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By allowing wonder to bubble up as science and scientists ponder life, they encounter the staggering mystery that is the existence of this world, a mystery that facts alone can never begin to fill. This is the experience of truly wise scientists.

In recent times, the essential elements of wonder and curiosity in the true researcher have brought science to the very boundary of what it can know empirically, with its own methodology. In the study of health with regards to the human being, science is discovering that "meaning" is central to wellbeing, and subsequently, health. As science pulls apart species and tries to turn evolution into a linear process, it bumps up against a spherical, all embracing reality. As it delves into the smallest particle of matter, it discovers another universe that can only be explained by creating another physics that transcends and includes its junior. When Einstein’s brand of physics burst forward, it showed itself to transcend yet include Newtonian physics. Transcending and including: the process of evolution, the cosmology of the great chain of life, the foundation of almost all traditional spiritual religions.

As empirical science encounters its shortcomings in relationship to living things, perhaps, with a dose of honest humility, it can fully admit that there are dimensions of existence, especially in regard to living beings, that it cannot begin to know through a strictly empirical approach. Perhaps, then, we can envision a broader, Integral Science, and revisit, and bring new insight to traditional methods of knowing, that modern science mistakenly has dismissed, or does not recognize.

The knowledge (data) being sought by the homeopath is that which needs to be cured in a patient (§ 3). It is called the totality of symptoms or the total disease image (§ 104 and § 7). This totality includes mental emotional states, spiritual meaning and soulful existence. How can we assure that our homeopathic practice leads to valid knowledge that approaches truth in all these areas? And, how do we assure that our method precludes speculation, personal opinion, or other invalid conclusions?

In this article, we will explore the essential elements of scientific investigation and apply them, but in a multi-dimensional, integral paradigm so as to satisfy the integrated, holistic potential of homeopathy.

We will begin with an application of the three strands or the three central aspects used in scientific inquiry. 1. Instrumental Injunction (Instruments to use and clear instructions for the experiment), in other words, the parameters of the experiment (in homeopathy, the case taking process). 2. Direct apprehension, or acceptance of the data or referents in the worldspace brought forth by the parameters of the experiment. 3. Communal inquiry. Falsifiability.
THE THREE STRANDS OF VALID KNOWLEDGE

Turning to science as an example of an effective method to understand the physical world, we see that there are three essential ingredients to ensure that the data are brought forth by valid means, that they are not invented or constructed and can be verified.

In homeopathy, as a whole person modality, it is important that these essential ingredients be equally applicable to interior and exterior domains and provide us with a methodology that could legitimate the interiors (mind, emotions, soul) with as much confidence as the exteriors (physical symptoms, observed or measured).

1. PARAMETERS OF THE EXPERIMENT (CASE TAKING PROCESS)

In every domain where knowledge is sought, the process of acquiring knowledge must begin with defining the parameters of the experiment to take place: the instrument most suited to the subject of study, and the steps required to ensure that the data is accurate and not constructed.

The parameters are always in the form: "If you want to know this, use this and do this." (and refrain from doing...) These injunctions come directly from Hahnemann, and are found in the Organon.

§ 83 states: The individualizing examination of a disease case demands nothing from the medical art practitioner except freedom from bias, healthy senses, attention while observing, and fidelity in recording the image of the disease.

§ 84: ...The physician sees, hears, and notices ...what is altered, unusual ...he writes everything down with the very same expressions used by the patient...The physician keeps silent, allowing them to say all they have to say without interruption.

Hahnemann is instructing that the most appropriate “instrument” to use in determining what needs to be cured, is the practitioner him or herself, free from bias, using his or her healthy senses.

But, how does one use the senses? To answer this question, let us consider the proposal made by St. Bonaventure, a favourite philosopher of Western mystics, who taught that men and women have “three eyes (or ears)” as he put it, following Hugh of St. Victor, another famous mystic. He described the “eye of flesh”, by which we perceive the external world of space, time, and objects; the “eye of reason”, by which we attain a knowledge of philosophy, logic, and the mind itself; and the “eye of contemplation”, by which we rise to a knowledge of transcendent realities. These three “eyes” or “ears” correspond to specific ways of knowing, each best suited for a specific realm, each using a different process and type of illumination. All three “eyes” are used by the homeopath to “perceive” as Hahnemann stipulated in §3.
The ways of knowing via the three “eyes”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eyes/Ears</th>
<th>Eye of Flesh</th>
<th>Reason or Mind’s eye</th>
<th>Eye of Contemplation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowing</td>
<td>Cogitatio, or simple empirical cognition, is a seeking for the facts</td>
<td>Meditatio is a seeking for the truths within the psyche itself</td>
<td>Contemplatio is momentary transcendent insight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realm</td>
<td>Gross: the external world of space, time, and objects</td>
<td>Subtle: philosophy, logic, and the mind itself; and the Soul</td>
<td>Causal: transcendent realities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Monological: requiring no dialogue with the “object” being studied.</td>
<td>Dialogical: an entering into the exchange required when studying a living “subject”.</td>
<td>Translogical: an opening to insight in non dual gnosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
<td>• Exterior and inferior illumination • knowledge of sense objects</td>
<td>• Interior or lumen interius, • knowledge of philosophical truths</td>
<td>• Superior or lumen superius • truth which is unto liberation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Eye of Flesh (Empiricism)**

is related to Cogitatio, or simple empirical cognition, seeking for the facts. These facts are in the gross realm of the external world of space, time and objects.

It is the empirical eye, the eye of sensory experience. ("Empirical" detection by the five human senses or their extensions). When empiricists like Locke concluded that all knowledge is experiential, they meant that all knowledge in the mind is first in the five senses. When Buddhists say that "meditation is experiential," they do not mean the same thing as Locke; they are rather using the term "Experience" to mean "directly conscious, not mediated by forms or symbols.” They are referring to a type of direct communication, a trans-logical experience with Divine or universal consciousness, which belongs to the eye of contemplation.

The empirical experience is monological, a subject-object relationship. The subject observes the object. There is only one subject speaking. Empirical science is of the eye of the flesh, a monologue based on observation of an object.

In a homeopathic case taking, the eye of flesh is used to observe colour, texture, state of skin, posture, external signs, tongue, tears, hair colour or lack of hair, colour and texture of rash, measurements such as weight, height, blood tests, and all physical observations. The eye of flesh uses exterior illumination or a light source outside the body to gain knowledge of sense objects.
MONOLOGICAL EMPIRICISM

The real problem with empirical science is not that it is atomistic instead of holistic, or that it is Newtonian instead of Einsteinian, or that it is individualistic instead of systems oriented. The real problem is that all of these approaches – optimistic and holistic alike – are monological. Empiricists claim that all science is empirical and sensorimotor-based – evidence supplied by the senses or their instrumental extensions.

We assume that all men and women possess an eye of flesh, an eye of reason, and an eye of contemplation; that each eye has its own objects of knowledge (sensory, mental, and transcendental); that a higher eye cannot be reduced to nor explained solely in terms of a lower eye; that each eye is valid and useful in its own field, but commits a fallacy when it attempts, by itself, to fully grasp higher or lower realms.

If you studied MacBeth empirically, you would get a copy and subject it to scientific tests: measure its size, weigh it, count the number of pages, analyze the material of the pages and the number of molecules of ink. But if you wanted to know the meaning of the play, you would have to read it (a form of dialogue) and enter into its interiority, its meaning, its intentions and its depths. The only way you can do that is by interpretation. Here, empirical science is virtually worthless, because we are entering interior domains and symbolic depths, which cannot be accessed by exterior empiricism, but only by introspection and interpretation. Not objective but inter-subjective. Not just monological, but dialogical.

THE EYE OF REASON (MIND - RATIONALISM)

is related to Meditatio, seeking for the truth within the psyche itself. These truths are in the subtle realm of ideas, images, logic, and concepts. With the light of the intellect [the lumen interius] we can see things which are invisible to our bodily senses. . . . The truth of ideas cannot be seen by the senses and is discovered through some type of dialogue.

LOGIC

We 'see' not simply with our eyes but with a great part of our mental equipment as well [the eye of mind]. . . . For example, mathematics is a non-empirical knowledge or a supra-empirical knowledge. It is discovered, illuminated, and implemented by the eye of reason, not by the eye of flesh. No one has ever seen, with the eye of flesh, the square root of a negative one. It is a trans-empirical entity, and can only be seen by the mind's eye.

WILL

Moral understanding, rational thinking, and reason cannot be seen as objects are seen. Will can delay the flesh's instinctual and impulsive discharges and thus transcend the merely animal and subhuman aspects of the organism.
IMAGINATION
The mental field includes but transcends the sensory field. While not excluding it, the mind's eye rises far above the eye of flesh: in imagination, it can picture sensory objects not immediately present, and thus transcend the flesh's imprisonment in the simply physical world.

INTUITION (NOUS)
Intuition is also of the mind, and meditatio.

The ancient Greeks sometimes equated Nous to intellect or intelligence, as a philosophical term for the faculty of the human mind necessary for understanding what is true or real, similar in meaning to intuition. It is also often described as a form of perception that works within the mind ("the mind's eye"), rather than only through the physical senses. A sixth sense as it were.

Intuition is not always reliable, as it can fall under the sway of the emotions. Just as logic can be blinded by emotions, intuition relies more on symbolism and an archetypal level of knowing, thus falling in between mind and spirit, between purely mental and mystical, prodding us to create a fourth category for greater clarity as in the chart below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels:</th>
<th>Body</th>
<th>Mind</th>
<th>Soul</th>
<th>Spirit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modes of knowing</td>
<td>sensory</td>
<td>mental</td>
<td>archetypal</td>
<td>mystical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of knowing</td>
<td>empiricism</td>
<td>rationalism</td>
<td>symbolism</td>
<td>mysticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realm</td>
<td>objects</td>
<td>thoughts</td>
<td>images</td>
<td>light</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But one should realize that both logic and intuition are involved in all perceptions of reality. One of the truths realized in modern times, is that reality is not simply pre-given, but in some significant ways reality is a construction, and interpretation.

For example, we say that we can easily see that our fingers are different from one another. But where is that difference located? Can you point to it? Can you see it? You can see the individual fingers, but can you actually see the difference between them?

The fact is that “difference” is a mental concept that we superimpose on certain gross sensations. Nowhere in those sensations do you actually experience or see "difference" – we construct it, impose it, interpret it; we never actually perceive it. In other words, much of what we take to be perceptions are actually mental conceptions and not empirical.

Thus when many empiricists demand sensory evidence, they are actually demanding mental interpretations without realizing it.
THE EYE OF CONTEMPLATION (MYSTICISM)

is Contemplatio, the knowledge whereby the psyche or soul receives transcendent insight (revealed by the eye of contemplation) of the causal (transcendent and contemplative).

It uses a Trans-logical process: transcending the logical, the rational, or the mental in general. Formless mysticism, sees beyond the eye of flesh and its monological empiricism, beyond the eye of mind and its dialogical interpretation, and instead stands open to insight in non-dual gnosis. This requires a process which is both meditative and aware, is proven (as many spiritual practices such as meditation), and practiced for many years. It uses the superior or lumen superius, the light of transcendent Being which illumines the eye of contemplation and reveals salutary truth, "truth which is unto liberation".

The eye of contemplation is to the eye of reason as the eye of reason is to the eye of flesh. Just as reason transcends flesh, so contemplation transcends reason. Just as reason cannot be reduced to, nor derived solely from, fleshy knowledge, so contemplation cannot be reduced nor derived from reason. Where the eye of reason is trans-empirical, the eye of contemplation is trans-rational, trans-logical, and trans-mental.

The process of contemplatives has nothing in common with the quest of philosophers, since philosophy’s basic principle of exhaustive verbal adequacy is opposed to any liberating outcome, to any transcending of the sphere of words.

2. DIRECT APPREHENSION, EXPERIENCE.

Direct apprehension is the immediate acceptance of, or receptivity to, information without passing judgment on its validity, often without complete comprehension. In a homeopathic case taking, the homeopath (as instrument) sees, hears and notices everything without judging whether it is based on actual occurrences or facts, and often without fully understanding what the patient means.

This is an immediate experience of what is brought forth by the process of disclosure. One of the meanings of the word “data” is direct and immediate experience. This strand is well explained by Hahnemann in the Organon.

§83 states: The individualizing examination of a disease case demands nothing from the medical art practitioner except freedom from bias, healthy senses, attention while observing, and fidelity in recording the image of the disease.

§84: ...The physician sees, hears, and notices ...what is altered, unusual ...he writes everything down with the very same expressions used by the
The physician *keeps silent, allowing them to say all they have to say without interruption.*

§86: When the narrator has finished what he wanted to say of his own accord, the physician enters a closer determination... §87: without ever asking a question that would put words into the patients mouth or that would be answerable with a simple yes or no.

After the patient is finished what he wants to say, the homeopath should not take for granted that she or he knows what the patients means, nor should the homeopath be bothered by this. As the context is filled out, meaning will most probably become clear.

Meaning is context dependent, and contexts are boundless. The founder of modern linguistics, Ferdinand de Saussure, pointed out that words and phrases have meaning derived from their place in a larger structure. A simple example is the word "bark", which carries a very different meaning in "bark of the dog" or "bark of the tree". Any given word in itself is basically meaningless because the same word can have different meanings depending on the context with the structure in which it is placed.

According to Saussure, it is the relationship among all the words themselves that stabilizes meaning, and not simply pointing to an object, because that pointing cannot even be communicated without a total structure that holds each word in meaningful place. So Saussure's great insight was that a meaningless element becomes meaningful only by virtue of the total structure.

The fact that meaning is context dependent means that a multi-perspective approach to reality is called for. Any single perspective is likely to be partial, limited, perhaps even distorted, and only by taking multiple perspectives and multiple contacts can the knowledge quest be fruitfully advanced.

This means that no single perspective should be privileged in a holistic or integral view. Cognition must therefore privilege no single perspective.

### 3. Communal inquiry. Falsifiability.

This is a check of the results – the data, the evidence – with others who have adequately completed the first two strands. In science it leads to the confirmation or rejection of results. In other domains, such as homeopathy, it may lead to insight, some internal experience, and greater truths.

This strand emphasizes the importance of falsifiability: genuine knowledge must be open to disproof. Otherwise, it can be simply opinion, interpretation or viewpoint in disguise. The state with which one enters the inquiry is one that is willing to falsify rather than to prove any particular interpretation.

The falsifiability principle has the potential of being perverted when it is restricted only to sensory data, which, in an incredibly hidden and sneaky
fashion, automatically bars all mental and spiritual experience from the status of genuine knowledge.

Interiors cannot be objectified, turned into objects of monological gaze: subjective mind cannot be reduced to material brain, intentionality cannot be reduced to behavioural conditioning, compassion cannot be reduced to serotonin, or consciousness reduced to digital bits.

**GREATER AND LESSER TRUTHS**

In communal inquiry, the recognition that not all interpretations are equal, and, that not all “truths” are equal is central to the process. All interpretations are not equal, as some will be based on a bigger worldview, and therefore encompass more truth than one with a smaller worldview. The larger worldview truth does not disqualify the smaller worldview truth within its worldview, the smaller one only loses its validity in the bigger context.

There may be numerous interpretations, but which one covers the most? Which one covers the highest dimensions and deepest levels?

Reality is a rich tapestry of interwoven levels reaching from matter to body, from body to mind, to soul, to spirit. Each level transcends and includes the one preceding. Each senior level, although it includes the levels preceding it, nonetheless possesses emergent qualities not found in the junior levels. The vital animal body includes matter in its makeup but also adds sensations, feelings, and emotions not overtly expressed in rocks. While the human mind includes bodily emotions in its makeup, it also adds higher cognitive facilities such as reason and logic not found in plants or other animals. And, while the soul includes the mind in its makeup, it also adds even higher cognition and effects, such as archetypal illumination, and vision, not found in the rational mind. In short, each higher level possesses essential features of its lower levels. but then adds elements not found on those levels. Each higher level transcends but includes its juniors.

This view of reality, called the “great chain of being” forms the backbone of the nearly universal consensus on reality held by humanity throughout all human eras and history. It is not specific to any culture or religion. Houston Smith, considered the world’s leading authority on comparative religion traditions, states in his book “Forgotten Truth”, that virtually all religions believe in a great chain of being.
As Walter Lovejoy demonstrated in his treatise on the great chain, this view of reality has, in fact, “been the dominant official philosophy of the large part of civilized humankind for most of its history.” Subdivisions and the number of levels might be different in each tradition, but all traditions hold similar insights and essential doctrine.

Each senior level envelops or enfolds its junior dimensions in a series of nests within nests within nests of being. Each one transcends and includes the previous one. Every thing and event in the world is interwoven with every other and all are ultimately enveloped and enfolded by spirit (Gaia, God, Dao, Brahman), or the absolute itself. Quantum physics transcends yet includes Newtonian physics. The soul level transcends, yet includes the sensations, emotions and physical symptoms.

Homeopathy, as a holistic or integral medicine addresses body, mind, and soul, and therefore embraces all levels of reality, and the chain of life as a whole. The “chain of life” is an essential component of holistic homeopathic practice. It is the only way to make sense of the relationship of similars between the experiences of nature in provings and the experiences of the patient: they are all part of the same interconnected whole with distinct levels. If it were not for the great chain of being, there would be no relationship between proving experiences and remedy prescription.
SUMMARY

These three strands of valid knowledge will be our guide through the delicate world of the deep interiors, the within, the divine, where they will help us, as they do with the exteriors, to identify valid knowledge.

For these essential strands to apply to homeopathic case taking, we must remember the importance of approaching our subject not from the outside, in an objectifying and distancing stance, but rather from the inside, from the within, in a stance of mutual understanding, recognition.

The three strands are concurrent, although to different degrees, not linear or divided into phases. An integral or truly comprehensive paradigm will draw freely on the eye of flesh and the eye of mind, but it must also draw significantly on the eye of contemplation.

THE THREE EYES IN ART

The Sensorimotor, the mental, the subtle soul, and the causal spirit levels each transcend and include their predecessors, so there is nothing mutually exclusive about any of these levels. It is simply that each senior level processes emergent qualities not found in its juniors. Each level often takes these new, emergent, and defining characteristics as the topic for appreciation, thus giving each level a very distinctive stamp. Let us take the example of art.

SENSORIMOTOR ART

The art of the sensorimotor world takes as its content or referent the sensory world itself, as processed with the eye of flesh, from realistic impressions to landscapes to portraiture. This is objective Art, representational art, and whether the art objects are bowls of fruit, landscapes, industrial towns, news, railroad tracks, mountains, rivers, they are all sensorimotor objects. Realists, impressionists, and the entire tradition of naturalism would be typical examples.
Mental Art

The art of the mental domain takes as its referent the actual contents of the psyche itself, as interiorly perceived with the eye of mind. The realists are the most obvious; but conceptual art, abstract art, and abstract expression on this are also typical examples. The interest is to re-create ideas and painting, and to put painting at the service of the mind and not simply of the eye of flesh. As is Constantin Brancusi's "Bird in space analysis" on the left.

But this is not mental abstraction in the dry sense. The inward empiricism of the eye of mind, from mathematics to mental art, is actually experience of some of its deepest, richest, most intense textures. Mental art attempts to give visual expression to ideas and essences.

Subtle Art

The art of the subtle level takes as its content or referent various illuminations, visions, and archetypal forms, as inwardly and directly perceived with the beginning eye of contemplation (or transpersonal awareness). It is, we might say, soul art, as Frantisek Kupka stated, “Yes, [this] painting means clothing the processes of the human soul in plastic forms." This means, of course, that the artist himself must have evolved or developed into the social domain, as Wassily Kandinsky knew: "only with higher development does the circle of experience of different beings and objects grow wider. Construction on a purely spiritual basis is a slow business. The artist must train not only his mind but also his soul."

In the eastern traditions, one of the main functions of soul art is to serve as a support for contemplation. In the extraordinary tradition of Tibetan Thangka painting, for example, the Buddha and bodhisattvas that are depicted are not symbolic or metaphoric or Allegorical, but rather direct representations of one’s own subtle level potentials.
By visualizing these subtle forms in meditation, one opens oneself to those corresponding potentials in one's own being. Soul Art, of any variety, is not metaphoric or allegorical; it is a direct depiction of the direct experience of the subtle level. It is not a painting of sensory objects seen with the eye of flesh, and it is not a painting of conceptual objects scene with the eye of mind; it is a painting of several objects seen with the eye of contemplation. That means that artist and critic and viewer alike must be alive to that higher domain in order to participate in this art. This artistic material form is a reminder of, and a call to, extraordinary vision.

A PAINTING BY ALEX GRAY

As the eye of contemplation deepens, and consciousness evolves from the subtle to the causal and non-dual, subtle forms give way to formless and eventually to the non-dual. What characterizes this art is not its content, but the utter absence of self contraction in the artist who paints it, an absence that, in the greatest of this art, can at least temporarily evoke a similar freedom in the viewer.

Ultimately, all Integral modes of learning reveal a transcendent reality: the Good, the True, and the Beautiful, or simply the faces of spirit as it shines in this world. Spirit seen subjectively is Beauty, the “I” of spirit. Spirit seen inter-subjectively is the Good, the “we” of spirit. And spirit seen objectively is the True, the “it” of spirit.

Whenever we pause, and enter the quiet, and rest in the utter stillness, we can hear the whispering voices of the Good, the True and the Beautiful from the deepest sources of our own true being, from our essence.

The voices call to us to never forget the Good, never forget the True, never forget the Beautiful, these are but the faces of your own deepest self.