

The terms Holistic and Unity

Copyright Tim Reeves, Carolastr. 1A, D-04736 Waldheim

Since I'll be using these terms, I want to first make clear what they mean, and how I use them.

Unity

From Anglo-Norman *unité*, from Latin *ūnitās*, from *ūnus* ("one") + noun of state suffix *-itās*, ultimately from Proto-Indo-European **óynos* ("one, single"), hence distantly related to *one* and *an*. Displaced native Old English *ānnes* (literally "oneness").

[wiktionary.org](https://en.wiktionary.org)

Here are some definitions of how the word is currently understood:

Unity is the state of being as one (either literally or figuratively) Wikipedia

a whole or totality as combining all its parts into one. ... the state or fact of being united or combined into one, as of the parts of a whole. dictionary.com

the state of being joined together or in agreement dictionary.cambridge.org

But look how the word is actually used nowadays (you can do this for yourself easily on the internet – I didn't want to sully my book with the actual quotations): In reference to war (the defeated party being forced into a unified whole with the victors), to the colours of a competitive sports team, to a politician's prayer; and efforts to force the appearance of at least a temporary unity, as something about which a deal was made and broken, and even in one breath with a triple homicide. And that's all before we even start to look at the concept of unity in a religious context. In contrast, my instinctive feeling about unity is of genuine consensus, mutuality, of recognised and welcomed interdependence, something in which many different parts are seen as belonging equally to the whole without any hierarchy of importance.

Holistic

Holism (from ὅλος *holos*, a Greek word meaning all, entire, total) is the idea that all the properties of a given system (biological, chemical, social, economic, mental, linguistic, etc.) cannot be determined or explained by the sum of its component

parts alone. Instead, the system as a whole determines in an important way how the parts behave.

New World Encyclopedia

Holistic is the adjective form of holism: *The theory that parts of a whole are in intimate inter-connection, such that they cannot exist independently of the whole, or cannot be understood without reference to the whole, which is thus regarded as greater than the sum of its parts.* Oxford Languages

Here are four statements for 'holistic' taken from online dictionaries:

- *that the parts of something are intimately interconnected and explicable only by reference to the whole.* Oxford Languages
- *the tendency in nature to form wholes, that are greater than the sum of its parts, through creative evolution.* Oxford English Dictionary
- *relating to or concerned with wholes or with complete systems rather than with the analysis of, treatment of, or dissection into parts.* Merriam Webster
- *Holistic medicine attempts to treat the whole person, including mind and body, not just the injury or disease.* Cambridge Dictionary

First of all, let's make sure we're not confusing holism and holograms. A hologram is the stored form of a three-dimensional scene as illuminated by two laser beams, whereby the interference pattern of the beams is stored. When it's illuminated in a special way, a three-dimensional image of the original scene is reproduced. *When a hologram is cut in half, the whole scene can still be seen in each piece. This is because, whereas each point in a photograph only represents light scattered from a single point in the scene, each point on a holographic recording includes information about light scattered from every point in the scene.* Wikipedia.

It's worth adding that while the whole scene is stored everywhere on the recording medium (e.g. a special type of photographic film), the smaller the part of it used in the reproduction, the more blurred and indistinct the reproduced image will become. Even so, this is a peculiarly intimate form of non-separation.

On the other hand, when something is viewed as being holistic, it can have many different types of parts which interdepend on each other, yet the whole which they together make up has no resemblance to any one part. We can see this easily in our own bodies – a heart, an esophagus, ankle bones, blood cells... They are all very different parts which together make up one organism – you or I. When your liver doesn't function properly, it can poison the rest of your body; and if your lungs don't work properly your brain can die of oxygen starvation. And if your mind is in fear, a mass of hormones will be released to help your body deal with

the dangerous situation (fight or flight). This is why I find a holistic approach to health, including emotions and beliefs, the right way to go.

Is existence a holistic unity?

Is existence itself – spacetime and / or the foundational level – holistic in nature? Are the two, individually or together, a unity? Is the sum more than just a catalogue of its parts? To answer those questions, let's first gather the most relevant definitions at one place:

Holistic: *that parts of a whole are in intimate interconnection, such that they cannot exist independently of the whole, or cannot be understood without reference to the whole, which is thus regarded as greater than the sum of its parts.*

Oxford Languages

Unity: *the state of being in agreement and working together; the state of being joined together to form one unit; a single thing that may consist of a number of different parts.*

oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com

First of all, how much of 'existence' are we talking about here? In everyday use we would probably mean spacetime. But spacetime is an emergent property of the foundational level. So to consider spacetime (ST) alone makes no sense, as it would not exist at all without the foundational level (FL) which brings it forth.

So could we at least consider the FL in itself to be a unity? We observe our spacetime universe to obey a great many physical laws, and they seem constant as far as we can observe. It therefore seems logical that this reliability must be mirrored at the FL – if it were chaotic then how could our reliable ST emerge from it? So let's assume that the structures and processes at that level work together, in a lawful and reliable way, to produce the ST we live in. In this sense I think it fair to propose the FL as being a vast and inseparable collection of energies which work together, according to laws which we may never understand.

Can we assume that the FL has no choice other than to bring forth the ST? Just as unavoidably as apples fall to earth due to gravity – they don't have a lot of choice about it, that's just the way it is in our ST. If we consider the hypothesis that 'All is Consciousness', then we would have to say no, it's not a safe assumption that the FL is choiceless in what it produces. Personally I can't imagine that some Great Consciousness could at some point decide it's fed up with creating the ST and just stop doing so. So for now I'll suggest that we imagine the FL as a level which simply (for reasons unknown) exists, obeying laws of its' own, which include it bringing forth the ST.

To further illustrate this concept: Could we just take out photons and have a spacetime without them? I hardly think so – that would involve a total rework of the FL, and unless

we happen to live in a computer simulation I can't imagine that happening either. In this context, we should be clear that things which happen in spacetime also affect the FL, for example morphogenetic fields or working with energy (auras and chakras). In fact, the longer I've been mulling over these topics, the more I see how broadly, and how intimately, the two are intertwined. Therefore I assert: both together, the FL and the ST, form one unity – the FLST. And the title of my trilogy therefore remains The Unity Trilogy.

From all these viewpoints, the FLST can only be seen as being of a holistic nature – the parts cannot be understood without reference to the whole. Finally: We don't know if the FL brings forth other universes or forms of existence besides our own spacetime. So perhaps we should be cautious and refer to the FLST+X

To return briefly to a question raised above:

- Where is the seat of our consciousnesses? Is it here in the ST, or there in the FL? Perhaps the question itself arises from a wrong way of looking at things. If the two are so inseparably and intimately intertwined, a true Unity, then simply to pose the question may have missed the point.

There's a further aspect of the word unity to look at – that of being in agreement. As I've noted, nowadays "unity" seems in practice to be forced on people even when many don't want it – through war, dictate, despite lack of consensus, via media manipulation... So I see this as a major aspect of the title "The Unity Trilogy" – as a plea for each of us to develop our world view to encompass the whole, to perceive the non-separation in consciousness, to orient ourselves to the common good and find true agreement.

Here's one citation which I find particularly relevant:

A unity that includes all possible worlds seems to have a greater kind of existence than one that merely exists in all possible worlds. dictionary.cambridge.org