

The Nature of Form – Paper II

The reflection of these pluralist methods was, and is, in the corollary of the relations, in their USE to some intended purpose. Mankind gradually perfected his Control of situations, and could replicate those he had used in the experiment, and construct them in the use situation. Only then did his isolated, extracted and abstracted equation deliver as required.

Mankind had constructed his own small Worlds in which he could extract and use his relations effectively.

Mankind had extended his recognition of Form from being a “partially hidden” element in a complex nexus, into pure and separate individual Forms.

But, this revolution was pragmatic and fraught with new difficulties. The most important was Mankind’s assumption that by the above described means, he had “released” a primary “cause” from its hidden place in a confusing and un-useable mix.

He began to view and collect his equations as essential “components” in actually **producing** Reality.

Yet, it was clear that many simultaneous things were contributing to any actual unfettered situations in the Real World, and he considered that he was revealing them one at a time. Ultimately, knowing them all, he projected that he would be able to reproduce all phenomena to order.

These ideas are best encapsulated in Plurality – the Whole and the Part, both in its analytic and in its synthesizing forms.

So, we have a strong tendency for Form to be given the primary role in producing the real nature of Reality.

The trouble is that all Forms revealed by the above methods were NEVER eternal.

In any investigatable situation, the mix of determining elements would inevitably change and the results were often damning for the pluralistic perspective. The very factors which had been isolated, extracted and abstracted into our “banker” components as equations would, as conditions changed, begin to fade and ultimately would vanish altogether.

They were NOT the “components” that we thought they were, but formal features that, in a given set of circumstances, had “formed” and thus could just as easily dissociate, after which something else would come to the fore instead.

All equations were shown to have limited Domains of Applicability, within which they pertained, but outside of which they were meaningless.

Now, we have to clarify here!

It would be easy to stick to our pluralist “principles” and insist that our vanishing relation was STILL THERE, but merely getting smaller and smaller in effect until we could no longer even detect it. This belief is also very widespread and maintains the pluralist approach, in spite of the relations seeming to vanish.

The World from this standpoint becomes an **addition** of many such relations all of which ALWAYS PERTAIN, but increase and decrease in dominance. The Boundaries of Domains are, with this view, not changes in Nature, but merely where the balance of forces switches over.

The essential principle binding the whole of Reality together thus becomes the principle of Reductionism. This asserts straight-through, always-present **continuity**, and will, in the end, allow of the conquest of all of Reality, one step at a time.

Now, this all sounds fine, until we address Qualitative Change in Reality, and in particular that version of this which is termed Evolution. Does Reality itself evolve?

The pluralist/reductionist view would insist that it doesn’t – that all that happens is incessant remixing and quantitative changes of eternal elements. It would allow of complication, but not actual Evolution.

We, of course, **must** ask, “Why no Evolution?”

It is because that implies development, progress and, most important of all, creation. And it is in this area of Qualitative Change that the pluralist/reductionist approach fails miserably.

The touchstone, as always, turns out to be the Origin of Life from non-living matter.

Now, in addressing such profound Events, the ideas embodied in the pluralist/reductionist approach are found to be totally inadequate to the task. They were, and still are, **the approach** in the period of the Industrial Revolution, and flourished as THE methodology for that era of production, supplying its primary driving principles. But, it is now clear that a new approach must be required which is better suited to the paramount questions of today, and the crucial element must be Qualitative Change.

Indeed, what seems to re-assert itself is the age-old alternative to Plurality, which is, of course, Holism.

To be continued

(726 words)