Integral and Mosaic:

Questions of comparative meta-modelling

Alexey Shindin

Master's degree in Mathematics, Psychology and Political sciences

Founder, MosaicIntegral

Reseacher, International institute of differential psychology

MosaicIntegral.com

IIDP.ru

Alexey.Shindin@gmail.com

Russia, Moscow

Integral Theory Conference, July 2013

San Francisco USA

As humanity evolves in the historical process, times change like situations, problems and aims; the world is entering the period of recurrent pluralism - now instead of one-two integral theories we are dealing with a multitude of integral approaches. It becomes ever more difficult to expand, amplify and integrate everything present in the field into one system. The issues of dynamics of the global constructs then come to the forefront: the world of multi-integralism.

In the early 21st century, as a forerunner of such trends, the concept of Mosaic, representing the diversity of manifolds, has begun to take its shape. It is not next a meta-system, aimed at embracing the whole spectrum of large-scale constructs, but a methodology for modelling of and working at conceptions in the modern world, experiencing the next turn to the diversity of global systems, which are entering the period of competing for survival and further evolution.

Mosaic can be perceived in two senses. The first one refers to meta-modelling methods - the field, where research, creation, transformation and dissolution of various systems take place. In this sense, Mosaic is an all-inclusive and refillable tool for meta-modelling, which embodies the idea of



multi-systemacity. On the other hand, in the course of its development, Mosaic forms various ideas and systems. Different researchers keep exploring the field, gathering interesting and quality data. Mosaic field can be constricted, if necessary, to give us familiar methodologies and constructs. Mosaic approach does not imply a single, rigid set of instruments or group of authors.

Mosaic Integralism or Integral Mosaic is an interplay of unity and multiplicity, implying their co-existence without contradiction or neutralization: an evolutionary unfolding of inherently authentic meanings and prospects.

The today world - along with the trend for unifying and creation of integrating theories of everything - is defined by the drift towards multifaceted "patchiness". Mosaic perceives any category as a non-wholeness variety. Integrity is possible only as an artificial convenient

generalization, preserved by force of habit. Categories, such as "creature", let alone "self", "I" seen as a separate entity, undergo major changes, they are now perceived as a contextual integrationdifferentiation of parts. We introduce tools of multiple "projections" and reciprocal recursive reflections, with no access or no specification of the initial image.

Meta-modelling is an exploration of conditions, under which conceptions, models and systems can emerge, exist and function; it includes consideration of issues, situated beyond the scope of particular paradigms, while the observer holds a meta-position towards a given area of research. The meta-observer can pose a question "Is it so?" regarding the essential premises of any system, and try to uncover how they emerged.

Development and types

Living being and environment represent two major factors, identified for the purposes of research. These aspects are considered in various interrelations, in various conditions and stages of transformation. In perfect conditions, it can be difficult to differentiate the domains of the two factors. Generally, we assume that they are closely linked and interweaved.

Some models do not take into account even these two factors, because it requires a twodimensional/two-factor model. The majority of models simply imitate the complexity of two and more factors. The fact that the issues, mentioned above, are not clarified causes increasing difficulties, repetitions, autocorrelations and phenomena, which exist only in the model itself, not in reality we assumed to explore.

Indeed, a researcher may focus on a certain manifold ABC...N... in order to systemize it and to identify separate elements A+B+C..+N..., but sometimes such identification is impossible, though the model can contain such elements. An example of a two-factor model is Wilber-Combs lattice. It is based on the assumption of independent existence of two factors. What happens if we have more than two such factors?

One of such interesting, though not deeply researched issues, is interrelation of typology and

other aspects of Integral Theory, such as stages. It is assumed that we can build a two-dimensional chart with types on one axis and stages - on the other. Research, implemented during the last two decades on the basis of the scientific typological model "Psycosmology" of 12 types, can shed light on the ambiguity of such constructs.

The category of "development"

itself becomes a useful tool for identifying typological differences. "Development" is perceived differently when we look from the outside or from the inside of each quadrant. If we provide people (aside from their own conceptions of development) with complex sets of conceptions and allow

them to choose from them, we will see that certain options tend to be preferred, rejected or treated as neutral. The possibility of multiple ways of development stems from the fact that different types of people have their own concepts of development, while the types are practically innate. Each type just has its own model of development. Then, how adequately do

we differentiate general stages of development?





When we identify both stages and types, it becomes difficult to create common twodimensional construct, which would outline general principles of development, acknowledged by all types. Schemes of development that imply ranking, for example, inferior and superior stages, often simply do not take into account typological differences that lead to certain strategies and categories of development. We can objectively assess development, using this or that set of levels, but such assessment ignores typologically different approaches and meanings that motivate real people for their development.

The typological can become a kind of bridge between the general and the specific, in case when the specific enriches the general, partly relying on it. While cosmic habits gradually become fixed, retaining their flexibility only at the stage of formation, types remain the same throughout history, presumably changing only in respect to percentage. It is possible that each type not only develops through given stages in a different way, but has, in principle, different disposition to and proportion of certain stages: it leads to multi-optionality of development Itself.

As Mosaic implies the use of fuzzy logic and continuous scales, part-whole relations become a significant issue. Along with conventional interpretations, such as the whole being the sum of its parts or the whole exceeding its parts, we consider cases when the whole is less than its parts, as in dissinergy and subadditivity. We explore the issue of correlations along with multifactorial influences, when a transformation of any factor changes the relations between parts and the whole. Assuming that the whole is perceived as a whole only in certain conditions, provided that we ignore a range of factors, but in other conditions it is perceived differently, we set us a target to define the conditions that enable us to perceive the whole as a whole, the target being a subject matter in factor modelling of part-whole models.

"I", creatures and trans-creatures

An interesting related problem refers to mechanisms of acquiring new features and expanding. We know that the accumulation of new features without elimination of the old leads to

the emergence of holarchical structures; but what happens when the acquiring of new features implies the elimination and the loss of something that was an inherent feature at the previous stage? If we observe a continuous renewal - both in respect to addition and elimination - we may question the consistency of the whole itself: to what extent it is a whole and not just a sets of manifolds in a constant flux, where the category of "wholeness" is introduced only to facilitate modelling, but in general case, it can simply be non-existent.

These important issues have an experimental background. Chladni figures, for example, refer to the self-structuration of scattered and unstructured grains of salt and sand, caused by external influence of waves (such as sound) and leading to emergence of various wholenesses that have no intrinsic interior and structure. Here we see the process of creation of wholeness without formation of internal construct.

Among other Mosaic models, the problem of living being, human, "I" and its representation plays an important part. We propose to consider a model of living being as an aggregate of manifolds without introduction of a core structure or its emergent self-creation, triggered by dynamics of the elements in the manifold. "I" is then a construct without a core, based on the model of multiple bodies. Furthermore, as the border between "I" and the external world remains relative and flexible, we can state that there are no separate wholenesses or different "I"-s, as well as no clear line between a living being and its environment, individual and collective (quadrants).



The model of Mosaic bodies enables us to conceive the mutual dynamics of two bodies as we conceive the dynamics of two holons; here we enter the meta-field for modelling of various kinds of typologies that can be specified by entering input data and functions for the model, describing mosaic bodies of the living being.

The "I" structure refers to partial manifolds, identified in a certain way, their elements being substituted from time to time. The closer we get to the deemed "core" of the I-structure, the more inalterable elements we find there. Alongside with the core, we can distinguish other stable elements in the I-structure, that can be compared to standing waves in physics.

The model gives as a wide range of explanatory opportunities that enable us to approach different phenomena. Let us discuss multiple transpersonal cases that S. Grof investigated in the course of his decades-long study and various altered states of consciousness, experienced by participants of transpersonal practices. The transpersonal states enable people to experience perceptions, totally unfamiliar and alien to our human nature, when people become other creatures, objects or processes of the universe. Alternatively, they can report about events or affairs that take place in distant areas and time periods.

The Mosaic bodies model can help us to envision the mechanisms of functioning of such states. As bodies (especially peripheral) are replaceable, new bodies can be adopted for the time being, and the current set of "I"-bodies can resonate with any other structure, be it a creature or anything else, a certain person - due to such connections- can get a temporary access to other bodies and information that they store. In some cases, the center of gravity can temporarily shift into other places, or attracted new bodies can look like "other creatures". Theoretical representation of such processes can make them "objectively" scrutable phenomena instead of mystical and paranormal; it can also allow to elaborate comprehensive tools for studying them. Such a representation can also contribute to merging of some paranormal currents with classical science.

Mosaic suggests an alternative model of development, when a person develops through stages not in a fixed order, but in various ways, which imply many cycles. This makes possible the existence of discontinuous profile of the person, as well as alternative ways of identifying aspects at each level. In this case, the resulting historical print, or holon, will show much greater diversity.

Moreover, mosaic modelling allows for alternative forms of evolution of organisms, including conscious beings. This enables us to expand not only the variety of holons, but the trees of evolution itself, embedded as "cosmic habits", which can vary throughout civilizations (including presumable extraterrestrial civilizations). Apart from being a way of modelling, inherent to human consciousness, Mosaic then becomes the awareness of multiple creatures that are not always evolve like humans.

An additional model for presentation of creature or consciousness -as well as the capacities of consciousness that enable the development through levels - is a model of "potentials". In this model, any system is seen as nested resonant circuits with the center and periphery, where the center determines the range and the borders of peripheral development, and periphery, in return, brings new information to the center. The center itself is yet another element of periphery in another trans-circuit, forming nested systems, different from holons in respect of principles of formation.



The simple example of this model is the structure of the outer space: satellites revolve round the planets, planets - round the stars, stars -round the centers of galaxies, and so on and so forth. In such cases, it is necessary to gain a potential -"cosmic speed" -to proceed to the next scale. While an object or creature exists within a certain level of resonant circuit, it functions as a fraction and a view in its narrow frequency range in the first place. This fact must be taken into account, when we

talk about global processes and categories, such as system of levels, God or Spirit, which are, from this perspective, perceived only within the current circuit.

Integral approach enables us to introduce different perspectives - from the first-person to fourth-person. We may extend the spectrum by suggesting new instruments for modelling of structures, such as memes, egregores, archetypes or collective creatures.



A group of such "creatures" represents a separate new field of research. For example, we can examine how such formations emerge and exist, as well as their relations with individual and collective holons.

Another stages and lines models

Mosaic is about levels of co-perception of reality, each of them implying a fundamentally different methodology, sets of constructs about perception and action. In the process of model construction, we use old systems of levels, suggested by Ramon Llull (13-th centurty), Beloselsky-Belozersky (18-th century), etc, their modern versions, as well as contemporary models created by researchers from many countries.

For example, the model of information processing includes 15 stages, while the model of levels of action - 17. Each level of action may correspond not only to a certain color, but to certain questions, types of operations, forms of constructs, and many other phenomena. Such models have

been elaborated by researchers from Russia and the USSR; you can get acquainted with them in the issue-related studies.

Currently mosaic model-construction implies following general constructs of levels. Each level is characterized by the following axis: infinite heterogeneity <-anti-manifold \leftarrow anti-group<--1<-0->1 \rightarrow group \rightarrow manifold \rightarrow infinite heterogeneity. The position on the axis specifies the mechanisms of interaction on a certain stage.



Actually, it means that if an individual reconstruct reality in a certain way, through a certain kind of constructs, the positive part of the scale points to the level of adaptation and adequacy of an individual, who at first has to master a single construct and practically apply it. Then the individual can stop, because often a single good tool is enough for functioning. If he/she tries to master a second or a third construct and starts to use several constructs, he/she takes another step on the axis, the step that fundamentally changes his/her vision and activity.

Multiplicity of constructs opens up opportunities for fast and flexible mastering of perspectives, as well as for creation of unique constructs on certain stage. In this case, we speak about pluralism and multifacetedness of views. Transition to infinite heterogeneity leads to transformation of constructs themselves, converting a living being into the transformer of the stage, aside from being the creator of constructs; it also gives an individual an opportunity to shift into another direction, not necessarily to the next stage.

The null points to absence of relevant work and manifestation of constructs at a certain level, neutral stability, lack of understanding or use of constructs. The negative part of the axis points to the fact that the living being does not accept the construct that it observes, rejects it or even represses it or seeing no alternatives at the same time. In case of anti-group we find a negative attitude towards a particular group of constructs, but it does not necessarily mean that the person is not aware of them, on the contrary: he/she can learn more and more about them, but the attitude never changes, remaining negatively rejecting.

Anti-manifold can evolve as a global rejection-repression of the whole domain of certain constructs, which stems from some significant worldviews. Here we find an active confrontation, opposition to this domain, because a person is aware of the approach, but does not approve of it. Therefore, negative infinite heterogeneity can become a point of radical transformation, either at this particular level, or implying the shift to some other domains.

Mosaic model-construction implies a continuous scale from minus to plus infinity, each of the points on the scale correlating with two levels of lines of development or with "altitude" in Integral approach. Thus, we can unite infrared-magenta into the layer 1, red-amber (blue) into the layer 2, orange-green -3, teal-turquoise -4, etc. Then the levels of Integral model can be placed between 1 and manifold in the positive side of the axis.

Indeed, if we take a closer look and model each pair of levels, we can notice repetitive patterns, accentuating either oneness or multiplicity and forming a pair of levels. Such a configuration significantly expands the field for taking actions, comparing to rigidly progressive single-step shifts. For example, we can imagine strategies of developments that include only even or odd levels. Besides, ways through the negative part of the scale are also possible: it implies that some of the layers have been developed, but not manifested.

The story does not end here, as the mosaic scale, continuous on the whole, contains many transitional points between one and manifold. Besides, the category of manifold opens up opportunities for transformation at a certain uniformal stage, which are not necessarily described by the next pair of levels, but can produce various results. The points on the scale, close to infinity, represent new categories and their transforming and predictive aspect is quite complicated. It is the disposition that can cause highest possible deviations and are the source of unpredictable change.

Activity intelligence

We should also emphasize the unfixed position of levels, if we understand them as stages of lines development. A level of integral model can be located almost everywhere on the mosaic scale, depending on the context, conditions and actual state of things. Our approach, enacting continuity and fuzzy logic, allows to unravel a certain unity, the center of gravity of a level in various ways. Therefore, Mosaic model-construction always allows us to get more special, but simplified cases such as Integral approach itself or interpretations of separate lines of development. There are following levels/layers in the model of activity intelligence: 1-st layer infrared - magenta: isolated constructs and separate objects 2-st layer red - blue: one-dimensional constructs of lines or sequences. 3-d layer orange - green: two-dimensional constructs of scales and surfaces. 4-th layer yellow - turquoise : structures of spaces and worldviews. On this layer, a person reflects reality into complex spaces. Here we talk not only about cause and effect, but about paradoxicality of schemes, when the paradox itself becomes not a dead-end or a problem, but an method.



At one end of the scale - one - a person perceives reality as a complex, uniform space, system of views. Paradoxical and recursive loops create new meanings within the worldview. However, it is possible that the worldview does not include some phenomena or allow them to be included, therefor treating such phenomena as non-existent. Going further -many -a person begins to understand other worldviews and learns how to shift between them. It is quite a complicated process, as each massive system, such as worldview, requires a lot of resources for maintenance their wholeness, cultivation and re-organization. However, only at this stage a person can identify with other worldviews, perceiving them "as they are", not only through his own worldview. The "infinity" mode spaces become multilayered and intersecting, and also more and more heterogeneous.

We always have to deal with many systems, which can be aligned, but sometimes it is not legitimate to incorporate them into one system. System diversity means the representation of reality within a system in limits of admissible diversity. Diversity of systems means the construction of reality in different systems, which, in general case, exist independently. These two terms refer to different phenomena, based on varying principles of meta-modelling. To achieve a multifaceted view of reality, we should use diversity of systems instead of system diversity, as restriction of diversity to oneness is also a kind of reductionism.

In Mosaic, the transition from oneness to several and then to manifold implies, first of all, independence and self-sufficiency of each new oneness, which can be compared to other structures as a part of various processes. However, independence is impossible, if a kind of inherent origination or linear consequences are implied, because it means that we deal with cause-effect relations. Each element of manifold is independently valuable regardless of the manifold's size.

Holarchy is a manifold, coordinated in a certain way with regard to its interrelations, therefore, it is a single system, such as the "great chain of being" or AQAL, both representing system diversity. From Mosaic point of view, such a formation is not an independent diversity, it is closer to oneness, wholeness, which includes and structures a certain diversity. Therefore, we can place holarchical constructs between "one" and "manifold" on our scale.

A truly independent diversity of systems implicates that there are many self-dependent systems - worldviews, such as integral or other systems, each of those being totally independent and able to describe the world in their own terms. This is exactly what Mosaic is aimed at: we promote maintenance of manifolds of manifolds as well as non-reduction of diversity to oneness. We can place this approach with many independent spaces-worldviews near the "manifold" on our scale.

This approach enables us to admit or state the diversity of the most general categories - the diversity of Spirits, at the same time transforming all other worldviews that earlier were perceived in terms of system diversity, as independent, but interacting manifolds of manifolds. Indeed, even if we accept the axiom that relatively higher structures transcend all the lower structures, we can still construct competitive manifolds at every layer of the universe.

Any diversity may be simplified to oneness, constructed from selected elements, in other words, manifold may be transformed into oneness, but with the loss of some data. Therefore, a universal Spirit, or a universal wordview, such as AQAL map, which in fact includes a tremendous diversity of phenomena, is self-sufficient, but is not contradictory to other co-existent diversities.



Now let us return to layers of our scale. 5-th layer scarlet- indigo: tunnels and self-combined structures. At this layer, we deal with unfolding of random structures that depend on the sutiation and are adjust to each following moment.

We perceive system of worldviews or sets of such systems as extensive, massive and complex formations, but this layer emphasizes difficulties both of adequate maintenance of one system (as far as it projects/reflects everything, even other massive systems, through itself), which does not accept the existence of other similar systems, as well as variety of independent and interacting systems, as each of them needs to be supplemented, stay consistent and adequately respond to new challenges. These systems become more and more massive and finally too complicated to be sustained. Therefore, we introduce the metaphor of Tunnel construct-representing a pervasive, situational dash through necessary elements of various worldviews that allows to preserve only essential things.

Below we trace several other layers that are still emerging:

6-th layer lime - violet : zones of origins and insularities;

7-th layer gold - silver: horizons, black and white holes;

8-th layer white - black: wave fronts and interference patterns;

9-th layer achromic transparent: holographic projections;

The model of continuous scale, covering all possibilities from minus to plus infinity, allows us to introduce any other categories, aside from levels, using a scale with multiple values instead of a binary scale, shift from binary logic to multi-valued or fuzzy logic, which enables us to create flexible boundaries between categories and states without any artificial joints.

Age and development psychology

Before we discuss interrelations between levels of lines of development and the general Integral approach of transcending and including, we would like to discuss other possible options in our model, such as inconsequent development, non-linear activation of different layers. Mosaic offers a range of approaches to such options, expanding the sphere of possibilities.

Integral model suggests that in the process of its development, a living being evolves in historically-formed (as certain habits) stages, which are embedded in social and other areas. The development of the stages is rigidly determined to the extent of genetics, and is bound to certain periods of growing-up that enable beneficial development of this or that aspects of an individual.

Age psychology explores the stages of human life relying on age characteristics that evolve under the influence of genetic and social factors. Here we can mention studies of intelligence by Piaget, or epigenetic theory of E. Erikson. The stages and crises that they distinguish are rigidly bound to certain age periods. On the other hand, we have developmental psychology, exploring human development, its conditions and meaning. This approach implies stages, through which a person evolves in the process of his individual development.



While during the period of early childhood age psychology and developmental psychology almost merge, they start to differ increasingly in later periods, so that at the age of 15-18 lines of development and age periods start to evolve separately. Age psychology still explores the predetermined periods and crises (as transition points between periods), that cannot be reversed or postponed. It means that a person has to evolve in such stages, acquiring particular traits of character (for example, E.Erikson research). On the other hand, development psychology, which works with stages, admits, that the development of self and particular lines can be suspended for the time being. The development can be launched/continued (presumably) at any moment in order to go further. In this respect, age psychology and development psychology implies two or more independent processes. Let us discuss one of the consequences that follows.

If we imagine a developmental profile of a human as a set of completed stages (steps), and aspects of self that were formed at certain stages, then overlapping of these two processes (along with other possible processes) creates an inconsistency in the profile. It does not mean that holarchical nesting or periods of age crises are not observed, but we also observe a cell-void profile.

In 2007, we conducted a research based on theory of activity intelligence. According to the results of the research, we constructed profiles of participants, based on three most prominent types of constructs, which correspond to levels of the 8-level model. The results showed that these types of constructs not only differ in kind and degree in various people, but appear inconsistently, with gaps. We can admit that a person completed several stages, but in the course of the development formed different shadows, but this hypothesis encounters several problems. Besides, there is a view that next stages cannot be completed before the shadows of previous levels are integrated.

For example, we can designate active levels by digits, such as (3,6,7) or (2,4,6) or (1,2,8); other levels at the moment often function poorly and often inadequately. It is evident that they has been also completed, but the profile reflects only dominant levels, entrenched in consciousness, as well as in everyday human activities. More than 70% percent of the profiles in our research were inconsistent, with gaps. Moreover, these gaps referred not simply to irrelevant and non-functional, but to very poorly developed, subjectively non-valuable constructs that could not be adequately and continuously worked on. When taking various activity tests, people showed lack of competence at inactive levels that were often replaced and imitated by their strong features.

However, we should be very careful, summarizing and interpreting such kind of data. We can hardly spread the results of the research on all models of lines of development, particularly when we talk about individual or collective processes; we also cannot univocally assume how age

psychology and developmental psychology interrelate, but still it is very probable that the idea of cholarchical transcendence and inclusion can be extended and contemplated from different perspectives to trigger the search for new solutions.

Multifactoring

Mosaic meta-modelling implies use of 4 factors, each with multiple sub-factors-tuners, for flexible and precise modelling, adjusted for particular aims: 1. creature 2. environment 3. observer 4. projection and other factors

We model each factor (as well as sub-factor) in most independent fashion to avoid repetitions, entanglement and confusion of different categories. This extremely generalized approach to modelling enables us to shift from multi-factor to more simple models, for example, 1-2 factor models, such as line of levels. We also use iterative-recursive tools to align resulting constructs and test them in action.

Let us consider unifactor/one-dimensional model of levels (for simplicity we can present it as a line, not a spiral; we will get a spiral, placing the line on the surface of a cone). Therefore, we have 8, 10 or 17 levels. Now we add the second factor - the environment. Then, instead of one-

dimensional image, we see a twodimensional chart, where each box refers to the results of activity of a creature of a certain level in an environment of a certain level. A two-factor approach was developed by C. Graves, but he admitted a hypothesis that when two factors diverge, one of them tends to coordinate with the other one, thus



inspiring further development. It can actually happen - in the case of boxes on the diagonal. However, we still have many empty boxes.

In the today world, we can hardly speak about the progressive movement that incessantly balances factors. Moreover, we should perceive levels not as isolated characteristics, but within the whole spectrum of their possible manifestations. In this case, a person, acting from a certain level(levels), may find himself in a totally alien environment: his position is then represented by special boxes in the chart. Thus, we can fill all the two-dimensional field. If we proceed to profiles, the two-dimensional chart becomes insufficient, because a profile consisting of of N-elements of one factor is reflected into another profile consisting of N-elements (if both factors have similar number of levels).

Note, levels were predetermined in both of the discussed cases, only the character of their interplay was changing. However, in each particular case the predetermined nature of levels or their evolution relates to some action of a certain observer-evaluator, who is also represented by a profile

of levels in the environment of a certain level. At this point we can either add the third factor to the model, or represent the observer as another construct of combination of the two discussed factors.

We can add yet another factor, for example, using a transpersonal or cosmic factor, thought its influence and dynamics are not thoroughly studied yet. As we see, the process can be continued. In general case, to align various factors, we use a recursive



function: on the input it deals with starting levels and conditions and then - iteration after iteration - changes both the tissue of research and the meaning of sets of levels (if it is our target). This function stops working when a certain predetermined condition is satisfied. This is how the recursive N-dimensional factorization works.

Starting one-dimensional constructs of levels and gradually integrating more aspects in our study, we have come to complex model formations, where we can hardly speak about any linearity or even levels. In fact, we often deal with a blend of formations in the first place, that we try to systemize, distinguishing separate factors, and then re-integrate in a uniform representation.

Graphs and clusters

Mosaic approaches the issue from multi-dimensional perspective, because irregularity of distribution and non-linearity of transitions between levels indicates that we deal with cluster-based manifolds. What happens to levels in this case?.. We transform clusters into levels with the help of admissions within our model, like

introduction of new conditions. To unravel a certain cluster, we can - based on some theory - use particular rules to simplify the initial structure into a more simple one, with a number of dimensions, up to one dimension. After that we will obtain levels, for examples, referring to lines of development. Therefore, we see clusters as general forms, that can be reduced to levels of different systems. Mosaic focuses on the shift between clusters and levels.



As for cosmic habits and genetically and socially entrenched stages of development, Mosaic does not deny them, focusing more on the fact the any variety of creatures or boundaries of conditions can be never precisely defined, being inherently unfixed. We should not say that this group of people uses this set of habits and exists in this range of conditions, while another group - in some other range. But why do we speak about nations, countries, continents, the planet or the parts of the Universe?... Of course, boundaries must exist, because conditions of existence for different species (especially when we imply not only humans, but other supposedly intelligent animals and extraterrestrial forms of life), as well as their history differ a lot. Different initial conditions -all other conditions being equal -cannot lead to shared cosmic habits, in particular, when formations (such as nations or species) are located far from each other - in time and space.



In this case, Mosaic model-construction suggests that evolution is multi-directional; accordingly, we have many post-metaphysical pluralisms. In general case, Mosaic transformation model looks like a graph structure with many branched trees stemming from its knots. As these formations are very complex, we cannot exactly determine all real characteristics of evolutionary processes; it is even more true for a certain species or nation. However, theory of graphs is very promising as a model tool.

Abstractive-specific model

Integral theory - using traditional, modern and postmodern achievements - rather implies post-metaphysical pluralism than predetermined metaphysics. Mosaic uses a similar construct, called "abstractive-specific model", which contains no ontology, but provides a technique for modelling of various manifestations of existence.

There is a certain similarity between modelling of a creature and modelling of reality. This similarity manifests itself not in the non-determined nature of constructs or the nature of their sets, but in the approach to modelling itself. In contrast to Integral approach, we do not take existence of the Spirit, priority of consciousness or ideas of panpsychism, as an axioms. We assume that the initial field of abstraction is empty, we deal with chaotic existence. Even the subject does not exist. Under certain conditions, the subject spontaneously emerges, along with any other formations.

The model of infinite Mosaic ocean manifests itself only through one axis - the axis of abstraction-specificity. Total abstraction implies formless and unmanifested reality, with of specific constructs but ultimate potential. Total specificity implies to the opposite: ample and specific forms, conditions and manifestations, as well as highly determined processes and lack of potential.

Fluctuations in this model field generate structures, situated between these two extreme values, provided that each construct can be manifested at various layers of abstraction. Constructs emerge spontaneously or in an orderly way, interact, disappear, generate sub-constructs at various layers. It does not reduce radical diversity or mitigate the struggle for manifestation - the struggle that can be also expressed through creation of dependent constructs and projections that scaffold a certain construct.

We can show that the model is applicable to reality, using the example of humans in all their aspects. Here - within a certain range - we can present all the categories, qualities and functions of human that we know now, from purely material to subtle: they would represent different layers of abstraction. We can also investigate how human relates to egregores, memes, archetypes or other more fundamental universal programs, which pervade the whole ocean; and consequently move to

more and more specific and determined layers of the world. The model of Mosaic ocean amplifies the set of modelling tools, giving us alternative ways of structuration, alongside with holarchies.

Projectors model

The closest alternative map for AQAL in Integral approach - with its quadrants and zones is a meta-field of projectors, or constructs-factors in Mosaic, independently determined by the researcher. Complex of such factors in a switched mode behaves as a projector that illuminates an

empty field for various meta-model experiments.

The term "projector" refers to the fact the researcher unrestrictedly fills the field with those factors, sets and conditions that enable him to solve certain problems. Above we mentioned a set of factors (as an example): creature, environment, observer, and projection structures.



These factors divide into 15 zones for an observer: 1. Forms of life 2. Environments 3. Observation 4. Projection structures 5. Creatures in environments 6. Observation of environments 7. Projections-observations 8. Projections of creatures 9. Observation of creatures 10. Projections of environments 11. Projections of creatures in environments 12.Observation of creatures in environment 13. Observation of projections of environments 14. Observation of projections of creatures 15. Observation of projections of creatures in environments.

Quadrants and zones in Integral approach can be compared to lighting created by projectors in Mosaic. Any projector can be constructed as a simple and multifaceted. Multifaceted projector consists of several sub-projectors, sub-projectors - of several sub-sub-projectors, etc. Therefore, the constructs of projectors in Mosaics are infinitely divisible.

Here are several examples of sub-projectors. AQAL's elements can be found among them. 1. Creatures (forms of life): 1.1 Complexity of the specimen, 1.2 Quantity, 1.3 Layers -levels/clusters, 1.4 Specification - types, 1.5 Interrelation-interaction, 1.6 Genetics 1.7 History 2. Environments: 2.1 Complexity, 2.2 Quantity, 2.3 Layers, 2.4 Range - scope 2.5 Interrelationinteraction, 2.6 Nesting - holarchies

- 3. Observation: 3.1 Involvement states, 3.2 Observer viewpoint from the inside/from the outside
- 3.3 Boundary internal/external
- 4. Projection: 4.1 Degree of abstraction, 4.2 Quantity, 4.3 Range 4.4 Nesting, 4.5. Interrelation



These examples show that such tools can be used not only for exploring situations, but for designing new systems, such as AQAL and other approaches. We could choose projectors, sub-projectors, then indicate certain conditions as tuners and switch the projectors on. The required system will appear before the researcher on the illuminated field. After that we can work on particular details. However, if we want to correct the system itself, we have to tune projectors and sub-projectors again and observe the result. This is a meta-tool for creating meta-constructs.

References

Artemieva, Tatiana. (1988) Beloselskiy-Belozerskiy and his philosophic heritage (in russian)

Beck, Don Cowan, Christopher (2005) Spiral Dynamics: Mastering Values, Leadership and Change

Cook-Greuter, Suzanne. Nine Levels of Increasing Embrace

Grekova, Tatiana (2006). Psychological types: semantics of concept "development". (in russian)

Kudryashov, Alexandr (2000). Crimea's consciousness and bioenergetics school (in russian)

Leontiev, Alexey (1999) Psyche evolution. (in russian)

Luriya, Alexandr (1979) Language and consciousness (in russian)

Nagibina, Natalya. (2000-2003) Psychological types. System approach, parts 1-4 (in russian)

Nepeivoda, Nikolay. (2007). The foundations of infosophie (in russian)

Nalimov Vasiliy, Drogalina Zhanna (1995) Real of unreal. Probabilistic model of unconsciousness

Rubinstein, Sergey (2003). Entity and consciousness (in russian)

Shindin, Alexey. The modelling problems of "changes and development" (2011). (in russian)

Vygotskiy, Lev. (1999) Thinking and speech. (in russian)

Wilber, Ken (2007). Integral Spirituality.