ANNEX 21

EXPERIMENTALLY-GENERATED, INTEGRATED, MULTI-SET CONCEPT SCHEME

Rendered searchable by OCR, but recognition errors may prevent this in some cases. PHP variants (incomplete tables) via http://www.laetusinpraesens.org/docs/level20.php

The ordered series of 210 mutually incompatible, transformation-oriented statements in this Annex was generated on the basis of the material in Annexes 0-20. The procedure is described in the paper entitled: Beyond method; engaging opposition in psycho-social organization.

The items within this Annex are ordered according to the number of set elements. This number is given as that portion of the statement number before the oblique. The portion of the number after the oblique identifies one distinct statement within the set.

Inadequacy of formulations

1/1 No single formulation (including this one), nor any logically integrated set of formulations, adequately encompasses the nature of the development process. Every position or formulation is therefore suspect. When it is formulated within a domain of unquestioned consensus, this potential doubt is inactive, thus establishing a boundary of uncritical discourse which inhibits development.

Opposition/Disagreement

2/1 New initiatives, including this one, are formulated by taking and establishing a particular position in opposition to whatever is conceived as potentially denying it. The nature of the initiative is partly determined by the way in which the challenge or initial absence of any opposing position is perceived and the possible nature of the response. It is the immediacy with which the challenge is perceived that empowers the initiative.

2/2 The taking of a position as a result of a new initiative engenders or activates a formulation which is its denial. Every formulation is therefore necessarily matched by an initiative which is incompatible with it, or opposed to it, or takes an essentially different direction from it. This opposition is fundamentally unmediated and as such cannot be observed or described. It can only be comprehended through identification with one of the opposed positions.

Dialectic synthesis

3/1 A form, through the affirmation of its existence, exerts pressure in response to its context which acts as an impulse for the continual transformation of the latter. As antecedent of any such transformation, it subjects any outcome to constraints. To the extent that the nature of the pressure on its context is unrecognized, any action initiated is distorted or unregulated in its impact on the context.

3/2 A form existing in the present stands in opposition to other pre-existing forms within the same context. As a result it is constrained by them to be of the necessary scale and proportion to oppose the pre-existing forms most dynamically. Within a given context, however, an opposing form of a particular type may be engendered which has been superseded in other co-present contexts. Forms corresponding to different stages of development may thus re-emerge and co-exist if the communication between contexts is obstructed in any way. To the extent that ignorance concerning this obstruction prevails, contexts become progressively more restricted, such that the dynamism of the opposition of the forms engendered within them diminishes with a corresponding increase in the inertia or resistance associated with the least developed forms.

3/3 Opposition between two forms tends to give rise to a new form which has properties characteristic of both of them as well as new mediating properties unique to itself. The new form interrelates or harmonizes the original opposing forms. It reconciles them at a new level of expression of unity, whether or not they then disappear. The potential existence of the new form is therefore partially implicit (athough incomplete) in each of the opposing forms prior to its generation. It thus functions as a stimulus or attractant by providing a pattern for their interaction and the organization of its outcome. Once created, the form will in its own turn prove inadequate and be opposed and superseded by more adequate forms whose nature it partially defines. The attraction of a particular form may however prevent the energetic development of this process.

Developmental interaction

4/1 In a set of forms, one form acquires a dominant status at any one time. As such it establishes the formal pattern of relationships between other forms by observing and distinguishing their elements, and interpreting their significance. Any infringement of this monopoly of power is met by a conscious reaction on the part of those associated with it who strive for position within the framework it supplies.

4/2 In a set of forms, one or more forms acquire a recessive or sub-dominant status at any one time. As such they are characterized by both minimal inherent organization and high inertial resistance to transformation. Any attempt to change those associated with such forms is met by unconscious reaction.

4/3 In a set containing a dominant and a dominated form, the pattern of relationships governed by the dominant form proves progressively more inadequate as a framework for handling the accumulation of new information and experience. Inconsistencies, contradictions and incompleteness gradually accumulate and become increasingly apparent as conditions change. The dominant form alone does not contain the variety to encompass and control the complex conditions to which it is exposed. The value of the recessive or inferior form becomes correspondingly apparent by contrast. The unconscious or impulsive actions of those associated with both forms serve merely to aggravate the condition and to highlight the absence of a form providing any adequate sense of direction or functional orientation for the whole.

4/4 In a set containing a dominant and an inferior form, and characterized by contradictions, adequate control is usually maintained through the momentum of working processes governed by the dominant form. Any deviation is corrected by a conscious integrative action on the part of those associated with that form. As the contradictions cease to be held in restraint in this way, the source of control is effectively transferred form the dominant form to the inferior form which thus emerges to take its place. To the extent that this transfer of control is resisted, the change is likely to be violent rather than smooth.

Constraints on existence

5/1 For a form to exist and acquire any momentary significance, it must bear a consciously recognized relationship to a context. If this relationship is ignored the form effectively merges into the context and cannot be distinguished from it due to the absence of any recognized boundaries or limits.

5/2 For a form to exist and acquire any momentary significance, it must be sufficiently general to be perceived as relevant to other variants of the phenomenon detached from immediate perception within the domain of discourse. If it is so general that it is perceived as relating to too wide a range of phenomena, then its significance is lost. Or, alternatively, it becomes so detached from immediate perception that its significance becomes fragmented into seemingly unrelated facets which arouse differing degrees of attachment or rejection.

5/3 For a form to exist and acquire any momentary significance, it must be perceived as relating to tangible phenomena of immediate relevance. But if this relationship is so strong as to be perceived as merely a reflection of those phenomena or identical with them, then its significance is lost or engenders contradictions, confusion and associated conflict.

5/4 For a form to exist and acquire any momentary significance, it must be perceived as sufficiently complex to encompass the complexity. If this is too much greater than that of the phenomena, its significance is either lost or a faith in the form may be engendered which is then valued for its own sake, independently of the phenomena, and possibly as being in some way superior to them.

5/5 For a form to exist and acquire any momentary significance, it must be sufficiently simple to be a comprehensible vehicle for intention. But if it is perceived as too simple or trivial) the significance is lost. The unchannelled intention then reinforces inactivity or degenerates into sublimated forms of action.

Coherence through renewal

6/1 Sustaining the coherence of a form through its continual renewal requires a focused reaffirmation of the existence of the elements which ensure its integrity. To the extent that this reaffirmation is lacking, knowledge of its structure is eroded and the boundaries of the form become confused or dissolve.

6/2 Sustaining the coherence of a form through its continual renewal requires redefinition of the form to distinguish it from the superficial features of encroaching alternative forms with which it interacts. These may appear more attractive if concentration is relaxed. To the extent that this transformative process is lacking, aspects of the alternative definitions may be partially incorporated, thus progressively destroying the form as an integrated structure by formation of a hybrid or an egglomerate.

6/3 Sustaining the coherence of a form through its continual renewal requires repeated effort to understand the essential or general characteristics of the form which underlie any particular set of superficial features and thus not bound by them. To the extent that this understanding is lacking, the superficial features condemn the form as unnecessarely constraining, unsatisfactory, with consequent reactions.

6/4 Sustaining the coherence of a form through its continual renewal requires periodic detached recognition of its wider significance and how its development can best be controlled in relation to this. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, transformation of the form is blocked because of the narrow perspective with which it is viewed.

6/5 Sustaining the coherence of a form through its continual renewal requires recognition of the contextual structuring constraints, qualitative characteristics and challenges which ensure its stability, and in terms of which it may be transformed. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, the stability of the form is undermined by doubts concerning its present relevance.

6/6 Sustaining the coherence of a form through its continual renewal requires adaptation of insights concerning its possible development to a realistic strategy for its actual development. To the extent that this adaptation is lacking, any strategies formulated will be impractical and will result in maldevelopment of the form.

Modes of change

7/1 Under certain conditions the only form of change perceived as effective is through the willful destruction of a prevailing form, whether or not a new or more adequate form can be substituted in its stead. This approach is favoured when the existing form is perceived as essentially static and an inhibitor of any form of dynamism or growth.

7/2 Under certain conditions the only form of change perceived as effective is through supportive interaction (dialogue) with the various perspectives formulated within the community concerned. Through such participative involvement on the part of the change agent as a sympathetic catalyst, a new community viewpoint can develop naturally from its existing foundations and be transformed. This approach is favoured when existing methods are perceived as implying destructive discontinuity or the imposition of inappropriate external formulations which would do violence to the community's growth and thus effectively retard it.

7/3 Under certain conditions the only form of change perceived as effective is through the formulation of a new all-encompassing philosophy (paradigm, theory, or strategy) as the reference framework in terms of which change can be initiated and undertaken. This approach is favoured when the diversity of existing initiatives is perceived as breeding confusion, dissipating resources, and undermining any possibility of a new level of collective achievement for the community as a whole.

7/4 Under certain conditions the only form of change perceived as effective is by enabling a more sensitive recognition of the variety of existing forms and the manner in which, through their various (and possibly discordant) interactions, they already constitute a rich and harmonious pattern saturated with meaning at a deeper level of significance. This approach is favoured when there is concern that new forms advocated are insensitive to and detached from the inherent harmony in those which have already been organically integrated into the tissue of lived reality.

7/5 Under certain conditions the only form of change perceived as effective is through the formulation of laws and definitions concerning observable processes on the basis of controlled investigation of their properties. Through such forms control is obtained over the processes which can then be used to restructure the environment according to their possibilities. This approach is favoured when there is concern that the processes of change are clothed in superstition, mystification, and are attributed solely to chance, or accident, or inexplicable agents acting spontaneously beyond the control of man.

../..

7/6 Under certain conditions the only form of change perceived as effective emerges by renunciation of forms based upon the spatio-temporal world in favour of other factors and frames of reference to which appeal may be made. This approach is favoured when there is recognition that manipulative control of particular sub-systems of the external physical environment is only partially satisfactory (even when it is complete), and that less tangible dimensions need to be taken into account. Any such forms are frequently at least partially based on transformations of the inner world of the individual as it relates to the external world.

7/7 Under certain conditions the only form of change perceived as effective is to design configurations through which the full range of existing forms in opposition to each other can function creatively as complementaries, compensating for each others limitations and excesses. This approach is favoured when there is concern that the various approaches to change are functioning together so discordantly that some new form of dynamic order is required which provides a context for their different, and essentially incompatible, orientations.

Constraints on change

8/1 In assessing any apparent need for change, care is required to avoid mistaken formulations of the environmental condition. These can lead, for example, to an impetuous response or action for action's sake, from the consequences of which recovery may be difficult.

8/2 In formulating and planning any change initiative, care is required in selecting the point and manner of intervention. The constraints rarely offer the desired freedom of action and may easily be used as a focus for distracting dissatisfaction.

8/3 In formulating the nature of the change initiative, care is required in adapting any presentation of it to avoid the temporary benefits of pleasing whoever is identified with the current condition or failing to acknowledge the difficulties to be encountered in changing it. These difficulties include weaknesses in those associated with the change initiative itself.

8/4 In implementing a change initiative as formulated, care is required that the initiative is not itself distorted by close association with the adverse conditions to which it responds or weakened by avoiding unpleasant decisions which have to be made to maintain the integrity of the response.

8/5 In sustaining a change initiative as formulated, care is required in ensuring its equilibrium with the intensification and expansion of activity due to confidence from successful experience with any adverse conditions encountered and with the distractions of contentment with positive achievements.

8/6 Once a change initiative has achieved its maximum deployment, care is required in responding to the limitations on any further development. The original direction of effort may well be deflected in the pursuit of further success, especially in response to any accumulation of negative assessments.

8/7 Once the essential task of a change initiative is approaching completion, care is required in deciding on the termination of activities as originally intended. It may seem natural to continue the activities or to institutionalize them. Positive encouragement to do so may be received from all concerned. Succumbing to these pressures creates the risk of entrepment by a pattern of activity which it may then prove difficult to terminate at any time.

8/8 After a change initiative has been terminated, care is required in evaluating the activities and the achievments in the light of the original intent in order to avoid subsequent dependence on them.

Implementation of a transformation process

9/1 Implementation of a transformative process subject to real-world hazards requires assembly of the necessary operational resources of an adequate quality. To the extent that assembly is impossible, or their quality is inadequate, the process will be handicapped and partially controlled by the nature of those deficiencies.

9/2 Implementation of a transformative process subject to real-world hazards requires precise and energetic clarification of the succeeding stages of the process. To the extent that this clarification is lacking, action will be confused and momentum will be insufficient to overcome unforeseen problems

9/3 Implementation of a transformative process subject to real-world hazards requires recognition of deviation or conflict between resources assembled and process planning in the light of independent critical questions concerning the implementation process. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, or that the questions are poorly conceived, further implementation (together with any corrective action) will result in an imbalanced process vulnerable to disruption.

9/4 Implementation of a transformative process subject to real-world hazards requires attentive preparation of the assembled elements to be processed. To the extent that this attentiveness is lacking, details of the preparation will be carelessly omitted or improprerly executed thus jeopardizing the success of the operation.

9/5 Implementation of a transformative process subject to real-world hazards necessitates a controlled manipulation of the prepared elements into an emerging configuration. To the extent that this manipulation is improperly controlled, or that the correspondence between the action taken and the knowledge of the action actually required is otherwise inadequate, the results will be unsatisfactory.

9/6 Implementation of a transformative process subject to real-world hazards requires dispassionate evaluation of the form emerging from the process in the light of the original intention and the current cirucumstances. To the extent that this evaluation is inadequate (and no corrective action is taken), the product may either not correspond to the original intention or be inappropriate to current possibilities for using it.

9/7 Implementation of a transformative process subject to real-world hazards requires that the emergent product be appropriately detached from the process which gave rise to it. To the extent that this separation is inadequate, or the relationship between the product and the process is otherwise confused, the resultant dependency relationships will jeopardize the value of the product.

../..

9/8 Implementation of a transformative process subject to real-world hazards requires controlled delivery of the product to its originally intended setting in the face of possible reactions against it. To the extent that there is over-sensitivity to such reactions, the delivery cannot be completed thus jeopardizing the original intent.

9/9 Implementation of a transformative process subject to real-world hazards requires an appropriate attitude on completion of the process to ensure that it is evaluated within its proper context. To the extent that this attitude is lacking, efforts may then be made to associate either the product or the process to other contexts and initiatives. This distorts, the originally intended significance of the initiative and runs the risk of confusing any new initiatives.

Endurance of a form

10/1 The endurance of a form is conditioned by its inbuilt ability to recognize the probable consequences of initiatives it determines and thus ensure relationships to other formulations which are supportive of their mutual development. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, destructive initiatives emerge with ultimately negative consequences for the development of the original form.

10/2 The endurance of a form is conditioned by its inbuilt ability to recognize the determining causes of developments in its environment and thus establish supportive relationships for the development of other forms on the basis of its own experience. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, the form develops parasitic or exploitative relationships with other forms which are ultimately detrimental to its own development.

10/3 The endurance of a form is conditioned by its inbuilt ability to recognize the characteristic initiatives and responses engendured by other forms in order, by exercise of discrimination, to determine those with which a mutually beneficial association is possible. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, the formulation is continually drawn into illusory or mutually conflicting relationships with other forms, in an uncontrollable manner which provides no stable foundation for its own development and effectively conceals its possibility.

10/4 The endurance of a form is conditioned by its inbuilt ability to recognize the developmental potential of other forms in order to adapt appropriately to such alternative perspectives for its own further development. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, the potential of such alternative forms is misrepresented, thus undermining the future adaptability of the form and the refinement of its own development goal.

10/5 The endurance of a form is conditioned by its inbuilt ability to recognize the different levels or capacities by which other forms may be characterized in order to relate appropriately to them to further mutual development. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, any relationships risk entrapment in apparent contradictions and in inappropriate responses to forms which stand in active opposition. In such circumstances the form may simply serve to spread dissension and bind awareness to particular expressions of a form.

../..

10/6 The endurance of a form is conditioned by its inbuilt ability to recognize the pathways and goals of different modes of development characteristic of other forms and to adapt appropriately to an environment with such contrasting possibilities. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, other forms are actively condemned, often with considerable prejudice. The power and development of the form is then severely handicapped by the distortion and fragmentation of the actions it determines into rigidly polarized opposition to other forms.

10/7 The endurance of a form is conditioned by its inbuilt ability to recognize, through some process of detachment, those of its features which need to be gradually abandoned and those which need to be reinforced. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, rigid attachment to an unchanging form deflects any inherent dynamism into superficial matters of little consequence.

10/8 The endurance of a form is conditioned by its inbuilt ability to recall earlier stages in its development and the manner in which weaknesses were progressively eliminated. To the extent that this recollection is lacking, the form is unable to sustain any method for its own transformation and the necessary confidence is instead displaced into reinforcing attachment to existing weaknesses.

10/9 The endurance of a form is conditioned by its inbuilt ability to recognize the probable future states of forms and the probable circumstances of their termination. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, the form tends to become the vehicle for negative intentions towards the positive achievements associated with other forms, rather than channelling that intention to reinforce its own developmental momentum.

10/10 The endurance of a form is conditioned by its inbuilt ability to recognize in other forms the weaknesses to which they have developed an appropriate resistance. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, the form becomes a vehicle for the development of destructive misperceptions which hinder any ability either to abandon the weaknesses they have overcome or to free other forms from such obstacles to their own development.

Empowerment and importance of a form

11/1 The empowerment and importance of a form is determined by the degree of constructive or destructive action with which it is associated and the manner whereby they are distinguished.

11/2 The empowerment and importance of a form is determined by the degree of enrichening or impoverishing action with which it is associated.

11/3 The empowerment and importance of a form is determined by the degree of protection or exposure with which it is associated.

11/4 The empowerment and importance of a form is determined by the degree of assistance or obstruction with which it is associated.

11/5 The empowerment and importance of a form is determined by the degree of bias or lack of bias with which it is associated.

11/6 The empowerment and importance of a form is determined by the degree of security or danger with which it is associated.

11/7 The empowerment and importance of a form is determined by the degree of confidence or doubt with which it is associated.

11/8 The empowerment and importance of a form is determined by the degree of consolation or dejection with which it is associated.

11/9 The empowerment and importance of a form is determined by the degree of inspiration and reinforcement with which it is associated.

11/10 The empowerment and importance of a form is determined by the quality of remedial advice with which it is associated.

11/11 The empowerment and importance of a form is determined by the power of the subtle qualities with which it is associated.

Harmoniously transformative controlled relationship

12/1 A form in a harmoniously transformative controlled relationship with its environment is characterized by forceful spontaneous intiatives appropriately guided by an implicit sense of opportunity and constraint. Such action opens up viable new possibilities. If inappropriately controlled, it may be excessively violent, misguided, unfruitful or merely self-serving.

12/2 A form in a harmoniously transformative controlled relationship with its environment is characterized by a capacity to respond receptively to a comprehensive range of external initiatives by providing appropriate frameworks within which they can be embodied and consolidated. To the extent this capacity is lacking, such receptivity may be over-loaded leading to selective resistance, non-response or alternatively to their cooptation.

12/3 A form in a harmoniously transformative controlled relationship with its environment is characterized by a capacity to interrelate initiatives, creatively and explicitly, with contexts within which they can be further developed. To the extent this capacity is lacking, any such catalytic mediation becomes diffuse and lacking in continiuty. Apparent contradictions are then a source of confusion rather than being perceived as aspects of an intricate pattern of stimulating diversity.

12/4 A form in a harmoniously transformative controlled relationship with its environment is characterized by the gradual emergence of higher order organization in response to intitiatives and constraints. If such emergence is absent or inhibited, the form engenders actions which are increasingly incapable of containing the forces to which they respond.

12/5 A form in a harmoniously transformative controlled relationship with its environment necessitates a degree of organization which enables it to respond fully, in an integrated uncompromising forceful manner, to a full range of external events of which it remains independent. To the extent that this capacity is inappropriately developed, such organization is characterized by domination, self-appreciation, and misuse of power.

12/6 A form in a harmoniously transformative controlled relationship with its environment necessitates intuitive readjustment of implicit assumptions in order to renew the capacity to respond appropriately to events in context. To the extent that this capacity is lacking, any response is inhibited or focused on superficial detail.

12/7 A form in a harmoniously transformative controlled relationship with its environment is characterized by a capacity for detached evaluation of past development from a perspective which provides both an intuitive balance between relevant factors and a sense of integrative possibilities. To the extent that this capacity is lacking, evaluation of external factors is negative or indecisive thus hindering further development.

12/8 A form is a harmoniously transformative controlled relationship with its environment is characterized by the capacity to respond spontaneously to higher order goals and possibilities even if the prevailing set of lower order goals and possibilities (with which it is identified) must be abandoned in order to do so. To the extent that the capacity for this transformation is lacking, the lower order goals and possibilities are distorted and reinforced to the detriment of further development.

12/9 A form in a harmoniously transformative controlled relationship with its environment is characterized by the spontaneous initiation of higher order processes which are focused in order to transform the operation of pre-existing lower order processes by which it is governed. To the extent that this capacity is inappropriately developed, any processes intiated are misdirected to the detriment of further development.

12/10 A form in a harmoniously transformative controlled relationship with its environment is characterized by an explicit pattern of control governing processes at all levels, whether in terms of past development, future possibilities, or current needs and opportunities. To the extent that this capacity is inappropriately developed, there is a tendency to over-control which is detrimental to further development.

12/11 A form in a harmoniously transformative controlled relationship with its environment is characterized by the capacity to engender appropriate design in the light of significant new insights which bring possibilities and constraints into focus in an unforeseen and fruitful manner, thus facilitating effective action for their development. To the extent that this capacity is inappropriately developed, it results in automatic negative reaction to external initiatives and conditions, to the detriment of their further developments.

12/12 A form in a harmoniously transformative controlled relationship with its environment is characterized by a response pattern of reconciliation between all potential initiatives or conflicts. This unifying pattern thus acts as a stabilizing influence ensuring continuity, particularly between higher and lower-order processes. To the extent that this capacity is inappropriately developed, the response pattern becomes confused, reacting inadequately to spurious conditions.

Creative renewal

13/1 Renewal is dependent on the emergence of a creative response to any impotence and enfeeblement of action associated with the form in its current mode.

13/2 Renewal is dependent on the emergence of a creative response to any unproductive action associated with the form in its current mode.

13/3 Renewal is dependent on the emergence of a creative response to any fragmented or inconsistent action associated with the form in its current mode.

13/4 Renewal is dependent on the emergence of a creative response to any non-viable products of action associated with the form in its current mode.

13/5 Renewal is dependent on the emergence of a creative response to any dependence and powerlessness of the form in its current mode.

13/6 Renewal is dependent on the mergence of a creative response to any rigidity or crystallization of the form in its current mode.

13/7 Renewal is dependent on the emergence of a creative response to any impracticality or shortsightedness of action associated with the form in its current mode.

13/8 Renewal is dependent on the emergence of a creative response to any sense of futility associated with the form in its current mode, or to any (consequent) self-destructive processes.

13/9 Renewal is dependent on the emergence of a creative response to any apathy or pessimism associated with the form in its current mode.

13/10 Renewal is dependent on the emergence of a creative response to any unpredictability or uncontrollability associated with the form in its current mode.

13/11 Renewal is dependent on the emergence of a creative response to any action associated with the form becoming narrowly focused as an end in itself.

13/12 Renewal is dependent on the emergence of a creative response to any corruption or dissolution of the form in its current mode.

13/13 Renewal is dependent on the emergence of a creative response to the total disappearance of the form in its current mode.

Cycle of development processes

14/1 The cycle of development processes includes extreme phases characterized by static, unchanging forms.

14/2 The cycle of development processes includes extreme phases characterized by the breakdown of forms into their component elements.

14/3 The cycle of development processes includes extreme phases characterized by the coalescence of forms through which a new form is engendered.

14/4 The cycle of development processes includes extreme phases characterized by the harmonious interaction of forms which retain their identity.

14/5 The cycle of development processes includes extreme phases characterized by a unified, continuous pattern of forms.

14/6 The cycle of development processes includes extreme phases characterized by a diversity of separate, discrete forms.

14/7 The cycle of development processes includes extreme phases characterized by specific conflictual relationships between forms.

14/8 The cycle of development processes includes extreme phases characterized by qualitatively significant undefinable relationships between forms.

14/9 The cycle of development processes includes extreme phases characterized by chance-determined forms.

14/10 The cycle of development processes includes extreme phases characterized by forms which result as a natural and predictable consequence of those processes.

14/11 The cycle of development processes includes extreme phases characterized by forms whose existence in the spatio-temporal world is self-explanatory.

14/12 The cycle of development processes includes extreme phases characterized by forms whose existence cannot be adequately explained in terms of the spatio-temporal frame of reference.

14/13 The cycle of development processes includes extreme phases characterized by fluidity, turbulence and chaos.

14/14 The cycle of development processes includes extreme phases characterized by ordered systems and well-defined patterns.

Construction and development of form

15/1 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires direct or indirect observation of empirical facts, whether events, processes, or phenomena.

15/2 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires appropriate procedures of measurement of empirical quantitative can be obtained.

15/3 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires appropriate procedures for the design and interpretation of significant experiments.

15/4 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires approrpiate procedures of empirical generalization and descriptive classification to organize empirical data in a preliminary way in preparation for systematic classification.

15/5 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires appropriate procedures whereby explanatory results can be represented.

15/6 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires the use of conceptual elements, whether characteristic abstractions, terminology or techniques, which constitute the intellectual keys by which phenomena are made intelligible.

15/7 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires hypothesis formation, namely postulation through creative insight of a conceptual model based on assumptions concerning existing experimental observations or measurements.

15/8 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires recognition of a problem which appears susceptible to solution by use, or extension, of available techniques.

15/9 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires the possible adjustment or replacement of a conceptual model as a result of new observations or measurements.

15/10 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires the selection of a particular style of explanatory procedure required for the application of a given group of concepts.

15/11 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires use of formal or mathematical elements, whether computational, construction or analytic procedures.

15/12 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires use of techniques of formal transformation, whether formalization (reduction to relations while disregarding the nature of the relata) or axiomatization (tracing of entailments back to accepted axioms).

15/13 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires validation of a conceptual model by checking its predictions against observations or measurements using techniques of confirmation, corroboration or falsification.

15/14 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires the production of rigorous formal definitions of the validity, probability, degree of confirmation, and other evidential relations involved in the judgement of a logical argument.

15/15 Construction of form and the logical prediction of its future development requires the use of a formal propositional system having a definite, essential logical structure, namely a formal scheme of propositions and axioms bound together by logical relations.

Values and assumptions

16/1 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlights any unfounded assumption that the form is without imperfection.

16/2 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlights any unfounded assumption that the form is an end in itself.

16/3 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlights any unfounded assumption that there is a permanent dimension to the form.

16/4 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlights any unfounded assumption that the form is composed of independent external features.

16/5 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlights any unfounded assumption that the inadequacies of the form have no cause or are their own cause.

16/6 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlights any unfounded assumption that the inadequacies of the form arise from irrelevant causes.

16/7 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlights any unfounded assumption that the inadequacies of the form are only due to one cause, independent of conditions or secondary circumstances.

16/8 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlights any unfounded assumption that the inadequacies of the form are necessarily permanent.

16/9 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlights any unfounded assumption that it is impossible to generate an adequate form.

16/10 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlights any unfounded assumption that the form as achieved is adequate, can be accepted, and that further effort to generate a more adequate form should cease.

16/11 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlights any unfounded assumption that the most abstract forms constitute the ultimate achievement.

16/12 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlight any unfounded assumption that, however perfect the form engendered, its inadequacy will eventually become apparent.

../..

16/13 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlight any unfounded assumption that there is no method adequate to the current circumstances.

16/14 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlights any unfounded assumption that there is no suitable method, or pattern of methods, whereby acentric significance can be effectively perceived or reflected in a form.

16/15 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlights any unfounded assumption supporting the practice of methods which yield no useful results.

16/16 Recognition of the values underlying a form highlights any unfounded assumption that there are no effective remedies for the inadequacies of the existing form.

Relationship potential of a form

17/1 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on its relative imperfection. Absence of imperfection reduces dependency arising from formal incompleteness thus removing any basis for interdependancy. However, the nature of the imperfection strongly influences the quality of interdependence with which the form can be associated.

17/2 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on the recognition that the form is not an end in itself.

17/3 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on recognition of the impermanence of the form. The larger the set of forms within which relationships may exist, the greater the probability that such relationships will involve patterns of formal development and transformation in which any invariance will be at a higher level of abstraction than that of the form as originally recognized.

17/4 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on recognition that the form is itself the integrated development of interdependent forms.

17/5 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on recognition of the causes of the perceived inadequacies of the form. Such recognition establishes a relationship between the form and other forms. However the nature of the perceived cause strongly influences the quality of interdependence with which the form can be associated.

17/6 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on recognition that the inadequacies of the form arise from relevant causes and not from causes irrelevant to the nature of the form.

../..

17/7 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on recognition that the inadequacies of the form are due to a multiplicity of causes themselves dependent on conditions and secondary circumstances.

17/8 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on recognition that the inadequacies of the form and their causes are necessarily of a temporary nature.

17/9 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on conviction that it is possible to generate a more adequate form. By focusing attention on possible adaptation of the form, its evolving relationship to other forms thus becomes evident.

17/10 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on continuing effort to generate a more adequate form and refusal, as adequate, of what has already been achieved. This ensures that the form is placed in a context of forms in process of transformation rather than in isolation.

17/11 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on recognition that elaboration and retention of the most abstract form does not constitute the ultimate achievment. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, any such form, despite its sophistication, is a hindrance to the dynamics of further development.

17/12 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on conviction that forms can be engendered which will not subsequently come to be perceived as inadequate. Such forms must necessarily incorporate and counterbalance the factors which make for the emergence of inadequacy in an evolving set of forms.

17/13 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on conviction that there is a method, or pattern of methods, which can be followed and is adequate to

current circumstrances. To the extent that this conviction is lacking, it is unlikely that significant relationships between forms will be recognized.

17/14 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on conviction that a suitable method, or pattern of methods, may emerge whereby acentric significance can be effectively perceived or reflected in form. To the extent that this conviction is lacking, methods used will continue to be centred on particular approaches which fail to take account simultaneously of insights emerging from those centred on other approaches.

17/15 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on recognition of the futility of practising methods which yield no fruitful results. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, the methods pursued will limit the range and richness of relationships which can be established between forms.

17/16 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms, is directly dependent on conviction that there are effective remedies for the inadequacies of the existing form.

17/17 The relationship potential of a form to other forms, namely the extent to which it is assimilated into a larger set of differing forms depends on (intuitive) recognition of the permeability and variability of the boundary of that form.

Inadequate transformation attempts

18/1 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as the assembly or mobilization of operational resources in accordance with a predetermined concept. This tends to engender either subservience or considerable resistance and alienation of potential support. Such forcing initiatives may well prevent formation of linkages vital to the future integrity of the operation and may lead to its early abortion or a considerable limitation in its scope.

18/2 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as allowing operational resources to assemble, as and when they may, according to the emergent processes of their initial interaction. This tends to result in considerable confusion, seldom with any creative operational outcome of other than a superficial nature. Such initiatives then lack coherence, continuity and any capacity for endurance.

18/3 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be underminded by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as the imposition of a programme of operations. This immediately splits the resources mobilized into the empowered and the disempowered. The strength of the former then tends to be overestimated, whilst their weaknesses are under estimated, and the full contribution of the disempowered is blocked. The imposed programme is never called into question. This procedure further alienates potential support and increases the risk that the operation will go out of control if circumstances later arise in which the blocked or alienated resources are essential.

18/4 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as the dependence on spontaneous, participative self-organization of operational programmes. This tends to result in uncertainty and conflicting activities which reinforce lack of coherence, of continuity, and of any capacity for endurance. Any programmes which emerge are immediately called into question.

18/5 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as the reassessment of objectives and direction through detailed analysis following the initiation of the operation, this tends to be a destructive, unfruitful exercise providing little more than an intellectual framework as support for

programme integration. The exercise then serves to alienate involvement in the operation, rather than to uncover new reserves of support for it.

18/6 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as the reassessment of objectives and direction through resensitizing processes, affirmation, and celebration of solidarity, following the initiation of the operation. This tends to emphasize the dimensions of consensus (whether intangible or superficial) at the expense of the dimensions of disagreement (often specific and fundamental). Operational coherence is then dependent on the former without any adequate framework to balance the issues raised by the latter.

18/7 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as the preparation or partial destructuring of the raw materials of the operation (for subsequent transformation), according to a rigid procedure unresponsive to contextual feedback. This tends to result in the accumulation of conditions which disrupt the procedure. The operation can then only be continued by overriding such obstacles or by limiting its original scope. Both solutions generate difficulties necessitating future operations for their elimination.

18/8 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as the preparation or partial destructuring of the raw materials of the operation (for subsequent transformation) according to a procedure totally responsive to contextual feedback. This tends to result in the erosion (and eventual dissipation) of the procedure whose impetus is then absorbed into the contextual precesses.

18/9 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as the transformation of the raw materials of the operation by a series of precisely defined (and reproducible) changes of structure . This tends to limit such operations to those of essentially mechanical scope and renders them inapplicable to transformations of perception, attitude or value.

18/10 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as the transformation of the raw materials of the operation by a set of intuitive, irreproducible processes. This tends to limit such operations to those of essentially intangible scope. This renders them inapplicable to transformations of tangible conditions which should reflect such changes and give them a measure of permanence.

18/11 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as evaluating the transformation in terms of the quality of the results achieved, without taking into consideration the viability of the process as a means to that end. This facilitates the emergence of processes whose by-products set the stage for later difficulties.

18/12 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as evaluating the transformation in terms of the viability of the process, without taking into consideration the quality of the results achieved (if any). This facilitates the emergence of processes carried out as an end in themselves, but which generate little of permanent benefit to the context in which they take place.

18/13 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as abrupt separation of the emergent product from the process which gives rise to it. Such sudden separation endangers the product in its final phases of dependency on the process.

18/14 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as continuing dependence of the emergent product on the process which gives rise to it. This pattern of dependency endangers the ultimate self-sufficiency of the product.

18/15 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as delivery of the final product to the originally intended setting in a manner insensitive to reactions from that setting. This tends to lead to the early rejection of the product.

18/16 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as delivery of

the final product to the originally intended setting in a manner overly sensitive to reactions from that setting. Unless the normal resistance to new products is overcome, this tends to prevent the product from being delivered.

18/17 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as complete rejection of any subsequent evaluation of the process or association with it. This tends to deprive subsequent initiatives from any value of the process as a learning experience.

18/18 Attempts at the transformation of form tend to be undermined by destructive energy-dissipating conflict between methodological extremes such as continuing identification with the process after its completion. This tends to distort any subsequent initiatives.

Qualitative transformation

19/1 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) the assembly or mobilization of resources in accordance with a predetermined concept.

19/2 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) allowing operational resources to assemble naturally of their own accord.

19/3 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) the imposition of a programme of operations.

19/4 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) the dependence on spontaneous, participative self-organization of operational programmes.

19/5 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) the reassessment of objectives and direction through detailed analysis, following the initiation of the operation.

19/6 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) the reassessment of objectives and direction through resensitizing processes, following the initiation of the operation.

19/7 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) the preparation or partial restructuring of the elements of the operation, according to a rigid procedure unresponsive to contextual feedback.

19/8 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) the preparation or partial restructuring of the elements of the operation, according to a procedure totally responsive to contextual feedback.

19/9 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) the transformation of the elements of the operation by a series of precisely defined changes of structure.

19/10 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) the transformation of the elements of the operation by a set of intuitive, irreproducible processes.

../..

19/11 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) evaluating the transformation in terms of the quality of the results achieved, without taking into consideration the viability of the process as a means to that end.

19/12 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) evaluating the transformation in terms of the process, without taking into consideration the quality of the results achieved.

19/13 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) abrupt separation of the emergent product which gives rise to it.

19/14 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) continuing dependence of the emergent product on the process which gives rise to it.

19/15 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) delivery of the final product to the originally intended setting in a manner insensitive to reactions from that setting.

19/16 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) delivery of the final product to the originally intended setting in a manner extremely sensitive to reactions from that setting.

19/17 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) complete rejection of any subsequent evaluation of the process or association with it.

19/18 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus, alternating from (and to) continuing identification with the process after its completion.

19/19 Qualitative transformation depends on harmonious transfer of focus between extremes whilst maintaining an appropriate periodicty for such transfers within a self-organizing pattern.

Significance of mutually constraining forms

20/1 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with their avoidance of unnecessary or excessive response to each other. To the extent that this forebearance is lacking, the significance is obscured by the turbulent nature of that response.

20/2 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with affirmation of their affinity. To the extent that this affirmation is lacking, the significance is obscured by the consequences of previous unbalanced interactions.

20/3 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with their controlled interaction. To the extent that such control is lacking, the significance is obscured by the uncontrolled nature of their interaction.

20/4 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with recognition of their sensitively supportive response to each others condition. To the extent that this sensitivity is lacking, the significance is obscured by destructive interactions.

20/5 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with reconciliation of their respective characteristics. To the extent that this reconciliation is lacking, the significance is obscured by non-recognition or non-acceptance of some characteristics.

20/6 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with acknowledgement of inadequancies. To the extent that such acknowledgement is lacking, the significance will be obscured by distortion of the relationship for short-term advantage.

20/7 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with abandonment of claims to non-existent qualities. To the extent that such claims are not relinquished, the significance will be obscured by efforts to achieve short-term advantage.

20/8 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with the implicit development of principles governing their actions. To the extent that such implicit principles are lacking, the significance is obscured by unconstrained actions and their consequences.

20/9 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with the explicit development of principles governing their actions. To the extent that such principles are lacking, the significance is obscured by unconstrained actions and their consequences.

../..

20/10 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with acknowledgement of obstacles to further development. To the extent that such acknowledgement is lacking, the significance is obscured and their power reinforced.

20/11 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with abandonment of efforts to increase the resources associated with either form. To the extent that this is not achieved, the significance is obscured by the dependance created on the resource-seeking activity.

20/12 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with reservations concerning the resources and characteristics associated with the forms. To the extent that this reserve is lacking, the significance is obscured by preoccupation with these attributes.

20/13 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with enthusiasm for the functions with which they are associated. To the extent that this enthusiasm is lacking, the significance is obscured by indifference to those functions.

20/14 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with perseverance. To the extent that such persistent attention is lacking, the significance is obscured.

20/15 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with recognition of the constructive and destructive consequences of their interaction. To the extent that this recognition is lacking, the significance is obscured.

20/16 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with recollection of the multiple aspects of their interaction. To the extent that such memories are eroded, the significance is obscured.

20/17 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with alertness to potential confusion. To the extent that such attentiveness is lacking, the significance is obscured.

20/18 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with intelligent interest in their interaction. To the extent that such interest is lacking, the significance is obscured.

20/19 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with balanced attention to them. To the extent that there is preoccupation with one form, the significance is obscured.

20/20 The significance of mutually constraining forms emerges with ability to focus on their interaction. To the extent that such focus cannot be maintained, the significance is obscured.