

This speech is called Cosmos/Chaos. It is dedicated to Plato primarily and ~~HERACLEITUS~~ ^{HERACLEITUS} ~~PARACLETES~~ and Parmenides secondarily, because I think that I am personally very interested in neo-Platonic thoughts and Plato directly. I think even today that philosophy is Plato, and in this particular piece I am trying to deal with the phenomenology of Cosmos/Chaos as concept and as percept. My personal belief is that any concept can eventually become perceived and any perception can be analyzed back to a concept and so that the world of the forms of Plato and the world of every day street reality can be connected. That is my own personal, in a sense mystical, approach to life: the idea that there is a transcendental metaphysics which connects with the metaphysics of our own subjectivity and finally with the physics of our objectivity so that they are not forever disconnected. In other words, I do not believe in a metaphysical proposition of there being an ultimate duality; there is one unity in the Universe. As it exfoliates, it produces its various aspects, and these primary aspects, the first outpouring of what I would call the low Gods, ^{THESE} are the people we call saints, Chaos and Cosmos. Plato in his own analysis utilized the theories of ~~PARACLETES~~ ^{HERACLEITUS} for ~~is~~ a sense of chaos and the theories of Parmenides for dealing with Cosmos. The first identification would be necessity as opposed to reason. Necessity is in a sense that cussedness of matter. If we want to make another type of distinction between spirit and matter we can do this but neither one of them ever becomes definable unless you use the words chaos and cosmos. You get into a kind of 19th century conundrum where you come to words, and there is no definition of it after awhile until you use them in some kind of practical way rather than what the definition is dealing with symbolically. Plus you have to go back beyond, that so I would take spirit and matter and apply the Platonic distinction of reason and necessity. Necessity is... of

those things about nature that ultimately cannot be dealt with, there is always something that you forget, some kind of nature that you can't get at. There is no way to deal with it in terms of systems thinking because I think reason has its ^{APOLLO}~~hypothesis~~ in systems thought. So its like Apollo on the right hand and Dionysus on the left hand, where you have a way of making, you have a way of thinking, and you have a way of believing, and a way of feeling that are completely distinct. I'll try to go through those. From Cosmos and Chaos the next exfoliation would be to ^{SPATIALITY}~~Spaciality~~ and Temporality. One of the things that I've been working on is a dimensional system. I think this is going to become more important in the future than now because people have dealt with dimensionality in a kind of almost non-philosophical manner. Then even when it gets into, say mathematics, I have an octave of spaciality and an octave of temporality. The reason I use octaves is again in homage to ^{PYTHAGORAS}~~Pythagoras~~ which ~~is~~ is what Plato used as a connecting link between the work of ^{HERACLEITUS}~~Parmenides~~ and the work of ^{HERACLEITUS}~~Parmenides~~ is dealing with the flux and the flow of existence. Parmenides is dealing with something that does not change. It is the static and the dynamic, a way of doing something with something done in a cosmetic fashion, like when you make-up. The word cosmos in cosmetic is the same thing as to make-up your face. That very act that you perform appears to have a natural closure almost like a gestalt where when you do something you know exactly where you have left off, and you know exactly how much you have done, and you know when you pick the work up again, exactly how to proceed. I have used in this work, as a symbol of that, the famous ^{SHRI YANTA / THE}~~Shri Yantra~~, Hindu primary meditation diagram which is composed simply of two interlocking triangles. We see that a lot in people all through history who have used diagrams, ^{SUCH AS} the equal-lateral triangle up and the equal-lateral triangle down. I'll talk about that later,

but that is a very primary symbol. The Hindus used it in a very elaborated form, but as you can see the way you make that, you can start out by drawing the triangle and then drawing another one, and then if you stop to eat you can come back and you know where you have left off and you know how far the program has to go before you complete the work. Now that is not the case with Chaos. I've used exactly the same: one triangle down and one triangle up, like ^{THE} new mathematical theories of people like mathematicians Mandelbrot and others who have been dealing with what is called fractel. It turns out that fractels have the quality of chaos in them because what they are, ~~is~~ ^{IS} something that it has no parts. You see, this work has perceptible parts where you can tell one part is ^{THEW THIS IS} the sense of the holistic. When people talk about the universe having holons, holistic or a holyarchy you are always dealing in the realm of Cosmos. That's not the way it is in Chaos. It is something that in the same way in necessity appears (snap) like that, where reason is a deliberated condition where you have to move forward slowly and you know where all the wheels are grinding. Whereas a necessity will present itself apparently without origin. Now that's the reason why the sense of the spontaneous is sometimes defined as being the nature of the creative. I say that is really in a sense imagination whereas the other way this has to do with criticism and rationality. Both of those are totally legitimate forms of creativity. They just happen to be of a different nature. And you can see that to make that you can only make it to a certain point if in the next step in terms of making that more complex, you have to go right back to the beginning. You can't add on to that without destroying the entire form, you see, so there is no way. I can keep elaborating that. I can add things to it and it can almost be inevitable where you eventually would get to a point where it would be totally predictable as to what I would do next. This is

absolutely unpredictable in its situation. Now again, often people utilize unpredictability as a condition of creativity as opposed to predictability. I would say that in the same way that is the same type of prejudice that someone might have for Cosmos as being plus and Chaos being minus. It's the same thing. If you say, "Well this guy is predictable and that guy is unpredictable", you know you are using that ~~is~~^{IN} a pejorative sense to the person. I'm claiming that's not true at all. That happens to be a person who is more Apollonian than he is Dionysian and the other one is more Dionysian than he is Apollonian.

[Interrupt] How do you take care of the person that does both?

The stringed instrument. This is where Pythagoras comes into the picture. And the ~~optic~~^{GRAPHIC} egg which represents in a sense the dwelling of the soul. I mean finally, this is the street reality situation from the logos. The many comes back into the one and the one goes back into the many. So this is like the basis of philosophy itself - the one falling into the many. The primary question, is what Pythagorus does with numbers. Eventually I think when you read in the Philibus one of the dialogues of Plato, he then makes the kind of connection (also Epinomas^{IN} one of his Epistles,) between the numbers and the form, but he is not doing this from the point of view of quantifying this. In other words it is the qualities of numbers. In other words, Pythagoras always had the idea that each number had a quality that was intrinsic to it. In the same way that we would consider a quantity intrinsic to numbers, (we think of that as obvious) there might be cultures where the quantification would not be obvious but the qualification. Saying that, suppose three was masculine and two was feminine. Then as a primary situation five, the meaning of the first masculine and the first feminine number, is a number of

5

marriage and it's also like when you make a pentacle and you have this five sided thing. You know we have all these things with fives, the ~~Vietnamese~~ ^{FIBONACCI} series, the ~~logarithmic~~ ^{LOGARITHMIC} spiral, all dealing with the divine proportion which is like making the masculine and feminine unite so that balance is working. In other words, the numbers like one as a monad, cannot be defined in its quantitative state. When you meditate on the notion of one, the quality of oneness comes out rather than the quantification, because quantification arises when you have a number of objects. When you look at one thing you don't get that sense of quantity. You get the sense of uniqueness which is the qualitative side of what one is. So the ~~Pythagorean~~ ^{PYTHAGOREAN} thought about the even numbers as being feminine and the odd numbers being masculine. In this way, you can't perceive two. You can conceive of two. It's like when I hold two fingers up. It's A and B and the relationship between them, so it's three. It's like yin and the yang, the two fishes that swim around each other so that the-swimming-around-each-otherness is the third element in the two parts. We stand on six points. Now that is another reason for using the two interlocking triangles. This also represents a way of presenting twoness and threeness. Each foot, you know has three points and so when I stand on that, it is not that I'm standing on one point. I am actually standing on a tripod, and when I put down my other foot, I have on two tripods that are interacting in the same way that those two triangles interact. So that the twoness must be conceptualized and therefore a concept which is essentially the work of the imagination is unlimited.