

Integral Politics as Process

Tom Atlee¹

Abstract: Using the definition proposed here, integral politics can be a process of integrating diverse perspectives into wholesome guidance for a community or society. Characteristics that follow from this definition have ramifications for understanding what such political processes involve. Politics becomes integral as it transcends partisan battle and nurtures generative conversation toward the common good. Problems, conflicts and crises become opportunities for new (or renewed) social coherence. Conversational methodologies abound that can help citizen awareness temporarily expand during policy-making, thus helping raise society's *manifested* developmental stage. Convening archetypal stakeholders or randomly selected citizens in conversations designed to engage the broader public enhances democratic legitimacy. With minimal issue- and candidate-advocacy, integral political leaders would develop society's capacity to use integral conversational tools to improve its health, resilience, and collective intelligence. This both furthers and manifests evolution becoming conscious of itself.

Keywords: Collective intelligence, conversational methodologies, democratic legitimacy, developmental stage, evolution, integral politics, integration, perspectives, process.

Of the many perspectives on integral politics, one particularly dynamic one focuses on the interactive processes through which the fulfillment of collective needs and aspirations are (and could be better) pursued. These engage the evolving, integrated sensibilities, thoughts, and actions of a whole community or society. Those of us pursuing this approach ask: What is the social systemic process dimension of transpersonal activity and development? Where might a holistic, integral perspective take us beyond the predominant battle between competing worldviews, interests, and power centers within which humanity currently suffers and is possibly generating its demise? Developing political modes beyond the current problematic process could make all the difference in the world, quite literally.

¹ Tom Atlee is founder and research director for the Co-Intelligence Institute in Eugene, OR, co-founder of Evolutionary Life in Seattle, WA, and author of *The Tao of Democracy: How to use co-intelligence to create a world that works for all* and *Reflections on Evolutionary Activism: Essays, poems and prayers from an emerging field of sacred social change*. Once a peace activist inspired by Quakerism and Eastern spirituality, he now researches, writes, and networks about social issues, holistic and collective intelligence, wise democracy, conscious evolution and evolutionary change agency. He works closely with "evolutionary evangelists" Michael Dowd and Connie Barlow and whole systems process consultant and author Peggy Holman. He is a member and former steering committee member of the National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation. His current interests include developing a theory and practice of "evolutionary integrity," defined as alignment with the fullness of reality and the possibilities therein -- and bringing greater process sophistication, wise-democratic understandings, and conscious-evolutionary perspectives to help empower already sophisticated transformational efforts such as the Transition Towns movement. Email: cii@igc.org.



My discussion begins by introducing the dynamics of wholeness and their relation to what I propose integral politics may be. This serves as a foundation for proposing a definition of integral politics and characteristics of integral political process that follow from that definition. I dedicate the main body of the paper to introducing ramifications I draw from those characteristics. Discussed individually, the ramifications fall into seven categories: wholes and parts – diversity and coherence, dissonance, conversation, developmental stages, power and leadership, issues and candidates, and participation. These suggest some concrete ways we would see integral politics manifest. The concluding section is my reflection on all of this in relation to my ideas about conscious evolution.

Introductory Basics: Dynamics of Wholeness

We can view life as forever seeking wholeness, seeking health and congruence within itself, and seeking fit and harmony with its environment. I use wholeness as the most fundamental concept in my worldview, although my sense of it is not homogeneous but rather rich with diverse dimensions and manifestations (Atlee, n.d.-a).

Two dimensions of wholeness I see as having particular relevance to integral politics are inclusion and coherence. *Inclusion* means welcoming, taking seriously, and creatively utilizing all the factors relevant to the whole situation we are dealing with. Such factors include viewpoints, people, information, values, resources, history, and possibilities, and more could be listed. To acknowledge and tap the infinitude of interconnectedness in which we and our situation are embedded, we should frame relevance broadly enough to include borderline elements and even wildcards to stimulate lively engagement and keep us open and alert. In particular, inclusion of different *worldviews* is important because of their power to shape what people see, think, feel, and do, and thereby play a preeminent role in the productivity of political process. Furthermore, because worldviews impact the *kinds* of political system and process people prefer and promote, the principle of inclusion challenges us to wisely utilize a diversity of processes, as well.

Coherence means the way diverse elements hang together into a whole, whether a whole worldview, a whole community, a whole story, and so on. Coherence includes the relationships among the parts, as well as the factors they hold in common (like logic, culture, language, intention, theme, common interests). Thus, coherence includes everything that helps us make sense of a whole and all its elements as one thing, and for those involved to share a sense of “common sense.”

We usually find some dynamic tension between coherence and inclusion. In any system or situation, including additional elements or a bigger field tends to disrupt whatever coherence existed before the inclusion. Likewise, efforts to maintain coherence tend to make it harder to include new (and thus potentially disruptive) elements. Since novelty and disturbances are continually emerging in any system, inclusion and coherence are perennial issues of life as it seeks to be whole within itself and with its environment. The fact that both inclusion and coherence are essential dimensions of wholeness tells us something very important about wholeness: it is dynamic. Wholeness *evolves*—driven by inclusion, disruption, and the eternal impulse towards coherence.

Here I find the concept of “integral” especially useful for naming the successful *integration* of inclusion and coherence. To the extent we embrace all the relevant elements—including emergent dissonances—in a coherent way, we have an integral system or dynamic. The fact that in real life new factors are always emerging to disrupt coherent systems suggests that an integral system evolves through successive coherences. The family system gets disrupted by the birth of a child. One’s prejudices are disrupted by a compassionate or unexpected act from a person in the disrespected category. One’s pet idea is critiqued with devastating effect. Each instance raises in us the need to find some new coherence to depend on.

With that as grounding, I propose a definition of integral politics, followed by what integral politics “does” if we follow that definition. I offer these for exploration, introducing my initial forays into ramifications of viewing integral politics this way.

Integral politics would be politics that were especially competent at including diverse elements in evolving coherence that served the ongoing vitality of a community, nation, or other human system.

What integral politics does:

- Integral politics embraces any and all interactive process through which the evolving diversity of a community or society engages in consciously co-creating its collective life.
- Integral politics emerges from other forms of politics to the extent that we attend to the dynamic relationship between “the parts” and “the whole” (the members of a community and the whole community; conflicted political positions and the whole field of opinion around an issue; our many facets as individual human beings and our essential wholeness; and so on).

Ramifications of Integral Politics Definition

Wholes and Parts - Diversity and Coherence

Assuming that definition, then, as politics became more integral, we might expect it to include more attitudes, efforts, and phenomena like the following (as they pertain to public affairs).

Welcoming people from diverse demographic, developmental, and other groups into appropriate forms of participation while promoting the respect and commonality of all people as human beings regardless of what category or categories we, they, or others may place them in.

Engaging diverse dimensions of our humanity (head, heart, body, spirit, behavior, etc.) and their related modes of understanding, expression and engagement, while *understanding* the various ways these can influence each other to enrich (or undermine) the larger wholeness of who we are, individually and collectively.

Engaging diverse sectors, stakeholders, and interest groups in aligning their self-interest to the well-being of the whole (community, society, natural order) by co-developing truly integral solutions, stories, social system designs, etc.

Including diverse partisan people in transpartisan or metapartisan explorations of how all of us as citizens of a common community or society can most creatively share challenges, resources, and destinies.

Weaving diverse perspectives, bodies of information, and values considerations regarding an issue or situation into expanded “big picture” understandings of what is involved (sometimes called “framing an issue for deliberation”).

Helping people’s diverse creative or practical insights, gifts, and passions interact towards solutions that are, as a result, (a) broadly understood and appreciated, (b) implemented in participatory ways and (c) effective over the long term (because of the inclusive wisdom of the original design), being revised as necessary through such continuing interactions.

Another application of wholeness is this. Integral politics understands that every whole is a part of some larger whole, and that every part is a whole in its own right. This understanding not only helps us see things in the context of the larger systems they are part of, and the smaller entities that make them up (a perspective known as *holonics*). There are also two *dynamic* aspects of wholeness that offer agents of integral politics potentially free resources.

Synergy is a common term highlighting the dynamic relationships through which a whole becomes greater, stronger, or more than the sum of its parts. Whenever we integrate youth and elderhood, head and heart, private and public, top-down and bottom-up, us and them, or any other such diverse energies or entities, they together form a whole that is far more powerful than when they are separate or opposed.

Holergy is a term I coined to call attention to the often invisible power of each entity’s embedded uniqueness. That power becomes a resource to the extent we look beyond any single role they play or obvious categories they belong to. We might summarize this as “the part is greater than its role in the whole.” Each person and group is both a whole in their own right and part of many other wholes. So a teacher who knows that her students are not *only* students will tap their experiences, hobbies, and families for resources to use in teaching her class. An integral mediator will recognize that conflicted parties are not only adversaries but are also sources of insight and creativity for resolving their shared problem. An integral politician will recognize that citizens are not only voters, supporters, complainers, and recipients of government services, but potential sources of wisdom, creativity, and implementation in public affairs.

Significantly, both of these phenomena—synergy and holergy—include the phrase “greater than” as part of their definition. This means that the entities and factors in a situation can generate greater or lesser power and benefit, depending on how we view and engage with them. This is useful knowledge for anyone seeking to create change with limited resources. Well-utilized diversity in well-designed whole systems can provide free resources “out of nowhere.” The diversity of a community, well engaged, can generate collective healing, collective intelligence, and collective transformation accessible in no other way.

Dissonance

In public affairs it is normal for problems, issues, conflicts, differences, and other forms of dissonance to surface among those involved (among the parts) and between them and the larger community or society (between the parts and the whole). Integral political theory and practice would invite us to engage with this dissonance in different ways than those invoked and used in partisan politics. As we grow into integral politics, we would increasingly embrace the whole and all its parts in our calculus—and see the dynamics among them, including dissonance—as a sign and source of life energy, of life trying to find its way toward wholeness.

As politics becomes more integral, dissonance would less and less invoke assumptions about one “side”—one part of the whole—winning over the other “sides.” We would not even assume that the ideal is a compromise solution tolerable to all sides. Instead, we would see the supposed “sides” as partial expressions of a larger whole that has not yet been fully comprehended. We would, therefore, increasingly see dissonance as a resource for moving into a more vibrant wholeness of some kind. We may strive toward healing—renewing some healthy coherence of the past—or for learning, transformation, and development toward some new coherence of the future.

It would be increasingly natural for people practicing integral politics to see every issue or conflict as an opportunity not only to find good solutions, but to heal and/or transform the community involved, and all those in and around it. Often a community will actually heal itself by meeting crisis together using collective transformational engagement. The Transition Towns initiative (Hopkins, 2008), for example, is a remarkable program of community healing through collective transformation towards resilience and sustainability. Integral politics recognizes that working with emerging dissonances is a key aspect of sustaining ongoing health and development, individually and collectively.

This phenomenon can be taken as an identifying criteria for how integral our politics is: To what extent are issues, conflicts, crises, and so on seen as opportunities for healing and transformation at all levels, rather than as something to fight over, solve, suppress, or get beyond?

Of course “growing into integral politics” is no simple matter. But then, neither is playing the game of adversarial politics. The primary difference lies not in the effort or resources required, but in the unfamiliarity of the territory, the pioneering imperative, the need to try different responses to dissonant stimuli. Instead of closing down in the face of challenge or discomfort, we need to open up. Perhaps most importantly—because politics is not primarily an individual project—we need to take proactive initiatives, together, to create contexts in which welcoming dissonance and working creatively with it are supported and empowered. The more we can bring (and embed) such assumptions and practices into our culture, public discourse, and political institutions, the less we will need to depend on—and the more effectively we will benefit from—enlightened individual capacities.

Conversation

Conversation is arguably the primary form of human social interaction. (Some might argue that war and commerce are more influential, to which I would respond, Where would war and commerce be without conversation?) Obviously, because we are different and seriously challenged to cooperate in order to survive and thrive, conversation remains key to solving our problems and conflicts nonviolently and wisely as well as to transforming ourselves and our societies together in life-serving ways. Because of its remarkable power to creatively engage the life-energy of all participants, we find conversation plays a central role in most efforts to move beyond violence and manipulation.

Violence and manipulation help us dominate others with our own desires, visions, and perspectives, rather than engaging them in finding out what is best for all involved. In contrast, integral politics assumes that every perspective and passion has gifts for the whole, and so views the use of violence and manipulation as *wasting* those gifts and *wasting*, as well, the potentially coherent self-organizing life-energy of the whole that comes from creatively engaging those perspectives and passions.

From *a systems perspective*, conversational interactivity is the medium through which different parts of a system can find the coherence—coordination, protocols, and shared understandings, narratives, intentions, etc.—that they need to function efficiently as a whole. From *an individual perspective*, high quality conversation is a primary alternative to violence as we seek to pursue our self-interest in a world of other self-interested entities with limited perspectives.

Conversation derives from roots meaning “to turn together,” as in a dance. From a big-picture perspective, we are dancing with everything around us. The universe is in conversation with itself. At the most literal, physical level, few objects, systems, or conditions in our lives have come into being without being shaped one way or another by conversation. Conversation is how we can and do create desirable futures together.

Conversation is therefore central to any *dynamic* conception of integral politics. More model-driven conceptions of integral politics make a great contribution with political maps of how different political ideologies or developmental stages fit into larger political and developmental realities. When such maps inform the designers, conveners, facilitators, and participants of conversations, they move into a realm of dynamic interactions through which that diversity can actually be employed to create larger benign realities in our lives and help us all heal, learn, and evolve together.

High quality conversation is now a major field of theory and practice—and even faith. Going by such names as dialogue, deliberation, choice-creating, cafés, facilitation, gatherings, conferencing, forums, public participation, citizen engagement, hosting, mediation, coaching, community involvement, etc., conversational know-how has become very sophisticated in recent decades. Professionals in this field know a tremendous amount about “whole-system engagement,” “collective intelligence,” “participatory leadership,” “holistic politics,” and other topics of great interest to practitioners of integral politics.

Conversational methodologies abound, from Future Search to Open Space, from Dialogue Mapping to Sacred Circles, from Appreciative Inquiry to Listening Projects, from Dynamic Facilitation to World Café, from Citizens Juries to Study Circles, from The Integral Process for Complex Issues to Holistic Management. Inventories of such methodologies get compiled in both book form (Atlee, 2003; Holman, Cady, & Devane, 2007) and online databases like the Urban Research Program Toolbox (Griffith University, n.d.) and the Engagement Streams Framework (National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation, n.d.; in particular, note its “three page accompanying handout” for a list of processes).

Perhaps most importantly, work is underway in a number of quarters to identify conversational success criteria and wisdom about the underlying dynamics of conversations that matter. These inquiries free practitioners from the segregated silos of methodology into more flexible, creative design and hosting of powerful conversations.

I believe that knowledge and competency in this arena of the practice and institutionalization of powerful, empowered conversations is one of the primary foundations of integral politics. I see it as key to helping fragmented parts of the body politic become truly whole and sustain their evolving wholeness, especially when faced with changing circumstances or consciously moving in transformational directions.

Developmental Stages

Different developmental stages and worldviews offer different benefits and problems for a society that includes them all. For example, tribal dynamics provide both a strong sense of belonging *and* often provincial distrust and dislike of *others*, while modernist perspectives provide tremendous innovation *and* often destructive exploitation of natural and human life. To the extent possible, those practicing integral politics would endeavor to welcome and validate the positive manifestations of each stage while minimizing or ameliorating its more toxic dynamics (Beck & Cowan, 2005; Cook-Greuter, 2006).

People manifesting different developmental stages or worldviews often have a hard time relating to each other. Confronted with a logic and reactivity that makes no sense to them, they can drive each other into negative manifestations of their respective levels of awareness. Integral politics can use high quality conversational process and competent facilitation to ameliorate this dynamic. A large amount of experience with dialogue and deliberation that engages the broad public suggests that such diverse people have a far greater capacity to work together for the common good than is acknowledged among those with less experience with high-quality conversation or with an ideological bias towards the incompatibility of diverse values systems. There is tremendous hope in this.

There is also tremendous hope in another dynamic. One of the most intriguing phenomena I have seen in powerful conversations shows up in successful efforts that engage ordinary citizens constructively with others unlike themselves in a shared search for insights and solutions that can best serve their community. I have the distinct impression that as such conversations unfold, the effort to truly comprehend other viewpoints expands the individual participants' state of

awareness such that they collectively manifest a higher level of awareness and development than they individually did at the start.

Other factors are probably involved in this phenomenon, for example:

1. Some conversational methodologies produce this effect more powerfully than others;
2. The presence of one or more psycho-spiritually mature, systemically aware, and/or broadly informed person in the group can raise the group's awareness toward theirs;
3. Potential repression or the positional stance, authoritative status, or expertise of certain group members can hinder this effect if not ameliorated by appropriate conversational design and competent facilitation.

In short, I believe that the conversational dynamic noted above—the expansion of awareness through successfully facilitated hearing of diverse viewpoints among ordinary people—happens to some extent in any case, and can be augmented by (1) and (2) and impeded by (3).

This phenomenon—and the capacity of people with different values and worldviews to develop policy recommendations together—can be the basis of testable hypotheses I would love to see researched in more rigorous ways.

If both these phenomena prove out and their nuances become adequately understood and applied, they may well offer a breakthrough channel for systems-change work by integral change agents. To the extent conversational forums are actually empowered to influence policy decisions and/or public awareness, plugging them into existing political-governance systems (Atlee, n.d.-b) could raise the developmental level manifested by society as a whole in its collective behaviors and impacts, beyond that of the vast majority of its individual members. This would remove, or at least ameliorate, the problems involved in the commonly advocated strategy of improving society's developmental state by increasing the awareness of its individual members.

Power and Leadership

If one of the chief characteristics of integral politics includes *the interactive process through which the evolving diversity of a community or society engages in consciously co-creating its collective life* (as introduced above) we need to rethink power and leadership from the top-down shaping of social phenomena to a more participatory, emergent, “power-with” worldview. What kind of power and leadership does a community or society need in order to engage its diversity in interactions that consciously co-create its collective life? I think this question leads to three related forms of servant leadership.

Capacity-building eldership that does whatever is needed—from inspiration to provocation to teaching to convening—to increase the capacity of the led community or society to lead itself. In the early stages, this can include whatever managerial guidance may serve to maintain the community or society while it achieves greater self-organizing competencies. But this more directive leadership can only work (for this purpose) if it is humble enough to keep trying to delegate more responsibility to the led system, and thus work itself out of a job.

Emergent participatory leadership, in which different people serve the group by (temporarily) leading in a realm defined by where their volunteered competencies and life-energy meet the needs of the group. This produces a fluidity and distribution of leadership functions among the group, according to the needs of the moment.

Embedded systemic leadership in which the guidance systems needed by the group to function and evolve are embedded in its culture, collective narratives, institutions, infrastructure, systems, and technologies. These ever-present sources of direction minimize the need for individual leadership to provide guidance—at least until the established guidance systems cease to function adequately.

At such junctures, when systems no longer function well, capacity-building eldership or emergent leadership shows up to bring group consciousness and co-creativity to the dysfunctional area. This is a sociological manifestation of the general rule that increased attentiveness is called for when automaticities—habits, institutions, reactions, etc.—are no longer serving well. Consciousness temporarily replaces the automaticities in making life's choices while also exploring the dysfunctional dynamics in order to create new automaticities that better serve the new circumstances. Putting newly functional automaticities in place then frees consciousness to attend to other things.

Issues and Candidates

Since the essence of integral politics, in the sense discussed here, is the capacity of a community or society to make its own high-quality decisions, integral political activism would not focus on issues and candidates to the extent traditional activism does. The one exception would be if decisions on this issue or the election of that candidate would make a significant contribution to the society's capacity to engage its diversity in consciously co-creating its collective life.

Integral political activists could also usefully focus on how issues and candidates in the public limelight were being dealt with by the existing political system, using them as stimulants for dialogue exploring more integral approaches that might better serve the whole society.

However, by its very nature, integral politics is not about taking sides or promoting particular solutions. So even if integral activists saw political solutions that could help us make more integral decisions, they might prefer to present them in a context where diverse citizens would consider alternatives in ways that furthered public understanding the issues involved. Integral approaches would not tend to push their favored solutions or candidates through to a win, no matter how “integral” those solutions and candidates might seem to be. This, itself, implies a radical shift in activist perspective to a deep trust in the collective wisdom of ordinary people in generative conversations.

Participation

When terms like “public participation” and “citizen engagement” are used in traditional forms of politics, they tend to refer to (a) interested people being able to have their say, thus exercising

their agency as individual citizens in the political process and/or (b) as many people as possible engaging in political or community activities of all kinds.

Because of the dynamics discussed in the previous two sections, integral politics, in the sense being explored in this essay, would tend to function with a different concept of public participation. To a great extent, the goal would no longer be mass participation or the exercise of citizenship, per se. The rationale for engagement would be primarily the inclusion of diverse perspectives in processes capable of generating useful, integral results that benefit the community, usually involving collective intelligence or transformational potential.

Some participation issues are common to both traditional and integral politics. For example, participation plays a major role in generating shared understanding, agreement, ownership, and energy for implementation. But even here there are important nuances to consider.

Traditional political theory discusses the role of *consent* in establishing *legitimacy* in governance. A legitimate policy, leader, political process, or governing institution is one that has the consent of the citizenry. In other words, the population will go along with it without being compelled to do so. The concept of democratic legitimacy implies that those in authority need minimum force to implement their decisions, and that what force they do need to use is considered appropriate by a sufficient majority of the population. This minimization of force is often noted as the primary mark of democracy's superiority over dictatorship.

This is where participation comes in. If a large number of people or a broad spectrum of stakeholders and opinion leaders have been involved in making a decision, their sense of being part of the collective decision-making process tends to produce "buy-in" to the results. They consider the process legitimate. (The fact that participation and consent can be manipulated with PR and media mechanisms is a related but separate issue that I will not address here.)

Similarly, from an integral perspective, to the extent the population broadly understands why a particular approach to a public issue is better than others—particularly if they have either participated in or witnessed the interactions that came up with that approach, and have seen people like themselves powerfully involved—they will join in support for and implementation of that approach. The decision "makes sense" to them, so they willingly or eagerly engage with it.

But high quality deliberations that include vast numbers of people are notoriously expensive to implement. So one of the primary approaches of integral politics might logically be the efficient use of well-selected microcosm groups to come up with good decisions on behalf of the rest of us. High quality information and access to experts can be combined with high quality dialogue and deliberation in a highly focused way to generate powerful collective intelligence with minimal expense. This was one of the original rationales for representative governance. However, most representatives are not anything like the rest of us (e.g., millionaire lawyers), and we've all watched how far they can be pulled from public realities and pursuit of the common good.

So other forms of microcosm conversation have been developed that are less subject to the distortions of representative democracy, more reflective of the population, and often more

capable of high quality decisions, which can serve to improve the performance of existing governmental structures and processes. For example, citizen deliberative councils use a randomly selected one-time group of 10-100 ordinary citizens to come up with solutions to a public issue and/or to evaluate existing proposals or candidates. (Atlee, n.d.-b) The fact that these councils are small and may not include a certain level of diversity may subject them to “legitimacy” challenges.

However, there are ways to generate a more integral (and deeper) form of inclusion and legitimacy than can be achieved even by mass participation. Convenors can consciously select participants and publicize the process in such a way that most citizens see people like themselves engaged on the council (for example, see the *Macleans* magazine People’s Verdict project, Doyle, 1991). Participation can be further promoted by engaging the public in conversations with the council and/or each other before, during, and/or after the council’s deliberations. Engagement with the council can be done through hearings and white paper submissions, as was done with British Columbia’s Citizens’ Assembly on Electoral Reform (Citizens’ Assembly, 2004) or on the web, or through TV or radio combined with call-in and “televote” phone numbers. All these engage the public without having to provide them all with the expensive conditions that enable the high-quality council process, nor (for the sake of economy or co-optation) engaging everyone in low-quality conversations that do not adequately serve the common good. This kind of engagement—synergy between a citizen deliberative council and the broad public—takes participatory democracy beyond consent into the realm of collective identification with the process, authentic co-creativity, and co-evolution.

Conscious Evolution

I do see a larger story being played out here than one of mere politics, or even of democracy. It is the story of conscious evolution. We are all participants in life and society, no matter what we do or don’t do, whether we are aware of it or not, whether we intend to be or not. Participation is intrinsic. Both action and not-doing are actual contributions to what happens next, for better and/or worse. We are all part of the evolutionary process, which unfolds with inexorable inclusivity.

Conscious evolution means becoming an aware, intentional participant in that evolutionary process. Conscious evolution means seeking to be aware of what is involved in that process in specific domains and situations and seeking to be aware, too, of who we are and who we might be in relation to that. It involves making choices and taking action—or not—with as much awareness as we can of our evolutionary role as we seek to serve and manifest the best of what life is and seeks to be. Conscious evolution means not only being a conscious agent of evolution. It means realizing we are living manifestations of that aspect of evolution that is becoming conscious of itself.

I see integral politics as a societal manifestation of conscious evolution. It is the means by which a community or society consciously co-creates its next evolutionary development. In the development of integral politics, we see living political systems waking up, becoming conscious agents of their own evolution and, therefore, manifestations of evolution becoming conscious of itself in and as social systems.

This perspective does not necessarily provide how-to guidance to agents of integral politics, unless, of course, we wish to study the known dynamics of evolution in cosmic, geological, biological, and cultural systems in search of patterns we might use in consciously evolving our political and economic systems, communities, and societies. However, this evolutionary perspective *does* give a greater meaning and cosmic significance to what we are doing when we work towards creating a more integral politics.

From the evolutionary perspective, what we are doing here is the next chapter in a remarkable—and many of us would say sacred (e.g., Dowd, 2007)—story that goes back at least 13.7 billion years. It is a very fresh chapter. This particular task has not been done before. We are the edge of a wave, developing modes of being together that will play a profound role in the evolutionary destiny of the human experiment. There's nothing small about what we are doing.

And it is not only about process, it is *in* process. And, ultimately—like, and as, evolution—it *is* process.

References

- Atlee, T. (2003). *The tao of democracy: Using co-intelligence to create a world that works for all*. Providence, RI: Writers Collective.
- Atlee, T. (n.d.-a). Wholeness. Retrieved January 14, 2008 from <http://co-intelligence.org/I-wholeness.html>
- Atlee, T. (n.d.-b). Using citizen deliberative councils to make democracy more potent and awake. Retrieved January 14, 2008 from <http://co-intelligence.org/CDCUsesAndPotency.html>
- Beck, D. & Cowan, C. (2005). *Spiral Dynamics: Mastering values, leadership and change*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform. (2004). Citizens' assembly on electoral reform—improving democracy in B.C. Retrieved January 14, 2008 from <http://www.citizensassembly.bc.ca>
- Cook-Greuter, S. (2006). Ego development: Nine levels of increasing embrace. Retrieved November 11, 2009 from <http://www.cook-greuter.com>.
- Dowd, M. (2007). *Thank God for evolution: How the marriage of science and religion will transform your life and our world*. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Doyle, K. (Ed.). (July 1, 1991). The people's verdict. *Macleans*, 104(25). Retrieved from <http://www.co-intelligence.org/S-Canadaadvrsariesdream.html>
- Urban Research Program, Griffith University, Environment and Planning Department . (n.d.) The urban research program toolbox. Retrieved January 14, 2008, from <https://www3.secure.griffith.edu.au/03/toolbox>
- Holman, P., Cady, S., & Devane, S. (Eds.). (2007). *The change handbook: The definitive resource on today's best methods engaging whole systems*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Hopkins, R. (2008). *The transition handbook: From oil dependency to local resilience*. Totnes, Devon, UK: Green Books.
- National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation (n.d.). Engagement streams framework. Retrieved February 9, 2010, from http://www.thataway.org/?page_id=1487