Integral Leadership Review
Volume 22, Issue 1

12/21 – Feature Articles

A Brief Introduction to Raimon Panikkar: A Great Integral, Intercultural and Interreligious Philosopher and Leader

John O'Neill

My intention in this article is to introduce some of the works and key concepts of Raimon Panikkar, with the hope of making the case that he was a great integral, intercultural and interreligious philosopher, thinker and leader, worth serious attention within the integral community. My methodology will be to present his ideas as clearly and concisely as possible, not drawing direct parallels with Integral Theory or presenting his work within that framework, but rather respecting his consistent and holistic vision within its own right. As Ken Wilber wrote, "the works of Raimon Panikkar are provocative in many profound ways" (Spirituality, 199). Wilber also said to me when I mentioned that I was a student of Panikkar at an Integral Incubator group in his loft in 2011, "ah Panikkar, he was a great, great philosopher!"

Panikkar's life and work

Raimon Panikkar was a great intercultural and interreligious philosopher who died in 2010. He was born in Barcelona, Spain, in 1918. He had a Catholic Catalan mother and a Hindu Indian father, so both religions were in his heritage. He was a Catholic priest who lived much of his life in India. For many years he was parish priest at Varanasi. He obtained three Ph.Ds., in chemistry, philosophy and theology. He taught at universities in Madrid, Rome, Harvard, and San Diego. He wrote around 50 books and 900 articles. He had astonishing erudition and scholarship. He was able to speak, read and write in several languages: Catalan, Spanish, Italian, French, German, English, Greek, Hebrew, Sanskrit and Hindi. Sometimes in his writings he would quote passages from several languages within a few paragraphs or pages. He would also often refer to many books in several languages within a single paragraph. At other times his writings were very distilled and simple. As well as living a deeply contemplative life, he was very active, presenting addresses and papers at numerous conferences, symposia, and other gatherings around the world, including The Parliament of World Religions and the World Congress of Philosophy. He once famously said "I left Europe (for India) as a Christian, I discovered that I was a Hindu and returned as a Buddhist without ever having ceased to be a Christian."

His written works have been put together into a collection called *Opera Omnia*, which comprise 17 books over 12 volumes. They range across mysticism and spirituality; monasticism; religion and religions; Christianity, Hinduism (including a 640 page translation of the Vedas with commentary from the Sanskrit) and Buddhism; intercultural and interreligious dialogue; Trinitarian and cosmotheandric vision; hermeneutics, myth, symbol, ritual and faith; philosophy and theology; sacred secularity; and, lastly, space, time and science (please see References).

I had the opportunity to attend a Panikkar conference at the University of Girona, near Barcelona in 2015. Many of his closest colleagues and friends presented papers, including Milena Carrara Pavan, Maria Roberta Cappellini, Joseph Prabhu, Michiko Yusa, Young-Chan Ro, Gerard Hall, Francis D'Sa. The occasion was the handing over of his library of 13,000 books and 700 journal sets to the university library. After the ceremony, I was able to have a quick look at his collection. I found Wilber's *Up from Eden*, which had Panikkar's neat handwritten notes to the introduction. The notes were quite critical of Wilber's idea of evolution. After the conference, I did a three-day retreat/pilgrimage to Tavertet, the Catalan Mountain village where he lived for the last 20 years of his life.

During his lifetime and since his death there have been many Panikkar conferences. However, I haven't been able to find any Facebook presence or groups, except one, administered by Cappelini, inactive now since February 2018. Perhaps this article may stir up some Facebook interest in his work.

Panikkar's Cosmotheandric Vision,

Panikkar's key cosmotheandric principle, crucial and central to his whole philosophy, is that reality, for human beings, have three irreducible, interrelated, and interpenetrating dimensions, united in relationship: the divine, the human and the cosmic, or God, Humanity, and the Cosmos. Cosmotheandrism is a term coined by Panikkar to express the inter-relational connectedness of these three dimensions of reality: World (Greek, *kosmos)*, Man (Greek, *anthropos/aner)* and God (Greek, *theos)* (Phan and Ro, 271). Panikkar had hoped that his usage of the word Man would be taken in an inclusive, non- gender specific, sense, as equivalent words in other languages, according to him, can be. I think this is a forlorn hope. Mostly, when discussing his work, I update it to Humanity or human beings, although this often doesn't quite reflect his meaning.

Panikkar often uses the word cosmotheandric in front of words like mysticism, reality,

> intuition, myth, vision, principle, consciousness, and experience. His cosmotheandric intuition is his vision that together these three dimensions form an undivided whole. They can also be considered as the material, the conscious and the spiritual, or, similarly, body, mind, and spirit. Reality/for him is cosmotheandric, sometimes seen under one aspect, at other times under another aspect. The cosmotheandric intuition is the undivided awareness of the totality of reality as a whole, an integrated vision of the seamless fabric of reality. It does accept the complexities of reality with its many levels and degrees. It does not claim that these three dimensions are three modes of an undifferentiated, monolithic reality. Nor does it claim that these are three elements in a pluralistic system. Rather, one though intrinsically manifold relationship expresses the ultimate constitution of reality. Everything that exists presents this triune structure expressed in three dimensions. This relationship shines through, fresh, in every spark of the real.

Panikkar proposed that we live so open to this triple dimension of reality, open to other human beings, to the world and to God that we might achieve harmonious communion with all, a cosmotheandric reconciliation. He also spoke of this experience as being more mystical and ineffable than philosophical in the traditional sense, although he wanted to broaden philosophy to include this.

His understanding of the cosmotheandric dimensions was another way of expressing the radical Trinitarian conception of reality. He extended the Christian understanding of the Trinity - Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, to the whole of reality, He saw trinities and triads throughout many religions, traditions, and philosophies. The triadic structure and the trinitarian conception were not merely in his thinking but also in his methodology. He even organized his writings in triadic structures, as in his “novenas” (three times three), where he often used nine sutras in discussing a topic.

Divinity

Panikkar discussed privileged places for the experience of the divine (*The Experience of God*). These include love, joy, suffering, evil, transgression, forgiveness, crucial moments, nature, silence. For him, silence is very important for experiencing the divine, which points towards the beyond, the infinite.

He wrote that the experience of the divine is possible when we have arrived at the triple silence of mind, will, and action. It is an experience that shows that our thought, like our desire and our action, never exhausts its purpose. The self-awareness that we are without beginning or end is the experience of divinity. The divine transcends language and human faculties and shows up in

experiences of the void, emptiness, and silence.

Our philosopher considered that the experience of the divine is the "ultimate and universal experience incarnated in the concrete and particular," such as conversations with friends, sharing a meal, the love that we experience, the ideas which we defend, the pain which we endure. It shows us the value within the deepest and most real of our human acts. It is an experience of the third dimension beyond the physical and mental, which can show its effects in the profound ways of conducting human activities. The interpretation of the experience depends on our cultural milieux. It coincides with the fact of seeing the divine in "all things" and all things "in the divine," if that is the name which we want to give the divine. Panikkar, in *The Rhythm of Being,* drawn from his 1989 Gifford Lectures, "wanted to rescue the divine from being considered a separate entity, a supreme Being above the rest of reality at the top of a pyramid" (Rhythm, 319). He saw the divine as a constitutive dimension of reality, ineffable, infinite, numinous and free.

Mysticism

In *Mysticism and Spirituality, Part One,* the first book of Panikkar's *Opera Omnia,* he discussed the importance of mysticism in his overall philosophical vision. He outlined 9 sutras, (128-210), which I will compress into a concentrated summary.

For him, mysticism is the integral experience of life. For an experience to be integral at all, it must encompass reality as a whole, not just a part of it. The integral experience is the pure, whole experience, which interpretation can't touch. The mystical experience touches on realty directly, consciously, and immediately, but only at a single point, contingently or tangentially. It sees the whole of reality in every human being, in every being.

Reality is neither objective nor subjective: it is our mythos, which is the ultimate horizon of presence, the first step of consciousness. The mythos is like the picture frame in which we place everything that we become conscious of, thanks to our logos. What we believe in, without feeling the need to ask ourselves why is this so, is what constitutes the mythos on which we rely.

Consciousness is consciousness of things, of itself, of abstractions or pure consciousness. What we commonly call "consciousness" is complex and polyvalent. There is a component of consciousness that transcends reason and that is present in every act of consciousness. Pure consciousness is the experience of a love- filled presence.

Mysticism, for him, is the experience that allows the body and the sensuous love of life to

integrate the fullness of human life, without losing the hierarchical balance of the three anthropological dimensions of body, soul, and spirit. By hierarchy, he means the "sacred order" that maintains the harmony of reality and not the prevalence of one part over another. It is because the mystic sees with an intellect filled with love and feels with a love filled with knowledge that he can penetrate the mystery without dissolving it.

Love, for Panikkar, is the synthesis of the constitutive tendency of human beings, and on an even wider scale, of all reality: the centrifugal dynamism that drives every being towards another, towards transcendence, towards difference, externality, the unknown, which makes us whole. This dynamism runs through the whole of reality towards Fullness. The experience of love is open to every human, but it is more than an animal experience, it is also a spiritual experience, neither simply attraction for a body, nor the mere projection of a mind, or the dialectical struggle between the two. It is an aspiration of the spirit that the pure heart feels when it has integrated them into the mystical.

For him, what we call Experience is the result of multiple factors. He suggests that we can reduce Experience to a simple formula: E = e.l.m.i.r.a:

e = experience
l = language
m = memory
i = interpretation r = reception
a = actualization

Panikkar goes on to consider each of these as elements of experience. He says,

> Human experience is like the multi-colored rays that converge into a single blinding white light: it is simple because it gathers the multiple dimensions of humanity into a single human *perichoresis,* which involves our body, our soul, and our spirit, and puts us into contact with Life and reality (*Mysticism,* 185).

He says that experience is equivalent to what he calls cosmotheandric intuition, which attempts to embrace reality as a whole, without splitting it into parts. In this sense, every person is potentially a mystic insofar as every person is capable of discovering the whole of reality in each of its constituent parts. The third eye is indispensable but sensory experience, just as much as intelligible experience, is an integral part of the complete mystical experience. Panikkar thought that living this threefold experience as a harmonious whole is the great human task in order to reach the fullness of humanity.

For him, the mystical experience is in direct relation to the totality of the human condition. He

considers that the great crisis of philosophy in today's world is due to the loss of the mystical sense of existence that "official philosophy" has not cared to nurture. A philosophy as a simple rational work neither guides nor illuminates humanity in its daily life. It leaves the field open to all manner of fundamentalisms and sects (205).

He considered that philosophy, when not mutilated, is mystical, that is, it includes the three dimensions of reality, in the object (the content) and in the subject (the philosopher). He didn't think that all reality/is knowable, not even by a supreme Mind. There is always Mystery (206).

Our philosopher thought that the great crisis of religion is due to the loss of the mystical sense of its essence reducing it to an ideology or institution, without its goal, to inspire a personal journey of liberation. He thought that religion also needs to enter politics. It needs to be tied (*religat)* to reality in all its many aspects, although not confused with any organization. He also thought that the ethical problems of humanity also need to include the mystical dimension (206-7).

For Panikkar, mystical experience is the integral experience of reality, including the whole human condition, such as peace and justice. Mysticism is the complete experience of life in all its fullness. It is not the specialized subject or a privilege for a few. It belongs to human nature itself and it invites us to participate consciously in the adventure of reality (210).

The Religion of the Future

Religion and Religions is Volume II of his *Opera Omnia.* This is a summary, mostly in his own words, of his chapter on "The Future of Religion" (187- 207).

He wrote that the problem of "the future of religions" is not that of the religion of the future. Our ordinary concept of "religion" does not apply to a large part of contemporary systems of belief that nevertheless are legitimate religious forms. The concept of religion cannot be applied to a majority of ideologies and religious concepts in the contemporary world. However, some of these are also different ways of being religious, e.g., Marxism, humanism, science, art, etc. Contemporary consciousness often finds that much of the dogmas and ethical precepts of the traditional religions don't correspond to the original function of these religions, e.g., Marxism, e.g., the salvation, liberation of humanity, its happiness and fullness, its realization. Many contemporary problems e.g., the climate crisis, hunger, COVID, poverty, war, refer to religious problems that touch the ultimate structures of humanity, societies, and reality. This has led to a chasm between religiousness and religion. In a pluralistic society, the traditional concept of religion is unable to supply meaning to the totality of human life and it becomes just a private reality or a religion of the state like a civil religion. He suggests that we need to consider the importance and the urgency of finding a notion of religion that is neither disconnected from nor

identified with any particular religion.

Traditional concepts of religion are obviously in crisis. Human beings are naturally religious, ever thirsty for something more. But traditional religions are no longer satisfying this except in orthodox communities. The crisis of the concept of religion cannot be overcome by the negation of religion. He thinks that to combat religion is already a religious act. To believe in nothing except the exclusively empirical, for example, constitutes another religious doctrine.

In the contemporary pluralistic and intercultural situation, we need mutual fecundation among the different traditions of the world, including the secular, the modern, the postmodern and the emerging Metamodern traditions. The word religion denotes a symbol rather than a concept. This means that it is much richer and more polysemic, that is, with multiple meanings, than a concept.

It requires dialogical dialogue, which is open and welcoming, a willingness to love another person as they are without trying to convert them. It suggests a willingness for mutual enrichment. He also speaks of being open to religious interpenetration and mutual fecundation and influencing of the different religions in order to achieve authentic pluralism. He claims that religion in the wider sense is a human transcendental which goes along with all the other activities of human life, not a separate category of activities. In this sense, religion can be defined as the dimension of ultimacy of the human being. The crisis of humanity's religious consciousness is both effect and cause of our cultural crisis, which is related to John Vervaeke's meaning crisis.

Panikkar asserts that culture gives religion its language and religion gives culture its ultimate content. Over the last couple of centuries both have been attacking each other and both are in crisis. He thought that we need a mutation in the meaning of the word religion, to reflect more our religious and cultural pluralism. He suggested that it should include an idea of sacred secularity.

The religion of the future, for him, is above all a personal religiousness and not a single unique religious confession. He saw the religion of the future as having a liberating character, supporting harmony between persons and between peoples. He didn't think there will ever be a universal religion. Religion will be more of a personal religiousness with as many different manifestations as there are different persons.

The novelty of the religion of the future will recognize the plurality of interpenetration and the freedom of personal conscience. He sees religion as a personal dimension of humanity. There will still be religious groups but the personal interpretation of life and its meaning for each person will become more important. This does not mean an individualistic interpretation of religion. It still requires communities, groups, and dialogues. He thinks that religion should not

just be a subjective devotion. It requires listening to others, including the community, the traditions and sacred writings, the poor and the marginalized, the call of the planet, etc.

Panikkar claimed that the religion of the future is a cosmotheandric religiousness or spirituality. It must bring together the three ultimate dimensions of reality: the material and corporeal aspect, the human aspect including all human activities and the recognition of the Divine, the mystical, the mystery. Religion will need to bind together the human person with God and with the whole universe. Religion must not be the specialization of the few or restricted to a personal sphere. It must permeate all reality, becoming central to human life, without dominating anything, Instead, it should link all spheres of reality together rather than be tied to any specialized institutions.

The New Monk

Panikkar wrote on the challenges of being a monk in *Mysticism and Spirituality, Part Two.* By "monk," he means a person who aspires to reach the ultimate goal of life with all their being by renouncing all that is not necessary to it - that is, by concentrating on this single and unique goal (113). He puts forward the thesis that the monk is an expression of an archetype that is a constitutive dimension of human life. He discusses the fundamental principle of the monastic tradition: blessed simplicity. He suggests that a contemporary expression of this will be through harmonious complexity rather than traditional simplification. He calls for a new synthesis and integration of both.

Kairological Time

Panikkar suggests "three kairological moments in the history of human consciousness in *The Cosmotheandric Experience,* (27).

1. The primordial or ecumenical moment, that pre-reflexive attitude in which nature, humanity and the divine are still amorphously mixed and only vaguely differentiated. This has similarities with the magic Magenta stage in Integral Theory.
2. The humanistic or economic moment, that historical attitude in which the process of differentiation and individualization proceeds from the macrosphere to the microsphere. This has similarities with the rational Orange stage in Integral Theory.
3. The moment of the *new innocence,* the cosmotheandric moment that maintains the distinctions of the second moment without forfeiting the unity of the first. There are similarities here with the integral, especially Turquoise stage in Integral Theory.

As is evident here, Panikkar has insufficient stages in his philosophy. Integral Theory adds more stages, greater detail, and more differentiations. Nevertheless, there are broad similarities between the two. He later added a fourth moment, the *technocratic* one. He was very critical of the increasing dominance, acceleration, artificiality and control over both nature and humanity

associated with technology, disturbing the harmonious "rhythm of being."

Panikkar's Quaternitas

Panikkar has a fourfold arrangement, which brings to mind Wilber's four quadrants, although they are different. Here, Panikkar is pointing to the nature of humanity: First Centre: Earth and Body, waking; Second Centre: Water and Self, dreaming; Third Centre: Fire and Being, sleeping; Fourth Centre: Air and Spirit, the mystical. These also call to mind Wilber's states of consciousness: the waking, subtle, causal, and nondual states.

Mythos, Logos, Pneuma

For our writer, *mythos* means the implicit cultural-religious framework which underlies, frames, and implicitly shapes a worldview. Contextually, the mythos is the frame within which we exist that is opened by another person via dialogical dialogue. His idea of *mythos* is an implicit and lived self-understanding of the cultural and religious frameworks of human identity that are shaped not by rational capacity or conscious belief but by living participation in the myth. It is a horizon which transcends the *logos* (Phan and Ro, 275). *Logos*, adapted from Christian and Greek philosophy, refers to the rational capacity to order, understand, know, objectify, and grasp reality with the intellect. It is contrasted with *mythos,* but both are tied together, and each informs the other. *Pneuma*, (Greek: spirit or breath), belongs with them both, with the latter as the unthinkable, along with *mythos* as the unthought and *logos* as thought. These three interpenetrate and dwell within each other (perichoresis).

Imparative Philosophy

Panikkar suggested that we try to grow together, to interact, to understand each other and to learn from each other. He prefers to speak of imparative or dialogal philosophy rather than comparative philosophy. For him, to *imparare*, is to learn by being ready to undergo the different experiences of other peoples, philosophies, and religions (in *Religion,* 252).

It is reflexive and critical, open, and provisional, aware of the contingency of its own assumptions, and ready to question its own foundations, if called upon to do so. It tries to take into account the full range of human experience, as much as possible in any situation (254). It is open to a dialogal dialogue with other philosophical or religious views and not only to dialectical conflict or rational argumentative dialogue. This offers a passage from imparative philosophy to what he calls dialogal philosophy. Imparative philosophy has three basic rules:

1. To have the internal disposition to listen and learn.
2. To try to speak a language that may be understandable outside its own formal enclosure, eg using myth, metaphor, poetry, etc.

3. Language must be capable of expressing the truth of the respective philosophies and not only their formal correctness

Dialogal philosophy is pluralistic, open, and processual, opening the way for eliminating misunderstandings and where mutual fecundation can take place. It is also interior, linguistic, political, mythical, religious, whole, and unfinished (*Cultures and Religions in Dialogue*, *Part Two,* 118).

Dialogical Dialogue

For Panikkar, dialogical dialogue with another person or culture implies a piercing through the rational capacity to knowing the other person's implicit mythos which shapes not merely what they believe but the frameworks for belief. It entails a meeting of person, rather than dialectical dialogue, so that the self- understanding of the other becomes part of one's own self-understanding and experience. It allows the person to existentially adopt and experience the mythos of the other person as one's own. It involves an openness to meaning across cultural, historical, philosophical, and religious boundaries that imply a universal dialogue of sense between different cultural mythoi (Phan and Ro, 273-4).

Intrareligious and Interreligious Dialogue

Panikkar outlined several principles for interreligious dialogue- that must be free from apologetics, that one must face the challenge of conversion to the other's view, that it is more than just philosophical or theological. Rather it is a truly religious act, in faith, hope, love, trust and a common search for truth. He considers that such dialogue is vital for building sustainable peace in our world.,

Intra-religious dialogue implies a deep encounter of two or more religious traditions within a person, often after an inter-religious encounter (Phan and Ro, 274). It occurs when a person encounters the spiritual dimension of an "other" within "me." This can connect two or more religious traditions by participating in another tradition than one's own. This can involve finding features of one's own religious tradition within another one. It entails having some kind of interior dialogue between two or more religious traditions within one's self. It requires an openness to being converted by the other religious tradition although it most often leads to finding hidden treasures or riches within one's own tradition, illuminated by the other one.

Panikkar writes here of the move from interreligious to intra-religious dialogue, which can then lead in a virtuous circle around to the former again, enriching all participants and contributing to a more harmonious world:

> All these traits (laid down by Ramon Llull, as necessary for dialogue between religions) can be summarized in one: the passage from interreligious to intrareligious dialogue —from exteriority to inferiority, from the condemnation of others to the examination of one's own conscience, from the problem of personal power to personal issues, from dogma to mysticism. Until humanity's religious problem is seen and understood as an intimate, personal problem: until religion is fathomed and discovered as a dimension of the human being —and therefore affecting all of us; until there is despair and lamenting over the human destiny we all form part of; until then we will not be able to distinguish doctrinal disputes, political rivalries, and personal ambition from the true religious act — that is, the common search for humanity's very purpose and cooperation and accomplishment of the very destiny of the universe. Religion is far more a constitutive dimension of humankind than an institution (Cultures and Religions in Dialogue Part Two Intercultural and Interreligious Dialogue, 103).

Diatopical Hermeneutics

Diatopical hermeneutics extends self- understanding within one's own historical tradition, which Gadamer wrote about, which Panikkar called diachronic hermeneutics, to another historical tradition of self- understanding and interpretation. It does this by passing through one mythos or topos (place) into another one and back, allowing the space for understanding the other as other when one lives and participates in the myths of another as one's own. It implies a cross- cultural hermeneutic that involves the diachronic history of more than one cultural and religious tradition, allowing the other to become a part of me without negating the other as other.

Tempiternity

Tempiternity, for Panikkar, means that the eternal can be found in the temporal, giving the temporal an eternal significance. It indicates that the sacred and the divine transform the temporal. The experience of tempiternity is to live the present as intense experiencing of the moment without reference to the past that already was or the future which will be. Time is the other face of eternity, both occurring together. This means, for him, that eternity does not come after time, nor does it exist before time.

Tower of Babel

Within Panikkar's broad, cosmotheandric vision or *mythos*, his approach is intercultural, interreligious, and pluralistic. He is critical of attempts to build an overall system like the AQAL one, so his work is a salutary call to some epistemic humility. He uses the biblical story of humanity's attempts to build a Tower of Babel, one universal language, which met with God's displeasure and the dispersal of humanity into its various small groups, cultures, tribes, etc,

attempting to communicate with each other in more egalitarian, heterarchical, networked ways. This reminds me that instead of Integral Theory becoming a universal, all-encompassing, comprehensive model or map, what we are now seeing are many more liminal groups, eg Metamodern Spirituality, Rebel Wisdom, Game B, Spiral Dynamics, Mutations, Perspectiva, Emerge, The Integral Stage, Integral Life, The Daily Evolver, Developmental Politics, The Stoa, P2P; all in communications and dialogues with each other and influencing each other in many ways. Panikkar's approach is quite contemporary even though his intercultural and interreligious language may seem a bit dated now. As he was Indian as well as Catalan, became an Indian citizen and lived there for many years, he was quite critical of colonialism, modernism, our hyper- technological societies, capitalism, the arms races, militarism, etc. He was strongly committed to social justice, e.g., for the Dalits of India, and developed an approach of deep listening to the wisdom of the Earth, which he called Ecosophy. He also writes of Kosmology, as listening to the mysteries of the Kosmos.

Sacred Secularity

Panikkar thought that sacred secularity may be an important emerging *mythos* for our times. His idea of secularity is related to his understanding of tempiternity. It carries the sense that Being and Time are irreducibly and inextricably linked. Time is a constitutive dimension of reality. He saw this world as well as the time span of this world (saeculum) as sacred, and therefore, he posits that even our secular actions have transcendental ramifications.

In *Myth and Hermeneutics,* he acknowledges that secularity is an important part of the life of the twentieth and twenty- first centuries, that will continue to accompany the growth of human consciousness. He suggested that what has been emerging today is the sacred dimension within secularity. The temporal is regarded as positive and, in a certain sense, sacred. He considers this to be a new development in human history. A secular human is not necessarily anti-religious just because they uphold the positive, sacred value of time and temporal reality. He noticed a new attitude emerging, which considers time as both positive and definitive, not as a means to be manipulated or a phase to be overcome but as a worthy end in itself. He mentions that mystics often embrace the secular and are able to experience the tempiternal nature of reality.

Panikkar suggested building a bridge connecting the sacred and the secular through worship, especially when integrated into everyday life. It can give fuller meaning to life by exalting the importance of human actors, such as growing up, getting married, making love, working, eating, drinking, dancing, and dying. In some respects, his attitude was quite Tantric. Integrating life into worship means discovering values that are universally recognized or accepted. He considers that it is imperative to discover symbols and forms of worship which have a nonsectarian universality at a deep level. It would need to include rubrics such as spontaneity, universality, concreteness, sincerity, continuity, and orthopraxis (right action). He saw the need for including

these basic acts of worship: devotion (bhakti), knowledge (jñāna), and action (*karman*). Other elements of worship include beauty, goodness, and truth. Worship needs to integrate these elements in order to fully satisfy human needs and fulfill the meaning of human life.

Panikkar suggested that in every human activity there is always something greater and more profound involved. Worship also has scientific, intellectual, and contemplative aspects. It also includes work, serving the world, sports, artistic and cultural activities, collaborating with others to build a better world.

Homeomorphic Equivalences

This refers, in Panikkar's usage, to religious and cultural symbols and concepts that provide similar functions in different religions and cultures. They function as a cross-cultural reference for things in different traditions that serve the same function, e.g., God/*Brahman*, Christ/Ishvara. They don't refer to the same thing but rather they refer to religious phenomena that serve the same or similar function in different religious traditions and systems. It is a useful conceptual tool because, while it does respect the specificity of each religious configuration and it does not provide misleading comparisons, it does allow for the building of bridges between related ones.

Conclusion

Panikkar's conclusion to his final book *Rhythm* is

> A new mythos may be emerging. Signs are everywhere. I have already given many names to this fragments of this dawning: cosmotheandric insight, sacred secularity, kosmology, ontonomy, radical trinity, interindependence, radical relativity, and on. I may also use a consecrated name: *advaita*, which is the equivalent of the radical Trinity. Everything is related to everything but without monistic identity and dualistic separation. I have tried to spell it out throughout these pages (404).

We could add other names to this emerging *mythos*: integral consciousness, an integral age, Metamodernism, mutational consciousness, integrative metatheories, etc. I would encourage anyone interested to read some Panikkar. His works provide rich, deep, wise, fertile resources for an emerging integral philosophy and leadership. May this brief introduction encourage more conversations, discussions and dialogues around Panikkar's work and its potential contributions to addressing some of the planetary Metacrises of our times, with his reminders of the importance of including their spiritual, religious, sacred, and divine dimensions.

References

Panikkar, R. (1989). *The Silence of God,* Orbis Books.
Panikkar, R. (1993). *The Cosmotheandric Experience* . Orbis Books Panikkar, R. (2006). *The Experience of God.* Fortress Press.
Panikkar, R. (2010). *The Rhythm of Being.*Orbis Books.
Panikkar, R. (2014a). *Mysticism and Spirituality. Part One: Mysticism, Fullness of Life.*Orbis Books
Panikkar, R. (2014b). *Mysticism and Spirituality. Part Two.Spirituality, the Way of Life.* Orbis Books
Panikkar, R. (2015). *Hinduism. Part One: The Vedic Experience: Mantramanjari.* Orbis Books
Panikkar, R. (2016). *Christianity. Part Two : A Christophany* Orbis Books.
Panikkar, R. (2018a). *Cultures and Religions in Dialogue. Part One: Pluralism and and Interculturality.* Orbis Books
Panikkar, R. (2018b). *Cultures and Religions in Dialogue. Part Two: Intercultural and Interreligious Dialogue.* Orbis Books.
Panikkar, R. (2020). *Mystery and Hermeneutics.* Orbis Books.
Panikkar, R. (2021). *Philosophy and Theology. Part Two: Philosophical and Theological Thought.* Orbis Books
Panikkar, R. Retrieved June 1, 2022. https://www.raimon-panikkar.org/english/glossary.html
Panikkar, R. (2022). *Space, Time and Science.* Orbis Books.
Phan, C. Peter and Ro, Young-Chan. (2018). *Raimon Panikkar A Companion to his Life and Thought.* James Clark and Co.
Wilber, Ken. (1981). *Up from Eden.* New Science Library. Wilber, Ken. (2006). *Integral Spirituality.* Integral Books.

Biography

John O'Neill is a retired Commonwealth Government social worker, studied some philosophy in two degrees, long term member of Sydney Integral, Australian and world integral communities. He has participated in several integral events in the US, including presenting a paper at the Integral Theory Conference in San Francisco in 2013, He had an article published in the September 2021 issue of Sophia Journal about the works of Panikkar and Wilber. He is a practicing Catholic and has been recently developing a deep interest in Nondual Śaiva Tantra, as taught by Christopher Hareesh Wallis. He is committed to interreligious dialogue. He lives in Pelaw Main NSW Australia. jtduckz9@gmail.com