

Just so, I maintain, does a given undivided portion of experience, taken in one context of associates, play the part of a knower, of a state of mind, of 'consciousness'; while in a different context the same undivided bit of experience plays the part of a thing known, of an objective 'content.' In a word, in one group it figures as a thought, in another group as a thing. And, since it can figure in but both groups simultaneously we have every right to speak of it as subjective and objective, both at once.

William James, Radical Empiricism

There is a universal flux that cannot be defined explicitly but which can be known only implicitly, as indicated by the explicitly definable forms and shapes, some stable and some unstable, that can be abstracted from the universal flux. In this flow, mind and matter are not separate substances. Rather, they are different aspects of our whole and unbroken movement.

David Bohm, Wholeness and the Implicate Order

Separateness and Separability

Meditation on John Muir

When we try to pick out anything by itself, we find it hitched to everything else in the universe.

To identify a separate thing is to violate a system of nature that includes all things, all possible modes of thinking about them, all possible processes and connections between things. Separateness is any absolute and final state, separability keeps alive more than one possibility.

A separate entity is dead and cut off from the world. A separable entity can be seen as separate while retaining its embeddedness in its context. Admitting the possibility of seeing a thing as separable does not destroy its relationships with everything else. Things are aspects of wholes that are in turn parts of greater wholes that themselves are aspects of a unity whose parts are coterminous with other parts, the whole and the sum of their relations. In this way of seeing, things begin at their limits and radiate toward each other and into the organic unity of the world.