

For My Offspring
and Other Friends

Carlton Wayne Turner

Copyright ©2014-2019 Carlton Wayne Turner.
No part of this document or the related files may be reproduced or transmitted in any form, by any means (electronic, photocopying, recording, or otherwise) without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Introduction

There are some things that strike me as significantly important and often rarely understood, that I would like to share primarily with my family and friends. There have been years that I have been more capable of sharing these things, but also during those years I was less impressed by their importance. So now that I may be less able to do it, I am also more impressed that it needs to be done. I wonder how often folks experience this.

I am not interested in getting into things like “do not eat that” or “don’t do this” or “don’t do that”, or anything like that. This is not so much of a behavioral or what to think thing, but more of a *how-to-think* focus.

When we are looking for something very specific it is common for us to miss almost everything else. This makes it important to enter search routines as dynamically as we can. I can remember regaining increasing coherence after my stroke and discovering what it is like to notice every little thing around me. Walking slowly up the road or along a path I would notice the tiniest little things: gravel, leaves, seeds, branches, and much more. Everything seemed so special. Then, as coherence advanced, I noticed less of the details, and even eventually began thinking about something entirely different than what I was perceiving. This I recognized to be a common disability, not an enhanced ability.

Everything I am writing here is testable. It is all true. This information is, of course, very interesting to me, and I, of course, would not care to share anything with you that was not interesting to me. Just as most of us do not share things that are not interesting to us. My hope is that by sharing about these things with a hopefully sufficient degree of clarity and a bit more depth than I ever have before, perhaps, and showing their relationships to each other, that your interest in them can be developed. Some of the things I am sharing here may appear to be anecdotal, but none of it is dependent upon anecdotes. All of it can be reviewed and tested fully. I will try to provide links or citations to places where you can find more information so that you can see for yourself.

I am trying to describe why I am writing this paper, and give you a little bit of an idea in advance because I am trying to help you control your imagination in your understanding of *fractals*, *holons*, and *vortexes*, etc. You cannot escape these things so I want you to interact with them in the most productive ways. This is not Wayne's fantasy. These are things which are factual. Things which you will deal with whether you recognize it or not. That is why the whole paper has much more to do with *how to think* than with *what to think*.

The core topics are interrelated, as I see them, and therefore the discussion of each one tends to touch on the others. Therefore, when reading anything about one of them, there may be a mention of others which would require you to jump forward and look at them before finishing the current topic. For instance, I mentioned “vortexes” I think only twice in the imagination section and then

they are discussed later. This is not a confusing topic, but you might want to read more. This is often the case when combining a variety of topics into a single paper which must be, or typically is, read linearly, where the topics relate to each other. If you can jump from one topic to another to get a better idea of things in your reading in more of a circular or ad hoc motion, you may gather more from it. A good way for me to make this easy might be to make it into a hypertext document so you can jump back and forth.

I realize that everybody has opinions about things and, of course, this does not mean that all the opinions are factual. You can test people's opinions and find out which ones are true and which ones are not. You may discover that something I have shared with you is not accurate. I do not comment as much nowadays on the things that I share on Facebook, for instance. But if anything is not true I fully expect to be told so and why they are not true, and I will apologize to all involved when found in error.

It is interesting to learn how people learn. I enjoyed spending time with my father partly because I found out about how he learned things. And I found out about the limits of what he learned in a variety of directions, not just one linear path of learning. We each experience a tree of learning. We find out things along different branches of our learning, and I learned how his grew and divided, and when and if he discovered that some branches were not viable, how he backed up from them to continue growing a branch he thought was more viable. That is the way for all of us trying to learn things.

So, though I have increasingly rarely given you things that you should think, I do hope I did this well. I do not know. There is no way to tell that I am aware of. I have increasingly tried to share *how to think*, because that is the most important thing, and I do feel rather successful in this because of the things that you do and the decisions that I see you have made. I can tell that you have often thought about some things in a more complete way than many people do and that you care about things that are more important to care about. And that is why I would like to sum up a few details regarding how to think, and about how most folks think, so that you can understand the limitations of thinking and how to adjust your thinking. We all must *change our minds* at times if we are to be successful in living and teaching our children and others.

This is a work ‘in progress’, so please be patient.

There are several related topics that I may add, but for now four of the topics that I intend to discuss a bit are:

1. imagination,
2. fractals
3. holons
4. vortexes.

There are other important things that I am not writing about directly here yet. Such as:

Consciousness,
Neural plasticity,
etc.

Imagination

Imagination is a critical capacity of humans. We have the capacity to imagine how things will be in the future, how things are now, and how things have been, and why. While this is extremely valuable it requires another step that often does not get accomplished. That step is proof. We can readily imagine many things, but to determine their truth and to determine their viability for helping us see future things and what we should do, requires proof. Often, we are very quick to latch onto an idea that we can quickly understand, but often an explanation that we can understand quickly is not sufficient proof.

Seemingly unfortunately, across the human landscape you can see varieties of *vortexes* of human civilization at work. Large groups of people believe things that are not true that have been imagined by people, sometimes quite a bit prior to themselves. Yet they believe them. A hallmark of this capacity that is perhaps most obvious is the context of religion. But I would not want you to think that I am thinking religion is the only area of human experience or human thinking where imagination gets carried away. It is not. When we fail to prove things that we have imagined or that other folks have imagined and shared with us, we tend to give them imagined ‘reach’ which they do not deserve. This application of the word “reach” is important. It is a word that I learned in 2016. I like it a lot. Here “reach” is the capacity of an explanation to answer more questions than sought the explanation. That is, when you develop an explanation for something, test it, it appears to be true and you keep on testing it, you do not necessarily declare that it is true but you keep on looking at it, you keep on testing it. Then you can give it a *reliability factor*. But most folks do not give things a carefully developed reliability factor. We believe what someone has shared with us, either because of who shared it with us or because we do not have a better explanation, or a variety of other reasons. Because of the strength of different imaginative *vortexes*, our desire for social coherence leads us to believe them with no proof at all. This is because we all need social coherence of some sort. And it becomes difficult to engage with people apart from such things they may merely imagine.

To understand how our apparent understanding of reality develops it is helpful to look at the writings of Piaget.

http://web.mnstate.edu/smithb/Psych_TL/HD/Lesson1/PsychTopics/disequilibrium.html

<https://traveldisequilibrium.wordpress.com/2012/06/16/piagets-theory-of-disequilibrium/>

He studied childhood development and how children learn things from the blank slate forward. He describes how a child may encounter his first four-legged beast and say “mom, what's that?” And the mother would say, “that's a cat.” The child remembers this. It goes deep. It latches hold. We learn from our parents or whoever we have. Then another day the child encounters a dog and

the child says, “look mom, another cat.” And the mother says, “no, that's not a cat.” The child is thrown back and asks, “oh! what is it mom?” And the mother says, “that's a dog.” So now the child's world of four-legged critters has been divided into two. It was only one thing. And now it is two things, cats and dogs. But in that instance between knowing that this four-legged creature is not a cat and not yet knowing what it is, the child experiences a state that Piaget refers to as “disequilibration”. This is the state between believing something to be true, discovering that is not true, and learning what is true. It can be difficult. Both children and adults must find out what *is* more true. Afterwards, as you might imagine, a young person discovers many more four-legged creatures and learns what they are called and defines them. This is the way that we learn *all* things. In this process, we learn that there are some sources of information that we can trust more than others. And we learn even late in life that some sources we cannot trust. And we discover *why* we cannot trust them.

It is always good to continue loving the people around us, but it is critical that we learn who we can trust in certain areas of knowledge *and why*. It is inevitable that we discover that a line of thinking that we have believed is not accurate. It may have been used, yet inaccurate, for a long time now.

Fractals

<https://youtu.be/ZbK92bRW2lQ>

Benoit Mandelbrot – Hunting the Hidden Dimension

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8246501>

Burlando ~ The fractal geometry of evolution

http://flatrock.org.nz/topics/science/fractal_evolution.htm

Fractal Evolution

<https://www.newscientist.com/article/mg20827821-000-the-chaos-theory-of-evolution>

The Chaos Theory of Evolution ~ Keith Bennett

This juncture brings up the topic of **fractals**. There are a variety of sources of information on the meaning of fractals and how fractals proliferate in nature, but often the ideas that you run into are fractional. Where the ideas are often lacking is in the fractal nature of *our thinking*. We learn things across a variety of lines of thought. We are learning about animals or trees. We are learning about rocks. We are learning about grasses. We are learning about people. We are learning all kinds of things and we are taught these things by the people that we have been closest to during these learning years. Then we discover that we have been taught something that is not true, because we have been later able to test it beyond how the person who taught us tested it, and beyond their fears.



You can look at the things that you have learned as a tree of knowledge on a personal level. You can also look at this, on the level of humanity but it is easier to look at it first, at the level of our personal learning. When we discover that there is something that cannot be extended or proven we have an error involved in a portion of our knowledge. When we discover an error, we must look back down that limb of knowledge and find out where it diverged from something that is testably true. When we get down to that point where we diverged from truth, that limb of false knowledge, big or little, needs to be removed. The difficulty in this is that often that limb of knowledge contains details that were critical to us. So, we must consider why certain details are critical and if there are not better answers. So, once we truncate that erroneous limb, which can

be a large limb, we must look through our other limbs to see if there are other answers to those things that we just truncated. That can take some time. It can take years.

It may not even be accomplished. At times like these, and it happens again and again, it can be extremely important to understand that forgetting something that you thought you knew, but did not actually know, is not a loss. It can be a gain simply to understand that you do not know. It should become a pleasure, at least for a season, to be able to say, "I don't know."

It can be helpful to look at this tree of learning, tree of knowledge, like the tree of life in the context of evolution. If you look at the tree of life you can see that some varieties of creatures varied from their root instance and developed a little bit and then stopped. They were on a truncated line of growth that did not continue. There are lots of truncated lines of growth, ceased lines of development. The ability to truncate a line of growth in our minds by *changing our minds* is of immense importance. Everyone needs to learn how to *change their minds*. It suggests a quote from Emerson

A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines.

ATtribution: *Essays. First Series.*
Self-Reliance.

The *inability* to change our minds is tragic. Developing our capacity to change our minds is of **huge** benefit.

So briefly back to the topic of imagination, I do not want to give any kind of impression that imagination is something to be avoided. It is not. Our imaginations are critical along with our capacity to prove things.

Holons

I want to begin to discuss the concept of **holons**.

A **holon** (Greek: ὅλον, **holon** neuter form of ὅλος, holos "whole") is something that is simultaneously a whole and a part. This usage was coined by Arthur Koestler in his book *The Ghost in the Machine* (1967, p. 48).

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holon_\(philosophy\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holon_(philosophy))

<http://www.integralworld.net/20tenets.html>

The Twenty Tenets (Exploring Theories of Everything)

I want to discuss the definition, its importance, and the reality of it. There are several sources you can review regarding this, another is *Janus* by Arthur Koestler in the first appendix especially. Koestler coined the term and developed several related thoughts. Another author is *Ken Wilber* – I cannot remember the book. Briefly, holons involve the way wholes and parts work together. Everything around you is composed of smaller parts and those parts of yet smaller parts and those parts of yet smaller parts and so on. Everything around you is also a part of something bigger which is a part of something yet bigger, which is a part of something yet bigger. Yet in each of these stages, each of the things that we look at appears to be a whole and they are a whole as well as a part. An important aspect of holons is the way a specific whole relates laterally, upwardly, and downwardly. [Add citations]

Downwardly, for instance, in consideration of the wholeness of our body, we recognize that we are composed of parts. Each of those parts, such as our organs, are whole in themselves and can operate independently of the rest of the body. To maintain a healthy whole body, we must take care of our components. This is the downward view of holons, where a whole recognizes its components and takes care of them.

Laterally we see other people around us and we develop rules that address how to best interact and behave towards other wholes like us.

Then there is the upward view where we learn to interact positively with the wholes above us, which we comprise. This would be, for instance, how we respond and behave towards the families that we are part of, or the towns or communities that we are part of, or larger and larger groups of people. Interestingly, without using the word holons our original Constitution in the U.S. provided for a more holonic government. Households would vote for a local government official who could facilitate the government of a neighborhood. Such neighborhood personalities

would join to vote for regional persons to support the governance in a region. Roughly, the person so selected for a region would then vote along with other regional facilitators for County government individuals and then those county facilitators could vote for state representatives, who could then vote for the president and the Supreme Court. This way, locally selected individuals could apply their integrity upward to use that integrity in the areas that they are aware, further and further up the stream, in respect for the fact that we cannot directly know who we are voting for president. Individually, the folks that would be doing the voting *would* be aware. We would select folks who had worked their way up in governance from lower levels to higher levels of wholes. That way the selection of our representative in the holon above us would be able to select facilitators in the next larger whole and so on. In this way, we have the most direct approach to selecting the most able facilitators at each level of holons of governance. Our current manner of selecting officials high to low produces a large break that cannot be aggregated intelligently.

The fact that I occasionally smoke indicates a lack of adherence to holonic health. The fact that tobacco is available to me from a larger economic holon shows that we do not have a good relationship between these holons. Then the fact that I choose tobacco to smoke shows that I do not have a good holonic relationship with the organs that constitute me. There are lots of imperfect relationships in our holonic environment.

Persons that exercise viable gifts in the context of governance in whatever holons, say a lower holon like a household or community are viably selected to help in a larger holon in this way. Since everyone is passing through time, if such holonic offices are limited in time, say 4 years or something like that, then they can be voted for if they did well in all smaller holons, putting them into a position in a higher holon and continuing to move them up upward through a variety of holons, from the narrower local holons to the broader national holons.

Nationality may even become obsolete in this way of thinking because expertise in governance in these areas of larger and larger holons would be helpful to everyone globally. It may have crossed your mind - why does none of the rest of the world have a vote in who becomes the president of the US. It becomes problematic because the US has such an intense effect on everywhere in the rest of the world, but the rest of the world has no vote. But they should. Our current example is the way Donald Trump was elected or presumably elected to become the president of the United States. He has zero qualifications for this office. He has never served any civil governance holons. This alone should have made him unavailable to run for such an office. He became available as a candidate, largely due to non-holonic falsehoods. This tragic capability of the nomination of a candidate due to falsehoods is a weakness because of our lack of understanding of holons.

<http://www.integralworld.net/edwards13.html>

There is nothing perceivable that is not a holon. Everything that we see, everything that we experience, is a part that comprises many parts of a whole. And everything that we perceive is comprised of distinct smaller parts. Tracing the smaller parts, smaller and smaller, to see what they are comprised of, and see what those parts are comprised of, and see what those parts are comprised of we find that we are very much made of the same stuff. We are made of stuff that came from former stars.

Divesting ourselves of former imaginations regarding our sources and components, what we are, and where we came from, is critically important. In this struggle, we find ourselves really at war with the things that former people and ourselves have imagined and believed yet did not prove.

Growing Fractally

Stretching our context of exploration from personal areas into more general, larger areas it is again important to recognize *fractals*. Fractals are the context in which holons proceed.



Daily I walk through the woods. Walking through the woods is a walk through a dance of fractals. Every tree, for instance, is a fractal. The obvious part of the fractal is above ground. Each tree has a trunk that divides into limbs that divide into smaller branches that divide into twigs and eventually produce leaves. The leaves produce energy for the tree through exposure to sunlight. But this is only the aboveground part of these fractals. Below ground the most active part of the trees are also fractals in the root systems that extend out like an upside-down tree. This part of trees is very active all year round. They are typically invisible to us as we walk through the woods but even in the wintertime they remain very active. Trees talk to each other and it is not obvious what they are saying.

Below the ground fractal trees communicate primarily through the web (the World Wide Web you might say) of fungi. The fungi produce the soil that trees are dependent upon. The fungi become the World Wide Web for the trees to talk to each other. And they do.

For us, being mobile creatures, we communicate largely through our languages. Yet our languages are problematic because of our ability to communicate things that we imagine but have not proven. Trees do not have this problem, but we do. It is critical that we work with each other and argue with each other to determine the truth of matters so that we do not depend inappropriately on things that we have imagined. We must imagine things to move forward but we need to prove the things that we imagine. And we need to do this together. This makes it critical to learn to argue properly. There are lots of levels of argument. Wrangling is the least important. It is critical to learn to argue properly. A perspective of this is that we need to learn to lay our ideas out in front of a group of people, and let our ideas fight with each other. We need to hold our ideas loosely and not identify with them. It is not healthy to fight with each other

personally. It is critical, however, that we learn to argue well, that is, to put our ideas out in front of us explained in the best way that we can and discern their value. We need to let our ideas fight without having a fight with the person we are arguing with. We need to learn how to lose an argument. And we need to learn how to win one. Over time, this enables us to separate truth from falsehood in the arena of our imaginations.

Vortexes

I realize I have used the term vortex previously, and that I am only now defining it better. A vortex is a common spin structure that we can see all around us. They are evident in the tiniest and largest things that we look at. As far as small things go, we see them in atoms, and you may see them yet smaller.

Then much, much larger we see all kinds of cycles in nature. The cycles of the

seasons, for instance. We see them in the lifecycles of all kinds of life. Everything to do with spinning or cycles form vortexes. In that sense, a vortex is the context of spinning that occurs throughout nature. We see vortexes in cyclones. We see them in dust devils, the little spinning air cycles that look the same shape as a cyclone, but they are small and you can see them going across your yard picking up leaves and dirt and snow or whatever they happen to catch. It is very



interesting to see how they accumulate debris. A vortex traveling across a lawn, for instance, can pick up lightweight debris because the spin nature of a vortex gives the strength to accumulate things.



People develop vortexes of ideas. The vortex provides strength to pick up other people to think along those lines, and to behave in a way that is commensurate with the vortex that they are considering. When a vortex is based on an unproven imaginary concept, that it can maintain itself among a group of people, regardless that it is false. Vortexes are all sizes. Someone without knowledge of something that would prevent them can be sucked into a thought vortex and think along those lines and believe the conclusions that are part of that vortex, indefinitely. So, throughout the human landscape, using your imagination only slightly, you can see many vortexes of human thinking and human thought debris.



This does not occur only in the human environment. For instance, it has also been shown to exist in at least other primate environments. [\(get the Lyall Watson link\)](#) There was a tribe of monkeys of some sort. Perhaps they were bonobos or some other kind of monkey or ape. It was a large group, maybe hundreds of them. The

leaders of the group were very harsh and demanding and difficult to get along with. They would be rough with their subordinates. A widespread sickness arose and many of them died, including those that were older and who behaved in that harsh way. After that sickness was over, the monkeys required a fresh system of leadership and there were those that were elder among them that they sought to take over the roles of leadership in the tribe. The new leaders were not like the old leaders and they behaved completely differently. They were very gentle, understanding, communicative, able to teach the younger ones, and able to reinforce positive behaviors. Over time, and not much time, this condition led that group to completely change their social quality and they no longer had to deal with the difficulties that they dealt with before, which were self-imposed by their prior leadership. Now they dealt with things in a very positive and easy-going way and the stress level diminished drastically. All of them were much more healthy and able to resist many more diseases. This is an example of a social vortex which all the monkeys in the tribe got sucked into but which did not serve them well. That earlier vortex was diminished and a new vortex formed, which is inevitable, and they lived a much better life.

I will share more about vortexes later...



Bibliography

Michio Kaku

Daniel Deutsch

Ken Wilber

Arthur Koestler

Sam Harris

Piaget

Lyall Watson

More to follow ...