

Wilber's 'Broad Science': A Cure for Postmodernism?

Charles Westheaver

This paper will argue that postmodernism has gone too far in suggesting that *all* of reality is socially constructed. The result is a return to pre-modern thought, where observation and verifiability are discredited. Wilber's model of Broad Science is used as a means of maintaining the insights of Social Constructionism while avoiding the extremes of postmodernism. His Four-Quadrant model of Broad Science offers a means to integrate all therapies into a coherent framework, thus avoiding many of the power struggles that have been characteristic of family therapy's history.

Introduction

Postmodernism arose to challenge the excesses of both religion, the dominant paradigm of its era, and science, the dominant paradigm of our own, which had led to the oppression of those on the receiving end of both (Foucault, 1977). Postmodernism, although it has produced many insights into the social construction of beliefs we had previously considered 'set in stone', has a fatal flaw which undermines many of its achievements. This flaw is the assertion that *all* of reality is socially constructed (Wilber, 1998). One implication of this is that postmodernism has taken us back to pre-modern thought, where the concepts of observation and verifiability were not considered important.

Wilber (1998) would agree with Foucault that scientific empiricism is indeed a problem and that religion has led to many excesses; however, he would also argue that even before Postmodernism there have been a number of failed attempts to challenge the excesses which scientific empiricism has created. The prime reason for the failure of these attempts was that they had simply been ignored by science. He argues that science's position has become so unassailable that unless a philosophy can challenge empiricism on its own territory, it is doomed to failure. The essence of the scientific position is that all 'true' knowledge should be verifiable. Wilber offers an alternate approach to verification. His Broad Science model also provides a framework within which to integrate all therapies into a coherent whole, as opposed to the current situation where various therapies are involved in petty squabbles. The current squabble, as far as the broad family therapy

field is concerned, seems to be 'Whose therapy is the most respectful?' (Larner et al., 2002). Previously it was, 'Whose is most systemic?' If the behaviour of therapists toward each other is any indication, there are no winners in the 'respectful' stakes.

Challenges to Empiricism

Three attempts which have the standing of philosophical schools have been made to challenge empiricism: Romanticism, Idealism and Post-modernism (Wilber, 1998). This paper will deal mostly with postmodernism, but the other two will be discussed very briefly here.

Romanticism (Rousseau, 1762) saw a return to the primitive as a balm for the ills of post-industrialized society. It idealised primitive cultures and religions and thought of them as pure and uncorrupted. Quinn's (1995) highly creative and acclaimed *Ishmael* is a popularisation of this approach to healing the problems faced by an increasingly alienating modern society. Romanticism has a number of different modern faces, the link between them being the belief that things were better before — before civilisation, before the industrial revolution, before rational thought. The New Age Movement has embraced both the return to the primitive and the view that feelings are more 'pure' and 'true' than rational thought. There are a number of therapies which espouse this approach. The key criterion of a therapy that falls into this category is 'getting in touch with one's feelings' as an *end state*, as opposed to regressing to primitive emotions in order to create a stronger Ego (Blank & Blank, 1979), the end result is simply to encourage narcissism (Wilber, 1998).

Fundamentalist Christianity is another example of an approach which assumes that things were better before; in this case, before the Fall of Man. For a Fundamentalist, the Bible is the *literal* word of God — for example, the account of the Creation in the Bible is factual and happened exactly



Charles Westheaver, Change Management and Leadership Development Consultant, Mark Dignam and Associates Pty Ltd, Croydon NSW 2132 Australia. Email: westheaver@optusnet.com.au

as it is described. According to this account of Creation we have fallen from a state of intimacy with God to a 'sin' nature where we are separated from God. The key point is that intimacy with God is *behind* us, not ahead of us, i.e. we were better off in the past.

Idealism (Hegel, 1807; Kant, 1781), on the other hand, makes the opposite claim: that we are *evolving towards* intimacy with God (Wilber, 1998). We don't need to regress to a state before rationality to regain our innocence — we need to *evolve beyond* rationality. The end point of the evolution of Trans-rational thought is described in Buddhism as 'seeing our original face', that of spirit. From a Christian perspective, it is described as 'Unity with God' (Keating, 1986). The contemplative traditions of all the world's great religions are the traditional pathways to this evolution on an individual level. Wilber (1998) argues that the main problem with this philosophical position is the absence of a method of proof. Idealism fell into disrepute since there was no way to prove its claims.

Evolutionary Psychology: Setting the Stage for 'Broad Science'

Wilber's (1983; 2001) Evolutionary Psychology combines the Great Chain of Being (the core of all religion) with Idealism. The Great Chain of Being suggests that reality is hierarchically organised and consists of (in ascending order) matter, body, mind, soul and spirit (Walsh, 2002). The stages of growth in Wilber's model correspond with the levels in this hierarchical view of reality.

According to Wilber's model, psychological development parallels the evolution of Society and proceeds through seven stages of growth. Although Contemplation is the traditional path of this psychological evolution for the individual, Wilber (1983; 2001) and Kant, (1781) suggest that this natural adaptation is also being played out on the evolutionary stage.

Wilber's seven stages are: Reptilian (where the human being is immersed in pure survival, with no 'higher consciousness' available), Typhonic (magical thinking, 'higher consciousness' located in Gods who represent the power of the natural world; tribal culture), Mythic Membership (development of social structure, hierarchy and power: priestly elites control access to the insights that are part of higher consciousness); Mental egoic (development of rational thought, democratic institutions, empirical science); Integral-aperspectival (the ability to entertain multiple perspectives simultaneously, see Four Quadrant Model below), Unitive (soul/holiness) and Unitary ('seeing' our 'original face'/union with God).

Each stage of growth depends on and incorporates the preceding stages. To use a mathematical analogy, it is impossible to understand algebra without first understanding basic arithmetic, and impossible to understand calculus without understanding algebra and so on. There is nothing 'bad' about the behaviour at any stage: we need to integrate the developmental learnings from each stage to move on. However, if we *dissociate* rather than *integrate* then we can't

adequately move on, i.e. we have 'unfinished business' (Wilber, 1998). Contemplation is the ancient way of finishing the business. The Saint, especially, has *access* to the behaviour of all the stages. To continue with the mathematical analogy, Einstein would not have lost the ability to do arithmetic!

We now turn to a discussion of the evolution of society from pre-modernism to postmodernism, to set the stage for Broad Science.

Pre-modernism: the Excesses of Religion

In the pre-modern Catholic Church, reality (doctrine) could be decided upon at the whim of the clerics. In effect, it was socially constructed by them. They just had to agree that a particular doctrine was true. The result was the exercise of *pure power*. In postmodernist terms, those who have ownership of the *dominant paradigm* define the hierarchy. This approach to defining reality and gaining power over people's lives led the Church of the time to many excesses, one of which was *buying* salvation. Another was labelling as heretics those who were seen not to conform to established doctrine. A doctrine or a theory about reality could be adhered to, despite evidence to the contrary, to a bizarre extent. Galileo was excommunicated because he claimed that the world spun on an axis and was not flat. To prove his point, he asked the clerics to look through his telescope (*the clerics declined*). In terms of Wilber's stages in the evolution of consciousness and society, Medieval Christian Europe would be a 'mythic membership' society, with a priestly caste wielding enormous power and controlling 'reality' for everyone else.

Science: The Beginning of Modernism

To counter the whimsical nature of the Church's doctrinal excesses, Luther (1522) argued that doctrine had to have a Biblical basis. Science, in an attempt to counter similar excesses, argued that theory must have a basis in observable and measurable reality. They both in effect went down a similar path; i.e. you can't just make up 'facts!' This is the beginning of modernism (Wilber, 1998). Modernist thinkers decided that if an idea doesn't pass the test of measurability, then it can't be taken seriously.

According to Wilber (1998) the great achievement of modernism was to differentiate science (It), morals (We) and art (I). Science is the study of matter (It). Morals refers to the study of group determined (socially constructed) behaviour (We). Art refers to the subjective internal experience of one individual, the I, and includes (at the point of the birth of Modernism) both Art and Contemplation. Previously, science couldn't act independently of institutionalised religion, hence Galileo's problem. Modernism allowed Galileo to look through his telescope without fear of being burnt for moral corruption. This differentiation led to the ideals of equality, freedom, justice and universal human rights. On the other hand, Wilber goes on to suggest, it has led to the 'disenchantment of the world, the

death of God, the commodification of life, the brutalities of capitalism, the loss of value and meaning, rampant and vulgar materialism' (2001: 74).

Modernism contained within it the seeds of another problem, the result of science first differentiating itself from, and then *dissociating from* the other forms of knowledge, i.e. *denying the validity* of all forms of knowledge other than the 'objectively verifiable'. Differentiation is the hallmark of an evolutionary process. Dissociation is the equally natural, pathological form of differentiation. To give an example, what often happens when our cognition develops is that we 'repress' our more primitive feelings and impulses. This is Freud's definition of neurosis (Freud, 1905). Differentiation, on the other hand, is developing the cognitive processes while maintaining psychological connection with our 'basal' impulses. In differentiation, these impulses are now *subject* to critical thought not *dominated* by thought; i.e. 'There are consequences to having sex with everyone', rather than 'sex is evil and dirty'.

According to Wilber (1998) this is the distinction between a useful and a pathological hierarchy. In hierarchical development, differentiation precedes *integration*. In the pre-modern era, there was no differentiation between Art, Morals and Science. When they differentiated, on the advent of modernism, *integration* should have meant that each *respected the other's valid claim* to the knowledge of the other and *cooperated* in the development of knowledge.

However, as soon as Modernity differentiated Art, Morals and Science, Scientific Empiricism proceeded to kill off the other two. Science became the new tyrant. Narrow empiricism implies that the only true knowledge is that which can be described by the senses. In this coup, the Great Chain of Being was reduced to its lowest common denominator (matter). *The essence of Science is observation and verifiability*. However, most people accept that Science is the study of matter and can't even imagine any other reality.

Postmodernism Challenges the Dominance of Empiricism

Wilber affirms the usefulness of some of the fundamental positions of Postmodernism:

1. *Constructivism*: Knowledge is not simply 'given' to us, but is partly a social construction — things are 'true' or 'real' — because human societies have agreed to regard them as so.
2. *Contextualism*: Meaning is context-dependent. An example is the use of the term 'liberal'. It equates with 'dangerously radical' for a conservative, but signifies 'broadminded and reasonable' for someone who votes for the other side! Since possible contexts are potentially infinite, there is no way to give a 'final' or 'true' meaning to anything.
3. *Integral aperspectivalism*: Because meanings are context-dependent, any single perspective will be partial and distorted, and we therefore benefit from the bringing

together of multiple contexts. An 'integral aperspectival' view is able to integrate multiple perspectives into a meaningful whole. However, Wilber goes on to suggest that postmodernism went from recognising the importance of giving all perspectives their fair share of attention to the self-contradictory and self-annihilating view that no perspective is better or worse than any other — except, of course, postmodernism's own (Walsh, 2002)!

For Wilber (1998), the central problem of postmodernism is that it fails to distinguish between 'the social construction of reality' and 'the construction of social reality'. The former implies that there is no truth, and that no perspective has any stronger claim to our attention than the rest. The latter suggests that any socially-constructed power hierarchy creates the *illusion* that some people (and their perspectives) are better than others. The distinction has profound implications. As Wilber suggests, if there is no reality apart from what is socially constructed, then there is nothing left *except power*. Religion, Science and Postmodernism all ask us to accept their portion of the elephant as the whole elephant, and attempt to define their own as the dominant paradigm. Postmodernism has fallen into the power trap, alongside the very positions it arose to subvert! By rebelling against Science, postmodernism has actually taken us back to pre-modern thinking. There is no possibility of observation and verifiability since there is no possibility of defining 'real'.

'Broad Science'

Despite his criticisms, Wilber (1998) admits that postmodernism has been a noble effort to escape the worldview that there is nothing except the study of matter. Abstractions such as love, fear, passion or understanding cannot be directly observed by the senses, but must be inferred by introspection and interpretation. Curiously, science has never *really* believed in the narrow version of empiricism. For example mathematics, which is the cornerstone of science, is the study and *verification of mental processes*. Empirical science tries to deny the possibility of verifying mental processes, while verifying them all the time in mathematics, a very odd state of affairs indeed! For those without a background in Mathematics, this later comment could very well be interpreted within a postmodern perspective; that is, mathematical processes are conventions that everybody agrees are true. Wilber in his discussion of the real scientific method suggests that

After all, we tend to think of vector analysis, logic, tensor calculus, imaginary numbers, Boolean algebra and so on as scientific in the broad sense. Clearly, 'sensory' and 'scientific' are not the same thing at all (Wilber, 1998: 152).

Later he says, '... we always resort to *experience* to ground our assertions'. Experience can be *sensory, mental or spiritual*. Mathematics is mental experience, just like passion, fear and love; all can be subject to scientific verification. The reader is strongly encouraged to consult Wilber

(1998) directly on this matter of experience and verifiability, as it is not possible to adequately address this issue in a paper of this length. However, very briefly, I will describe the three components that for Wilber constitute valid knowledge and hence should direct scientific inquiry.

1. *Instrumental Injunction.* Strands of knowledge can be verified by performing some action (which might be a laboratory experiment, or alternatively, subjecting oneself to some particular kind of mental or spiritual discipline). Either way, a particular experience results, which may confirm or deny the aspect of knowledge in question.
2. *Direct apprehension.* Data is the result of direct and immediate experience. Science anchors all of its concrete assertions in such data. However, for Wilber, 'immediate experience' may be internal or mental, not just 'externally observable' as in classic 'science'.
3. *Communal confirmation (or rejection).* This means checking your results with others. If others faithfully repeat the procedure specified by the injunction 'Do this!' then they will have the same experience. This is confirmation of the data.

Locating Therapies within Wilber's Four Quadrant Model

Wilber's Four-Quadrant Model consists of four different hierarchies representing distinct but interrelated areas of scientific study. As shown below, it is possible to locate different forms of therapy, as well as different types of scientific enquiry, within the four 'quadrants', in a way that makes clear both their distinctive features, and their complementary (rather than oppositional) natures.

Upper Left Quadrant

Here Wilber places the study of the internal, subjective experience of the individual. In the therapy arena, we might place here the various Psychodynamic therapies, Person-Centred Therapy, and Wilber's own Evolutionary Psychology (Wilber, 1983 & 2001). All of these invite the individual to search within for deep truths, as do the contemplative traditions of the major religions.

Lower Left Quadrant

Wilber's lower left-hand quadrant is where he locates culture, i.e. the *shared internal experience* of a group of people (Wilber, 1998). Culture is interpretation; i.e. group meaning making; consciousness shared (We). If consciousness evolves, then culture also evolves. This is the area where approaches such as Social Constructionism, Hermeneutics and Second Order Cybernetics are useful.

This is also the quadrant where I would place Narrative and Milan Therapy. Narrative Therapy focuses on deconstructing the impact of broader socially constructed 'truth'. Milan, on the other hand, engages the family in questioning how meaning is created in an indi-

vidual family by highlighting pattern and meaning making processes within that family.

Upper Right Quadrant

This is the province of traditional Science, the study of matter (It). Here, we would expect to find the observable behavioural correlates of the internal states that Wilber locates in the upper left quadrant. For example, different brain wave patterns are associated with different states of consciousness; and recent developments in neuroscience (Le Doux, 1996) have enabled us to find a part of the brain (the amygdala) which roughly corresponds with Freud's 'id'. Behaviourism would be the form of therapy that would most readily be located in this quadrant, since it deals with observable, externally measurable actions.

Lower Right

Wilber's last quadrant represents the external or observable (It) aspect of collective or group behaviour. For example, sociology and first order cybernetics both study and interpret the *patterns* of observable behaviour of groups. Structural-Strategic Family therapy would be located within this quadrant, since it is primarily based on observing external patterns of family/group behaviour, with relatively little attention paid to 'meaning'.

Implications

The tendency of therapy approaches to discredit models which belong in other quadrants is an example of the human tendency to differentiate, and then dissociate. An example is the move by systems theorists (Lower Right) and behaviourists (Upper Right) to discredit psychodynamic models (Upper Left); or for systemic and behavioural therapists to discredit each other, for that matter! In reality, these approaches cannot be cut off from one another in this manner. An intervention by a therapy in any of the quadrants is likely to have ripple effects in domains of experience located within other quadrants. A particular presenting problem may be more efficiently dealt with by applying an intervention which focuses on the upper left quadrant, but another problem may be better dealt with by intervening at the level of culture.

An integrative model would allow practitioners to operate in all four of these contexts, which study human behaviour, depending on the needs of the client (rather than the need of the therapist for theoretical purity). It will be argued below that this integrative approach is crucial to working with highly complex families who have 'done the rounds'.

An Integrative Model: The Next Stage of Family Therapy

The next stage of development in family therapy needs to realise the *intention* of postmodernism — a stance where it is possible to think in multiple contexts simultaneously.

This is Wilber's 'Integral/Aperspectival' stage, the next stage in evolution after the Mental Egoic. As Wilber suggests, postmodernism has failed to deliver a philosophical position which allows this stance to be developed. On the other hand, his own Four-Quadrant Model spells out the contexts that need to be embraced to fulfil this move towards an Integral-aperspectival position and (from our viewpoint) an integrative model of family therapy.

In a number of previously published papers (Westheaver, 1984 & 1990 & 1993) I attempted to create an integrative model of Family Therapy. I argue that the ideas presented in these papers need to be at the core of a therapy that calls itself 'Family' therapy. Three concepts are at the core of my model. These concepts are Triangulation, Distance Regulation and Differentiation. Normally these concepts are applied to families. I however have applied them to the *behaviour of the therapist* in a family, i.e. the therapist can be Triangulated, as a result, he/she functions as a Distance Regulator and needs to Differentiate in order for the family to improve!

Without exception, the couple or family therapist is 'invited' to take sides (Westheaver, 1984). This side taking typically becomes unconscious behaviour on the part of the therapist. Milton Erickson (1993) documented many examples of a therapist being involved (not sexually) with one of the partners in a marriage for twenty years! This is a very extreme version of the therapist acting as a Distance Regulator; however the same dynamic can operate even in brief therapy.

As a result, the *most important behaviour of a Family Therapist* is to be able to *empathically connect* with both adults, preferably in each other's presence. This will be illustrated in the case study below. Borzomenyi-Nagy (1986) refers to this as Multi-directed Partiality. It means being *on the side of everybody*. I have suggested (1984) that Differentiation, in essence, could be defined for both the therapist and the child as *the ability to be on the side of both parents*. Whitaker would agree. He has suggested (Neill & Kniskern, 1982) that it is up to the therapist to show the child how to differentiate.

Evolutionary Psychology

Although I believe that the ideas of Triangulation, Differentiation and Distance Regulation represent the core of Family Therapy, Wilber's stages govern how the subtleties are played out. For example, someone who is operating at a Mythic Membership level of consciousness is likely to be politically conservative, and/or embrace some form of religious fundamentalism. Patriarchal beliefs (e.g. that the woman is 'subservient to' the man, or that he 'owns' her) would be likely. The woman would be the emotional pursuer and the nurturer, while the Man would be an emotional distancer, and punitive. By contrast, a couple who are both operating at a Mental Egoic level would more likely embrace egalitarianism, would be considered politically liberal (with a small 'l'), and would probably not have a religious affiliation. Their problem

might be that clearly defined gender roles or parenting roles are no longer available to them, leading to uncertainty where a Mythic Membership couple would experience no doubts. These couples would handle closeness–distance very differently.

Certain cultures have a preponderance of people operating at one level. For instance, hunter-gatherer societies are operating from a predominantly Typhonic consciousness, although a few individuals within them may be operating at Reptilian levels. The West (at least in theory) is operating at the Mental Egoic level, however, two prominent forces attract people who are operating at other levels. As we saw earlier, Romanticism in the form of New Age teachings would ask us to return to Typhonic consciousness and narcissism. Religious fundamentalism (including Islamic fundamentalism) would ask us to return to the emphasis on power and hierarchy of Mythic Membership, supposedly as a cure for the ills of modernism. While the counter-move by fundamentalists is often very destructive, its intent is to return to a time when there were values. Both modernism and postmodernism have decimated values.

A Case Study

When I first saw them, the family had been in psychiatric treatment since their child was five years of age; he was now sixteen. His parents' original complaint was that he directed *violent* outbursts towards the *mother*. The psychiatrist had begun by instructing the *father* to *restrain* the child (behaviourist intervention). Why not instruct the mother? At age sixteen, the father was still attempting to restrain the child, who now weighed 90 kilos. At this point, the family complained of the father's emotional *distance* from the *child*. It is not difficult to guess why! The child had had several admissions to psychiatric hospitals. At least one was after a serious reaction to Prozac (an upper right quadrant intervention), resulting in violent outbursts, hallucinations and near death. He was in alternative accommodation at the time I became involved, because the family was unable to cope with his violent outbursts, which had occurred non-stop for eleven years. They were more than happy to cling to a 'flavour of the month' psychiatric diagnosis as the *cure* for *their* overwhelming sense of guilt, failure and despair.

According to the treating psychiatrist, the family had, in the past year, been seen by a number of family therapists who despite belonging to a very well respected medical facility were unable *even to engage* the family. I understand that the family had seen a bevy of helping professionals since the child was initially brought for treatment, with very little change in the presenting problems. But I am not aware of the specifics of these encounters.

The crucial issue here is not that the psychiatrists or the family therapists were incompetent or ill intentioned, but that they were operating from a *limited and limiting perspective on reality*. The psychiatrist was clearly operating

from an upper right quadrant perspective and had no understanding of the systemic implications of the father restraining his five-year-old. The family therapists may have been operating from any one of the quadrants, but without an understanding of the others. The family and the child suffered greatly.

Using an Integrative Approach

To get in the door to *begin* to heal these wounds, I had to connect empathetically with *both parents*. The father was almost universally seen as hard-nosed, belligerent and abusive towards his child; no one liked him and all blamed him overtly or otherwise for the deterioration of the boy. *Everyone could connect with the mother*. Everyone judged the father and to some extent rightly so, but that judgement was not therapeutically useful and contributed immeasurably to the child's suffering.

The dynamics of the family were so typical of the classic 'pathological triangle' Westhefer (1984), that it seemed a shame not to use a structural-strategic framework as an overarching strategy. This was done with extreme caution, however. Would colleagues see me as out of date? Would I be seen as 'politically incorrect'? Or worst of all, might I be seen as not using a sufficiently 'respectful' intervention? Heaven forbid going down *that* path!

This part of the strategy involved getting parents to reverse roles. The mother was to take total charge of discipline (which created distance) with the support of the staff from the child's halfway house and the police. The mother was told to tell the child over the phone that if he failed to follow the mother's instruction during the next access visit, the halfway house would be phoned to take him back, until the following access visit. She was also told to tell him that if there was any hint of violence, the police would be called immediately and he would be charged (so much for respectful interventions!). Neither of these threats ever had to be carried out. The father was then to take charge of *nurturing activities*, which created potential *closeness*.

It may come as a surprise, but this was *not* the first intervention. Jeffrey Zeig (1982, personal conversation) suggested that 'an intervention is like a golf swing. One percent involves actually hitting the ball, the rest depends on what you do with the club as it is travelling towards the ball!'

My *first* strategy was to listen to the despair that the parents felt and take them through the history of their involvement with treatment — their previous family therapists didn't even rate a mention. Circular questioning was used during this history telling, to loosen up the projections that had displaced the parents' struggles onto the child. By the end of the first session, the parents were crying and hugging each other and discussing how the *child's* emotional distance was a roadblock in *their* marriage. This is a *shift* from the *diagnosis* as the *explanation* for his behaviour.


In the next two sessions, both parents began discussing how the *father* was emotionally distant from the *child and his wife*. Only after the parents were openly admitting that it was the *father* who was the emotionally distant one could the traditional structural intervention be used. Using a structural intervention initially, as a means of metaphorically intervening in the closeness–distance balance (Byng-Hall, 1982; Westhefer, 1984) would have resulted in the parents not returning. The mother had not been getting emotional closeness from her husband and would have sabotaged anyone attempting to move her son out of providing it. They required the healing of some of the wounds of the marriage before they would take the emotional risk of ceasing to scapegoat their son and change the (first-order) systemic pattern.

Major changes occurred in the family system in six sessions. The child was able to have weekend access without any violent outbursts and to comply with parental requests. Progress was made towards moving the father into a more nurturing role with his child, to the point where the father would go out of his way to support and help the boy. Once I understood that the father thought it was his duty to protect his wife, he was able to consider a different way to care for his family. The child's behaviour improved out of sight and even his schoolwork improved, although the latter could well be the result of coming off the drugs that his current psychiatrist described as 'poison'.

Conclusion

All therapies have had a disturbing tendency to go down the path of parochialism. I certainly struggled when I trained in Structural family therapy following initial training in psychodynamic therapy. For example, my supervisor criticised Bowen as being a closet analyst, not a *true* systems thinker. My issue was one of loyalty. I suspect that I was not alone in going through such struggles. My approach to solving this dilemma was to find a way to be *loyal to both supervisors* by publishing papers that *integrated* the two opposing positions. An implication of 'over-loyalty' to one's family therapy model is that one just doesn't think, nor do therapy, like those (inherently bad or at least ill informed) people who work from an opposing model, even when that may be very useful behaviour. It is most unfortunate that 'opposing' is the correct term to describe how too many family therapists view other models. And yet, although over-loyalty is seen to be a problem, there have also been many papers published that see eclecticism as an equally great problem! To counter this pendulum swing between eclecticism and parochialism, this paper has attempted to provide a framework within which to *integrate* various therapies. It is hoped this is not the end of such a journey. As Wilber argues, when we throw out verifiability all we are left with is power struggles, much like the ones we encounter in families! This is the state of family therapy today.

References

- Blank, G. & Blank, R., 1979. *Ego Psychology II*, NY, Columbia University Press.
- Borzormenyi-Nagy, I. & Krasner, B., 1986. *Between Give and Take: A Clinical Guide to Contextual Therapy*, NY, Brunner/Mazel.
- Byng-Hall, 1982. Family Legends: Their Significance for the Family Therapist. In A. Bentovim, A. Cooklin & G. Gorrell Barnes (Eds), *Family Therapy: Complementary Frameworks of Theory and Practice*, Vol.2, London, Academic.
- Foucault, M., 1977. *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Freud, S., 1997. *Dora: an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria*, NY, Simon and Schuster. First Published 1905.
- Hegel, G. W. F., 1977. *Phenomenology of Spirit*, transl. by N. K. Kemp, Oxford, Oxford University Press. First Published 1807.
- Kant, I., 1929, *Critique of Pure Reason*, transl. by N. K. Smith, NY, St. Martin's Press. First Published 1781.
- Keating, T., 1986. *Open Mind: Open Heart*, NY, Continuum.
- Larner, G., Lobsinger, C., Arnstein, M., Perlesz, A., McNatty, B., James, K., Brown, J., Holmes, S., 2002. What are the Core Learnings of Family Therapy? *ANZJFT*, 23, 3: 128–137.
- Le Doux, J., 1996. *The Emotional Brain: The Mysterious Underpinnings of Emotional Life*, NY, Simon & Schuster.
- Luther, M., 1522. In J. K. Irmischer (Ed.), *Dr. Martin Luther's Vermishte Deutsche Schriften*, transl. by Robert E. Smith, 63: 124–125.
- Neill, J. R. & Kniskern, D. P. (Eds), 1982. *From Psyche to System: The Evolving Therapy of Carl Whitaker*, NY, Guilford.
- Quinn, D., 1995. *Ishmael: An Adventure of Mind and Spirit*, NY, Bantam.
- Rousseau, J. J., 1978. *The Social Contract*, transl. by M. Cranston, Dayton, OH, Fitzhenry & Whiteside. First published 1762.
- Walsh, R., 2002. Science and Religion: Proposals for the Reconciliation: An Essay Review of Ken Wilber's *The Marriage of Sense and Soul: Integrating Science and Religion*. (http://members.ams.chello.nl/f.vissers3/wilber/rev/rev_mss_walsh.html). (Accessed 02/11/02.)
- Westheaver, C., 1984. An Aspect of Live Supervision: The Pathological Triangle, *AJFT* 5, 3: 169–175.
- Westheaver, C., 1990. Intervening in a Rigid Supervisory System: A Bowen/Structural View of Neutrality, *ANZJFT*, 11, 3: 147–157.
- Westheaver, C., 1993. Negotiating the Middle Management Triangle, *ANZJFT*, 14, 3: 123–128.
- Wilber, K., 1983. *Up from Eden*, Boulder, CO, Shambhala.
- Wilber, K., 1998. *The Marriage of Sense and Soul: Integrating Science and Religion*, Melbourne, Hill of Content.
- Wilber, K., 2001. *A Theory of Everything*, Dublin, Gate.
- Zeig, J., 1982. Personal Conversation, during a Master Class with Carl Whitaker. 

Editors and their Sheds: The Youngest Member

Ruth Witters-Green reports in ‘Increasing Breastfeeding Rates in Working Mothers’

(*Families, Systems & Health*, 21, 4 (2003): 415–434): ‘In a study with 101 working mother participants, 59 of whom were breastfeeding and 42 of whom were formula feeding ... the breastfeeding group had fewer and less severe infant illnesses and less maternal absenteeism (Cohen, Mrtek, & Mrtek, 1994a) (419).’

Condon, John J., 1985. Therapy of the Expectant Family: The Foetus as a Force to be Reckoned with, *ANZJFT*, 6, 2: 77–81.

Huston, Cathie and Armstrong, Ken, 1999. Home Visiting Family Therapy for Children at Risk, *ANZJFT*, 20, 1: 41–43.

Sved-Williams, Anne, 2003. Family Therapy and Infant Mental Health: Natural Partners [Education Update], *ANZJFT*, 23, 1: 26–32.

Wertheim, E. S., 1980. An Exploratory Study of Adaptive Processes involved in the Preparation for Parenthood and in Becoming Parents, *AJFT*, 1, 3: 138.

Available from the editors @ \$10.90 per issue (\$10.00 + 0.90 GST) and \$16.30 (\$15.00 + \$1.30 GST) for issues that are available only as photocopies). Postage extra.

Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy

Editors: Hugh and Maureen Crago

4 Jellicoe Street, Blackheath NSW 2785, Australia.

email: mhcrago@mail.bigpond.com