

PART 1:

An Introduction to the Theory of Emergent Worlds

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

P.O. Box 4402
Garden Grove CA 92842 USA
714-638-7376
palmer@netcom.com

Copyright 1997 K.D. Palmer.
All Rights Reserved. Not for distribution.
Version 0.01; 06/29/97; ewt00d00.doc

Keywords: Worlds Theory, Emergence, Systems Theory, Meta-Systems Theory, Special Systems Theory

Summary:

Introduction

This book shall introduce a new kind of theoretical endeavor. That is the General Theory of Emergent Worlds. For many years there has been some attempt to produce a General Systems Theory. Of these attempts that which seems the best is the work of George Klir summarized in his book Architecture for Systems Problem Solving. Here we go far beyond that programme to suggest a broader framework that considers worlds, and particularly the phenomena of emergence with respect to worlds as the central focus of a new discipline whose object is not 'systems' but instead worlds. In many ways this discipline has its basis in recent philosophy that singles out the world

as the highest humanly accessible schema for comprehending existence that we can experience directly. But, this of course suggests that there is, in fact, a hierarchy of schemas by which we organize experience and so we need to explore this whole hierarchy as part of our definition of the level of the world. However, since all these other schemas are embedded within our world it is possible to see all the other layers as part of the patterning of the world itself. Thus, systems, along with the other finer and courser grained schemas appear as just one layer in a highly ramified set of templates that include all other schemas by which we comprehend experience. It is one of the propositions of this new theory that in order to understand systems theory it is necessary to look at the theory of worlds as the proper context for a broader understanding of what systems might be, and that systems themselves make no sense outside of this context.

But our reference point is not just Systems Theory but also Philosophy. We shall be extending the range of philosophical discourse considerably as a basis for constructing a general theory of worlds and considering their emergent properties. In fact, philosophy has been turned into a specialty in recent decades and in this book that trend will be rejected. Here the whole spectrum between specialized sciences, general systems theory, and philosophy will be treated as a continuum and as a whole rather than as the subject of special disciplines. And we will attempt to further our philosophical agenda in the process of considering the theory of worlds. That agenda is the attempt to build a non-dual philosophy within the Western context and in the process connecting with fundamental issues that appear in other philosophico-religious traditions. David Loy wrote the book Nonduality which explored the interface between the dual orientation of the Western tradition and non-dual Far Eastern traditions. We will show how Emergent Worlds Theory

(EWT) leads us to consider how to build non-dual philosophies within our own tradition rather than merely observing them from afar in other traditions.

In this book we are bringing together many different pieces from disparate directions and attempting to produce a global vision of how these pieces fit together. This process demands more of the reader than many other similar studies might. This is because the reader must perform some of the synthesis himself in order to get the whole picture. In other words, we are not attempting to present a finished work with all the conclusions already drawn and the proofs completed. Rather we are offering the possibility of taking a journey together through a wild and untamed intellectual landscape. Your insights might be as valuable as mine as we see what undiscovered country lays along the way. This book is then in some sense always already unfinished. And we invite you to share in the experience by way of computer mediated communications. There is a virtual seminar on the world wide web and associated email list connected with this book. We might consider this book the partially finished textbook for that seminar. You the reader are invited to join the seminar as long as it continues and in that way contribute to the discussion of the discoveries along the way, as we truly make this journey together.

The landscape that we will travel in together is an imaginary landscape produced by speculation. Where science normally shows us finished facts and finished theories we are instead more concerned with meanings and significances of what is discovered than frozen images of results. Understanding must always lead us beyond the information given. For you the reader to claim to understand the material that we will be considering you must be able to show you can go beyond this material. This book will act as a tutorial for your undertaking of a

journey of your own, and some of the things you find discussed here might be considered resources and tools for that journey. But fundamentally we are assuming that you are planning to take a journey yourself into the world of ideas concerning the nature of the world and its foundations. Part of those preparations is learning how to speculate, building up imaginary universes and exploring them and then jumping to still other universes as we rove through the vast expanses of the possible without being utterly bound by designated realities. Instead we judge the designated realities, truths and identities through the comparison to the many virtual worlds of the imagination that strike out in all directions from the mundane world of normal science. Instead of staying close to home, we will instead wander far out into the fields of possibilities in order to attempt to find other vistas from which to comprehend the mundane in ever new ways. Thus in this book you are on the threshold of a sea of myriad worlds of possibility that you are expected to explore and report back to us your findings. This book is about one persons journey out into that ocean. You can take it as an example and a point of departure for your own excursion into the 'twilight zone' of the unknown that surrounds the world we normally take as given.

All this should prepare us for our entry into the virtual worlds of cyberspace. It is cyberspace and the possibility of producing virtual realities that gives a concrete basis for building alternative worlds as well as those that Gelertner called Mirror Worlds that augment the designated as real world by data infusion. The Emergent Worlds Theory is the necessary background for the builders of virtual worlds to situate them within our tradition in philosophically and scientifically relevant ways. We are on the verge of the production of a myriad virtual worlds in cyberspace. This coming explosion is what gives the Worlds Theory its relevance. But most of these worlds will

be mere repetitions of the worlds we know already. The question that this book considers is what makes a world emergent, i.e. utterly new and unheard of, and how is it possible for emergent worlds to exist within the Western worldview. Beyond that we must consider the relation of the emergent worlds to both the mundane designated as real world and other previous worlds. It is clear that before Western world domination there were already myriad worlds in existence supported by many world cultures. Now through violence and colonialization these have been reduced and subjugated. But now out of the Western worldview are emerging the possibility of a plethora of emergent worlds arising. What is the basis of this production of worlds and how do these relate to the subjugated or destroyed naturally occurring worlds that preceded them. The story of the vying of different world civilizations is not over. The West is going into decline and the eastern civilizations are rising again. Although different major worldviews have been submerged under the dominant Western worldview, it is still far from clear who will build the virtual worlds that will be most vital and compelling in the future. What forms will the virtual worlds created by the Chinese and Japanese take as compared to those we will build in the West? If there is a collision of world cultures, then we must also consider the possibility of a war of the worlds in cyberspace as different visions of virtual worlds arising out of different cultural backgrounds vie for supremacy. Some of these ideas are considered under the rubric of Information War. But normally Information War assumes that we are fighting this war in a single world that is designated as real throughout cyberspace. But what kind of information warfare can occur between virtual worlds? Can we not say that the ultimate weapon in an information war is an utterly new emergent world where all the rules have been changed by us and the norms are broken so that the builder of the new world has an inherent advantage in the

production of this new context.

This book will attempt outline approaches for considering some of these questions. It will do so by looking at fundamentals not merely surface phenomena. But one of our primary tasks will be the attempt to understand the new holonomic theory of ultra-efficient special systems within the context of worlds theory and especially the relations between these and the phenomena of emergence within the Western worldview. Thus we are considerably advancing the state of the art in theory by applying the new ultra-efficient theoretical foundation within the context of the theory of worlds. So this series of essays is not a review of the literature on worlds but summarizes and brings into focus the previous work of the author in his unpublished manuscripts. In The Fragmentation of Being and the Path Beyond the Void I have explored the foundations of the Western worldview and showed that the phenomena of the fragmentation of Being is a deep and pervasive part of our worldview. Following that in the book of working papers called Reflexive Autopoietic Systems Theory I considered the basis of Systems Theory and its relation to not just meta-systems but also to the anomalous ultra-efficient special systems which will be explained here. Also in my book Wild Software Meta-systems I establish the connection between modern Software Technology and these philosophical foundations. So this book will act as a review of the major aspects of this work which has been developed starting with my Ph.D thesis at the London School of Economics called The Structure of Theoretical Systems in Relation to Emergence and the various working papers done in England that supported that dissertation. After returning from England I have worked as a Systems Engineer, Software Engineer and Technologist. However, I continued my academic studies while I worked in industry and these studies eventually led to the discovery of the general theory of ultra-

efficient holonomic systems. This book is meant to be a summary of that whole line of research within the context of developing the general theory of worlds. In other words in the process of developing the theory I am still attempting to push the envelope of my ignorance. Hopefully this will lead to a lively presentation of my many different theoretical interests at least partially integrated into an overall framework.

If you are a specialist then you are probably going to have problems with this book. The only way of talking about these things is in terms of generalities that use knowledge from specialties as examples but look for broader explanatory contexts. In fact, we are looking at the broadest possible humanly accessible context: the world. And when we talk about worlds we are assuming that they are socially constructed. So this book contains a sometimes implicit and other times explicit sociological bias that sometimes appears as a full blown social theory which I call Social Phenomenology. Since worlds are intrinsically social it is necessary to have a fundamental sociological theory at the basis of any theory of worlds. In this way we get an integration between philosophical concerns and sociological concerns. The important point is that though the development of an explicit ontology we can connect these two motifs to the motif of technology and meta-technology. This produces a very deep and robust basis for a Worlds Theory. However, it also leads to theoretical intricacy. That is why there are many threads that must be interwoven within the compass of this book. Hopefully these threads will together form a coherent pattern, but there are bound to be some loose ends and some places where the synthesis produced here can only be suggestive for further thought and study by the reader.

So let us go then you and I, my imaginary reader, on this journey into the ocean of myriad upwelling worlds, each unique and bearing indications that we take

from the signs within each world

Social Phenomenology

The approach that we will consistently take in this series of essays is called Social Phenomenology. This approach asserts that the social fabric comes first, prior to anything else. It starts with the assumption that we are before anything else social beings. We are born from the interaction of social beings into a social ambiance which is the environment in which we acquire our individuality. This approach has been developed by other prior philosophers to a certain extent. But here we will make it a radical starting point. The whole theory of Emergent worlds along with the other schemas of comprehension will be considered to be socially constructed in the sense coined by Berger and Luckmann in The Social Construction of Reality. This approach was inaugurated by Husserl in Krisis and Fink in the Sixth Meditation. It was further developed by Merleau-Ponty, Levinas¹, and Statler². Here we will not lay out the history of the development of Social Phenomenology as a approach on phenomena. But rather we will assume this approach from the beginning and develop our own way of expressing it.

Deleuze and Guattari³ outline three levels of being:

- Desiring Machines (partial objects)
- Individual (body centered individualization)
- Socius (social field)

Desiring Machines are the equivalent of so called “partial objects” developed by Melaine

¹ Cf. Totality and Infinity

² Cf. Love and Existence

³ Cf. Anti-Oedipus and A Thousand Plateaus

Kline in Object Relations Theory. She pointed out that the child does not see the whole mother but relates only to the “breast” as a part of the mother. Deleuze and Guattari have generalized these partialities that occur between bodies as Desiring Machines. They note that Desiring Machines hang out of ‘the body without organs’ like medals and badges on a well decorated general. The ‘body without organs’ is their name for the unconscious. Desiring Machines arise orthogonally from the unconscious. If they are not orthogonal then there is some conscious contents associated with them. The ‘body without organs’ appears to have various intensities the lowest of which is the material world. The highest of these intensities is exhibited in schizophrenia. They call the exploration of these intensities schizoanalysis. At high intensities the unconscious fragments to encompass the migrations of whole nations. We might say that these migrations are the precursors to an even higher intensity which exemplifies itself in the ecstatic production of emergent worlds. Deleuze and Guattari posit that the individual centered on the body is an illusion that is socially constructed by the ideational individuation process. They hypothesize that at a fundamental level we are actually composed of desiring machines rhizomatically connected in the field of the socius. All Desiring Machines connect between bodies or within bodies or across bodies and the isolated individual that we see as separate from other individuals in Western Society is an illusion.

Although many aspects of Deleuze and Guattari’s social field theory is nihilistic in its radicalization of human experience, the recognition of the social field as *socius* as more basic than the individual will prove to be a key insight that we will use as a touch stone in what follows. We will use the theory of Coutu which identifies *Tendencies in Situations* (Tinsit) as the basic constituent of human relations. Our view will be closer to that of Statler who points out that

phenomenology and existentialism in general have a bias toward the individual. He explores the phenomena of love and shows that this phenomena points to something that is more basic than the existential angst of Heidegger and Sartre and the other individualistically oriented phenomenologists and existentialists. We will attempt to modify the extremism of Deleuze and Guattari by following the exposition of John S. Hans in The Play of the World. Hans locates the same philosophical strata as Deleuze and Guattari and identifies it with Play and Aesthetic experience. We see play as another phenomena like Statler’s love that shows us the primordial social field in action within our world that acts as a social fabric which binds us together prior to our individuation.

From perspective of this approach Husserl’s *problem of intersubjectivity* does not arise as a problem. We see Fink beginning to approach the solution by placing the transcendental intersubjective unity prior to the unity of the individuals transcendental subjectivity. This avenue was explored further by Merleau-Ponty who focused on the mother-child relation as the primordial social bond prior to the individuation of the subject. Levinas went further collapsing metaphysics and ethics together in the mutual bearing of the mother and child symbiosis. Sartre in Critique of Dialectical Reason and Cannetti in Crowds and Power focus on *the fused group* or the *pack* as the primal social group from which all reified social groups arise. Many different philosophers of this century have attempted to solve the *problem of intersubjectivity* one way or another. In this series of essays we will not consider this a problem any more but instead will start with the intersubjective cohort as our fundamental basis for approach to all phenomena and will explicitly develop our theory of worlds out of a social phenomenology. We will consider all individuation of isolated subjectivities or even ‘ecstatic beings’ such as Heidegger’s Dasein as epiphenomenal to the social field made up of desiring machines and

disseminating machines that exhibit tendencies in situations. Coutu still thought of individuals as exhibiting tinsits. But instead we do not believe that individuals exist except as social constructions of rhizomatic desiring and disseminating machines within the socius. Individuation is a culture proclivity exhibited by Western culture that is projected on all other cultures as it exerts colonial dominance. This peculiarity is not necessary endemic to the human condition. Once we recognize that the social is fundamental then many of the problems that arise with subjectivity and individuation vanish. One of those problems that vanish, as Fink realized, is *the problem of intersubjectivity*. It is replaced by the problem of subjectivity instead, but that problem now becomes world historical because it is recognized that it is a peculiarity of the Western culture which is not shared by all cultures.

When we consider the social field as the fundamental substrate for all phenomena then what becomes evident is that all the schemas for understanding are standing waves within that field. In other words, the field itself supports many different regimes of patterning at various levels of complexity and that these schemas are all articulations of the same social field. The world is merely the coarsest grained of these schemas which we can directly experience. Our theory of Emergent Worlds must encompass all the different schemas that arise in the social fabric for comprehending things at various levels of granularity. The worlds theory is merely the articulation that encompasses all other nested articulations of the schemas of comprehension. Worlds arise spontaneously within the social fabric, as do the other finer grained articulations. This spontaneous self-organization of the schemas at various levels is the focus of our theory of Emergent Worlds.

We balance the concept of the Desiring Machines defined by Deleuze and Guattari

with the concept of the Disseminating Machines⁴. Disseminating machines are the inverse of the Desiring Machines. They are sources of information/energy that the Desiring Machines latch onto and suck up. The landscape that encompasses the rhizome of the Desiring Machines can be seen as what Holland calls a complex adaptive system⁵. Such a landscape must have sources of resources that the desiring machines need. The networks of desiring machines which only concern themselves with *what works* or with *hows* must secure the resources that maintain their viability. This is done by hooking onto Disseminating machines which are fountains of energy, matter, information or some combination thereof. Deleuze and Guattari do not speak of disseminating machines because despite their call for the end of Psychoanalysis through the cancellation with Marxian economics, they did not realize the fact that the unconscious is dual. X's analysis in The Production of Desire goes right to the point by identifying the dual unconscious: i.e. the interior unconscious of Freud which is opposed to the exterior and structural unconscious that produces Alienation that Marx identified. As X shows the Freudians do not recognize the external Alienating social structural unconsciousness and the Marxians do not recognize the internal subjective unconscious of the Freudians. But it solves many problems if we recognize that the unconscious is inherently dual and that duality is defined in terms of the relation between the individual and the social. In other words there is a *body without organs* which is the body of the individual and another *body without organs* that is the social body. These are two bodies without organs that are bifurcated and separate. One operates within all individuals and the other operates outside of all individuals. But both

⁴ This terminology and the realization that disiring machines have a dual is due to Aiyub Palmer, UCLA freshman.

⁵ Cf The Hidden Order

are reflexive. In other words the *inner body without organs* reflects the outward and we call that the collective unconscious as discovered by Jung. The outer *body without organs* reflects the inward and we call that the mythic absolute past from which the “history that never was” emanates. If we get cut off from the inner *body without organs* the result is anomie, i.e. meaninglessness, while when we are cut off from the outward *body without organs* the result is alienation. The inward unconscious is a connection with everyone within the social field. The outward unconscious is a separation between everyone in the social field. By recognizing the inherent complementarity between the inward unconscious of everyone with the outward unconscious of everyone we clear the way to recognize the Disseminating Machines as opposite the Desiring Machines. Disseminating Machines exist in the environment of the social field external to any particular Desiring Machines. The labor is not just stolen from the individual by the capitalist system but produces channels of information, energy or materials or flows. Deleuze and Guattari analyze the flows but do not seem to recognize that the flows must emanate from something other than the Desiring Machines. Disseminating Machines are the sources of the flows. By latching onto those flows Desiring Machines establish and maintain their viability.

Much of the work of this series of essays will hinge on the description of the field of the social in terms of the relations between desiring machines and disseminating machines. We see this relationship as establishing a “general economy” within the social field in the sense that Bataille⁶ uses the world which is the opposite of a restricted economy. Individuals as social constructs are attempts to produce restricted economies within the social field of interacting disseminating and desiring machines. For simplicities sake we anchor our view of the

⁶ Cf. [Accursed Share](#)

world to the bodies of individuals rather than to the social groups that arise and vanish into the social field. The reification of the individual obscures our view of the disseminating and desiring machines that well up within the social fabric. In the general economy these false restricted economies break down and are continually merging into the general economy. Within the general economy we see the desiring machines as nodes in an autopoietic system. We see the disseminating machines as aspects of the niches of the ecological system of which the autopoietic system is a part. Niches are a conjunction of resources (informational, energetic, or material) and the space to reside for the autopoietic system. The flows that Deleuze and Guattari speaks of as being channeled by the Savage, Barbaric and Capitalist regimes appear from the disseminating machines which are producing the *accursed share* or surplus that allows the desiring machines to organize themselves and maintain their organization as a self production. A great deal of our effort will be expended attempting to understand the nature of the general economy which we will call meta-systems and their relation to systems that inhabit them and maintain their viability in the context of those eco-systems of niches.

Metaphysics

We are operating within the Western Philosophical and Scientific tradition. Therefore we must begin by dealing with the fundamental assumptions that appear in that tradition. One of those assumptions deals with the projection of duality upon the world. When we transitioned from the mytho-poietic stage of the unfolding of the Western worldview to the metaphysical two fundamental dualistic dichotomies arose. The first of these was inaugurated by Thales and refined by Anaxamander. This was the distinction between the transcendental metaphysical principle and the immanent

domain governed by that principle. Thales said that it was the Water of life that was the transcendental metaphysical principle that dominated everything. Anaxamander suggested instead that it was the Unlimited (Apeiron) which dominated the limited (peiron). Anaxamenes went on to suggest that the most fundamental principle should be instead Air (the pneuma of life). What is important here was the basic dualistic split between the transcendental metaphysical principle and what it dominates. Prior to the metaphysical era this distinction was never made with respect to things. Instead the distinction was between the immortal gods and mortals. A second split was posited between heaven and earth. These two distinctions taken together defined the mythopoetic world according to Socrates. After the advent of the metaphysical there were still two fundamental distinctions that were arrayed against one another. But prior to the phase transition between eras of the worldview these distinctions had a different configuration and meaning to that that appeared after the phase transition. Before it was humans verses the gods while after it was humans verses things. Before it was heaven and earth that were distinguished while after these were fused into the limited and opposed to a transcendent principle that was independent of both heaven and earth. In the book The Fragmentation of Being and the Path Beyond the Void I deal in detail with this shift in perspectives that caused us to enter a new epoch in our Western worldview⁷. The point is that once we made this transition, everything is analyzed with respect to the dominate metaphysical principle. Parmenides suggested that this principle should be Being, i.e. a special aspect of Indo-European language that indicates persistence. This suggestion held sway and has influenced the entire history of the development of the metaphysical era within the Western tradition. The lone voice counter to this was that of Heraclitus who

⁷ Cf Hatab

pointed to the fact that change, not persistence, was the most prevalent characteristic of manifestation and that flux should be taken as the Metaphysical principle not persistence. However, most philosophers followed the lead of Parmenides and used Being as the metaphysical touchstone. But it is important to realize that other suggestions were made before the linguistic turn toward Being.

After we have established the split between Apeiron and Peiron then the Peiron again splits into Logos and Physis. Logos is the upwelling of speech both between people and as thought within people. Physis is the upwelling and unfolding of things in terms of growth. Either Physis or Logos may be taken as dominate within the Peiron. Materialism is the result of the dominance of physis and Idealism is the result of the dominance of Logos. This fundamental split sets the stage for the debate concerning substance. Is substance something material or something ideal? Kant eventually proposed a compromise which turned the three dualistic principles into transcendentals. The transcendental subject is the source of the upwelling of Logos, the transcendental object (noumena) is the locus of the physical and God as the infinite transcendental provides the coherence between these two fundamentally different views of things. Understanding is confined to the intersection of reason and experience. Reason alone cannot be a source of knowledge as previous dogmatic philosophers had thought. Thus, it is only when there is interaction between the realm of logos and physis that real knowledge can be gained. This was the first recognition that Logos and Physis need to work together and mere domination of one or the other is fruitless.

Husserl accepted the transcendental framework set up by Kant. But he had the idea of looking at experience itself as the basis of his philosophy. He was the first

philosopher to explicitly describe experience while attempting to limit the effects of his projection of his assumptions about experience. When Husserl did that he discovered something very important. This is the fact that essences are different from ideas and that essences, or kinds of things, are not merely simple ideas. Thus, induction and deduction do not apply to essences. That discovery was the basis for a metaphysical revolution. This revolution has been occurring all during this century in Continental Philosophy and has been largely either misunderstood or ignored by Analytical Philosophy which has dominated in the United States and United Kingdom. Thus it is little realized that a fundamental metaphysical revolution has occurred in this century. It revolves around the fact that essences have a different kind of Being than ideas. Ideas are frozen snapshots and abstract glosses. Essences describe an unfolding, like the unfolding that appears there in the root meanings of both *Physis* and *Logos*. *Physis* means not just physical things but their growth. It does not just mean language but speeches that upwell either within us or in the social field. So this upwelling, growth, unfolding of both *physis* and *logos* appears in the term *essence* and does not appear in the term *idea*.

Heidegger took this distinction between the ontological foundation of essence and that of idea as the basis for his formulation of a new ontology in *Being and Time*. In that work he distinguishes between Being independent of time and Being fused with Time. The former modality of Being is the basis of ideas and the latter is the basis of essences. In this philosophy Heidegger focuses on the essence of Man which ecstatically projects being-in-the-world. The essence of Man lies in his ecstasy, projecting outward the stasis of Being from man's dynamic locus as 'dasein', *being there* in the world. Heidegger defined the monolith of Being as containing a static mode and a dynamic mode corresponding to the difference between the essence and the

idea. These harkened back to the views of Parmenides and Heraclitus' different visions of the metaphysical principle. This freed ontology from the need for the framework set up by Kant because now with the new modality we could cross out of the realm of understanding without breaking the boundaries set by tying reason to experience. This also opened up a Pandora's box in which different kinds of metaphysical principles could arise at different meta-levels of Being. A progression occurred where step by step different meta-physical levels were identified by different philosophers, manytimes using different terms for the same meta-level of Being. The author has attempted to sort out this confusion in his Dissertation at University of London, London School of Economics called The Structure of Theoretical Systems in Relation to Emergence submitted and accepted in 1982. First it was merely different modes of Being, but then a radical difference was identified that gave rise to three kinds of Being and finally these were discovered to have their own integrity so that a fourth kind of Being became evident. This sequence of the unfolding of the different integral kinds of Being gave birth to four meta-levels of Being which will give us a basis for exploring the inner patterning of our worldview. This development in Ontology burst the old Kantian idealism and pushed the limits of what is knowable in our world back to make it a much more complex place to inhabit.

In this series of essays we will explore this development as a basis for understanding what shape our worldview takes. Understanding the four kinds of Being is an important prerequisite to any theory of worlds, especially a theory of emergent world because it is the four kinds of Being that define genuine emergence. This was a major finding of the research that led to my Ph.D. which is recorded in my dissertation. The definition of something that emerges within our worldview, i.e. the unheard-of and radically new is that it must pass through all

four meta-levels of Being as it traverses the path of manifestation from nothing into full Being. Thus emergent worlds are those that fully embody the four kinds of Being as a synthesis.

Non-Duality

We posit that although there are four different meta-levels of Being that there is no fifth meta-level. The fifth meta-level is unthinkable and thus may be interpreted as corresponding to SUNYATA (Buddhist Emptiness). Thus the metaphysics that flows out of the discovery of the meta-levels of Being is empirical due to the fact that it may be tested by anyone who is willing to try to think the fifth meta-level. If a fifth meta-level were discovered it would deepen our appreciation of our world. But the Author posits a theory that says that the World has a finite depth in terms of the meta-levels that we can experience. In that I follow the argument of Gregory Bateson in Steps to the Ecology of the Mind in which he shows how the concept of motion and learning both have finite series of meta-conceptual levels. Since motion is a basic component of the physis and learning is a basic component of logos it is believed that what is true for these components is also true of the world that encompasses the two aspects of the limited and the principle of the unlimited. Being is the principle of the unlimited. Being itself is articulated into the meta-level layers of Being. But that articulation is not infinite but instead stops at a precipice of the unthinkable. We can easily identify the unthinkable with emptiness in the sense that the Buddhists use the term defined by Nargarguna the Mahayana Logician. It is however admitted that there are other interpretations. However, we use one stemming from the Indo-European worldview itself. Buddhists were part of the Indo-European worldview but found a way out of the nihilistic conundrums that occur due to the positing of Being as an ultimate. The

Buddha found that these conundrums fell away as soon as one embraced the concept of Emptiness as the absolute middle of all opposites. He leaves the assertions of the metaphysicians and does not respond to them as the articulation of emptiness produces a viable alternative with great subtlety and depth. The realization that the meta-level articulation of the metaphysical principle of Being is finite, which signals the facticity of our own finitude, allows us to rediscover the same thing the Buddha discovered in terms that they can be understood in the Western branch of the Indo-European worldview. In this branch the law of excluded middle limits severely what can be thought and thus the sophistication of our reasoning. But if we adopt the view of the Indian Logicians that does not recognize the excluded middle proposed by Aristotle then we can very precisely define emptiness as Nagarjuna does. In the Western branch things are either **A** or **not-A** and anything in between is labeled absurd. In the Eastern branch of the Indo-European worldview two other forms of postulates were approved **both A and not-A** and **neither A nor not-A**. Nagarjuna defined emptiness as the difference between these last two propositions hidden in the excluded middle.

Non-dual philosophies accept as did the Indian Logicians and also the Buddhists logicians that followed in their footsteps that the middle needs to be included and it is precisely there that emptiness is found. The acceptance of the included middle allows us to formulate non-dualistic philosophies including those that are based on emptiness which are the deepest of these. We intend to follow this direction ourselves but in a context of Western Philosophy by the articulation of the bridge to the non-dual possibility through the finitude of the levels of Being. Thus we provide a deeper theory of worlds than would otherwise be possible. The most radical possibility is the emergence of worlds out of the void. We take this possibility as the touchstone of our

philosophy. Thus the most radical emergent worlds theory is that where the worlds unfold from out of emptiness and then fold up and vanish again into that emptiness. Emptiness itself is precisely defined as the orthogonal and non-interfering disconnection between emergent worlds. In the theory we propose this process of unfolding and folding up of worlds occurs over and over again so that we in fact achieve a vision of the plurality of myriad worlds similar to that which has been posited as an alternative to the standard theory in quantum mechanics by Hugh Everett (1956).

Approaches

There are several basic approaches in Humanism that have been developed over the last century. We identify five basic ones:

- Structuralism/Semiotics
- Hermeneutics
- Phenomenology
- Ontology
- Dialectics

Ontology is the study of the basic substrate upon which all these other approaches depend. Ontology as we will define it is the study of the different kinds of Being in the world and how the projection of the world is accomplished as a social construction with that specific articulation. Hermeneutics studies significance and meaning within the world, Phenomenology studies essences of forms, Structuralism and Semiotics study the internal structure of forms and their referents. Dialectics studies wholes and parts and the role of negation. But all of these approaches lead us to consider again the Being of the things that they study. Each of these approaches in a different way

introduces distance between the observer and the thing under study. Thus we question this distancing and follow Z who posits that there must be an approach that does not distance the observer from the observed. This other approach is called Heuristic Research. That is a method that allows the subject to identify with the object of study and completely fuse with it in order to gain greater understanding of the phenomenon in question. We will apply all these different methodologies but will reserve the right to apply Heuristic Research as a fundamental approach as well. We apply it especially when we look at the world because it is impossible to distance ourselves from our world. So for ontology heuristic research is the only possible approach that does not distort the object of study. However, we must continuously resort to pulling away from this encompassing by the world through application of the other Humanistic approaches as well occasionally because both complete fusion and complete distancing are nihilistic opposites of each other and the non-dual alternative lies between these extremes. However, it should be clear that this is a non-traditional approach to the subject which does not accept normal academic conventions that assume the validity only of distancing from the object of study.

In fact it is the assumption of the value of distancing that led the first existential phenomenologists to eschew the social phenomenological approach. For Cennetti, Heidegger and Sartre there was a fundamental distrust of group movements caused by the phenomena of mob violence. Sartre focuses upon the moment of the mob taking things into their own hands in the French Revolution. Cennetti explicitly explores the dynamics of Crowds that in a moment may come into existence as a super-human and irrational force. Heidegger talks about the immersion into Das Mann (the They) by Dasein immersed in Mitsein and how we must pull away from that into isolation via the contemplation of death to

become authentic. Thus the distancing from the social was the prerequisite for the consideration of the basic structure of the world in these and other cases. The fact is that the world is fundamentally encompassing and we cannot distance ourselves from it in any meaningful way. The world is also inherently social. It is a major step forward that Statler made to realize that the world has modalities in which we experience it as WE rather than I and that these are more basic than the experiences in isolation. Thus the experiences without distance are more fundamental than those with distance. Those experiences are predominately social and in fact are non-dual.

We are continually going into trance when we focus on some aspect of our existence that touches on our finitude. For instance we go into trance when we eat, have sex, get dressed, converse, read a book. All these are social phenomena related directly to our finitude. We normally eat with others, have sex with others, dress for others to look at, talk to others, read what others have written. In all these cases we are confronted with the finitude of our beings in very specific ways and we react to that by going into trance. The experience of trance is non-duality in action. Our dualistic world is projected upon the various trance states surrounding our discovery of our finitude. There is an intrinsic little recognized relation between trance, sociality, and non-dual experience of immersion in the world. When we are immersed non-dually in the world it is no different from **us**, and here the '*us*' is emphasized. This social world of trance in which we blend completely into the world is the primordial state out of which we construct the world as separate from us and ourselves as separate from the world. We do this by building socially acceptable non-trance states which transcend our finitude and exist as dualities supported by the dualistic metaphysics that we project on our world.

So the studies in this book are based on a Heuristic Research like entry into this non-duality and its comparison with the dual states that are constructed in opposition to it. This is accomplished by the trick of disengaging the interaction of the mobile of traditional metaphysics. That mobile relates the metaphysical principle to the limited and within the limited relates the physis to the logos by some dominance relation. If we disengage these aspects of the metaphysical mobile from each other we discover the non-dual aspects in the difference between the dualisms. Between physis and logos we discover the non-dual nomos (order). Between the Apeiron and Peiron we discover the non-dual RTA (Asa, Right). These non-dual moments appear in the reversibility of the chiasmic relation between the dualities. Within the social field there is an upwelling of order that structures that field at various levels of understanding in specific schemas. Those schemas are ontological templates for understanding. They are opposed to the appearance of ontic levels of emergent order that appear in the physis. When these two different emergent schemas are brought together they either fit or not. If they fit then we see that as Right in the original sense of RTA which meant cosmic harmony. It is the social field that is articulated as ontic and ontological emergent levels and it is in the social field that the interference of these different kinds of emergent patterns interact. The social field itself defines the limits of our world as the world is merely the molar articulation of the field itself at the highest humanly accessible granularity. The social field itself holds the individuals entranced. We socially construct ways of leaving that trance but we are always brought back to it when we experience our finitude. That trance is our encompassment by our world and all analysis and synthesis must begin by recognizing the primordial nature of our immersion in our social world. When we say social construction we are always referring to the socially condoned departure from the common trance world by individuals

applying dualistic models of their own selves and the selves of others. But this departure can only be sustained for a short period of time as we are continually drawn back to the primordial ground of the spontaneous social ordering of the world and ourselves within it.

In this essay we attempt to untangle the strands of the emergent layers within the world in order to provide a coherent theory of the emergence of worlds themselves. Worlds have the inherent patterning of their own emergence built into them. This patterning appears as the different kinds of Being but also ramifies down the various nested layers that make up our full view of what lies within the world and how that relates to the physis and logos. Hopefully at the end we will understand not just the form of the world in this metaphysical era but also will have some insight into the fundamental changes since the advent of the metaphysical out of the mythopoietic. However there are a series of necessary steps we must go through before it will be possible to understand this intrinsic structuring of the worldview and how that has transformed from one era to the next. But in the process we will be wondering what the next fundamental transformation of our Western Worldview might be.

The Inner Coherence of the World

In this series of essays we will focus on a very special formation which was discovered by the author that makes sense of the inner structuring of the world. The understanding of this special formation will be the major objective of these meditations for it holds the secret of the inner coherence of the world. We ask the reader to pay close attention to this argument for it is very sophisticated and easily misunderstood. This is because the theory itself must be couched in a non-dualistic form which mirrors the form of the world itself. Thus it can only really be understood if you allow yourself to enter the trance prior to the unfolding of the world and

then allow the world to unfold again in yourself. We are the sites of the upwelling of myriad worlds and these worlds collapse into each other leaving behind the residue of the designated as real or designated as true worlds. We want to produce a model of this upwelling and collapse that makes possible the comprehension of how there could be myriad plural universes right before us. We posit that the trance state is identical to the state of quantum mechanics prior to the dualistic observation and that the world that we live in is quantum mechanical at the macro level. We do not see that because we are continually constructing ourselves as objective observers or as subjects. This prevents us from seeing the world as quantum mechanical at its grossest level and forces on us the Copenhagen interpretation. Similarly the world is inherently relativistic and we only see non-relativism when we make observation of clocks as objective observers or subjects. Heidegger produced his monolithic theory of Being that encompasses the modes of Parmenides and Heraclitus in an overarching whole in order to solve the problems of Relativity Theory and Quantum Mechanics. Heidegger wanted to be a Physicist prior to becoming a philosopher. This was his second choice after Theology. He was well aware of the problems confronted by physics in his day produced by the emergence of quantum mechanical theory. Heidegger posited that the ready-to-hand or the mode in which Being and Time were mixed was the state in which the quantum mechanical superimposition of states occurred and that only when we shifted to the present-at-hand or the dualistic mode did the probabilistic quantum mechanical wave form collapse. Similarly in Relativity Theory he implied that the different inertial frames of reference appeared in the present-at-hand while the Lorenz Transformation occurred across the ready-to-hand. This is how we can have local coherent states that are present-at-hand but global incoherent states that are ready-to-hand. We can project the present-at-hand onto the ready-to-hand

via the Lorenz Transformation. The difference between these two dual physical science views is that one sees the interaction of the present-at-hand with the ready-to-hand as something determinate while the other sees it as probabilistic. Because determinacy is a characteristic of the present-at-hand and probabilistic indeterminacy is a characteristic of the ready-to-hand then we might see the difference between relativity theory and quantum mechanics as two viewpoints on the interaction of the two modalities. Quantum Mechanics sees it from the viewpoint of the ready-to-hand while Relativity Theory sees it from the view of the present-at-hand. The present-at-hand modality itself without any account of the ready-to-hand is what is called Newtonian Physics. Newtonian Physics attempts to produce a static deterministic picture of physical phenomena based on the calculus. When this present at hand view interacts with ready-to-hand views then anomalies appear. We can see these anomalies in the interaction either determinately or indeterminately. If we see them as indeterminate we get Quantum Mechanics. If we see them determinately then we get special relativity theory. The world in which both relativity theory and quantum mechanics are both true at the same time is the pure ready-to-hand without any interaction with the present at hand.

When we take into account the other meta-levels of Being this initial solution of Heidegger becomes even more interesting. The monolith of Being breaks down with the introduction of what Michael Henry calls The Essence of Manifestation. That essence is purely immanent and never appears as transcendent. We see it as what Derrida calls DifferAnce, i.e. the differing and deferring of ~~Being~~ (crossed out or under erasure). When we can no longer distinguish immanence from transcendence we have entered yet another kind of Being called Wild Being by Merleau-Ponty in The Visible and the Invisible. Successively the monolith of Being breaks down first by exhibiting modes of

pointing and grasping, then by exhibiting kinds as we distinguish the distinction between modes as another kind of Being. Then finally we discover that not only are their different kinds but they have different integrities as we reach beyond the essence of Being toward the limit of our ability to distinguish at the level of chaotic order in disorder and disorder in order that exists within the substance of Being itself.

The substance of the world is Being and that substance is no longer like ether, but instead we have discovered that it as a peculiar meta-level structure which is necessary to understand in order to comprehend the fundamental patterning of the Western worldview. That inherent patterning gives us an insight stages of unfolding of emergence. The inherent patterning of the world determines the process of emergence and the process of emergence determines the structure of our world. The production of multiple worlds follows the same patterning giving the pluriverse coherence. This intimate connection between the kinds of Being, the structure of the world, and the phenomena of emergence within the western worldview will be explored in depth in this series of working papers. Out of that confluence we will attempt to build a general theory of emergent worlds based on the internal fragmentation of Being. In the process we will go deeply into the inner structure of our worldview in order to discover how that worldview can give rise to myriads of worlds and how myriads of worlds can give rise to an apparently unified worldview. The unfolding of that tale is a fascinating intellectual adventure which the author invites you to participate in as his companion.

Teaching

There are levels of Teaching. The first level is that on which we can easily recognize the teacher and the taught by the transfer of knowledge in one direction. But

there is a second level where the teacher discovers that he is indeed the taught as he learns more than his students in the act of teaching. But beyond that there is the level where in process of mutual exploration the roles of teacher and taught are exchanged by the participants and where the teacher becomes just a facilitator in that process of exchange. Beyond that there is the level at which all the participants become the taught as knowledge that none of them had before streams apparently from nowhere.

In this book we strive for the highest level of teaching where knowledge spontaneously appears in the midst of our dialogue. This only happens in a deep conversation which begins as a discussion between participants but ends up a dialogue between ourselves and existence. Let us pray that such an opening occurs in the midst of this work that we engage in together.