

## The Nature of Form – Paper I

Though it is clear to me that Form is **not** primary - that it is a result of Content and Context, it still presents major problems as to what it really is, and how its various patterns are determined. Various features of Reality, which are not directly or causally connected, deliver the same exact Form. Why is this?

We could start by considering the forms that are taken up by the adding together of large numbers of individual units, such as a pile formed by sand being emitted from a small hole and allowed to fall upon a level surface. The result is a conical heap. It doesn't matter what the units are, as long as they can fairly easily roll over one another. The cone will be the same form each time. Such cone-piles may differ depending on certain properties of the constituent units, but the Form will remain essentially the same. Obviously, the study of such a form tells us only the most basic things about the constituent units, and the bulk of what we can elicit are to do with the conditions and context alone.

But there are many less easily dealt with situations which exhibit the same Form at quite a different level.

We could consider the multiple examples of Convergent Evolution, wherein quite separate and clearly very distant lines of evolution nevertheless exhibit very similar Forms. So similar, indeed, that they were initially often considered to be necessarily very closely related. Indeed, it has always been the taxonomists' nightmare to avoid relating things that are not related – at least directly.

NOTE: It some joint work with a biologist who was attempting to construct a taxonomy of Waterbears (*Tardigrades*), his main problem was that every new piece of data required a major revision of his taxonomic system. I was able to supply him with a flexible and correctable dichotomous tree program that made his corrections easy and comprehensible. But, the difficulties were still hard to deal with in a new area, for determining the sequence and significance of changes was indeed very difficult, for the reasons outlined above.

The common names of many plants (and animals) often reveal the same mistakes, wherein, for example, The Evening Primrose is not a primrose, and the lesser celandine is in fact a kind of buttercup, and totally unrelated to the Greater Celandine, which is a poppy (papaver), and, of course, countless others.

It begins to become clear that Form is **not** the essential thing in relationships, but something determined by similar patterns of forming forces or causes. It is probably accurate to think of Forms as Modes – possible patterns, which arise out of very different Content, but which nevertheless display **one** of a finite number of these, due to their unavoidably holistic nature. Such Forms arise and multiply with increasing complication. Indeed, they occur “in sequence” as the Content changes, but nevertheless seem to pass through quite regular changes themselves. We can often explain individual Forms in terms of their individual Content, but we still only occasionally recognise them as parts of *necessary development sequences*.

NOTE: The clearest revelation of this is in the sequence involving the blastula, morula and gastrula stages in the growing of the fertilised embryo of many animals.

Yet we still flounder about!

The most important thing about Forms is their universality. The same equation can relate very diverse and unrelated phenomena. Forms recur all the time, and the study of Form – Mathematics, has even occasionally usurped the primacy causalities of Reality in the views of many “scientists” views.

The difficulty is in **explaining why Form is as it is**, as distinct from *explaining the physical causes!*

Answering this question is not helped by the ever more complex layers of detail revealed as we carefully investigate Reality as scientists. Indeed, in many areas of Reality, full conquest is clearly impossible.

The most important revolution in Mankind's efforts to understand the World was certainly the twin pronged attack involving both Plurality and Control in the famed “Experimental Method” In that method, the first requirement is for the researcher to attempt to control as many minor (and even some major) factors as

possible, to keep them constant so as to “reveal” some formal relation between what are evidently the most important determining elements of a given situation. This approach *rescued* Form from its frequent unintelligibility in unrestrained Reality. It “quietened down” most subordinate features leaving the major relation in clear relief.

Only when such an artificial and man-made situation was firmly established could the given relation be extracted from its real nexus and abstracted into an equation.

NOTE: Within this methodology was a crucial assumption.

Whatever was extracted and abstracted was seen as a separate **component** in Reality: how the relation came to hold was **not** addressable. The various factors considered were seen (if only temporarily) as eternal. The question, “Would these relations be exactly the same in unfettered Reality as they were in the massively controlled and nailed down situations necessary for the process of extraction to be possible?” Or, when allowing everything to vary naturally, would even these limited relations be *changed*? Were the extracted relations due to the factors that had been allowed to vary during the experiment actual components of the real world case? Now the answer is already known.

It is quite clearly, “NO!”

As in every single case of such relations, there would be a defined and limited Domain of Applicability, beyond which the relation would cease to hold, then the assumptions outlined above were proved to be wrong.

Indeed, it was the pluralist process itself which had created an *eternal relation*. Only if the firmly constrained conditions of the defining experiment could be maintained forever would the extracted relation be eternal. In the real world such eternally maintained conditions are impossible, and where they cease to be possible marks the limits of that particular relation.

It is WE, by our control of conditions, that impose a seeming eternality on relations. By such methods we extract an artificial situation out of Reality and investigate it in its pure unreality – i.e. in its Form alone. All such equations are about Pure Form and cannot exist as components of Reality.

Though within special limits the relation could be relied upon and used, it did NOT depend (in Reality) solely on the factors that had been identified and manipulated in the derivation of the relation. Clearly, more was involved, and when taken beyond the Domain boundaries the relation would no longer be determined solely by its associated factors. It would bite the dust.

**To be continued**

(1,104 words)