

# Practicism: The Unifying Body of Understanding for Everything

Wilfred Berendsen

Jacob Catsstraat 3, 7131 WP, Lichtenvoorde, The Netherlands

e-mail: [Wilfred\\_vse@hotmail.com](mailto:Wilfred_vse@hotmail.com); Skype: WilfredBerendsen

Our current sciences and practices are largely based on the underlying assumptions, structures and nature of philosophy. Consequently both Aristotle and logician Charles Sanders Peirce organized the sciences based on hierarchical differentiations. Metaphysics also is mostly based on these hierarchies, with one leading concept dictating the meaning of all others. Thus, our current sciences are still reductionist and partial, mostly because people concentrate on understanding more and more of a relatively "small" part of the whole. Then, because of the functional differentiations and the underlying structure of our current sciences and practices, real true great understandings at even higher levels can never be reached. This paper will try to explain an alternative understanding for everything by means of my Phronesis Meta-semeiotics.

## 1. Introduction

We have a lot of different sciences and practices in our society or universes. Of course, there are a lot of different notions for the both. And of course, our universes are not all of the universes available or existing. For the universes we can sense and partly understand till now, there is the huge question whether we are actually following the right methodologies. And whether it is actually sane to keep following the same methodological paths and ways if this is not the case.

## 2. Charles Sanders Peirce

Charles Sanders Peirce, a past American philosopher, might not be that well known by most people interested in physics or even natural philosophy. But his work is rather interesting and important. And not. Even his insights and philosophy were still too reductionist and limiting. More on this later. For now, and for this paper, it is important to mention that Charles Sanders Peirce is the one who firstly introduced the special type of philosophy called semiotics or semeiotics, the science of signs, or sign theory. Also he laid the fundamentals for pragmatism, although he himself rather called it pragmaticism.

Peirce's semiotics involves many notions, a quite important one being representamen, a sign representing another sign. The concept of representamen is important for understanding many parts of my phronesis meta-semeiotics and more about the connections with physics and other sciences. Just maybe it might also lead to people realizing that even the non-social sciences are actually also social sciences. And that the social part is a very important and fundamental aspect for both the sciences themselves and improvements thereof.

Another important and fascinating notion introduced by Charles Sanders Peirce is the notion of diagrammatic thinking. According to Charles Sanders Peirce, all of our thinking is diagrammatic. I will not discuss here what Peirce meant with this notion, but for now only mention that although I agree most people do think in diagrammatic ways, it is not a sane and great way of thinking. And it even leads to the main problems of current science and practices. Problems can be prevented and re-

solved by means of a holoplural mind perspective and reasonings. In fact, holoplurality is key for moving towards a more excellent sensemaking, resulting in better science and more excellent practices in our universes. As holoplurality is the sole underlying structure and nature of our universes. As such, also all of our sensemaking should be based on and guided by holoplurality.

## 3. Phronesis Meta-semeiotics

Phronesis meta-semeiotics has been developed by myself during the last couple of years. It is a specific type of semiotics, being very distinct from semiotics in many ways. The main difference is the foundation of and perspective from meta-semeiotics. This perspective, being the structure and nature of Phronesis meta-semeiotics, is different from anything existing before. It not only questions but also kind of condemns the functional differentiations mentioned in the beginning of this paper.

This is because differentiations can be functional and dysfunctional, of course. Differentiations based on similarities, like the ones mentioned at the beginning of this paper (the divisions of both Aristotle and Peirce of sciences based on hierarchical differentiations), are mostly not functional but dysfunctional. I even suspect they always are. What we need, and what all of science and practice needs, are differentiations based on differences, and based on a true understanding of the underlying structure and nature of our universes. This is the underlying structure and nature of holoplurality, the sole true underlying structure and nature of all of our universes, sense making, sciences and practices. A holoplural perspective and reality is where the differences between theory and practice can disappear (almost) completely.

## 4. Diagrammatic and Non-diagrammatic Differentiations

Most of current sciences are concentrating on finding structures and patterns and understandings in similarities, instead of finding understandings through and in differences. Diagrammatic differentiations, resulting from diagrammatic thinking, are mostly dualist differentiations within a diagrammatic frame-

work. Especially the sciences of physics but also economics are quite largely based and influenced by a specific type of diagrammatic reasoning, the most important parts of mathematics. Mathematic reasoning is a specific type of diagrammatic reasoning. This perspective of mathematics, or diagrammatic reasoning, is mostly the core leading perspective of physics and economics. While other types of diagrammatic, reductionist reasoning is not only largely influencing but also leading in most of social sciences.

My argument is that diagrammatic reasoning and also diagrammatic science is not only reductionist, but also wrong. And this kind of diagrammatic reasoning and perspectives damage our society at large.

But, even non-diagrammatic thinking and reasoning can be reductionist and therefore damaging. As also here, there are differences of course. In the end, what is needed is non-diagrammatic reasoning based on a holoplural perspective and fundaments.

## 5. Holoplurality: the Sole Underlying Structure and Nature of All of our Universes

So, what is this notion of holoplurality?? In its essences, it is a quite simple notion and concept. But, the consequences and foremost also the possibilities of this notion are far reaching. For understanding what holoplurality involves, it is important to understand also my notion of plurisigns, for understanding and representing a fundamental part of our universes in better ways. For me, also just everything in our universes is a sign. But, a very important aspect of this signs is the fact that they are plural in their nature. This means that principally they could consist of just about any possible compounds or aspects, themselves also being plural signs. This plural signs are what I call plurisigns, from "plural signs". Being plural is however not the sole aspect of plurisigns justifying them to be labeled or represented as being such. One of the other major aspect of them is that they need to be holoplural in nature. The other aspect is that also they should be understood by means of holoplural sensemaking. This last aspect is not an intrinsic requirement and even not a fundamental requirement for a plurisign for being a plurisign, but it IS a fundamental requirement for a plurisign being a real true plurisign and developing as such in most excellent ways.

Holoplurality is the holoplural perspective, based on the understandings that plurisigns are connected or not with other plurisigns in more or less tight ways. Plurisigns themselves also have holoplural characteristics, being plurisigns themselves. Both the structure and the nature of everything in our universes but also our sensemaking must be holoplural, by structure and by contents assemblages and disassemblies of plurisigns. These result from and are guided by sane sense making, which by nature also must be based on this same great notion and understanding of holoplurality.

## 6. Representing and Representamens

Representamens are, and are not, a very elementary aspect also of Phronesis meta-semeiotics. They are, as representamens are needed for representation. They are not, if understood in wrong ways. This also means a representamen must be (re)presented in

the right ways, again according holoplural structure and nature. Thus, a representamen is not strictly a representamen, but a phronesis representamen, by definition much more, although the representing aspect is more or less of the complete plurisign.

Also, following this understanding more or less of a representing aspect of the phronesis representamen, it should be understood that also of course there is a difference in quality of the representation. The more the representamen equals the plurisign being represented, the better this representamen is. Or not. It is, as far as it is aimed at indeed equaling the plurisign being represented. It might very well be not, in case the aim is to improve the representamen(s) of the plurisign(s) being represented even beyond the characteristics (plurisigns) of the represented plurisigns themselves. Example of it being photo-shopping a representamen to become visually even much better than the initial representamen started with.

There is however a difference in perceived and real improvements. Real improvements are only those improvements in line with the most excellent holoplural mind perspectives and sensemaking(s). Much more than mere mindmaking, sensemaking involves all the senses of relevance for the objects and realities under consideration.

## 7. Representing and Sensemaking

The problem of current sensemaking, is that a lot of sensemaking is based on representamens. Instead of sensemaking being based on phronesis representamens, but also phronesis representamens being adjusted and improved by sane sensemaking according to (phronesis) holoplurality.

In physics, most of representamens are based on mathematics or at least on diagrammatic thinking. As about all of our sensemaking and representing is. The sole way to get towards more excellent understandings is to add something by means of holoplural thinking and sensemaking, which is why even the more non-social science of physics is actually a social science. And why a much better understanding of representation and sensemaking is key for improving also the understandings and quality of physics.

## 8. Representing, Methodological and Mind-making Aspects of Sense-making

The phronesis meta-semeiotical body of understanding being developed by me during the last couple of years is represented by the notion of practicism or practicism. An important part of this practicism is based on sane sensemaking. Sensemaking consists of a methodological sound way of using all of our senses. But also representamens, in whatever form and existence, are part of this sensemaking. Sensemaking of this sort is much more than mere mindmaking.

A representamen is, like I mentioned before, not solely the representamen as such. It is, of course, like every sign a plurisign, with a lot of characteristics being plurisigns themselves.

Some of the important characteristics for this discourse are the following aspects of representamens

1. The representing aspect connected with signs (semeion)
2. The methodological aspect (sophy or phronesis)
3. The mind making aspect (myalo)

This resulted in me developing the notions of myalosophy, semisophy and semiphronesis. Semi is here about the representing aspect, myalo about the mindmaking aspect and sophy or phronesis about the methodological aspect. This methodological aspect is not only expressed in the ways of mind-making, but also in sensemaking in general. Part of it is the representing aspect of plurisigns in our realities.

When considering the methodological aspects of representamens, my notions of semisophy and semiphronesis errors and mistakes are important to grasp. Sophy stands for theoretical wisdom, in this context being all wisdoms grounded on wrong foundations, foundations not in line with holoplurality.

When considering the mindmaking aspect of representamens, my notion of myalosophy is important to grasp. Myalosophy is a combination of the words myalo (μυαλό) and Sophy ((Σοφία, Greek for theoretical wisdom). Myalo means brain, mind or sense-maker. And sophy means theoretical wisdoms. So myalosophy mistakes are mistakes that result from brain processes based on theoretical wisdoms. In general, about all of mind processes based on theoretical wisdoms will lead to mistakes and damages in our realities.

## 9. Phronesis Meta-semeiotical Physics

My phronesis meta-semeiotics, being expressed in my body of understanding called practicism or practicism, is also important for physics in numerous ways. The most important reason being that the fundament of phronesis meta-semeiotics (being my notion and understanding of holoplurality) is the sole true UNDERLYING structure and nature of everything in whatever universes. In the end, we live in a world solely consisting of plurisigns connected in holoplural ways. This also has to be understood by means of a holoplural perspective.

In the past, researchers in physics have been searching for a so-called theory of everything, which is not possible ever to be reached. First of all, our universes are far too complex to reach a theory of everything. But, more important, a theory can never grasp anything or everything. As soon as we reach something FOR everything (something being possible), it is not a theory. As this something will have to combine theory and practise into something where the differences between theory and practise disappear, which would be a body of understanding for everything. Or, better, a grand unifying narrative for everything.

I claim that my phronesis meta-semeiotical body of understanding called practicism or practicism is just that: a grand unifying narrative for everything. This is simply because all of our present theory, practices and sensemakings should be based on holoplurality. Holoplurality has to become the new foundation for all of sciences, practices, and sensemaking. The more our universes are based on just this, the more sane and excellent our possibilities and existences will become. Also, holoplural understandings open up a whole new world of possibilities and existences. And can lead to real great growth of plurisigns.

Of course, it is interesting to get the understanding that every particle in our universes is holoplural. But, it is maybe even more interesting to understand that every representamen or thought processes not consistent with this holoplural perspective might lead to less inferior or even wrong results. And to what Peirce would call accritically indubitable beliefs.

Physics should be not solely about non-living plurisigns, but also about living ones and combinations of the both. This is why phronesis meta-semeiotics is also phronesis meta-physics. While this phronesis metaphysics is very distinct from the old, a wrong notion of metaphysics as being used at current times. The insane and wrong part of this old-fashioned metaphysics concerns mostly the wrong perspective consisting of wrong foundations. But also meta just should only be used for highest and most excellent levels, and not for parts. Phronesis meta-semeiotics is the ultimate level as it not only unifies theory, science, practice and sensemaking but also just all of universes and everything possible. It is a grand unifying antenarrative for everything.

## References

- [1] W. T. M. Berendsen, **A Phronesis Antenarrative: Towards New Ecosocial Systems through the Logic of Vagueness** (forthcoming), draft at [http://wilvon.com/download\\_center/index.php?phronesis\\_complex1.pdf](http://wilvon.com/download_center/index.php?phronesis_complex1.pdf).
- [2] W. T. M. Berendsen, "Holoplurality", [http://wilvon.com/download\\_center/index.php?Holoplurality1.pdf](http://wilvon.com/download_center/index.php?Holoplurality1.pdf).
- [3] W. T. M. Berendsen, "Phronesis Antenarrating, Reshaping Our Society and Universes through a Holoplural Mind Perspective", [http://independent.academia.edu/WBerendsen/Papers/181431/phronesis\\_antennarrating-Reshaping\\_our\\_societies\\_and\\_universes\\_through\\_a\\_holoplural\\_mind\\_perspective](http://independent.academia.edu/WBerendsen/Papers/181431/phronesis_antennarrating-Reshaping_our_societies_and_universes_through_a_holoplural_mind_perspective).