



GO Global Organization
Design Society



Readings in Global Organization Design
2007 GO Conference Materials

Philosophical Footnote to the Paper by Dr. W. Kinston
An Informal Explanation of the Scientific Basis and
Significance of THEE

by Warren Kinston

Article #09-05-27

Philosophical Footnote to the Paper by Dr. W. Kinston

An Informal Explanation of the Scientific Basis and Significance of THEE.

Karl Popper is one of the most influential philosophers of science of the 20th Century. On reviewing the paper, I recalled that my philosophical argument as to distinct realms are curiously similar to Popper's conception of Three Worlds which I became aware of many years ago. (For a full account, see K. Popper, *Objective Knowledge*, Oxford University Press, 1972; for a short succinct account, download Popper's 1978 Tanner Lecture entitled *Three Worlds* at: <http://www.tannerlectures.utah.edu/lectures/popper80.pdf>.)

World 1 is the world of physical objects, physical energies and living things. World 2 is the psychological world of subjective experiences including dispositions to act, thinking processes and conversations. World 3 is the world of products of the human mind and includes knowledge, plans, works of art, ethical values, societal institutions and theories (both good and bad, true and false). World 3 can contain unknowns e.g. undiscovered relations between existing theories or actual but unknown answers to mathematical problems. World 3 has an autonomy and it evolves. Its products have the potential to affect our thoughts and attitudes in World 2, and then via our actions there can be changes in World 1.

Popper wrote: *"One can even admit that the third world is man-made and, in a very clear sense, superhuman at the same time. It transcends its makers. (We must beware, however, of interpreting these objects [of thought] as the thoughts of a superhuman consciousness as did, for example, Aristotle, Plotinus and Hegel)."*

Popper's theory of world 3 has been received with less than wild enthusiasm by the philosophy establishment. It has been described as 'mulish', tiresome and infertile by Quinton, as a symptom of a research program in decay by Feyerabend, and it was dismissed in half a sentence by Ayer in his account of 20th century philosophy.

My account of natural science assumes, like Popper, that it studies World 1. My experiential realm is identical to World 2 of Popper. My taxonomy and my account of human elements in endeavour lie in Popper's World 3 because they are products of human thought and of studies in regard to objects within World 2 and their effects within World 2 and on World 1. Being in World 3, the Taxonomy is capable of being rationally criticized and either rejected in part or whole (as false) or improved to become more accurate, or even judged to be true. I did not view the Taxonomy as an account of things in World 2 as I regarded every thing that exists there as being conditioned. My view may be incorrect in some way, I cannot currently envisage. The Taxonomy could possibly be an account of things in another part of World 3. The other possibility to be considered is that it is an account of a World not articulated by Popper, World 4.

Sticking with Popper's worldview, my energy-filled WILL might be assigned to World 1, as a part of our biological heritage not unlike our sexual drive or aggressive drive. Or it might be seen as the energetic element of experiences in World 2. In either case, WILL (or something like it) generates the experiences in World 2 that I have formalized in the Taxonomy. A specific taxonomic entity like a priority, for example, evidently exists in World 3 in two forms (or perhaps, one might say it exists in two sub-worlds). First, it is an abstraction with a hypothesized function, properties and relationships when used in any situation; and second it is a specific purpose relating to decisions in a specific situation. Both of these World 3 objects have the typical property that once created they can be criticized and improved: in the first case to clarify the conception of priority, and in the second case to improve a particular decision. To be complete, we must ask whether WILL as pure energy (separate from the idea) can exist in World 3: I find it

difficult to imagine that this could be the case as a key criterion for World 3 objects is absent: how can pure energy be criticized and improved?

Popper does leave open the possibility of more than 3 Worlds containing real things. In the article, I have suggested the existence of a World 4, a transcendental realm, containing WILL as pure energy and emanating non-articulated energy-filled forms, forms that will never change and do have profound causal effects via World 2 on Worlds 1, 2 and 3. World 2 evolved from World 1, and World 3 evolved from World 2. However, World 4 has not evolved from World 3: perhaps World 1 evolved from World 4: an example might be the emergence of an electron and a positron (matter and anti-matter) in a vacuum.

World 4, if it exists, does not interact directly with World 3, and it would be a miracle if it had causal influence on World 1 at a macro level. God definitely exists in World 3 (as examinable conceptions of various sorts in virtually every culture) and in World 2 (as spiritual functioning and numinous experiences again found in every culture), but not World 1 (except via consequences). We can speculate that some sort of divine reality and possibly not-yet-existent and unimaginable potentials peacefully awaiting realization might exist in World 4, in addition to my proposed Taxonomic forms.

It may be that, despite avoiding positing superhuman consciousness I have fallen into a similar trap as Aristotle, Plotinus and Hegel—who are, perhaps, not bad company for an amateur. In any case, if my and their view in this regard is utterly incorrect, it will surely not alter the essential discovery of the Taxonomy in World 3 as an objective account of important aspects of World 2 including internal influences, growth potentials, and interaction with World 1. The value of developing, improving and using experience-based tools in a far more humanly beneficial, efficient and effective way within World 2 and World 1 remains untarnished.



OUR PURPOSE

The Global Organization Design Society is a not-for-profit corporation registered in Ontario, Canada to promote the following objective:

The establishment and operation of a world-wide society of academics, business users and consultants interested in science-based management to improve organizational effectiveness for the purposes of:

Promoting among existing users increased awareness, understanding and skilled knowledge in applying concepts of Levels of Work Complexity, Levels of Human Capability, Accountability, and other concepts included in Requisite Organization and/or Stratified Systems Theory.

Promoting among potential users of the methods, appreciation of the variety of uses and benefits of science-based management, and access to resources.

OUR BOARD

Barry Deane, Australia
Jack Fallow, United Kingdom
Donald V. Fowke, Canada
Jerry Gray, Canada, GO Treasurer
Judy Hobrough, United Kingdom
Ken Shepard, Canada, GO President
Harald Solaas, Argentina
George Weber, Canada

EDITORIAL BOARD

Jerry Gray, Ph.D.
Larry G. Tapp, LL.D.
Ken Craddock, M. A., Web Editor and
Peer Review Coordinator

CONTACT US

Global Organization Design Society
32 Victor Avenue
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M4K 1A8
Phone: +1 (416) 463-0423
Fax: +1 (416) 463-7827
E-mail: Info@GlobalRO.org
URL: www.GlobalRO.org



GO Global Organization
Design Society

Sponsorship is provided in part by the generous support of the following organizations:

