

Attending Responding Becoming

A living~learning inquiry in a naturally inclusional
playspace

Abstract, Guide and Glossary

by

Louie J N Gardiner

March 2022

45 Farrer Terrace
Edinburgh
EH7 6SG
louie@potent6.co.uk
+44 7730 596 771

www.potent6.co.uk
www.piacollective.org
LinkedIn: [linkedin.com/in/louiegardiner](https://www.linkedin.com/in/louiegardiner)
Twitter: [Potent6](https://twitter.com/Potent6)



Academic affiliation for articles:

Centre for Systems Studies, Business School, University of Hull, Hull, HU6 7RX, UK.

Abstract

Traditional scientific paradigms emphasise writing in the third person, effectively marginalising the subjective perspective of the researcher. Many systems thinking, cybernetics and complexity approaches are better in this regard, as they involve systemic interventions where the relationships between the researcher and other participants really matter. Writing in the first person therefore becomes acceptable.

In this Thesis (and a partner document coupled with it), I have explored how to reincorporate subjective empiricism into my systemic intervention practice. This has brought forth many unanticipated contributions. These take the form of new frameworks, concepts and approaches for systems and complexity practice, emerging from my engagements with myself and others, as well as from reflections upon those engagements.

However, the content of my reflections and ‘becomings’ are not all that represent my doctoral contribution; there is also the *form* of my representation(s), as well as the emergent nature of the process through which they have come to be. I have drawn from Gregory Bateson’s use of metalogues: where the nature of a conversation mirrors its content – e.g. getting into a muddle whilst talking about muddles! Intuitively, I grasped the importance of metalogue in what I was attempting, and found myself coining the term *metalogue coherence*. Without fully appreciating what this might mean in practice, I groped my way into undertaking and documenting my research in ways that I believed would be *metalogically coherent* with the complexity-attuned principles to which I was committing. In sum, and key to appreciating what unfolds in the narrative, is recognising this Thesis and its partner document as *metalogically coherent* artefacts of **naturally inclusional, complexity-attuned, evolutionary research**.

To fully acknowledge the different ways of knowing that have flowed into my inquiry, I have written in multiple voices (called *statewaves*, for reasons to be explained in the thesis). I found myself shifting from one voice to another as I explored and expressed different dimensions of what I was experiencing and discovering.

In addition, I have made liberal use of hyperlinks, so both documents are far from linear. They are more akin to a mycorrhizal network, interlinking flows of ideas and sensemaking, all of which can be accessed and experienced differently, depending on each reader’s engagement with and through it.

The thesis and its partner document are part of a composite submission that contains both poetry and artwork (visual depictions and animations of the ideas). These elements, along with the more conventional academic text, are augmented by penetrating reflections on my personal motivations, guided by a narrator signposting the streams as they flow into and between each other. All of my being has been implicated and impacted by this endeavour. When insights and new ‘becomings’ emerged flowfully during my practice, my joy was reflected in my narrative; as indeed were my pain, doubts and reinterpretations associated with ideas that were difficult to birth. I present all this in my submission, without retrospective sanitisation or simplification. In so doing, I am keeping faith with the principle that I remain at the heart of my research, and cannot be extracted from it without doing violence to the *metalogical coherence* that gives it meaning.

Keywords:

abduction; metalogue coherence; Natural Inclusion; Natural Inclusionality; second-order cybernetics; P6 Constellation; Participation Compass; Presence in Action; Point Attractor Inquiry (PAI); statewaves; subjective empiricism; symmathesic agency; symmathesy; systemic intervention; systems thinking; Systemic Research Framework.

Navigating this doctoral submission

Given the unusual nature of my doctorate, I thought it might be useful to offer some guidance to how you might engage with it. This composite submission comprises a range of digital files with **filenames commencing** with a number **00-06**.

▶ The components include: animated multi-media presentations i.e. ‘prezis’ (**00, 01, 02, 03a, 03b, 5b**); two coupled, text-dominant documents including my Thesis (**04**) and Chapter-Five-as-Appendix, i.e. §CA-5 (**05a**) along with a separate Abstract (**00a**) and Abstract, Guide and Glossary (**00b**); and finally, an anthology of poems written during my research (**06**).

▶ My ways of presenting come in four distinctive ‘voices’ which, together complement and convey my research inquiry and what has arisen through it. I refer to these ways/voices as *statewaves*; and when I formally introduce them in my Thesis (**04**), I explain why. From the list below, you will see that each file/component conveys its message through a dominant *statewave*. However, **all** *statewaves* show up, weave and flow, to varying degrees, within each component:

- ▶ **Navigator-Narrator (NN): file names commencing 00, 00a**
- ≈ **Visual-Kinaesthetic (VK): file names commencing 01, 02, 03a, 03b, 05b**
- ◆ **Intellectual-Theoretic (IT): file names commencing 04, 05a**
- ♪ **Aesthetic Poetic (AP): file name commencing 06**

▶ Each *statewave* and component is essential – bringing a different quality, dimension, tone, structure, presentation style and content to my overall contribution. Each is needed to grasp the distinctive yet complementary nature and essence of the ‘*abductive fruits*’ of my research.

Every way flows every way

▶ In principle, you could start with (and repeatedly revisit) any of these files, because each opens up and flows into all the others. Initially, however, I suggest that you proceed in numbered order, particularly as the contributions of ▶ **Navigator-Narrator** and ≈ **Visual-Kinaesthetic** afford an overarching synthesis which, I believe, will help you grasp the gestalt of what you are about to encounter in detail with ◆ **Intellectual-Theoretic**.

▶ Given the entangled, nonlinear nature of my undertaking, do use the: (a) within-in document hyperlinks (blue, underlined text); (b) between-document **section references**, e.g. §CA-5.1; and (c) external hyperlinks to the multi-media components of my composite submission.

▶ **For ease of access and quick referencing:** whilst engaging with the above material, you may find it useful to print file **00a**. This includes the Abstract, this Guide repeated, plus the Glossary – all extracted from file **04**.

▶ In case you cannot access components of my composite submission through formal academic channels, I have made my components accessible via the link below:

[Louie’s Doctoral Research](#)

PLEASE NOTE: Particularly within the files commencing **04** and **05a**, I include hyperlinks which will take you to the *online* versions of my ‘prezis’ (**00, 01, 02, 03a, 03b, 05b**). These require strong, fast internet connections to experience them ‘as intended’.

▶ If anything is inaccessible to you, I may be able to provide non-animated pdfs so you can access the content. Please do [email me](#) if you have any difficulties or queries.

Glossary

Term	Definition
Text emphases	<p>My use of bold, <i>italics</i>, “double” and ‘single’ speech marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bold – emphasising terms drawn from a third-person source outwith a direct quotation or simply emphasising a word. ○ <i>Italics</i> – anything I am uniquely introducing, e.g. terms, neologisms, definitions, including my interior commentary often used in sidebars. ○ “quotation” from an external reference. ○ A ‘quotation’ embedded in another quotation or outwith a formal quotation I may be indicating the use of a term as a non-page-specific reference; or that I am questioning the validity of a term or phrase, e.g. where below, I write: <i>so-called rational reasoning</i> I might another time write <i>‘rational’ reasoning</i>.
Abduction (see also ‘induction’ below)	<p>Here I offer an <i>alternative</i> description based on my synthesis which finally came into view as I was nearing the completion of my thesis. I suggest that:</p> <p><i>Abduction is situated, naturally inclusional, emergent, nonlinear processing that – when enhanced by a metalogically coherent, self-centering praxis such as ≈Presence in Action, or a collaborative praxis such as Symmathesic Agency using the PAI + Participation Compass – has the potential to generate radical insights, artefacts and responses that are real §CA-5.5.6.2 and efficacious to the person(s) generating them; and which, depending on the scope of their applicability, and the extent and rigour accorded to their iterative application ↔ adaptation, may reliably be transferable to others §CA-5.5.12.5: p. 578.</i></p> <p>I illuminate the terms I use above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Situated</i> – each person wherever they are, is locally situated in their relational, wider-world and kosmological realms. It is from these realms that they (non-)consciously access ‘data’ within and beyond themselves through all of their being. ○ <i>Naturally inclusional</i> – reliant on bringing into confluence, first person ‘data’ with second and third-person, in <i>reflective-reflexive</i>, receptive-responsive process(ing). This acknowledges that both tangible and intangible ‘data’ or presences/essences are in co-creative interplay. This is consistent with Natural Inclusionality and Peirce’s own recognition that nature holds the key to future knowing. ○ <i>Nonlinear</i> – infinite unknowable and some knowable presences/essences interact in unpredictable ways, generating new and repeating patterns – none of which we can invoke on demand. However, we can establish conditions in which they may be more likely to arise. This ties in to Peirce suggesting that “logical criticism is limited to what we can control” and “perceptual judgment cannot be sensibly controlled now, nor is there any rational hole that it ever can be” (Peirce, 1893-1913 [1998]: p.240). On this last point, in light of <i>Presence in Action</i>, it can be disrupted and converted, but never on command. ○ <i>Metalogically coherent</i> – <i>when metaphorm, practice/process(ing) and paradigm are mutually consistent §Glossary; §5.5.11.6: Figure A-68.</i> ○ <i>Self-centering process(ing)</i> – whatever we experience comes through our bodily senses; we notice what we are attuned to notice, and make what we make of what we notice. When we begin to notice what we are (not) noticing aided by the six outlying portals; and as we expand our <i>acuity</i> to notice more and notice differently, we cannot not generate new insights. This is abduction (emergent nonlinearity) coming alive in us, expanding beyond the partiality of ‘perceptual judgment’ (i.e. <i>Fiction-dominated meaning-making</i>). <p>Charles Sanders Peirce offers the earliest attempts to explicate abduction. His ideas evolved but many scholars retain his early formulation and remain attached to seeing abduction as a trade-off, losing ‘security’ in favour of ‘uberty’ (abundance) §CA-5.5.12.1: p. 559-560. I came to my synthesis, building on Peirce’s later thinking, aided by Thomas (2015) who draws parallels between Peirce’s work and complex/dynamic systems and complexity science. I found clarity and resonance, enabling me to marry my <i>subjective empirical</i> knowing with sources of new knowledge unavailable to Peirce and those wedded to earlier reductionist formulations.</p> <p>It is important to note that in philosophy (within the reductionist paradigm of traditional science), abduction is considered a form of explanatory reasoning in which there are two simplistic, confusingly contradictory uses of the term. The first refers to generating hypotheses and the second to justifying them. The latter is more commonly used and referred to as Inference to the Best Explanation (IBE) though increasingly the generative aspect is regaining ground in academia. Both are constrained by</p>

	<p>reductionism because they rely on so-called rational reasoning and ignore what else may be in play and implicated within a person’s interior processing.</p> <p>Shank and Cunningham (1996) §CA-5.5.12.1, using Peirce’s logic, derive six types of abduction: omen/hunch, Symptom, Metaphor/analogy, Clue, Diagnosis/scenario and Explanation. Simplistically, in all these types, there appears to be something in common which had me return to the roots of the word i.e. ab = away; ducto = to lead. At its simplest, abduction seems to be about moving something(s), e.g. ideas, patterns, similarities etc, away from its/their usual context and comparing, considering or applying it/them in another. In so doing, we may gain novel insights previously unconceived. We may be able to invoke this consciously, but even when we do not, I suggest, we are doing it, albeit in an impoverished way, i.e. based on linear, reactive tendencies which have us rely on distinctly partial data. Our capacity for nonlinear, non-conscious, <i>subjective empirical</i> processing is always available and in motion while ever we are alive. The question of import to me is: can we enhance the quality and efficacy of our abductive processing? My answer: Yes, but only if we engage in <i>a metalogically coherent, naturally inclusional, self-centering praxis such as Presence in Action</i> §CA-5.5.12.5.</p>
<i>Abductive fruits</i>	<p>That which has arisen through my <i>living~learning inquiry</i>: the ten tangible and intangible artefacts, representations/frameworks, concepts, models, praxes, presented in this submission, i.e. chronologically by arrival (1) the <i>Participation Compass</i>; (2) the <i>PAI</i>; (3) the <i>P6 Constellation</i>; (4) my <i>staterwaves</i>; (5) <i>Aphorisms of Nature + Symmatbesic Agency Behaviours</i>; (6) the <i>Symmatbesic Agency Model</i>; (7) the <i>Systemic Research Framework</i>; (8) <i>Presence in Action</i> ; (9) <i>metalogic coherence</i>; my (10) poetry anthology; and ultimately, this Thesis + Chapter-Five-as-Appendix §CA-5.</p>
<i>Acuity Practice</i>	<p>A noticing practice, embedded in the praxis of <i>Presence in Action</i>, invoked by a single question: <i>What am I / are you noticing?</i> It is associated with the <i>P6 Constellation</i> and the <i>PAI</i> and comprises four essential ‘behaviours’: <i>Notice; Reflect; Follow; Re-turn</i>.</p>
<i>Acuity Fountain</i>	<p>A visual metaphor that illustrates the generative, <i>self-centering expansivity</i> that arises from extending our capacity to notice more than we did ‘before’: generative <i>agility, fluency</i> and <i>reflexive artistry</i> are sourced in and by our personal commitment to extend our capacity to notice i.e. our acuity §CA-5.5.11.3: Figure A-63.</p>
Admit	<p>Sometimes I use this word for one of its meanings: acknowledge/confess; allow/let in, accept, accept as possible/valid. When I embolden the word, I am invoking all these meanings at once.</p>
Agency	<p>I have come to understand the concept of agency as a particular manifestation of self-organising dynamics tipping a living being into some form of motion; and that this is perhaps better (and more neutrally) expressed as animation §CA-5.5.5.5: p.293; §6.4.</p>
<i>Aphorisms of nature</i>	<p>An aphorism is succinct observation that has a kernel of ‘truth’ in it. My <i>aphorisms of nature’s way</i> have been likened to Zen Koans. They are poetic, provocative phrases that tease the reader into slowing down to ponder more deeply about what is actually being conveyed, e.g. <i>what is, is not</i> alludes to the notion that what we think is real may simply be a perception, conception or interpretation of a ‘thing’ or an event. For example: is a rock solid? It may seem so at one scale of observation but at an atomic scale it can be seen to be mostly space! My <i>aphorisms</i>: §CA-5.5.11.4 are products – acting as surrogates – of my synthesis of experiential and practical knowing, and encounters with other propositional content. Each one relates to one or more principles drawn from complexity science, systems thinking, Natural Inclusional or primal animation.</p>
<i>Community-in-practice</i>	<p>I make a distinction between ‘in’ and ‘of’. A community of practice has members who do similar work using similar approaches etc. The <i>PLA community-in-practice</i> comprises practitioners who self-reflexively work on themselves, supporting and supported by each other. It is a fundamental second order science distinction – we are mutually learning <i>in</i> practice together, not doing something to others we do not do ourselves.</p>
Complexity thinking paradigm	<p>The use of complexity science concepts as scaffolding for thought, recognising and admitting both the objectivist tendencies within complexity science and the interpretivist tendencies within systemic thinking. It also holds the space for stable patterns and particularities (Boulton et al., 2015: p. 29) §0.2; 0.3: Footnote 33.</p>
‘Data’	<p>I use this word with apostrophes to refer to an expanded range of interiorly-accessed, first-person data-types, framed within the <i>portals</i> of the <i>P6 Constellation</i>.</p>
<i>Decision (in P6 Constellation)</i>	<p>(<i>Reactive/Rational</i>) What we think we are going to do. If/when we do it, this becomes a <i>Fact</i>.</p>

<p><i>Eddy sidebars</i></p>	<p>The term I use for the sidebars in which I give space for my interior commentary, personal processing and sometimes poetry. ‘Eddy’ leverages the river metaphor I use for this thesis being a torrent of verbiage from which I take refuge in the eddies, affording moments of <i>self-centering – reflective-reflexive</i> processing (see below) that helps me ‘re-enter’ the river of words §0.3: Footnote 21.</p>
<p><i>Enform</i></p>	<p>Considered to be an obsolete word that I have re-instated here because it more closely captures what I seek to convey – “to form or to fashion” (Wiktionary, 2017)</p>
<p><i>Facts (in P6 Constellation)</i></p>	<p><i>(Past, Present):</i> The presence of a named ‘thing’ or person (material object); events/happenings that take place; what someone says or does (transient immaterial happenings) that can/may be recorded, noted or measured: i.e. that which is considered to be ‘objectively’ available to all, though not necessarily accessible by all, by virtue of personal perspective/position, proximity/scale, or perceptual filtering. Something that has “an apparently fixed, shared value... to be thought of as ‘facts’” (Glanville, 1982: p.6). NB. This quotation is of import. Philosophically, it illuminates that when we label something we are, in essence, making meaning of it i.e. we are deploying <i>Fictions</i> to give name to the thing so we can refer to ‘it’ or communicate about it with others. Anything we consider a <i>Fact</i>, is held by a normative agreement to refer to that ‘thing/happening’ with the label/name we have given it. Heuristically this distinction serves us.</p>
<p><i>Feelings (in P6 Constellation)</i></p>	<p><i>(Physical, Emotional):</i> A single term that includes our physical, physiological and affective states §6.4: Footnote 140; i.e. somatosensory (muscles, connective tissue, skin); proprioceptive (movement and posture) and interoceptive (our internal organs e.g. heart, lungs, guts); AND what we ordinarily call ‘emotions’. Bodily sensations are experienced in the entirety of our bodies (Johnstone, 2012; Sheets-Johnstone, 1999a, 2008) though, often, we may locate particular sensations ‘somewhere’ (e.g. “my skin is tingling”; “my lips are dry”; “my hands are shaking”). These and other outwardly imperceptible sensations are accepted as empirical if they can be measured (e.g. heartbeat, sweating, liver function). ‘Unmeasurable’ affective states are considered ‘subjective’ (which means that an outsider cannot know what goes on inside another); e.g. emotions such as anger, disappointment, frustration, delight, etc. In the midst of experiencing, we simply need to connect with all the feelings we are feeling – and often there are several-to-many, never just one!</p>
<p><i>Fiction (in P6 Constellation)</i></p>	<p><i>(What my mind does with...):</i> i.e. what we make of all that we consciously and non-consciously encounter and experience. We give labels and make assumptions, interpretations, judgements, conclusions, myths, stories, metaphors, imaginings, etc. Meanings do not exist outwith a relational and wider-world context. They are constructed and shared ‘inter-subjectively’ through language and symbols. However, my meaning-making is mine, affected by past encounters, accessed through me; yours is yours, through you. Sometimes our meaning-making coincides and sometimes it collides.</p>
<p>Induction (as distinct from abduction)</p>	<p>“Inductions and abductions can be distinguished by their different targets. Both serve the target of extending our knowledge beyond observation—but in rather different respects. Inductions serve the goal of inferring something about the future course of events—which is important for planning, that is, adapting our wishful actions to the course of events. In contrast, abductions serve the goal of inferring something about the unobserved causes or explanatory reasons of the observed events—which is of central importance for manipulating the course of events, that is, adapting the course of events to our wishes (cf. also Peirce 1903, CP 5.189; Aliseda 2006, p. 35). That abductions cannot be reduced to inductions follows from the fact that inductions cannot introduce new concepts or conceptual models; they merely transfer them to new instances. In contrast, some kinds of abductions can introduce new concepts (cf. Peirce 1903, CP 5.170). Following Magnani (2001, p. 20) I call abductions which introduce new concepts or models creative, in contrast to selective abductions whose task is to choose the best candidate among a given multitude of possible explanations” (Schurz, 2008: p. 2).</p>
<p>Influence</p>	<p>The original meaning of influence is ‘in-flowing’ and not effecting outward change. When I refer to Natural Inclusion, I draw on the original meaning – that receptive space influences i.e. draws in, invokes, induces responsive energy flow (Gardiner, 2019: p. 108; Footnote 21) §CA-5.5.5.2.</p>
<p>Intention/Intent</p>	<p>I take this to mean <i>explicitly expressed conscious purpose(s), that are future-oriented, aspirational and may be somewhat ‘worthy’ or ‘lofty’</i>, e.g. ‘I choose to adopt a daily exercise regime (<i>Decision</i>) in order to ‘enhance my health and wellbeing (<i>Purpose</i>)’; or ‘make a difference to the world’. At the organisational level some might speak of ‘strategic choice/intent’ a conscious, future-oriented statement directing the allocation of resources. At either scale, both are consciously chosen and the assumption is that the relevant actors will follow through, thereby accomplishing the stated purpose. There is an air of linear thinking in sway. Intention is explicitly verbally expressed though often not lived out. Because of this they show up as a kind of pretence §CA-5.5.6.2; §CA-5.5.12.2.</p>

Intentionality	I take this to mean <i>non-conscious purpose, implicitly conveyed through explicit, current being~doing expressions</i> i.e. through what we actually (do not) do and (do not) say. Intentionality is illuminated through the praxis of <i>Presence in Action</i> using the <i>P6 Constellation</i> . It can be generative/creative or degenerative/counterproductive. Through the decades of my reflective practice and now this doctoral inquiry, I have noticed the prevalence of two simple <i>primal purposes</i> – <i>play</i> and <i>self-protection</i> §0.3; §1.4.1; §3.5; §CA-5.5.6.2. These are life-enhancing and life-preserving but the latter can be distorted by our fast thinking tendencies that have us react, often in error, based on distorted/dramatically partial acuity, which then compromises our discernment and meaning-making capacities. Intentionality is lived out in each current moment, though is often not recognised nor verbally expressed unless revealed through a <i>self-centering</i> praxis such as <i>Presence in Action</i> §CA-5.5.1.1; §CA-5.5.8.3; §CA-5.5.12.2.
Inter-acting	Within the <i>Systemic Research Framework</i> , I use this hyphenated term to mean <i>taking action together</i> – differentiating from ‘interacting’ which is usually about ‘relating with others’.
Kosmos	“1. ‘Kosmos’ is a Greek word meaning the entire world – the physical, the emotional, the mental, and the spiritual. It has sadly been reduced to ‘cosmos’, which the modern world still claims to be ‘the whole world’, but it only includes the physical realm – materialistic reductionism in other words” (Wilber, 2017: p. 666). I adopt kosmos in the ≈SAM to re-instate the inclusional meaning invoked by it.
Living~learning inquiry	A term I adopt in preference to Living Theory Action Research §CA-5.1.5 which implies conscious intention. <i>Living~learning inquiry</i> encapsulates the emergent nature of learning that relies on non-conscious intentionality and conscious intention §CA-5.1.5; §CA-5.5.5.4; §CA-5.5.5.5; §CA-5.5.6.4; §CA-5.5.10.1; §CA-5.5.11.1.
Metalogic coherence	<i>Abductive Fruit 9: §CA-5.5.11.6 The pattern arising through the embodiment, alignment and attunement of intangible Knowing, Being and Doing §Figure A-68.</i> Thus, with metalogic coherence, Knowing represents the intangible (usually nonconscious) paradigm & principles informing a person; Being comprises intangible and tangible states and/or <i>metaphorms</i> (see below); and Doing reflects what people do and how they do/process what they do in practice (i.e. their practice/process(ing)). <i>In short, metalogic coherence manifests when metaphorm, practice/process(ing) and paradigm are mutually consistent.</i> ” I posit that <i>Presence in Action</i> and <i>Symmathesic Agency</i> are <i>metalogically coherent</i> patterns, made possible by the mutually consistent interrelating between their common paradigm & principles (expressed through my <i>Aphorisms</i> and <i>Symmathesic Agency Behaviours</i>); respective <i>metaphorms</i> (the <i>P6 Constellation</i> and the <i>PAI</i>), and shared <i>Acuity Practice</i> .
Metalogue	“A metalogue is a conversation about some problematic subject. This conversation should be such that not only do the participants discuss the problem but the structure of the conversation as a whole is also relevant to the same subject....Notably, the history of evolutionary theory is inevitably a metalogue between man and nature, in which the creation and interaction of ideas must necessarily exemplify evolutionary process” (Bateson, 1972: p. 12).
Metaphorm	Described as: <i>a framework/model/form/metaphor that is metalogically coherent with the paradigm it portrays, and the practice/process by which it is deployed.</i> <i>A metaphorm</i> may comprise a form/structure/procedure and/or metaphor(s) representing a phenomena/process – all of which are mutually consistent with each other and that which they are attempting to portray. A tangible <i>metaphorm</i> could be a visual or physical representation, e.g. the <i>P6 Constellation</i> floor mat; or the <i>PAI</i> funnel. Both examples rely on visual imagery accompanied by (intangible) metaphors drawn from the natural world e.g. vortical dynamics (e.g. whirlwind, whirlpool) illuminating the receptive-responsive principle of natural inclusion in which responsive energy is invoked into flow by receptive space; complex living systems (e.g. swarm behaviour); autopoiesis (e.g. change in/of a living being is determined by what that living being does with external occurrences). None of these metaphors stands alone, but combined they convey the essence and felt-sense of the complex, roiling, nonlinear processing within and between people engaged in each situated, solo and shared inquiry §CA-5.5.11.6
Natural Inclusion: Principle of	“Natural Inclusion is the evolutionary process through which all natural material forms come into being and diversify as flow-forms – mutual inclusions of space and circulating energy in receptive-responsive relationship” (Rayner, 2020: no pagination)
Natural Inclusionality: philosophy of	“Natural Inclusionality is a philosophy that brings our human awareness of two distinct occurrences in Nature — Matter and Space — into mutually inclusive relationship with one another instead of either treating them as mutually exclusive opposites (as in abstract philosophical ‘dualism’) or one and the same thing (as in abstract philosophical ‘monism’).

	This philosophy of ‘Natural Inclusion’ combines our ‘Sense’ — our sensory and mental ability to detect and reason from our knowledge of the existence of bounded material form — with our ‘Sensibility’ — our heartfelt awareness of the unbounded, friction-free presence of space everywhere within, throughout and beyond the surfaces of all material bodies. By so doing, it enables us to recognise the dynamic role of a third kind of occurrence, Energy, as it circulates around local gravitational centres of Space, in the formation of material bodies, ultimately from subatomic scale upwards. We recognise that all natural material forms are dynamically bounded within the continuous friction-free stillness and transparency of space, not immobilised within a rigidly definitive structural freeze-frame analogous to a photographic snapshot. The transparent ‘darkness’ of space and the energetic play of ‘light’ are appreciated to be mutually inclusive and co-creative presences, not adversaries in opposition to each another” (Rayner, 2019: no pagination).
Outcomes (in P6 Constellation)	Future <i>Fictions</i> , i.e. imagined <i>Benefits/Consequences</i> ; i.e. what we imagine happening that we do or do not want to happen.
PAI (Point Attractor Inquiry)	<i>Abductive Fruit 2</i> : The PAI is a naturally inclusional, nonlinear systemic framework that supports mutual contextual exploration of complex situations where none of the stakeholders implicated or impacted has any idea what (they could/should/need) to do §CA-5.5; §CA-5.5.10.
Participation Compass	<i>Abductive Fruit 1</i> : This helps discern and decide upon fit-for-purpose approaches and methods to use in particular interventions with particular stakeholders. It comprises four axes including <i>Purpose, Balance of Power, Nature of Interaction, Approaches & Methods</i> §CA-5.4; §CA-5.5.10.
PAI+Participation Compass	Combined, these comprise <i>naturally inclusional, nonlinear scaffolding that supports stakeholders in discerning how to intervene (what to do and how to engage) efficaciously in situations of mutual concern</i> §CA-5.5.10.
P6 Constellation	<i>Abductive Fruit 3</i> : A naturally inclusional framework providing representational scaffolding for the praxis of <i>Presence in Action</i> (combining an <i>Acuity Practice</i> underpinned by a deep praxis expressed in seven <i>Symmathesic Agency Behaviours</i> §CA-5.1.6; §CA-5.5.11.5. The framework comprises six outlying <i>portals</i> (<i>Facts, Feelings, Fictions, Purpose, Outcomes, Decision</i>) with a centering <i>Presence</i> portal that invokes the <i>Acuity Practice</i> .
Presence (in P6 Constellation)	(<i>Presence/Pretence</i>) Central portal in <i>P6 Constellation</i> . representing the ‘space’ invoking the <i>Acuity Practice</i> and inviting us to notice what is <i>current</i> in all that is present.
Presence in Action	<i>Abductive Fruit 8</i> : The <i>self-centering (reflective-reflexive, receptive-responsive) capacity of individuals to attend to what is present and current in place in space in time</i> . Within the text, I use the term ‘ <i>response-ability</i> ’ sometimes interchangeably with <i>Presence in Action</i> . It is: a praxis arising from a fusion of faculties attending to what is present and current; a state of Being ↔ Becoming arising from attending to what is present and current; a person <i>self-centering</i> through the praxis of ≈ <i>Presence in Action</i> §CA-5.5.
Purpose (in P6 Constellation, the PAI, Participation Compass)	I take this to include both intention and intentionality. <i>Purpose</i> in the PAI and <i>Participation Compass</i> , is about <i>conscious intention</i> (mutually agreed intent supposedly guiding what is done and how it is done). <i>Purpose</i> in the <i>P6 Constellation</i> illuminates the reactive, <i>non-conscious intentionality</i> actually manifesting through a person’s actions, simultaneously exposing their unfulfilled rhetoric of <i>intention</i> .
Reactive/reflex	Refers to nonconscious, habitual or instinctual reactivity (i.e. fast thinking) often though not always invoked by past experiences. I use ‘reactive’ in preference to ‘reflex’ to avert confusion by conflating reflex and reflexive (see <i>reflective-reflexive</i> below).
Receptive space	Omnipresent presence of absence inviting & invoking the inflow of responsive energy. <u>Understanding the distinctions between place and space</u> : Space is the omnipresent presence of absence; and place is the local neighbourhood in which a material entity arises from responsive energy flowing into space.
Reflective Contribution	A practice associated with the apprenticeship learning approach supporting <i>Presence in Action</i> . This practice is introduced in triad sessions when practitioners take on the roles of <i>Host, Witness</i> and <i>person</i> being supported ‘ <i>on the mat</i> ’ (POM) by the <i>Host</i> . Following a processing session, each individual takes it in turn to reflect into the group (a) something they noticed (i.e. a <i>Fact</i>) that the <i>Host</i> did/said; (b) a <i>Feeling</i> the individual experienced; (c) a <i>Fiction</i> that came up for them about themselves . They do not share any <i>Fictions</i> about the <i>Host</i> nor the POM. The <i>Host</i> shares first; then the POM, then the <i>Witness</i> §CA-5.5.5.5: Reflective Contribution .
Reflexive artistry	Exercising <i>Presence in Action</i> with consummate ability, made possible through ongoing, extensive practising, alone and in the presence of others §CA-5.5.11.3.

<i>Reflective-reflexive</i>	I use this term with a distinction related to time: <i>reflective</i> means looking back on what has been, including prior knowledge sources as well as reflecting something mirror-like with nothing added and nothing taken away; <i>reflexive</i> means attending inwards, focussing on oneself and on what is current in the present moment, relationally and in our wider world context. This includes what is folding in from the past and from our imaginings of the future. Attending to what has been and what might be helps us attune and respond to what is emerging through us in the moment §CA-5.5.4.3 .
Responsive energy	Energy inflowing into receptive space, <i>enforming</i> materiality and intangible presences/essences.
<i>Self-centering</i>	A naturally inclusional, embodied dynamic comprising psychical <i>reflective-reflexive</i> (past-to-present and present-to-immediate future) §0.3 ; §CA-5.5.5 ; §CA-5.5.6 and physical/bodily receptive-responsive processing, facilitated by the <i>metalogically coherent</i> praxis of <i>Presence in Action</i> scaffolded by the <i>P6 Constellation</i> , its <i>Acuity Practice</i> and deep praxis <i>Symmathesic Agency Behaviours</i> §CA-5.1.6 ; §CA-5.5.11.5 .
Simple rules	Non-complex behaviours referred to as ‘Simple Rules’ co-evolve through interactions between individual agents in complex living systems. These behaviours are usually non-consciously embodied by individuals, and when followed by all, generate coherent recognisable group patterns which in turn, shape the interactions of the group’s individuals. Such rules are inherent in either the biology or culture of those beings.
Staterwaves: ▶♪♠≈	<i>Abductive Fruit 4: Combined states of being and ways of exchanging that manifest in recognisably distinct ways</i> §0.1: p.21 ; and a <i>metalogically coherent mode of being~expressing i.e. coherently conveying our state of being into and through our ways of expressing</i> §0.1: p.44 . My <i>staterwaves</i> convey the reincorporating essence, content, form and outcomes of my living~learning inquiry. Each one (described below) represents a different dimension of me finding expression in, and contributing to, this inquiry.
♪ Aesthetic-Poetic	The dimension of ‘Me’ who expresses my felt-sensing and sense-making – through emotional, lyrical, metaphorical, musical, non-rational communicative forms including poetry, poetic prose and personal processing. Here ‘aesthetic’ is taken back to its broader archaic meaning related to perception by the senses, including emotional sensitivity and not simply that which accords a ‘sense of beauty.’ Churchman (1979: p. 26) was onto something when he challenged the idea that ‘aesthetics’ might be regarded as an enemy to the systems approach!
♠ Intellectual-Theoretic	Used here to convey the Me who expresses my rational processing and sense-making through linguistic discourse and intellectual, theoretical constructs. She brings cognitive muscle to the page, enabling me to wrestle with and weave together new and known material. This <i>staterwave</i> is full, dense – sometimes fast, other times slow – carrying an intensity that requires focus and concentration to aid navigation and comprehension. It has been the responsibility of ♠ Intellectual-Theoretic to draw into the mix what others think, feel and know. She draws on third-person constructs and theories, drawing on other voices, experiences and second-person exchanges.
▶ Navigator-Narrator	The Me who is the rational, objective observer/reporter and sign-poster – the voice and presence which sits apart from, yet commentates in factual terms on proceedings: what has been, what is seen, what is coming. She is generally precise, yet sometimes carries ♪ Aesthetic-Poetic undertones in her crafted expression.
≈ Visual-Kinaesthetic	The Me who experiences and expresses through visual, physical/spatial sensing and sense-making modalities and forms. She evokes both a visual, perceptual appreciation and proprioceptive, felt-sense of movement through the territory travelled, the resources deployed and discoveries made. Throughout the document – via hyperlinks to animated presentations (<i>prezis</i>) – I invite you to engage with her on her terms. In 2020, I discovered that my <i>need-that-would-not-be-denied</i> to express through this staterwave attests to the limited attention in embodiment and enaction literature given to ‘movement’: “either no entry exists for the tactile-kinesthetic/affective body and kinesthesia or paltry entries exist. In effect, the foundational ontological and epistemological reality of life is missing: <i>animation</i> is nowhere on the map” (Sheets-Johnstone, 1999a: p217; 1999b, 2010).
Subjective empiricism	An epistemology acknowledging the inevitability of subjectivity in all empirical inquiry. The self is always involved, even in something judged to be objective/intersubjective, as the latter cannot be perceived except by a participant-observer §CA-5.5.1.1 . I choose to refer to this as an epistemology differentiated from others on the basis of an inclusional principle in which all epistemologies combined in the knower could effectively comprise a single onto-epistemology that can be expressed without paradox within the philosophy of Natural Inclusionality.

<p><i>Systemic Research Framework</i></p>	<p><i>Abductive Fruit 7: a naturally inclusional playspace situating researcher/practitioner and research/interventions in place in space in time ≈Systemic Research Framework.</i></p>
<p><i>Symmathesic Agency Model</i></p>	<p><i>Abductive Fruit 6: the <i>Symmathesic Agency Model</i> ≈SAM where <i>symmathesic agency</i> is: the meta-conscious capacity to engage in mutual contextual learning through self-centering interaction in place in space in time... enacted through <i>Presences in action</i>.</i></p>
<p><i>Symmathesic Agency Behaviours</i></p>	<p><i>Abductive Fruit 5: These represent Simple Rules (as understood in swarm behaviour) derived from noticing the deep praxis in myself and other ‘systemic facilitators/ practitioners’: “Show up, open and hold the space; Think global, act local, make it personal; Attend to Littles; Illuminate patterns simply; Dance with emergence; Track, tickle and tap tension; Let go, when flow flows” (Gardiner, 2016: p. 52-54). These behaviours are attuned to the principles of complexity, Natural Inclusion and animation, which I distil in my <i>Aphorisms</i> §CA-5.1.6; §CA-5.5.11.5.</i></p>
<p>Symmathesy</p>	<p>A complex living~learning system or “entity formed over time by contextual mutual learning through interaction” – a neologism of Nora Bateson (2016b:169) §CA-5.5.6.</p>
<p>Time (bijective physics)</p>	<p>Recognised not as a dimension – but simply as a numerical ordering and measurement of material changes, known as fact only in hindsight (Fiscaletti & Sorli 2017); also held intangibly as embodied memories of events passed and future imaginings, both of which can obscure our capacity to attend that which is current in the present.</p>

References within Glossary

- Bateson, G. (1972) *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology*, 1 edition. United States: University of Chicago Press.
- Boulton, J., Allen, P. M. & Bowman, C. (2015) *Embracing Complexity: Strategic Perspectives for an Age of Turbulence*. OUP Oxford.
- Churchman, C. W. (1979) *The systems approach*. New York: Delta Books.
- Gardiner, L. J. N. (2016) *REAL : Regenerating engagement and learning within, across and beyond system scales and contexts*. Hull: School, H. U. B.
- Gardiner, L. J. N. (2019) Attending, daring, becoming: making boundary-play conscious, in Birch, J. & Welch, P. (eds), *Coaching Supervision: Advancing Practice, Changing Landscapes*, 1st edition. London: Routledge, 103-125.
- Peirce, C. S. (1893-1913 [1998]) *The essential Peirce: selected philosophical writings (1893-1913)*, 2, Indiana University Press.
- Rayner, A. D. M. (2019) Natural Inclusionality—A New Natural Philosophy of Sense & Sensibility. *Medium*. Available online: <https://medium.com/@admrayner/natural-inclusionality-a-new-natural-philosophy-of-sense-sensibility-6ba8ea79f513> [Accessed 2019-11-27].
- Rayner, A. D. M. (2020) *What is natural inclusion?*
- Schurz, G. (2008) Patterns of abduction. *Synthese*, 164(2), 201-234.
- Shank, G. & Cunningham, D. J. (1996) Modeling the six modes of Peircean abduction for educational purposes 1996.
- Sheets-Johnstone, M. (1999a) Emotion and movement. A beginning empirical-phenomenological analysis of their relationship. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 6(11-12), 259-277.
- Sheets-Johnstone, M. (1999b) *The primacy of movement*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub.
- Sheets-Johnstone, M. (2010) Body and movement: Basic dynamic principles, *Handbook of phenomenology and cognitive science* Springer, 217-234.
- Thomas, J. J. (2015) The Parable of the Chicken House: Charles S. Peirce, Complex/Dynamic Systems, and Environmental Science. *Journal of Environmental Science and Engineering*, B, 559-568.
- Wiktionary (2017) *Enform*. Available online: <https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/enform> [Accessed].
- Wilber, K. (2017) *The Religion of Tomorrow: A Vision for the Future of the Great Traditions—More Inclusive, More Comprehensive, More Complete*. Shambhala Publications.