ADVANCED WORLD THEORY FOR WORLD ENGINEERS

Chapter 4 of the Anti-thesis

Kent D. Palmer, Ph.D.

P.O. Box 1632
Orange CA 92856 USA
714-633-9508
palmer@exo.com

Keywords:

World, Schema, Meta-system, System, Process, Engineering

Summary:

None yet.

A Deeper World Theory

In the last chapter we have established the local context in which we must understand schemas theory which has to do with the duality between physus and logos. But there is a broader context with which we well attempt to deal in this chapter of the anti-thesis, as part of our stage setting. The duality dealt with most recently between physus and logos has an implicit and implicate order between the two duals which we call non-dual. Order is what allows logos to develop theories about the physus that are significant. Order is the go between that acts as a marriage broker between the two. But this is just one duality in a whole unfolding series of dualisms that inform the worldview, each of which carries with it an implicit or implicate duality. In order to have an understanding of schema theory we must understand this underlying hierarchy of duals and their non-dual counterparts. But this is a point where the schemas turn round on themselves because what we are describing when we look at these dualities and their implicit inner relations is an aspect of the world schema. In other words, in some strange way the schemas contain within themselves their own foundation. We know this from Nietzsche and Heidegger that the grounds of everything is groundlessness. But it is strange to see an example of that self-bootstraping pop up here in the realm of schemas. However, it is something that we must deal with if we want to understand schemas. Schemas are just one aspect along with logic and math of the articulation of the inner relations between physus and logos. But when we start to delve into the series of dualites that spring out of the logos/physus pair and underlie it then we are immediately involved in defining not just a particular schema, the world, but also one historical example, the western worldview. Other worldviews may not have this structure. But for sure the Western worldview has a particular structure of dualities informed by non-dual intermediates. Also this has not always been the case. It is the case in the meta-physical era of the Western worldview but a different set of dualites reigned over the mythopoietic era. This is a case of our factical historicity as Heidegger calls it. We are totally embedded in the Western worldview of our time and we find it difficult to understand either other worldviews or other eras of our own worldview so immersed are we in this worldview which is part of us as we are part of it. It is our water as if we were fish, it is our air as if we were

birds, it is the medium of our lifeworld and it is practically invisible to us yet it permeates everything we are and have and do. So we need to delve into this hierarchy of the schema of the world in order to understand the nature of our world which grounds our concept of schemas of which the world is a primary example. It is somewhat like an Escher drawing that turns inside out as we look from one point to another in the overall scene. In other words the relation between the schemas are what Aczel calls non-well-founded, i.e. a set CAN be a member of itself, contrary to Russell's dictum to the contrary. Here we are violating the principles of Higher Logical Type Theory, but for good reason. Since the world is the schema that is the ultimate horizon of our experience, called by Husserl the lifeworld, it should contain the basic structures that ground the other schemas, some of which nest into the world and others of which overflow it. The schemas in general are an ecstasy, as Heidegger would say of our projections of things. They nest into each other and in some cases overflow the horizons above the world or below the pattern. But even these overflowings appear as representations within the world, the ultimate horizon of experience. So the key schema is that which contains all the others even those nominally that go beyond it. Heidegger intuited that when he used the World as the basis for his analysis in <u>Being and Time </u>rather than the Form as Husserl did. Heidegger in that intuition leaped far beyond what Husserl had foreseen. Later phenomenologists filled in the blanks between form and world as when Gurwitch added the Gestalt which in our view is synonymous with the system schema. We have ourselves added the meta-system and domain schemas and then recognized the world schema and what lies beyond that.

Here is a good place to talk about how you recognize schemas. Our own approach has been to generalize from schemas that have struggled to be established in the last century. For instance there is the whole structuralist movement which attempted to establish a pattern schema below the form. And there is in philosophy the world schema that Heidegger drew attention to. And of course there is the system schema that has been the subject of General Systems Theory. In other words we have watched academics of various persuasions attempt to establish several different schemas, and watched the confusion as proponents of different schemas talk past one another as they discuss issues from different fundamental analytical positions advocating one schema as the end all and be all four understanding some particular phenomena. We think that what has happened in Systems Theory should happen vis a vis each schema, i.e. it needs to be generalized out of the disciplines into a particular form that then can be used as a template of understanding in all the disciplines. Systems Theory has come the furthest in this regard. But we jump ahead of these efforts to recognize schemas theory as an even more general discipline that encompasses all the templates of understanding so generalized away from the various concrete sciences. But this generalization itself is founded on the schema of the world which has its own particular structure in this timeframe within the Western worldview. Thus we loop the loop and find ourselves looking at our own backs because the world is a particular schema among schemas as well as a grounds for the articulation of all schemas. The phenomenology of the lifeworld is a prerequisite for the articulation of all schemas. Yet due to the ecstatic nature of our fundamental *being* we overflow that schema in the projection of schemas beyond that and within that that go beyond our experience. This overflowing is part of the facticity of our historicity, in other words we project schemas in concrete sciences first, then later we recognize the same schema in various concrete disciplines. Much later we discover that the schemas can be described independently of any specific discipline. This is key. If a schema cannot be described

independently and seen reflected in various disciplines then it is a concrete theory, not a schema. Theory means view. A schema is something that underlies and informs the views of theory. A schema is an approach, not assumptions which defines a paradigm. The series of schemas are orthogonal to the set of individual and social differentiations that we will discuss now. These differentiations include on the one hand given, fact, theory, paradigm, episteme, ontos, existence, absolute *and* on the other hand data, information, knowledge, wisdom, etc. In other words the understandings that are gained of the world by bouncing schemas off of things in themselves are encapsulated at both and individual and social level. These interleaved hierarchies of social and individual responses are orthogonal to the schemas or the ontic emergent hierarchies discovered by science. The ontological hierarchy of schemas arise from the pressure of reductionism, while the ontic hierarchy of emergent phenomena arises from the pressure of skepticism. The individual and social hierarchies arise from the pressure of nihilism.

There are really four hierarchies: ontic, ontological, social and individual. Where the ontic is related to Physus and the ontological is related to Logos, the social and the individual hierarchies are related to a deeper dichotomy that underlies the logos/physus split which is the split between the finite and infinite. Physus and logos are both exemplifications of the finite, but cast against this in the metaphysical era is the Apiron, the unlimited proclaimed by Anaximander. We not interpret that metaphysically as Being which we take to be the absolute following Parmenides. But this more fundamental split produces a gap which the series of social and individual hierarchical stations span. This more fundamental dualism has its own implicate and implicit non-dual which is Right that informs infinity and finitude in a way similar to how order informs both physus and logos. Right means both the right

way of doing something and also the right handed or dominant. Right is the spirit of the law as opposed to the letter of the law. It is a boundary past which when we pass it we spill over into hubris. But as such it is a distinction that is very difficult to draw. Rightness is related to the fundamental Indo-European principle of cosmic harmony, RTA that is seen in the Vedas. We talk of doing what is "right" by which we mean, not just what we are suppose to do but what is ultimately appropriate in the circumstances regardless of what the laws say. Rights are things that are assumed to be unalienable to the human being, but in fact are something that we have fought over throughout human history that has dualistically delineated slavery verses freemen, men verses women, and various other designations that has given rights to one group over the other throughout our history. We appeal to rights and what is right, and what is right handed or dominant continually in our civil discourse. And this has a bearing on schemas because we impose the schema as a template of understanding on things-in-themselves and we need to know what is the right amount of projection and to what extent we need to let the things in themselves speak for themselves. The things in themselves are another class of dominated things which struggle to be free, and partially are emancipated in the process of science, which also tortures them as Bacon put it. In other words, what rights do the things in themselves have. Are we to be deep ecologists and let them alone giving them the full rights with humans, or are we to dominate things as we have done each other recently in our history when we imposed slavery on Africans for example. Yet again even though science tortures the physus in order to pry from it its secrets, this is also a way of listening to the things in themselves and what they have to say to us beyond what we can understand within the limits of our current ways of approaching things. Sometimes giving something its voice is tantamount to torture if it is reticent to speak. So rightness has to do with our ownership of

the things we torture under the inquisition of science. But it also has to do with the degree to which we project and how much we allow the things to speak for themselves. And it also hearkens back to the cosmic harmony (*rta*) between man and nature that is established when the schemas are well fitted to the phenomena that we see. Being is the metaphysical principle which we identify with the transcendent, that we project on the finite. Being can be seen as projection itself, and infinity as the overspilling of that projection onto the world. Finitude can be thought of as containment of that overspilling projection. Too much finitude is entrapment and encompassing reification. Too much infinitude bursts all bounds. What is just right we need to intuit, i.e. the non-dual between finite and infinite, or immanent and transcendent. The inner teleonomy of the schemas is the approach of the right fit between our templates of understanding and the things-themselves. Balancing these two extremes determines whether our science progresses or dies. When science goes beyond this fittingness it becomes metaphysics. When it does not go far enough it reduces to scientism, i.e. a form of religion that worships science itself which no longer makes actual progress in adequating the logos and the physus.

We can go deeper. For below this level of limited and unlimited with the non-dual of rightness, there is a deeper level, that has to do with having and not-having with the non-dual of goodness. Both transcendence and immanence are something we can have as opposed to what we cannot have. Necessity for instance is what we must have. On the other hand contingency is what we might have. In both transcendence and immanence the question is how fare should we go with what we own, what we can torture, but this must be contrast with what we cannot have, what we are not allowed to torture. For instance at this time we can only torture those things in our own solar system with our instruments. The speed of light as it stands

makes this contingency of localization seem as if it is based on a necessity. So within our realm of influence the question is what is good enough, what is good for us and good for them. We need to ask not just how far should we go with our torture of things in themselves, but whether this torture is good for us and good for them of the things we have and how is that standard applied with respect to the things we cannot have. We can consider the things in themselves goods. How shall we distribute them? By our nature there is inherent variety in human beings and their productions. Some things are good for one person and bad for another. And then as Nietzsche says this dialectic between good and bad is transformed sometimes by the priesthood, ascetics, into a nihilistic differentiation between good and evil. Nietzsche points out that values are the basis of everything, and his great discovery was that no one had before him asked about the value of values. For Nietzsche the prime directive was life enhancing. What served the enhancement of life was good, and what detracted from life was bad, or evil. But value is a way of declaring what is good, for you. It is a reification of virtues, and virtue comes from the same root as *wir* which means man. Man is the measure of all things, or is he? Plato would say no, it is the Good that is the measure of all things. Man is just one thing among all the things, and what is good for all things is not necessarily good for man and vice versa. Understanding the Good, as the production of variety, the cornucopia, crucial to the comprehension of the schemas, because it is through the schemas that we get the good of things. The schemas are our fittingness to the things. Unless we fit the things we cannot derive good from them. Good is what is transmitted across the interface between ourselves and the things we seek to understand. And Plato tells us that the Good is a non-representable intelligible. Unlike order and right the Good cannot be represented.

Beyond the good is another dual which is

existence verses non-existence and the non-dual between them is fate. Fate is a primary Indo-European concept. And it is implicated in schema theory as well. A schema is an inner coherence of a gaze which we project on the world. But which schema is projected is a question of fate. Man is fated, i.e. he lives as mortal, and as Heidegger says it is from this mortality we derive our authenticity. Fate relates to our own, mortality, it determines whether or not we follow our dharma, what is right for us, and whether we derive good from our lives. Fate determines the things we cannot avoid in our lives. Part of what we cannot avoid is projection. We are fated to be ecstatic and project the schemas. And we are fated moment by moment to project this schema or that schema on the things in themselves. By that moment to moment projection we subtly predetermine our responses. What exists and what does not exist determines the starting position for our projections, and beyond that for our actions in response to what is seen through our projections. This deck of cards we are dealt is part of our fate, but also the way we play it and how the game turns out. There are certain ways the deck are stacked against us, and those subtle prestackings of the deck are also part of our fate. Yet overall the fact we are human means we will project in ecstasy the world and that together with the finitude of the projection process is part of our fate as humans.

Beyond existence/non-existence and the non-dual fate, there is a deeper level which we call actualization/non-actualization with its non-dual sources. This is the level that Plato is talking about in his theory of sources, where he talks about the sources of things, like the Beautiful. Something originates at the point where it can be had. Not necessarily when it exists, because many planets exist out in space but we cannot have them, we can at this point only procure those from our own solar system. So existence and having give us a transition of an originary kind. So too the transition between manifestation and

actualization provide us with the impetus of sources. Manifestation and Non-manifestation are associated with the non-dual of the root of things in which everything is one thing. But the sources of different things separate, and at that point different things can be said to have different sources. Via the schemas we see the sources, because the same configuration may appear in different realms. Via the schemas we see these repeated configurations and by that get some insight into the sources, even though we may believe that beyond these sources there is a single source of all things, i.e. the root. In manifestation everything is really the same, but in actualization different sources give rise to different things, and that difference is good when it relates to the differences inherent in the human population. It is suddenly at the level of sources that we begin to see what schemas give us, the ability to project templates of understanding across different concrete disciplines that allow us to see resemblances which in turn alert us to different actualizations of different sources, in spite of the root similarity of all things at the deepest level. The sources are the means by which the things belong together, i.e. are the same within their mutual support and mutual differentiation. In the root all the sources blend together into a single sources beyond all the genera and species.

For instance, the horse had died out in the Americas, so the Indians had no good long range means of transportation. This was a fundamental determiner of their civilization. There is a Chinese proverb that the Horse is the hallmark of civilization, both its good and bad aspects. Much good and bad comes with the horse and how it is used by humans after it was genetically engineered by Indo-Europeans into a large animal out of its small beginnings. The horse had this possibility within it to be bred larger and larger into a very big animal. Not all animals have that possibility built into their natures that can be exploited by genetic manipulation. So the horse is a case study, they had to exist in

order for anyone to have them. They have a source that may not be realized by any concrete individuals, and part of that source is the things that they make possible that would not be possible otherwise, 'civilization' in the sense of a culture driven by warfare using horses. This intensification of warfare drove technological change in the part of the world where horses existed to create a threat to everyone who were within the reach of those who would use the technological leverage that the horse gave men. There are many means to power, at root they are all the same, but the horse has a particular source that dictates a particular kind of actualization of power, which can possessed if horses exist. Those who have horses also gain other power over people and land. Such colonialization allows some to take power from others and derive the good of possessions. They determine the rights of different groups of people and then impose what they think is right. Eventually this is solidified into law which gives order to society until at some point the laws come to rule over even the sovereign. Eventually the sovereign fades as the laws become based on constitutions such as was established in the new world after the horseless, gunless Indians were trodden under feet. All this is just to say that the non-duals and the duals that they implicitly connect have far reaching importance within our worldview, and that their effects with regard to the schemas is just a small part of their overall importance for structuring our world. However, that significance with regard to the schemas is there and should be explored fully. Schemas have a depth, as do logic and maths that are unexpected if we follow our way down into the deeper dualisms of which the Western worldview are constructed. These dualisms interlock with each other and remain subtly connected with each other via the non-dual. They inform our understanding of the schema because it is the focus of our projective capacities. So it behooves us to attempt to understand this broader and deeper context of the schemas within our worldview.

Climbing Higher in World Theory

We have sought in the last section to go deeper into the Western worldview in order to ground Schema theory. Now we can attempt to move in the other direction from our starting point at the level of the duality between physus and logos. When we move in the other direction we first encounter the split of the physus into physics and thermodynamics. Traditionally physics addressed count phenomena and mass phenomena was left to thermodynamics. So the physus which means the unfolding of nature, say as organic growth is reduced to either count or mass phenomena and thus losing the ability to deal with the phenomena of life in the process. The idea that there was something between the count and the mass phenomena related to the physus, i.e. what we have called the *ipsity* in the *conglomerate* which is neither mass nor count but something in between was not considered in the reductionist milieu in which these distinctions were originally made. However, if we were to seek out the non-dual between thermodynamics and physics we might well think of it as something like infoenergy, which in ancient cultures was called chi or shakti. Informed (inschema-ed) Energy means an energy-matter configuration which order has been breathed into. In other words what physics as a count approach to things and thermodynamics as a mass approach to stuff has in common is that both exemplify energy-matter configurations and both exemplify order in various ways. What is called chi or shakti is merely the more subtle aspects of the ordering of energy as expressed in living things and natural environments rather than in the raw stuff or primitive things that are the building blocks of our ecosystem. Our scientific tradition is particularly blind to these more subtle manifestations of informed energy. This is rooted in our lack of comprehension of what lies beyond the meta-essence at the level of hyper being. We are good at understanding essences which are sets of constraints on

attributes of count things. And we can even understand meta-essences that determine the growth and development of things in evolution or the genetic unfolding of the organism. But the meta[2]-essence that appears at the level of Wild Being is unknown to us except through the Romantic poets. In there attempt to draw attention to the deficiencies of the scientific way of looking at things the Romantics attempted to draw attention to this blindspot in our scientific worldview. But other worldviews have not had the same blindspot and so have developed theories of the subtle manifestations of informed energy called Chi in China and Shakti in India.

When we approach the concept of the non-dual infoenergy which exists at the level of Wild Being and beyond at the interface between count and mass, or physics and thermodynamics we will need to delve into a realm that is fraught with confusion. One of the greatest signs of this confusion is what Stonier (?) points out when he says that we do not recognize that potential energy is really information. That is to say there is a transformation between energy encoded into the environment and information about the environment. This discrepancy in our way of looking at energy and information, isolating them artificially is one of the signs of this blindspot in our tradition concerning the interface between thermodynamics and physics. Let us consider the relation between infoenergy on the one hand and entromatter on the other hand. We know that energy and matter are at root the same thing by Einstein's famous equation. Likewise we know from Shannon that there is a fundamental relation between entropy and information. Entropy is constantly disinforming information. We could say instead *inschemation* to appeal more broadly to all the schemas not just form. However, we will follow the tradition here and concentrate on the schema 'form' as a stand in for all the schemas. For information to become registered it must do so either as

matter or as a trace on the substance of matter. Information is connected to matter in its persistence. Thus we might expect energy and entropy to be related, the diffusion of energy seems to be the carrier of entropy. So Information and Entropy as a pair of concepts are interlinked with Matter and Energy in a strange way. Now lets consider the possibility of negatives of each of these concepts. Most energy is positive but there is the possibility contemplated by physics of negative energy[1]. Similarly there is negative matter called anti-matter. So we might think that there might be something called negative information and negative entropy. We have already connected information and energy in what we call infoenergy (chi, shakti) and thus the counter concept would be entromatter which we can relate to what Sartre in Critique of Dialectical Reason calls the practico-inert. This gives us a complementarity of complementarities with cross wise mutual relations which is very interesting that stands in the interstice between physics and thermodynamics. Lets' see if we can make sense of it. But in order to do so we need to add one more ingredient, which is *exergy*[2]. H. D. Baehr gave the following definition *Exergy is that part of energy that is convertible into all other forms of energy*[3]. Goran Wall says "Energy and exergy could be expressed: (1) energy is motion or ability to produce motion and (2) exergy is work (= ordered motion) or ability to produce work. Thus, energy is most often

---

[1] Negative Energy, Wormholes and Warp Drive by Lawrence H. Ford and Thomas A. Roman http://www.physics.hku.hk/~tboyce/sf/topics/wormhole/wormhole.html

[2] - A USEFUL CONCEPT WITHIN RESOURCE ACCOUNTING

Göran Wall See http://exergy.se/

[3] H. D. Baehr, Energie und Exergie , VDI-Verlag, Düsseldorf, 1965. taken from preceeding footnote.

an all too hazy concept, whereas exergy is more strict.[4]" Exergy is a limitation of energy to that part that can produce work, i.e. that part that is out of equilibrium with its environment through which ordering may be accomplished. If we look at Shannon's information theory we can say that it is really about the capacity for carrying information, not information itself. Thus here we need a restriction as well between the capacity for carrying information and actual information which is coded rather than merely its surprise value. So let us see if we can distinguish inschematization capacity from the inschematization itself as a complement to exergy. Exergy is the work of inscribing differences that turn out to be the coding of information. We have already mentioned that there is a hierarchy of givens, data, information, knowledge, wisdom etc. In other words information comes from the comparison of two different data streams, it is different from the data itself. It exists in a hierarchy of static forms encoded understanding that an individual possesses. Shannon's theory is really a theory of data. It is a theory about the amount of surprise in the data. Surprize in the data is the capacity for carrying information, which ideally is something you find out that you did not know before. It usually comes from comparing two or more data streams. We convert information into knowledge which is our static store of what we know about the world based on our information sources. When we combine knowledge with broader experience then we begin to approach distilled knowledge we call wisdom. It begins to become clear that these intertwined concepts need a lot of work if we are to keep them clear and make sense out of them. Generally they are not all brought together in a single

---

[4] Exergy, Ecology and Democracy-Concepts of a Vital Society or A Proposal for An Exergy Tax by Göran Wall

configuration by which we can see how they interrelate. But generally we can say that energy and matter form a continuum which we assume cannot be created or destroyed. But against this conserved quantity there are qualities of information and entropy which are not preserved but in stead are continually effaced. This is a way of distinguishing more generally between Being and Becoming, between Parmenides view of things and that of Heraclitus. We ascribe to Energy and Matter Being as persistence, and we ascribe to Information and Entropy Becoming as mutability which is the dual of Being. In other words this difference mimics the difference between static Pure Being and dynamic Process Being. It makes us wonder where the higher meta-levels of Hyper Being and Wild Being come into the picture. So when we say that between physics and thermodynamics exist the non-dual infoenergy and its opposite extromatter we see that implicitly there is appeal to the difference between the various kinds and aspects of Being. In this way the situation becomes very confusing because there is a nexus of negative and positive infoenergy and entromatter which play out the interrelations between Being and Becoming and probably move out into higher meta-levels of being as well. This moving out into higher meta-levels might explain the way that exergy and coded information arise within the broader stream of energy and information capacity. At the level of Hyper Being we see arising the distinction according to Derrida of differing and deferring. It is interesting to postulate that the opposite of this duality related to Differance, could be efficiency and effectivity which combine to become efficacity. Work is related to efficacity. Coded information is related to differing and deferring. Exergy is the amount of energy that is not scattered by entropy. Exergy is a relation between energy and entropy. Coded Information must be coded in some media which must be based on matter in some way. So coded information, rather than information capacity (surprise) is a relation

between information and matter. If this is the case then we can say that Exergy and Coded Information, perhaps we might call it Excody, are the opposite of infoenergy and entromatter or the practico-inert. If this was the case then we have perhaps discovered the various relations between energymatter and infoentropy.

Let us review this result. Energymatter is a way that we talk about Being in scientific terms. It is assumed that it cannot be created or destroyed so it persists. But arrayed against that is infoentropy which is mutable and the very image of Becoming as opposed to Being. Infoentropy means the combination of all capacity for ordered coding which can generate surprise over against the second law of thermodynamics that states that all ordered qualities tend to degrade over time. Here we breach the difference between quality and quantity which is one of the Kantian Categories. Let us note that this difference can be seen in terms of N^2 verses 2^N relations. This is to say that N^2 relations are external relations between two things, while 2^N relations are fusions of things. Fusions of things produce qualities, while external relations produce quantities. We can say that Exergy is a means of converting quantities into qualities or vice versa. Quantities are count markers while qualities are mass markers. Excody, or Coded Information, likewise converts quantity into quality or vice versa. In other words they apply both to the physical and thermodynamic domain and that is why they are non-dual between them. Energymatter and Infoentropy cross combine across the line between Being and Becoming to produce Infoenergy, Entromatter (practico-inert), Exergy and Excody, Coded Inschematization). Exergy is the ability to do work which is seen as efficacious combining efficiency and effectivity, while Excody is based on difference combining differing and deferring. Hyper Being appears in the elements that cross the Being and Becoming in one way while Wild Being appears in

those elements that cross the Being and Becoming gap in the other way. Wild Being appears as Infoenergy and Entromatter. We have already identified infoenergy with Chi or Shakti. It is subtle informed energy that exists at the Wild Being level. Its opposite is matter tending toward entropy and disorganization which does not lend itself to coding. Sartre calls this the practico-inert in which matter "dies" when we put it down and turn to something else. But it holds the shape of the work we have done to the extent it is not disturbed by entropy. Everything we see around us that we are not working on at the moment is in a practico-inert state. When we are operating on something then we bring our infoenergy to bear on it and it comes alive and reflects back to us the results of our inschematizing work. That interaction is dialectical. But when we put down our work then it ceases to be informed by our organizing energy. Our infoenergy spills over into something else or is squandered, say in idle chatter, or useless activity. See how by exploring this complementarity of complementarities that arise out of the energymatter Being and infoentropy Becoming we have learned to differentiate the elements related to Hyper Being from those related to Wild Being. When we go beyond that into Ultra Being or Existence we see the non-dual of mass and count approaches in terms of ipsity, juxtaposition and conglomeration. We can say that the combinations of Energy, Matter, Information and Entropy dance around the difference between Being and Becoming which is augmented by the products related to Hyper Being (Exergy and Excody) and Wild Being (Infoenergy and the Practico-inert). But that difference contains a possibility of the non-dual that is neither set nor mass but something different which we have called a conglomerate. The conglomerate is composed of juxtaposed ipsities and has a logic of disconnection rather than the connections forged by either syllogism or pervasion. Conglomerates have the nature of Ultra Being or Existence and these dualities dance

around the non-dual center as a vortex. Ultmiately we will see that this vortex has the form of the Emergent Meta-system. Mediating between creation and annihilation is positive and negative Energy. Mediating between annihilation and schematization is positive and negative Matter. Mediating between schematization and mutual action is positive and negative Information. Mediating between mutual action and creation is positive and negative Entropy. The emergent meta-system is the means by which creation ex nihilo, long thought impossible, occurs. It is what Kauffman calls order for free, or organization from nowhere. The Emergent Meta-system circles around the non-dual between set and mass which is the conglomerations of juxtaposed ipsities. In that space the various non-dual segments such as infoenergy, entromatter, exergy and excody are seen in the difference between Being and Becoming represented by energymatter and infoentropy. Notice that infoentropy is a countiuum of ordering. So order the non-dual between physus and logos is further specified in this further bifurcation of the worldview. The Emergent Meta-system that inhabits this indeterminate space is never seen because the various elements are never assembled into the overarching field. The confluence and disintegration of ordering as Becoming in relation to the Being of Energy and Matter produces the possibility of negative entropy and negative information. Negative information are of course pieces of information that are withheld. The withholding of information brings us to think about the aspects of Being which are truth, reality, identity and presence. Negative information is a secret or a piece of information concealed. It is information rendered absent rather than present. Also we can think about the identity of information, the truth of information and its relation to reality. Information is the key to the expression of the aspects of Being within this cycle of exchange between energymatter and infoentropy. Truth has to do with the relation of statements to states of

affairs within the context of the other elements of the exchange. Reality has to do with testing in terms of configurations of energymatter against itself. Identity has to do with the sameness and difference of something with itself in the context of the exchange between quantity and quality. We can see that the relations between the aspects of Being appear in the interactions of exchange between the elements of the cycle. All of this is a dynamic model of the multilith of Being.

From this level we can go on to consider how physics splits into Relativity Theory and Quantum Mechanics in which the non-dual is spacetime, the ultimate category according to Igvar Johannson and that which is schematized before the categories according to Kant. We call the combination of Minkowoski Timespace and Einsteinian Spacetime the Matrix. The matrix first breaks up into Spacetime and Timespace and then into the separate elements of space and time within each version of the interval. These give us the basic elements of the meta-system which are origin, arena, source and boundary[5]. So we can see that out of the Emergent Meta-system at the lower level comprised of Energy, Information, Matter and Entropy comes a model of the ultimate meta-system as the matrix which is the non-dual between Quantum Mechanics which is the micropicture of existence and Relativity Theory which is the macropicture of existence. From Quantum Mechanics comes the particle/wave duality which has uncertainty as the non-dual. So out of Quantum Mechanics comes the complementarities that express the nature of the meta-system. In this way we see that this progression up the tree of the world takes us first into a model of the Emergent Meta-system, then to a model of the meta-system as the matrix and then into the complementarities of quantum phenomena. In

---

[5] See Meta-systems Engineering presentation for INCOSE 2002

a way everything that we ultimately want to say is contained in that progression. This we now know is how the Indo-European world differentiates itself within our era. And it gives deeper significance to the lower levels of the differentiation of the worldview that supports this scientific superstructure. Understanding the nature of the worldview and how it is structured is key to our understanding the role of schematization within the whole at the level of the logos/physus differentiation. Lower level non-duals come to inform the upper level non-duals giving them added depth. Science avoids combining its fundamental concepts in the way we have done to realize that they form an emergent meta-system, that unfolds to produce the matrix of spacetime/ timspace as ultimate milieu, which unfolds into quantum mechanical complementarities. Science is flying blind through a metaphysical atmosphere of its own creation. We are merely seeing the pattern in the smoke trails it leaves. We are surprised at what we find written on the wind.

This picture of the fundamental structure of the worldview comes from the realization that Heidegger was wrong about the fourfold, Heaven/Earth/ /Mortal/Immortal. Heidegger takes this definition of the structure of the world from Socrates in Gorgias. This is the fourfold from the mythopoietic era not the metaphysical era. We can show that this is so by an analysis of the opposites that appear in Aristophanes "Clouds" which is about Socrates. There the opposites that are at play are Finitude and Infinity on the one hand and Physus and Logos on the other. Socrates is talking about the traditional fourfold not those that govern the worldview of his day which had been utterly transformed by Anaximander. Heidegger, did not realize that this was an anachronism. In the book The Fragmentation of Being and the Path beyond the Void I explore the relation between the positive fourfold associated with the masculine and the negative fourfold associated with the feminine in our culture

and worldview. Once one realized that the central oppositions of the Metaphysical era in which we live were established by Anaximander then it is just a matter of taking those dualities as a base and asking what are the underlying dualisms that ground them. What you realize is that there is a progressive bisection of these dualities and at each level there is a non-dual associated with the duals that holds them apart yet together. We can take Plato as our guide in this because he teaches us about the deeper non-duals such as the good and fate which are nonrepresentable, and the ultimate non-duals of sources and root that are ultimately unintelligible. This depth is normally not understood within our worldview because it is hard to put what Plato is telling us about the nature of the worldview together. However, if you realize that much of what he is talking about are the Special Systems then it becomes clear how the larger framework is articulated that must exist for the Special Systems to be appreciated. It is strange how we can be immersed utterly within our worldview and not be able to see its structure because we are too close to it, we cannot see the forest for the trees. Plato attempts to show us the forest by telling us in the Republic about the difference between representable and non-representable intelligibles with the analogy of the divided line. Then via his analogies he tells us about the Sun of the Good which is both inward and outward. It is the source of the energy flow on which we all depend outwardly, but it is also the source of variety production inwardly. If we look for the opposite of the sun of the Good we find it in the Myth of Er at the opposite end of the Republic. There we find the rainbow unexplained between this world and the other world through which the souls circulate. That rainbow is the sign of fate. As it is in the story of Noah where the rainbow is a sign of a covenant with the Lord. Plato is mute about the rainbow, but we can reason about it in relation to the sun of the Good. The sun gives off light and that light strikes the raindrops to produce in the

viewer the illusion of the rainbow. Thus the rainbow relates the viewer, the mortal observing the sun, to the light of the sun. In that lights interaction with water is produced the appearance of the rainbow. Light strikes many droplets that act like prisms to produce the colors of the rainbow. We see the colors because we stand at different angles to the various falling droplets. As we look different raindrops are replacing others at the same angles. This is a very complex situation which took a long time for people to understand exactly how it worked as they attempted to illuminate it by scientific scrutiny. One thing we can say is that the rainbow is an excellent example synchroniety. In other words, we are not really dealing with causality here but a kind of juxtaposition. It is the juxtaposition of myriad droplets of water at different heights constantly being replenished that makes the rainbow appear to us. It is a mass phenomena but each droplet of water is a countable quanta. So it is a phenomenon that combines both mass and count aspects to produce a conglomeration of ipsities that come into juxtaposition to produce the effect. The juxtaposition is a synchroniety between the droplets from which we observe an effect that is not really a mass effect or a count effect. Notice that the cloud must be seeded with dust to produce the droplets. The droplets are like monads that are viewed by us and which mutually act to create the rainbow that we project a schema onto to see it as the form of an arch across space. It only continues to exist because there are myriad candidate droplets that can be created by the cloud to replace those that momentarily sustain the rainbow. So the rainbow can be seen as an example of the Emergent Meta-system formation. But also it can be seen as a symbol of fate, in the sense that in Plato's Myth of Er it stands at the center point for the revolution of the souls in and out of existence. The souls moving in and out of existence are like the raindrops falling. The interaction of the souls which produces society, or culture or history is like the

rainbow effects that come from their juxtaposition moving through time from a certain point of view. In the case of souls however, every soul is a point of view seeing the rainbow made by all the others. Fatedness has to do with the moment of arising, the position within the conglomeration of the ipsity of the human life of a particular organism, and the moment of annihilation of that ipsity. Fatedness has to do with the resources given to that ipsity by the environment created by the cultural and family traditions passed down from generation to generation, and the laws that govern their interaction, and all the accidents that befall them on their journey. The rainbow is a continuous emergent phenomena that arises out of myriad discrete water droplets falling together. That fallingness is like what Heidegger calls the fallenness of Dasein. When we look at the rainbow, we can see it as a convenant between the Lord and ourselves because the rainbow is a lot like the attributes of God, in as much as they flow from the interaction of things, like mercy that takes at least two things to manifest. Most of God's attributes that relate to creation are like the rainbow in as much as they come as an emergent phenomena from an interaction of things. They are normally not the attributes of things themselves. So the rainbow is like a mirroring in nature of God's characteristics. The rainbow is the closest thing we see to manifestation in existence.

Plato also teaches us about the sources of things, sometimes called source forms other times called ideas. Plato's teaching is mostly ill understood on this point. As we have said the sources are archetypes and are totalities of absences that are the diametrical opposite of the unities of presence that define the ideas. He also teaches us about the root of existence which he calls God and which the Egyptians called Atum before him. Much of what Plato teaches us comes from the Egyptians. Special Systems he claims where their invention and it was what made their

society last so long. Much of this claim can now be substantiated as we can discern in the structure of the Egyptian gods (ntr) the structure of the Special Systems and the Emergent Meta-system. Reading back Plato's works against the backdrop of the Egyptian view of existence which was suffused with a knowledge of that Special Systems we can get a clear picture of the basis of Plato's work in the Underworld inherited from Egypt. However, that is another story. What is essential here is the fact that we find in Plato the basis for understanding both Special Systems theory and also the structure of the Western worldview in the terms we have described that sees deeper and deeper non-duals (order, right, good, fate, source, root) that serve as the underpinnings of the distinction between logos and physus in which we discern the schemas related to logic and math. This view of the world is ancient, but still little understood because of the occlusion of the non-dual because of Aristotle's dictum concerning the excluded middle and the principle of contradiction. Generally we can only see the duals of our worldview and their different hierarchical interactions. But we seldom ask the question what binds together yet holds apart these dualities. That is the non-duals that hide behind yet between the dualities. It is in our blindspot created by the principle of excluded middle.

Worlding the world

In what has gone before in this essay we have established a way of looking at the 'world' schema based on the Western worldview in the Metaphysical era. We have seen that the dualities of our worldview inform and elaborate the intermediate level of logos/physus within the worldview in which the schemas find their natural home. The world schema was taken up by Heidegger in Being and Time as he focused on being-in-the-world or dasein. Later he discerned the world in terms of the fourfold which we have

attributed to the mythopoietic era and distinguished that from the fourfold of the metaphysical era that includes logos/physus and finite/infinte as opposites. In general the negative (chaos, night, covering, abyss) and positive (heaven, earth, mortals, immortals) fourfolds conjunct to produce the meta-physical fourfold in our era. We have seen how the various non-duals implicit in the trichotomous worldview, made up of duals and their non-dual interface/intraface effect our view of the schemas which exist within the chiasm between physus and logos along with math and logic. This is an important part of our grounding of schemas theory, but we recognize that the world itself is a schema, and that in some sense the world grounds the schemas but the schemas encompass many templates of understanding including the world. What is important about the world is that it is the widest horizon within experience. What spills out beyond the world is the kosmos and the pluriverse. All the other schemas are contained within this widest horizon although the lowest level schemas monad and facet also spill over beyond experience. As Hiedegger points out it is our nature as human beings to project the world ecstatically. This ecstasy, ex stasis, standing outside ourselves is the fundamental nature of the entity dasein. We are continually worlding the world. We can say that the world worlds in us as dasein. It behooves us to attempt to understand this process of worlding the worlds that calls forth the projection of the schemas which we project on the things-in-themselves within the world and beyond it. The schemas are a nesting within the world and beyond it of templates of understanding by which we mediate the things in themselves to ourselves. When we say worlding worlds we are referring to a face of the monolith of Being which is both noun and verb at the same time, i.e. that combines Pure Being as noun and Process Being as verb. But we must not forget that within the interstice between Pure and Process Being appear artifacts of Hyper Being and Wild Being as we discovered in

terms of the EnergyMass and InfoEntropy. When we say worlding worlds we are talking about the social invention and construction of worlds such as the Egyptian, Mayan, Sumerian, Hittite, Greek, Indo-European and other worldviews which have a social, cultural and psychological coherence of their own. Understanding the difference between one's own world and other worldviews is an important step toward understanding the nature of our own worldview, which is normally invisible to us. We are so caught up in the projection that we seldom notice the peculiarities of our own worldview. Yet it is important for us to attempt to understand our own worldview because it is having such wide global impact due to colonialization and globalization.

Here we want to establish the need for a World Theory, i.e. a general theory of worlds. We have systems theory, and other types of schema theory, but we have not gone on to attempt to construct a world theory except in terms of metaphysics of fundamental ontology. However, we need to attempt to articulate the nature of General Worlds Theory along the lines that have already been established for General Systems Theory. However, General Systems Theory is established in present-at-hand mode, as if it were only a part of science. It is difficult to do that with General Worlds Theory. We are forced right off the bat to recognize that Worlds contain all four kinds of Being, not just Pure Being that supports present-at-hand modality of being-in-the-world. There are in fact four different modalities of being-in-the-world including ready-to-hand, in-hand, and out-of-hand that we must deal with. What is interesting is that some theories, or myths contain all four kinds of Being. When the four meta-levels of Being appear together in a theory or myth then we call that a face of the world. In other words there is a way of looking at the world that we refer to in stories about the world that allows us to see all the various modes of the world presented together. It is these faces of the world that

becomes our standard for understanding the rest of the world in which the facets are not gathered together as yet. These faces of the world occur as emergent events because an emergent event to enter into the world must pass through all four kinds of Being. But even without a specific emergent event the world itself is emergent and at times we get a glimpse of the emergent character of the world itself which becomes the measure on the basis of which we judge the world in its totality and unity.

C. S. Peirce is our starting point for attempting to understand the faces of the world. He developed a theory of categories which we can elaborate to produce a vision of a theory that encapsulates a face of the world. In his theory he identifies Firsts, Seconds and Thirds. In our interpretation Firsts are the phenomena as they first appear unrelated to anything else within the world. Seconds are relations among Firsts. Thirds are artificial illusory continuities that we build up from relations. Peirce believed that there were the only categories that were necessary for understanding things in the world. However, we will add to these two categories, a Fourth that we will attribute to B. Fuller which will be called synergy. Synergy is the reuse of pieces to create higher order formations, as regular higher dimensional polytopes that reuse lower level geometric elements to build up more complex higher order configurations. Peirce's theory of types is based on logic not geometry. We do not really see synergy in logic as we do in geometry. Fuller based his insights into systems on geometry, especially a close study of the relations between the Platonic solids. So if we admit fourths then we have almost a full set of types. We also need to consider what may be called Zeroths, i.e. the void or emptiness out of which the Firsts appear. When we have added these two further types to Perice's typology we can see that the five types working together give us a theoretical view of a face of the world that combines all four kinds of Being. The kinds of Being are

what separate the five categories of things from each other as we might expect.

- ❑ Ultra Being
- ❖ Zeroth
- ❑ Wild Being
- ❖ First
- ❑ Hyper Being
- ❖ Second
- ❑ Process Being
- ❖ Third
- ❑ Pure Being
- ❖ Fourth
- ❑ Ultra Being
- ❖ Zeroth

All things that appear in the world may be understood within the rubric of the Peirce/Fuller categories. Each of the categories differ from the next through a kind of Being. So the theory is a face of the world in as much as through its differences it embodies all the kinds of Being that make up our modalities of experiencing the world. There are other examples developed by the author else where that have this same property like the theory of virtual particles that make up spacetime. The elements of the theory are differentiated fortuitously by the different kinds of Being. So it is with many myths in which the nature of the worldview's structure is made explicit which is the subject of ontomythology**6**. However, the Peirce/Fuller categories of things in the world are a good example of how such a face of the world works which is readily accessible. And what is good about these categories is that it shows us how we might begin to construct based on Peirce and Fuller's work a World Theory which is to say a theory of the manifestation of things in the world as emergent events. Emergent Events first appear as Firsts, isolated anomalous ipsities. Then these ipsities become juxtaposed and eventually relations are projected upon them.

---

6 See The Fragmentation of Being and the Path beyond the Void by the author.

After that the ipsities form conglomerates which are further projected as continuities or discontinuities. What first we understand through a logic of discontinuities, eventually is understood in terms of pervasion or syllogism, in terms of Set or Mass, ultimately as physics or thermodynamics depending on if we consider the phenomena countable or uncountable. The elements that we separate back out after projecting the continuity can be seen as synergetic, i.e. highly over-determined and reused to build up objects with a high degree of integrity. But that integrity points toward the emptiness which is the internal zero that is opposite the external zero of the void. Firsts arise from the void and return to emptiness through synergy. This process of Becoming produces a moment of Pure Being on its journey.

Aspects of Worlding the World

Once we have understood how the world can be seen in terms of the kinds of Being and the categories of Peirce and Fuller, as the prototype of an emergent event, and how this emergent quality can be seen in the faces of the world in which the different kinds of Being come together. Then it is necessary to add to this the aspects of Being which are Presence, Identity, Truth and Reality. When we consider the phenomenological worldview within the lifeworld of Dasein, we move to a characterization that is prior to the dualities such as subject and object, and also prior to the dualities, present/absent, identical/different, true/false or real/illusory. Each of the aspects of Being have a different valence at the various meta-levels of Being. The aspects of Being change their *aspect* at each deeper level of Being. This causes a great deal of confusion because truth itself is not true, i.e. it is varied in its nature depending on the depth of Being we are talking about. The same is true for Reality, Identity and Presence.

What this means is that the aspects appear at each meta-level of Being. So each aspect is transformed emergently at each higher meta-level of Being. There is not just one concept of truth but truth at each meta-level and the same is true for the other aspects. This gives us a series of sixteen aspects.

FACETS	Truth	Identity	Reality	Presence
Pure Being	Pure Truth	Pure Identity	Pure Reality	Pure Presence
Process Being	Process Truth	Process Identity	Process Reality	Process Presence
Hyper Being	Hyper Truth	Hyper Identity	Hyper Reality	Hyper Presence
Wild Being	Wild Truth	Wild Identity	Wild Reality	Wild Presence

This fact that each aspect transforms as we move to higher and higher meta-levels is little appreciated by most philosophers. It means that Being ultimately presents us with a faceted structure where each facet is like a part of a mobile in which all the facets intersect all the others as they move in the mobile.

For instance, Truth at the level of Pure Truth means verification. But it transforms at the next level up into Process Truth which is the Showing and Hiding of unconcealment that brings forth the truth. At the next level up Hyper Truth is what we see when the Unconscious reveals itself. Hyper Truth is the truth that is never manifested but which haunts the truths that are uncovered. Wild Truth is the final level and that appears when we realize that the revealed truth and the secret truth are ultimately the same. After that there is only the emptiness of existence where truth itself becomes an empty construct. Here ultra-truth becomes an indicator pointing at suchness.

If we were to look instead at identity we would see that Pure Identity is what we get in formal systems that have tautologies at their root. Process Identity is the next meta-level up and it is what Heidegger calls the belonging together of Sameness in Identity and Difference. At the next level up we have Hyper Identity which occurs when the undecidable enters the picture. Suddenly identities are ambiguous and multifarious. This is what Derrida calls differ*a*nce which he explains by way of differing and deferring. It is embodied ambivalence. The final level up is called Wild Identity. We see that in something like Hegel's 'absolute reason' in which the myriad varieties in their concrete details become identical in a sense, this is to say identity within and though difference, i.e. knowledge of the self though the other. Beyond that there is the identity of the sources of difference themselves in existence. At that point ultra-identity becomes empty itself and points to pure suchness.

If we look instead at reality then we see Pure Reality as the product of testing which like verification needs to be repeated often. Process Reality occurs when there is a continual regime of testing that never ends. We find this in some critical professions where they must continually be retrained to continue to hold their certification. Hyper Reality is a departure at the next higher level of reality where the simulation or test is more real than 'reality' itself. For instance some simulation environments allow for scenarios that are very unlikely to occur in reality but we can make them happen as if they were real in order to prepare for them. In Hyper Reality the game becomes more real than normal mundane 'reality'. Finally at the last step up there is Wild Reality in which we can no longer discern what is real and what is not real, what is the game and what is reality. Beyond that is the ultra-reality of existence itself. Ultra reality is a pointer toward suchness.

If we look at the next aspect then we need to consider Pure Presence. Pure Presence is static and fixed presentation of a product with illusory continuity. Process Presence is the underlying mechanism behind the presentation. The process of presentation is called appearance. Hyper Presence is the appearing of the always already hidden as a disruptive force within the presentational process which distorts the final product which is held within the illusory persistence. Wild Presence is when we cannot tell the difference between the things hidden and presencing behind the appearances and the appearances themselves. Beyond that is the realm that is never presented but merely is found lying around ignored which is called existence. Ultra presence is a pointer toward suchness.

All of these facets taken together give us a picture of Being in its totality which is utterly fragmented. We look at these facets as if for the first time and wonder at the complexity of the paradox of Being that our Indo-European ancestors forged. It is this mobile of facets that we find ourselves caught within. The ones that exhibit this encompassing the best are the Analytic Philosophers who are realists obsessed with Truth and Identity because they think reality can be formalized, or at least wish it could. They, of course, reject introspection and phenomenology which concentrated instead on presences. Thus philosophy is divided against itself. Phenomenology develops into ontology of the kinds of Being while Analytic Philosophy stays within the realm of the more orthodox concentration of philosophy on aspects. The kinds of Being are hidden behind the veil of illusory continuity of Pure Identity, Pure Presence, Pure Reality, Pure Truth. It is the heirs of Husserl that break though this veil mostly by way of his recognition of the fundamental difference between simple ideas and essences. By doing that they reveal the transformation of the aspects at the various deeper meta-levels of Being.

The world has depth to it which is contributed by the aspects of Being as they shattered across the fragments of Being as types across the meta-levels. Any theory of the world that does not take into account these depths is superficial. Also the non-duals beyond the dualities must be taken into account. When both the aspectival fragmentation of Being and the relation of non-duals to duals are taken into account the world theory becomes very complex and has a depth not seen in most metaphysical speculation that should not be ignored.

If we ask what is the relation between the aspectival fragmentation of Being and the three modalities of Being then we must breach the question of the multilith of Being and its combinatorics. The multilith is the set of sixteen aspectival fragments. But these fragments can be ordered in different combinations. There are twenty four possible combinations of the kinds of Being and also twenty four combinations of the aspects of Being. Each can be thought of as a tetrakys which descends from one to two to three to four. When these levels of the Tetrakys are multiplied by each other we get the twenty four combinations. The crucial number is three which makes the combinations divisible by three and produces the three modes for both the aspects and kinds. The three modes related to the kinds might be called the *exotics*, while the three modes related to the aspects might be called the *esotics.* The form that these two sets of twenty four combinations take is the four dimensional twenty four cell polytope with a lattice 1-24-96-96-24-1. This polytope is unique among the higher dimensional polytopes. It is made up of 24 synergetic octahedra. Octahedra have a special property that you can apply arrows to their lines and they will not be self-blocking. This means that octahedra, and the 24cell which is the synergy of octahedra allow unblocked flow throughout its form of Chi or Shakti or info-energy. In the multilith there is first an amorphous oneness of Being, which bifurcates and then trifurcates to

produce six dual estotics or exotics. These then split to produce the particular combination of kinds of being or aspects of being. The combination of the kinds and aspects of Being have three exotics or esotics with eight permutations each. One is related to logos, one to physus and one to the non-dual state. Each of the combinations of the kinds or aspects of Being finally undergo a symmetry breaking like that of the quaternion so that one kind of Being or aspect of Being becomes dominant and the other three become as if they were imaginary. Our views of the world are tinged by this symmetry breaking. For instance, in analytical philosophy only pure Being is considered actual and the other kinds of Being are considered the fantasies of the Continental philosophers. While on the other hand there is a fascination with truth, reality and identity because of the worship of formalism, but phenomenological presence is ignored. On the other hand Continental philosophers emphasize the three higher meta-levels of Being over Pure Being and they value presence over truth, reality or identity. Other schools or individual philosophers do variations on these biases. Few philosophers consider all the possible permutations. However, we can see examples in the Indian tradition, especially in the epics of concern with and understanding of the whole set of permutations, as for instance with the permutations of the objects that Vishnu holds in his different representations. The world is very rich both in its aspectival fragmentation and the permutations of possible combinations of the kinds and aspects of Being prior to the symmetry breaking after the various exotics and esotics become fully manifest as the tetrakys of the multilith unfolds. This unfolding of the possibilities inherent in the multilith is the prerequisite for the levels of the worldview which are differentiated into dualites and the non-dual mode that separates yet holds the duals together making them the Same. The tetrakys can be seen as the tip of the Pascal Triangle, the place where the special systems lie above the infinitely deep sea of non-division algebras. There is a deep fundamental connection between the three modes of the kinds and aspects and the existence of non-duality before and between the duals in the area ignored by the principle of excluded middle. We can experience phenomena within the worldview at any of the levels of duality, and in terms of any of the various non-duals that appear in that hierarchy. Of course, that hierarchy is only an example and in truth the dualities proliferate and the non-duals are mutable within the chaotic complexity of the unfolding of the worldview. Capturing this chaotic complexity in the insane, absurd, vicious circles, and paradox of the mutable world is all but impossible. World theory only hopes to make some of the more stable features visible by understanding how the multilith of aspectival fragmentation interacts with the tetrakys that produces exotics and esotics which are then presented as a series of duals and non-duals at various levels of differentiation which are recognized by philosophers within the meta-physical era of the Indo-European worldview.