, faculty budgets

Figure 6. *Quadrant map of the interactions of an academic’s everyday contexts*

This map shows some of the vulnerabilities that simultaneously interact with each other from all four quadrants of the individual faculty member’s life. The factors that the faculty member has probably the least level of control come from the LR – systems quadrant, so this is where the faculty member would need the most protection. This would be followed by the LL – cultural quadrant. In order for faculty members to be able to authentically work on the issues in the upper quadrants – the thinking, teaching and writing, they would need to be protected from the pressures assaulting their vulnerabilities from the LL and LR quadrants. This would need to be done systematically by the top leadership of the Faculty, which is the only one in a position to buffer the faculty members from the forces of the larger systems. Systems, as we know, are impersonal, and hard to stop, and universities are not in a position to opt out of the post-secondary system. This approach to protecting the Faculty is consistent with the thinking of

Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry, Summer 2019, 11(2), pp. 90-102

ISSN 1916-3460 © 2019 University of Alberta

<http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/cpi/index>

Grimmet and Chinnery (2009) who spoke of “buffering” as shielding of the actual work of learning and pedagogy (UL and UR) from adverse organizational and policy/political effects. Buffering is a common concept in business and policy, and here it is simply used to mean protecting an aspect of the organization from outside pressure.

This shielding would have to be formally acknowledged and reflected in the Faculty’s performance evaluation policy, grant-seeking funding and support, and enabling of self-organizing groups as well as individuals around meaningful research topics. Workload policies and planning, as well as prioritizing writing support would need to be highlighted, with large and small group involvement and self-organization being used as a meaningful component of the decision-making process. A forum for respectful but frank exchange of ideas and feedback would need to be in place. For trust to become an authentic driver of the relationships, the leader would need to be accountable to the Faculty for ensuring that their work is buffered. A visible means of accountability would also need to be developed to ensure that faculty members are accountable to each other.

What Might Such a Buffered Environment Look Like?

First, the leader would need to determine the actual minimum requirements for data – from the university and government level systems – and implement the least intrusive ways of generating these. Currently, many leaders, in an effort to demonstrate compliance and performance, often eagerly add several more layers of surveillance and measurement that are not actually required, but are conveniently used as a vicarious club to ensure staff compliance, while blaming the larger system. All this unnecessary activity comes at a cost of time wasted on needless reports and additional pressure put on faculty members.

The organization of the buffered Faculty would not need to be centralized and top-down. Indeed, there are many examples of the harmful effects of top-down, clinical efficiency and people-proofing that have been implemented with disastrous results in creativity-based organizations (Harford, 2016). Instead, it could be a coordinated web of small scale self-organizing groups that are based on direct responsibility of group members to each other. The population size of faculties of education, for example, tends not to be so large as to preclude eyeball-to-eyeball communications in small groups. The product of these self-organizing groups would be an overall map that would actually be used and revisited regularly.

The leader, who should be in a position to know the plans of the larger institution and the government regarding requirements and impacts on the Faculty, would be proactive in scanning and advising faculty members about forthcoming impacts. For example, curriculum mapping and departmental or Faculty reviews have become a frequent external pressure. Ensuring that the Faculty has ample time to work on reviewing the curriculum, would allow the small groups to create curriculum plans that would comply with the external requirements, while at the same time satisfying their own chosen pedagogic goals and perspectives. This could be done proactively and organically, as part of the ongoing work of the faculty groups, rather than dropping surprise deadlines and out-of-context requirements on faculty members

In this way, the positive aspects of the Orange level – the analysis and planning – would be maintained, while the pathological aspects – pressure, unexpected deadlines and time commitments, lack of trust due to uncertainty – could be alleviated. A Faculty that embraces

complexity and operates with personal accountability, trust and healthy relationships would then be in a position to promote the positive aspects of the Green developmental level. By modeling genuine dialogue among colleagues, faculty members could influence their students' educational experience, and begin to address in an authentic, reflective way, some of the Green level pathologies of extreme relativism, egocentrism and entitlement.

Judiciously modeling Post-Humanism (for example, Braidotti, 2013) as a mature transition from the Amber-Orange level Humanism to healthy Green level Post-Humanism, rather than some type of reactionary anti-humanism, would help our students face the uncertainties of the coming decade with more understanding and compassion. Providing for, and supporting a context for this kind of behaviour requires skillful and ethical leadership, such as is described by Brown (2018). Based on her extensive research, she demonstrates that such leadership is in fact possible.

With the extant institutional pressures being reduced (if not removed altogether), it is quite likely that the productivity of the Faculty would actually increase, as would its overall physical, psychological and ethical health and wellbeing. This would require fearless leadership, to lead a fearless organization. The resulting payoff for the faculty members, students, and wider community would be life giving.

References

- Alvesson, M., Gabriel, Y., & Paulsen, R. (2017). *Return to meaning: A social science with something to say*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alvesson, M., & Spicer, A. (2016). *The stupidity paradox: The power and pitfalls of functional stupidity at work*. London: Profile Books.
- Bendell, J. (2018). Deep adaptation: A map for navigating climate tragedy. *Institute of leadership and sustainability*, University of Cumbria UK, IFLAS Occasional Paper 2, www.iflas.info
- Bogost, I. (2012). *Alien phenomenology, or What it's like to be a thing*. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Bohac Clarke, V. (2019). Legitimizing integral theory in academia: Demonstrating the effectiveness of integral theory through its application in research. *Integral theory and transdisciplinary action research in education* (Bohac Clarke, Ed.). Hershey, PA: IGI Global, pp. 45-63.
- Bohac Clarke, V. (2018). A subversive role for collaborative inquiry in academia today. *Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry*, 10(1), 78-89.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brown, B. (2018). *Dare to lead: Brave work. Tough conversations. Whole hearts*. New York: Random House.
- Cook-Greuter, S. (2013). Assumptions versus assertions: Separating hypotheses from truth in the integral community. *Journal of Integral Theory and Practice*, 8(3&4), 227-236.
- Danaher, J. (2017). Building a postwork utopia: Technological unemployment, life extension and the future of human flourishing. In LaGrandeur and Hughes (Eds.), *Surviving the Machine Age*, pp. 63-82. Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Gregg, B. (2018). The coming political challenges of artificial intelligence. *Digital Culture and Society*, 4(1), 157-180. doi:10.14361/dcs-2018-0110
- Griffin, G. E. (2010). *The creature from Jekyll Island: A second look at the federal reserve* (5th Ed). Dauphin Publications.
- Grimmet, P., & Chinnery, A. (2009). Bridging policy and professional pedagogy in teaching and teacher education: buffering learning by educating teachers as curriculum makers. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 39(1), 125-143.
- Harari, Y. (2016). *Homo deus: A brief history of tomorrow*. London: Vintage Publishing.
- Harari, Y. (2018). *21 Lessons for the 21st Century*. Penguin Random House Canada.
- Harford, T. (2016). *Messy: The power of disorder to transform our lives*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Cultural and Pedagogical Inquiry*, Summer 2019, 11(2), pp. 90-102
ISSN 1916-3460 © 2019 University of Alberta
<http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/cpi/index>

- Klein, N. (2017). *NO is not enough: Resisting the new shock politics and winning the world we need*. Knopf Canada.
- Leonardi, E., & Pisani, G. (2017) Basic income (Eds., Special Edition). *Etica & Politica / Ethics & Politics*, 19(1), 7-10.
- Roberts, B. (1993). *The Experience of No-Self: A Contemplative Journey*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Snaza, N., Appelbaum, P., Bay, S., Carlson, D., Morris, M., Rotas, N., Sandlin, J., Wallin, J., & Weaver, J. (2014). Toward a Posthumanist Education. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 30(2), 39-55.
- Varela, F., Rosch, E., & Thompson, E. (1991). *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Weisman, A. (2008). *The world without us*. Harper Perennial.
- Wilber, K. (2000a). *A brief history of everything* (Second Edition). Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc.
- Wilber, K. (2000b). *Integral psychology: Consciousness, spirit, psychology, therapy*. Boston, Massachusetts: Shambhala Publications, Inc.
- Wilber, K. (2006). *Integral spirituality*. Boston, MA: Integral Books.
- Wilber, K. (2017). *Trump and a post-truth world*. Boulder: Shambhala Publications.