

Why We Disagree: Modal Conflicts among Religion, Art and Science

Frank J. LUCATELLI*

** University of Detroit-Mercy, Environmental Studies and Architecture,
Corresponding Address: 1936 Portage Street; Kalamazoo,
MI 49001-3834 USA
E-mail Address: Frank@Lucatelli.org*

Abstract

Two preliminary levels of logic are assumed as evolutionary stages allowing important questions concerning Religion, Art and Science to be addressed at a third logical level. These levels of logical complexity are defined by APMA (A-Priori Modal Analysis), a new method for clarifying the complexity of any topic. Religion, Art and Science are examined as alternative modal views of reality at this logical scale. This method demonstrates that within a third level logical context there is no contradiction for an individual to concurrently accept all three viewpoints as reasonable although each is uniquely subjective. Religion, Art and Science are consequences of the comprehensively universal human qualities of "Doing", "Feeling" and "Thinking". When disagreement is found among these approaches to understanding it is an indication of a need for reexamination of all viewpoints to find the point of truth, not a justification for the elimination of any one of the three.

Zusammenfassung

Zwei einleitende logische Ebenen werden als Entwicklungsstadien einer dritten Ebene angenommen, die Fragen der Beziehungen von Religion, Kunst und Wissenschaft untereinander zu untersuchen ermöglicht. Diese Niveaus der logischen Komplexität werden innerhalb einer neuen Methode des Bestimmens der Komplexität eines beliebigen Themas, genannt APMA (A-Priori modale Analyse), definiert. Religion, Kunst und Wissenschaft werden als alternative modale Ansichten der Wirklichkeit auf dieser logischen Ebene untersucht. Diese Methode zeigt, daß innerhalb eines logischen Kontextes der dritten Ebene es für eine Einzelperson kein Widerspruch ist, alle drei Ansichten, obgleich jede einzigartig und subjektiv, als angemessen zu akzeptieren. Religion, Kunst und Wissenschaft werden von den umfassenden menschlichen Qualitäten "Tun", "Fühlen" und "Denken" hervorgebracht. Wenn Widerspruch zwischen diesen drei Annäherungen an das Verstehen gefunden wird, so ist eine Notwendigkeit der Nachprüfung aller Standpunkte gegeben, den Punkt der Wahrheit zu finden, jedoch nicht eine Rechtfertigung für die Beseitigung von irgendeinem der drei.

Preface

Religion, Art and Science are habits of mind that have evolved into cultural institutions. There are those among us who are naturally inclined to scientific thought, others who are inclined to artistic expression and still others whose acts of faith are second nature to them. Humanity has come to accept and understand its ability to do things, have feelings and think about the relation between what it does and feels. Out of the natural exercise of these three modes of action, perception and understanding, the institutions of Religion, Art and Science as we now know them arose.

These three institutions have historically assisted humanity in overcoming natural limitations, but as the world now becomes ever more complex in its global interrelationships, difficulties are arising in the functional exercise of these three venerable institutions. There is *an urgent need to* reexamine the relationships among Science, Art and Religion as well as a reassessment of the meaning of each. The rise of worldwide violence in relation to religious fundamentalism, the confusion between creationism and evolution, and the paradox of rising spirituality and the loss of church membership point to this need.

The current age, like all ages, is unprecedented. Previously isolated cultures are now in daily contact with each other through the various forms of electronic communication. Such exposure calls into question previous assumptions made on all sides, whether religious or scientific. Even our concept of the Earth's environment as being the all-inclusive context has been transcended by our historically unprecedented ability to view the Earth from space. This fact has transformed our conception of our planet from "everything" into an Art object that may be transformed by our designs. There is a responsibility that attends the potential for transformation. It is the necessity for clear thinking about the relationships among those elements that may be affected by our intervention.

In the following pages we will explore what it will require in the way we think about Religion, Art and Science, to establish a cooperative balance among them. It is assumed but

not developed within this paper that as Religion, Art and Science establish their rightful relationship with each other, there will need to be a concurrent effort to build additional new institutions that will address the realities of greater world complexity. A part of the current dysfunctional nature of Religion, Art and Science is due to these three institutions assuming responsibilities that are out of scale with their original rightful purposes. As the needed newly forming institutions develop and as they progressively lift inappropriate burdens from Religion, Art and Science, they will never fully supplant these older and more fundamental institutions. Further, as the world advances in new directions, we may expect that our understanding and appreciation of Religion, Art and Science will become deeper and ever more significant in our common life.

What will be needed to establish cooperation, proportionality, and agreement among the institutions of Religion, Art and Science? The potential for such convergence is hidden in the necessarily assumed structures of their independent approaches, not in the particular facts that they consider.

The purpose of the following discussion is not to exhaustively define Religion, Art and Science. Rather, it is to articulate what seem to be fundamental assumptions that differentiate one from the others. In so doing, it is hoped that each of these three institutions will begin to appreciate the utter necessity of each approach and the complementarity shared among them.

Approach

So then, our question is: "Is it possible to imagine the relationships among Religion, Art and Science in a new way?" By using a relational logic analysis of the consequences of humanities' innate propensity for doing, feeling and thinking, we will show that Religion, Art Science and are not only necessary results of these human inclinations but also that these three cultural institutions are intimately intertwined with each other. However, the intersection of Religion, Art and Science is not a hopeless, chaotic confusion, but a highly

articulate set of relationships. If these important relationships are clearly understood they could lead to an enlightened appreciation of the roles that each of the three institutional approaches play in each other's development. While the positions of Religion, Art Science and are subjectively different from each other, there is a clear structural relationship among these three subjective viewpoints.

The terms "correctly", "appropriately" and "right" will be used often in the following pages. The use of these terms is not an assumption of having or holding the absolute truth, but rather an appeal to stand in the right place, logically or modally, so that it is possible to understand the facts presented in the context of their appropriate meanings. If these frames of mind may be mastered, it will become possible to more fully appreciate how the three cultural viewpoints collectively contribute to our advancing world culture.

Logical Context

Addressing "existence" requires the simplest level of logic where ideas are either "on" or "off". Having accepted the existence of something, which is Level One logic, Level Two logic asks, "How does that object interact with the rest of existence?" Level Two logic addresses the complexity of the inevitable give and take of stimulus-response or Ying-Yang, depending upon one's Western or Eastern understanding of the consequential implications of existence. These first two levels are assumed as preliminary evolutionary stages that allow us to address important questions concerning Religion, Art and Science at a third logical level. These levels of logical complexity are defined by APMA¹ (A-Priori Modal Analysis), a new method for clarifying the complexity of any topic. Religion, Art and Science are examined as alternative modal views of reality at this third logical level. This method demonstrates that within a third level logical context there is no contradiction for an individual to concurrently accept all three viewpoints as reasonable although each is uniquely

¹ APMA™ (A-Priori Modal Analysis) is a system of relational logic rather than causal logic, developed by HEAR, Inc. (Human Educational Alternatives Research, Inc.)]

subjective. Religion, Art and Science are consequences of the comprehensively universal human qualities of "Doing", "Feeling" and "Thinking". When disagreement is found among third level approaches to understanding it is an indication of a need for reexamination of all viewpoints to find the point of truth, not a justification for the elimination of any one of the three. Limitations of space only allow us to explore APMA Level Three.

Goodness, Beauty and Truth

Religionists believe that God is one, and that God is Good. The Beauty of Nature moves artists. Scientists think that ultimately there may be no contradictions if our understandings are True. Because these basic assumptions are not contradictory, Religion, Art and Science are all rooted in the same reality. They all three must adjust themselves to the same, identical, facts.

However, human action, perception and understanding are limited. Accepting these limitations for the sake of argument, we could say that different people might perceive and understand their life in terms of what they do, how they feel emotionally, or the way they think, in different proportions. Of course, we may consider things at other scales and other contexts, but "Doing", "Feeling" and "Thinking" is a complete set of matched approaches to life. They all operate at the same scale. If we first accept these three alternate views of life; doing, feeling and thinking, as equally plausible axioms, we can then say that these three views may be combined in eight different ways.² For any given number of assumed axioms, there will always be a finite set of postulated ways to recombine them.

² Two to the third power is eight, which is the powerset of three. A powerset is the set of all possible combinations of a given number of objects; in this case, the objects are the three axioms of a level-three system of relational logic.

Relational Logic

The diagram in Figure 1. is an example application of one of the logical levels of APMA. APMA is used to analyze the interrelationship of concepts. It makes possible a comprehensive view of any subject at a given scale or level. APMA distinguishes among different logical levels by the number of concepts, called axioms, that are required to fully express the topic. In this case, we have chosen what is called a level-three analysis because we have settled upon the three axiomatic concepts of doing, feeling and thinking to define the subject of our concern. These three concepts are each, unique “approaches to life”.

Diagrammatically, we get the following results when we consider the various ways of combining doing, feeling and thinking (Figure 1).

“Doing”, “Feeling” and “Thinking” are the axioms of this analysis, and the necessary relations among these three axioms will be called the postulates of this modal logic. Imagine “Null” as the blank slate that we prepare in order to think clearly about our chosen subject or topic. The three axioms are chosen because they are, for the sake of a given discussion, clear and obvious enough that they do not need to be defined. Another way of saying this is that it is not necessary to prove that people do things, that they have feelings or that they think about things.

Because the axioms are not provable in this context, neither are the postulates, because of their necessity. The names chosen for the postulates, “Unity”, “Contentment” and “Wonderment” may be argued with, but the fact that there are feelings associated with thinking, that there are thoughts associated with doing, and that feelings are associated with doing, is obvious. The final postulate “ABC” is the name of our topic: “The Nature or State of Life”. We might also ask as another way to grasp this ultimate postulate: “What is life like when 'Doing,' 'Feeling' and 'Thinking' are harmonized?”

With our axioms and postulates identified, we are now able to examine their relationship in more detail. If an harmonious life is the goal, and we find that establishing that harmony is too difficult to do directly, what other techniques

may we use to get there? Let's examine our options according to APMA logic.

"Life" or "ABC" may be fabricated by combining the axioms and postulates in five subjectively different ways as shown in Figure 2. (Items 1-5) or the totality may be objectively viewed as described by item number 6, also listed in Figure 2. The totality is the sum of all possible subjective ways of viewing the whole or any of its parts.

Although logically we can see that "Life" (ABC) may be examined and subjectively "constructed" in five different ways in order to achieve harmony among what one does, feels and thinks, there is only one way to understand the objective totality of Level Three logic. That is to explore every possible combination of the axioms within its powerset and every possible subjective reassembly of the whole.

Counting "ABC" as the "Name" of our subject matter, and Null as the expression "Not-3" or the blank slate where our three axioms don't yet exist, we find that there are fourteen (14) distinctly different understandings to be understood in the totality of APMA Level Three. They are the eight items in Figure 1. plus the six items in Figure 2. Understanding all fourteen positions is necessary before one can say that the objective whole is fully understood as a totality. It is easy to be fooled into thinking that one of the five subjective whole views, from Figure 2., is a complete view of the topic because each subjective whole contains all three axioms. However, because the viewpoints differ from one subjective whole to another, none of the subjective views is fully objective. It could be said, for example, that "fundamentalism" is an example of the result of confusing a subjective view of the whole for the objective view of the totality. Again, the totality of any topic may not be fully understood until all parts of the powerset of axioms and postulates and all possible subjective viewpoints, or reassemblies, of the whole are understood (Fig 2).

A simple example might explain the importance of being able to look at the same facts from different perspectives. Before calculators and computers, people who routinely calculated sums of numbers had ways of checking their work. This was done in a variety of ways. One way was to add the

digits of each of the numbers in the column and subtract nines until a remainder of zero through eight is left. If the sum of the digits of the sum total matches this result, then it is likely that the calculation was done correctly. This is not a certainty, but checking one's work in this way increases the likelihood of correctness. Analogously, Religion, Art and Science may be used to check each other's work.

Religion, Art and Science

Two of the five subjective options, the "aggregate" and "direct" approaches (items numbered 1 and 5 in Figure 2.) are not systematic approaches, but rather natural approaches taken by different personality types, analysts or synthesists. The representation of the whole as an aggregate of all its separate parts is the end result of analysis or the beginning point of synthesis. The holistic "name", "ABC", is the opposite of this; it is the beginning of analysis and the end of synthesis. We will be focusing on the three remaining approaches (items numbered 2, 3 and 4 in Figure 2), which characterize differing systematic approaches, which are the methods of Religion, Art and Science.

In discussion, if the parties do not agree upon a common mode of interpretation, it will be impossible to arrive at agreement about the facts. The modes do not determine which "facts" apply to the interpretation because all facts are equally present in each of the modal viewpoints. The only difference between any two modes is the manner in which the facts are interpreted. A common error is to shift from one mode to another, but retain the meanings that were previously interpreted from a different modal viewpoint. The facts must always be freshly examined whenever a modal change occurs. Carrying meanings from one mode to another introduces irresolvable contradictions into the discussion. What are the characteristics of these three different systematic approaches (modes) to life?

A plus BC equals ABC; Religion

This approach to life involves focusing upon "Doing" (A) and becoming unified in feeling and thinking (BC). As a result,

one faithfully centers what one does. In the sense that “work is worship” when performed with the appropriately unified attitude of thought and feeling, we can say that this approach to Life is a religious approach. The person who focuses upon the “Doing” component of this approach might be called the worshiper. The one who focuses upon the “Unity” of feeling and thought might be called the theologian. The worshiper wants to do the right thing; the theologian wants to understand, in both feeling and thinking terms, what the right thing could be.

The worshiper is conscious of her or his acts and assumes faith. The theologian is conscious of the basis of faith and assumes that appropriate acts will follow.

The aim of the worshiper is to integrate one’s life activities as a model of integrity. Theologians search for a balance between human feeling and the thoughts that provoke those feelings. Conversely, the theologian also reconciles thoughts with the feelings that stimulated them. To the worshiper, theology is wholly dispensable unless it proves to be a direct path to the Beloved. To the theologian, worship seems superstitious unless the belief system establishes one’s proper relationship to God.

B plus AC equals ABC; Art

This approach to life involves focusing upon “Feeling” (B) in such a way that one is contentedly lead to do and think (AC) about Life so that one’s planned activity is in harmony with one’s feelings. When one is able to express one’s feeling so that there is not any further desire for expression, we can say that this person is contented with his or her expression. Achieving contentment through expression is an artistic approach to Life. The person who focuses upon the “Feeling” component of this approach might be called the artist or one who expresses feeling. The one who focuses upon the “Contentment” of doing and thought might be called the craftsperson. The artist wants to find perfect expression of feeling; the craftsperson wants to operate the technique of expression correctly, both in terms of action and concept.

The artist is conscious of her or his feelings and assumes the means of expression can be found. The craftsperson is focally conscious of maintaining or developing a craft tradition and assumes that the proper execution of the craft will generate pleasant feelings; feelings that are associated with the contentment that no more is needed here.

The aim of the artist is to be true to one's feeling self. Craftsmanship is a means by which the artist finds expression. To the artist, craft is completely at the service of expressing the precise feeling. To the craftsperson the feeling is secondary to the proper, even excellent, execution of the craft.

C plus AB equals ABC; Science

This approach to life involves focusing upon "Thinking" (C) so that the "Wonderment" (AB) of what one does and feels aligns with what one thinks. This quest for thoughtful understanding is a scientific approach to Life. The person who focuses upon the "Thinking" component of this approach might be called the theoretician or one who seeks to create paradigms encompassing all relevant facts. The one who focuses upon the "Wonderment" of doing and feeling might be called the experimentalist. The theoretician wants to describe things accurately so that predictions become possible. The experimentalist wants to tease new facts out of nature by constructing devices and techniques.

The theoretician is conscious of the logical consistency or inconsistency of concepts and assumes that by eliminating contradiction from associated ideas, that practical results will be forthcoming. The experimentalist consciously believes that a demonstration is more powerful than an explanation and assumes that once Nature's operation is exposed experimentally, an appropriate understanding must follow.

The aim of the theoretician is to discover a side of nature that had previously been hidden from view. Experimentalists strive to produce results that demonstrate, both through success and failure, how nature works in a way that feels appropriate with the way in which nature is, or should properly be understood. To the theorist, the experiment must reflect the concept or be able to falsify it. To the

experimentalist, theory is nothing more than a synopsis or record of experimental activity.

Putting Humpty-Dumpty Back Together Again

Like the story of Humpty-Dumpty, once we recognize the pieces that we have, the question is how to reassemble the pieces to regain wholeness? We can now see logically at this third level of complexity, that there are five, subjectively different, holistic ways to approach Life. They are: Directly (ABC), which is taking everything as a whole and analyzing it; Aggregately (A, B, C), which is seeing only the parts and striving to synthesize them; through Religion (A + BC); through Art (B + AC); or through Science (C + AB). While it is possible for any person to participate in any of these five approaches to Life, it is not possible to focally concentrate on more than one at a time. The choice of focal attention shapes what one is able to “see” and simultaneously restricts us from seeing the other possible approaches that are, as Michael Polanyi³ might say, tacitly understood but not focally present.

The inability to perceive an object of perception in more than one way may be demonstrated by ambiguous figures. Three famous examples are shown in Figure 3. They are the “Old Woman or Young Woman”⁴, “Rubin’s Vase”⁵ and the “Necker Cube”.⁶ By shifting one’s attention from one mindset to another, it is possible to “see” different figures or perspectives, but never more than one perspective at once. In figures like Rubin’s Vase, it may appear that one is able to see both the faces and the vase at the same time. It is hypothesized that what is actually happening is that because of one’s familiarity with the figure, the person has learned to rapidly

³ Polanyi, Michael (1958, 1962, 1974) *Personal Knowledge*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

⁴ See: http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~cfs/305_html/Gestalt/Woman.html

⁵ See: http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~cfs/305_html/Gestalt/Vase.html

⁶ See: Psychophysiology, Volume 41 Issue 1 Page 1 - January 2004, Jürgen Kornmeier, Michael Bach (2004), Early neural activity in Necker-cube reversal: Evidence for low-level processing of a gestalt phenomenon, Psychophysiology 41 (1), 1–8. doi:10.1046/j.1469-8986.2003.00126.x

find the "other" figure. The rapidity of finding appears as if we are able to see both at once. This happens when the finding time is less than the refocusing time. In other words, we know where to look. This rapid oscillation does not translate to "seeing both at once", At any given moment, we are only focally aware of one perspective.

If we consider "the content of life" to be the given doing, feeling and thinking facts presented to us, depending upon our mindset, we will only be able to see that whole life from one perspective at a time. We will only be able to see it directly or aggregately, or through the religious, artistic or scientific implications of the facts. What is meant by mindset in this example is the way in which we parse the three axioms as an aid to our understanding, either as a direct or aggregate full life experience, a religious experience, an artistic or scientific experience.

We see what we believe is there, our impressions are interpreted by how we feel, and we do what we have faith will work. Our beliefs, impressions and faith are often misplaced due to limited experience, erroneous understanding, and degree of self-awareness. These biases of thought, feeling, action are common sources of misunderstanding and disagreement. Error has different meaning to science, art and religion. To science, error is inconsistency and contradiction or misapplied testing. To art, error is misrepresentation of feeling or carelessness of craft; and to religion error is superstition or the creation of disunity.

There is always the possibility of mismatched levels of awareness. This could be found, for example, between a teacher and her or his student. The issues addressed here are not concerned with levels of mismatched awareness. In such cases it is assumed that the one with higher awareness will be the one responsible for resolving tensions. In a classroom, these roles are institutionalized. In everyday discourse, it is not always as easy to decide the relative roles of teacher and student. However important this consideration is, it is beyond the scope of this presentation.

The purpose of this approach to recognizing differences of viewpoint is not to eliminate tension, but rather to discover ways to convert tension into understanding. Tension is an indicator of disagreement and as such is a strong motivator for conflict resolution. However, motivation without a method of resolution that works does not help to find agreement. It is hoped that by understanding the structural necessities of Religion, Art and Science, techniques of conflict resolution may be found that facilitate cooperation among these three important, but subjectively different perspectives. (Figure 3) Disagreements among Religion, Art and Science are a consequence of not realizing that each of these three approaches are subjective interpretations of a whole, but not the totality of it. The totality as previously alluded, is to accept that all correct subjective viewpoints must be admitted within the realm of actuality. That we are unable to focus on more than one subjective view at a time does not make the other views unimportant. For example, if you think of a house, you can consider that there are multiple subsystems that make the house functional, like the structure, heating system, plumbing, electrical system, and so on. While we think about the house's structure we tacitly know in the back of our mind that there is also plumbing present. But we are not focused upon the plumbing while we are considering the structure. The totality of the home is the interaction of all the subsystems and functions. Similarly, Religion, Art and Science are subsystems of Life. Failing to realize this may create disagreements of two kinds.

The first disagreement is when a person sees a set of facts, as belonging exclusively to either Religion, Art or Science and so is unable or unwilling to shift perspectives to see the same facts from another subjective modal viewpoint.

The second form of disagreement occurs within one of the modal perspectives of Religion, Art or Science when there is either a mistaken position taken or a stylistic choice presumed. Mistaken beliefs, misinterpreted feelings or misunderstandings of or within the theoretical model make agreement impossible because the assumed positions do not match the reality. However, stylistic choices often have the

same effect. In religion the choice of a specific religion often prevents the appreciation of the truths of other specific religions, stylistic approaches in art separate artists from one another, for example classical artists from impressionists or representational art from abstract art. Further, in science the allegiance to one theory or another will also separate scientists from each other, for example Platonists versus Aristotelians or behaviorists versus Jungians. In each of these examples, it is the differing mindsets of the persons that prevent concurrence. While holding one viewpoint, the other viewpoints can not be seen, and therefore, are difficult to accept.

Contextual Caveat

It is important to understand that this approach does not answer all issues, as no single approach can. In the ageless debate between Platonism and Aristotelian philosophies, or the difference between the assumption of pure form or statistical evidence as the primary mode of understanding, this approach, while focusing upon the Platonic method, by no means assumes that the Aristotelian method does not apply. Rather, it is assumed that, instead of an either/or choice between these two conceptions of reality, the actuality is one of alternation between them. Imagine, for example, that an atomic nucleus is a highly structured object because of its extreme compactness. When we move up in scale to the electron shell we find less compactness and more randomness of the location of electrons. This is why probabilistic methods of quantum mechanics are used to understand electron shells. But stepping up to the next higher scale of molecules we find again highly structured forms for the chemical molecules. But collections of molecules found in ordinary matter are not as tightly structured. These collections of molecules in ordinary matter are best understood as statistical arrangements. This alternation of pure form and statistical analysis continues as the magnitudes of scale increase, ultimately arriving at the grand universe. It so happens that the more appropriate viewpoint for structural understanding, or logic, is the Platonic viewpoint. But using a highly structured method of organizing

one's thoughts prepares one to face the messy statistics that the structured logical options allow.

Conclusion

If the viewpoints of Religion, Art and Science are correct, there should be no fundamental disagreement or conflict among the choices of viewpoint. If disagreement is found, it is a sure sign that there is either confusion of scale or error somewhere among the various viewpoints. The error and confusion may be isolated or widespread. Disagreement simply points to the need for further investigation. The current conclusions, for all parties, are not reliable so long as disagreement persists.

Religion, Art and Science are independent methods provided to us for examining the facts of our lives and our world. That these independent methods exist offers humanity a reliable way of overcoming our limitations. Our innate difficulty of bridging differing viewpoints prevents us from achieving reliable beliefs, precise expression and testable theories. The unity of religion, the contentment of art and the wonderment of science may each be used as boundary conditions for what may be reasonable and thus acceptable in the others.

We as a species, through a willingness to consider other mindsets, may achieve a higher level of faith, expression and certainty than is currently being achieved. Different understandings often require incomparable perspectives. One's integrity is not tied to unchanging opinions, but rather to holding appropriate opinions for the perspective considered. Developing an ability to imagine the facts from completely different mindsets seems to be a most critical necessity for reestablishing the totality of Life as it is variously illuminated by our religious beliefs, artistic expressions and scientific understandings.

Bibliography

1. 'ABDU'L-Baha, *Foundations of World Unity*, Baha'i Publishing Trust. Wilmette, IL, 1968, Originally published in 1945.
2. BAHU'ULLAH, *Gleanings from the Writings of Baha'u'llah*, Baha'i Publishing Trust. Wilmette, IL 1969. Originally published in 1939.
3. BAHU'ULLAH, *The Seven Valleys and The Four Valleys*, Baha'i Publishing Trust. Wilmette, IL 1952. Translated by Ali-Kuli Khan, Assisted by Marzieh Gail. Originally published in 1945.
4. BOOLE, George, *An Investigation of the Laws of Thought*, Dover Publications, Inc., New York, NY, Originally published in 1854, Dover edition is undated.
5. MC LUHAN, Marshall, *Understanding Media*, McGraw Hill Book Company. New York, NY, 1965, Originally published in 1964.
6. PLANCK, Max, *Where is Science Going*, Ox Bow Press, Woodbridge, CT, 1981, Originally published in 1933.
7. POLANYI, Michael, *Personal Knowledge, Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*, Harper Torchbooks, Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, NY, 1964, Originally published in 1958.
8. WITTGENSTEIN, Ludwig, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, England 1961, Originally published in German in 1921.

Captions for Figures

Figure 1. The Powerset of 3 and its 8 associated meanings of axioms and postulates.

Figure 2. Five subjective constructions of the “whole” and the objective “totality”.

Figure 3. Three famous examples of ambiguous figures.

Figure 1

0: Null

A: Doing

B: Feeling

C: Thinking

BC: (Not A) Feeling plus Thinking, called "Unity" of feeling and thought.

AC: (Not B) Doing plus Thinking, called the "Contentment" of doing what one thinks.

AB: (Not C) Doing plus Feeling, called the "Wonderment" of doing what one feels.

ABC: (Not Null) This is doing, feeling and thinking merged as one experience, or "Life".

Figure 2

Five subjectively constructed wholes of APMA Level Three:

1. A plus B plus C equals ABC (Doing plus Feeling plus Thinking equals Life; aggregate sum)
2. A plus BC equals ABC (Doing plus Unity equals Life)
3. B plus AC equals ABC (Feeling plus Contentment equals Life)
4. C plus AB equals ABC (Thinking plus Wonderment equals Life)
5. ABC equals ABC ("Name": The Nature or State of Life; identity of the whole or direct experience)

The objective totality of APMA Level Three:

6. The powerset of 3, including its eight separate views (See Figure 1) plus the five subjective wholes (See items 1-5 above) are ways of understanding and reassembling the three axioms.⁷
-

⁷ The direct whole "ABC" is both a member of the powerset of 3 (See Figure 1) and also one of the five subjective reassemblies of the whole. (See Figure 2)

Figure 3

