

CHAPTER «PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCES»

CATEGORY OF POWER AND ITS ROOTS IN PHILOSOPHY, PSYCHOLOGY AND ART

Denys Zhadiaiev¹

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-310-1-8>

Abstract. *The subject of this philosophical research is the category of power. It is argued that power, as concept, is not self-sufficient, standalone category but derivative from more fundamental – order and chaos, mental and physical poles, symmetry and asymmetry. The aim is to find out roots of the idea that we apply to the phenomena that we understand as related to power in broad sense of this word. By analysis, synthesis, and comparative method the category of power may find more aspects and relation to other notions in this review. Power, as argued, needs its counterpart category, such as *being affected* (Aristotle), *dependence* (Kant), *satisfaction, uniformity and contingency* (Whitehead), *chaos and order* (Prigogine, Bergson). After short but in depth philosophical analysis the author suggests to consider how feeling and idea of power interwoven in psychology of the self where in ambivalence of thoughts and feelings we may perceive (or not) such and such degrees of power and its root as kind of inspiration that may or may not makes art appealing. There is an attempt to explain why well-known aesthetical criteria (such as symmetry or asymmetry, uniformity and variety) may produce or fail to produce the feeling of beauty. An approach takes into account so-called asymmetrical interplay of chaotic and ordered data, physical and mental poles and how progress (if any) happens at these levels. A complex interplay of order and chaos with contingent and determined physical data of our feelings is showed in this paper in order to clarify a phenomenon in our mentality normally called as “ambivalence.” In parallel with this psychological aspect of impact that category of power*

¹ PhD, Associate Professor,
International Relations and Socio-Humanitarian Disciplines Department,
Dnipropetrovsk State University of Internal Affairs, Ukraine

produces in us, a few examples in the field of painting, architecture and music demonstrated to clarify similarities these seemingly different forms of art and psychology have when it comes to philosophical analysis. *The aim* of our research is to demonstrate what place category of power has in any possible cosmology, which is based on balance as its main concept. For reader's better understanding it is advised to have some basic knowledge of Whitehead's, Prigogine's, and Bergson's main works and ideas from psychology developed at the beginning of 20th century.

1. Introduction

This paper is another prolegomenon to the idea of balance developed in previous works of the author: Category of 'Power': Historico-Philosophical Aspect as a Prolegomenon to Idea of Balance (2023, in press), The Notion of Balance: Overcoming Alienation from Nature (2020), Ideas of Harmony in Whitehead and Hartmann Comparative Study (2019), Aesthetics as a Manifestation of Balance (2018), Back from Quantity to Quality, from Appearance to Reality (2015), The Notion of Balance. Part 1: Balance out of Chaosmos (2014), From the Climate Change to Changing Sceptics: "Genus" Point of View (2011).

A world that slowly but inevitably becoming more and more globalized scholars must suggest interpretation of its main categories and category of power might become popular nowadays yet, it is just one of the categories we also need for coherent, adequate, clear and unbiased picture. Power is supposed to be explained as derivative from other categories that, in their turn, can only be justified by the more fundamental category, such as balance. Since 2014, the category of balance was interpreted by the author in France (Whitehead Psychology Nexus), USA (10th International Whitehead Conference), Bulgaria, India, Czech Republic, Japan. This final (or rather primordial) category of balance is about normal coexistence in a variety of cultures, mentality. It must find its explanation regardless particular differences in different environment, fields of human activity: science, arts, education (otherwise it is not philosophical category). And power, as category, may make us believe that there is no such a thing like balance since power emerges where there is difference in status, where hierarchy that necessarily involves that difference, often where win-lose situations

only. We are aiming to provide the reader with the explanation that under philosophical consideration power is one among the other categories.

Power is an intriguing concept in today's reality but in our opinion it is misunderstood and took somewhat simpler and primitive form – another side-effect we may find in contemporary world – manipulation techniques and their popularity in society. Manipulations, as an intent to influence an opponent with the aim they unconsciously followed our wishes is primitive and must be neglected in comparison to the concept of power because: manipulation is just a 'win-lose' situation and the very nature with all its processes demonstrates in its evolution the development on the basis 'win-win' situation (nature continues to react on our activity so that it is we are who, as just one of the species, have to change our decisions and goals in order to survive in its self-sufficient and thus, balanced, organism (eco-system). And any form of manipulation is just short-term goals which are out of the scope of our interest because: (a) successful influence on the person may be contrary to our next goals and this means those who use manipulation and do not understand the concept of power just going round circles never achieve final goal or they just having meaningless life, (b) professional manager and good leader do not need any specific techniques on how to control behavior of others since the very meaning and goal of their business "correlates" their activity towards common well-being, not to just one person, and, (c) so-called successful manipulation reduces opportunity to consider whole picture because it is used to achieve, again, particular interests, not being ready to face new data reported. Philosophical understanding of power, instead, provides with less contradictory results, despite the fact it is just one of the categories in possible cosmology grounded on the concept of balance.

Previously, in articles mentioned above, we considered balance in terms of history of the ideas trying to show that the whole philosophy that concerns being (ontology) is necessarily achieves kind of equilibrium where ideas and categories counterbalance each other. I Western European thought after Greeks this balance was biased and history of the ideas turned to be a game where European civilization tried to justify privilege some minority over others, then 'teams' of this game split apart and philosophical consideration turned out to be rather eloquence used by continental and British philosophers that could not provide coherent balanced picture in

their system of thought (empiricism vs. rationalism). And later on this trend of philosophizing on particulars reached its peak when philosophy served rather social and political situation and not love for wisdom *per se*.

We also tried to apply some examples from other sciences where Gossen laws in economics aimed at predicting consumer's behavior and where idea of balance also was flickering in the scattered gaps of the bulk of particular facts and applied sciences. It was supposed and argued that the same idea of balance shines with similar light in theology and psychology of the self and that in aesthetics we may find this idea as well. In this paper we are trying to find out where else we can find balance taking into account its subcategory – *power*.

This time, again, we are trying to consider out main category of this article – *power* – under three layers: psychology of the self, philosophical context and aesthetics. This research must use combination of these layers because truly philosophical level can be reached if it was tested in seemingly different areas (here: philosophy, psychology, aesthetics) maintaining at the same time its entire and unchangeable (not depended on circumstances) primary meaning. To be sure, there can be other levels beyond those mentioned (and the more we use – the better) yet, for the sake of brevity we slightly consider only these.

We need to start from the self (psychology) since it is not possible to argue about some processes or phenomena without being aware of them. And not only psychology, but any natural science is a form of discourse and needs conscious beings to make any progress in it. However, this does not mean that we are prone to solipsism. We do not believe that consciousness is defining what we perceive. The difference is somewhere between the external world and the self (say, consciousness). This difference is still not noticed properly in the literature and while existentialism and phenomenology claim consciousness is primordial element in our experience, empiricism, natural sciences and some philosophical schools claim it is actual world what define what we feel. As in our previous articles, we argue that when it comes to the question of existence, the external world (the one which is not our self) actually exists and needs no our consciousness and feelings. Yet, when it comes to the values of the world, then we abide with the opinion that it is our mind (self, consciousness) that defines the values of the world which we

understand. The sunset pictured may have not lesser aesthetical value for us like the real sun, hidden far-away by atmosphere and dust. The sun, most likely, will continue to exist without our mind being aware of it. Yet, the beauty of it is not possible to find without us (that beauty which we understand as a beauty). As for the difference between phenomena and causal efficacy of empirical world was clarified in Whitehead's examples: (a) we see that light from some distant stars that existed before our mind, (b) the bones of dinosaurs found are evidence that something was existing before our mind, (c) the dentist cures the tooth by considering the cause of the pain, not the local pain (phenomenon).

The difference mentioned is important because when it comes to the globalised world with its media, social and political reality, such a fundamental terminology like 'reality,' 'actuality,' 'the world,' 'we are,' 'society,' 'state' are not that crystal-clear as they supposed to be. In the ear of technologies and information, our mind may not find the difference between reality of what it read and understood, between the idea and its interpretation (e.g., we may truly believe in God, but when it comes to religion, should our 'true' belief in God be adapted to the doctrine of particular confession? If so, do we really believe in God in this case or we started followed just one of the official interpretation of that idea? Then, is there difference between belief in God and worship to interpretation? Sometimes it is huge and the history shows that belief in official interpretation may provoke person to commit some things which they will not do when follow their intuitive belief in their *idea* of God). So, when it comes to consciousness, we may find much more paradoxes than it looks like at first glance. If our mind, self, consciousness is not that easy and definitive to understand, then how can we create any relevant and coherent cosmology? Well, it may sound ironical, but the answer is that despite the fact we know that we do not have perfect mind, being aware of its limits, we committing even more mistakes when we give up reasoning. The balance that philosophy actually was always looking for was distorted in early Medieval disputes between Abelard and Aquinas who were argued for opposite approaches to divine knowledge – one for the belief, another for reason. Of course this distortion was not caused by these early thinkers but much earlier by Socrate's disciples. So, we feel it is reasonable to start from the psychology of the self and then continue to other examples.

2. Balance and mind

Consciousness has hidden types of order (subconscious pleasures or satisfactions). For example, if we are speaking about an intellectual ‘power,’ then we suppose that an intellectual power can be exemplified, say, in a popular poetry, or scientific knowledge in depth – any creativity (be it science or art). What specifically makes an art ‘powerful’? There can be many definitions here – (a) an ability to influence population for better future or an aptness to touch the deepest strings of the soul of some people, (b) opportunity to find better perspective at which the object considered shines with all its sides, hidden in previous researches etc. And could we create any plan for us to become artists? Is there any plan to become talented researcher? Who could give an advice to us on how to become a genius poet?

Certainly, it is said that a good poet must have been suffering. Or, if you are not suffered, you cannot become a recognized poet. Well, the author assumes that happy people have chance to compose nice poetry. They are not likely to do so because poetry, as an art – and as any other activity that pretends to achieve some recognition – needs a drill. Happy people are not prone to do any training or drill. So, we assume that saying on the need for poet to suffer is figurative truth.

Suffering here is a motivation. In some other psychoanalytic explanations, creativity can be sublimation or release of what causes pain. In our consideration of the order, chaos, balance, we have to notice that suffering *cannot be planned* (!). Or, as shown above (theoretical, religious practice for mind etc.), *if suffering is planned, it is not suffering anymore*.

Consider this example. A student supposes to be graduated with high distinction on the faculty of classic literature. Let us suppose also, they want to become prominent poet. What kind of and how much ‘suffering’ must be taken into account for the years they are at university? Are we able to create a plan on how to have a heart broken? In order to have heart broken, can we plan in advance a love for someone? And if it possible, whom we love more: the person that supposedly will break our heart or ourselves and our career in literature? It is even clearer that following certain theory on what we must have in our mind (or heart) we are trying to lie to ourselves (even if the theory is 100% proven and especially if it works!). So, suffering cannot be planned or, if it is planned and successfully followed according

to that plan, it turns to be an ordering, to satisfaction, to pleasure. With this being said, we understand that a so-called intellectual power, in comparison to physical one, cannot be planned and another category must take place here – *contingency*. The cause of true poet’s “motivation” is *necessarily contingent*.

Now, to argue in favor of chaos and order, balance and harmony we have to draw clear lines where these notions take place. Otherwise, it would be difficult to believe that the world is ordered in any way. So, here we came to distinction between two areas where the interplay between chaos and order is at work: physical and mental pole, an order in physical and in an intellectual activity. Without this distinction in processes of ordering any explanation in terms of order and chaos is difficult. At this stage, we have to specify that processes of ordering on physical pole and mental one are not identical in their principles and there is some ground for them to be different. For the sake of simplicity, let’s consider order as a “+” sign, and chaos as “-“. To make a long story short (often a not very fortunate approach in philosophy, though), we could summarize the “work” of chaos and order in three layers:

- (1) mode of existence or operation in the physical or mental pole,
- (2) in the layer of motivation (cause and reason for ordering),
- (3) categories,
- (4) modalities.

On the first layer (mode of existence) the “movement” or “change” or “progress” runs from the chaos to order in the physical pole, where by “chaos” can be meant only the lesser degree of the order planned to be achieved, e.g., I have a garden, but I can make it more beautiful and I know how to do it. Or, the food can taste better with some more salt, or vice versa (and what is also *ordering* so far as it aims at better condition, to add more or less salt is also fulfillment of the initial *plan*) – adding less salt will gradually help organism to feel *real* taste of the product. It is change from lesser degree to higher degree of order when it comes to physical pole. On the mental one it is different so far as it is change from one aim (order) to another. If we want to make our life more ordered in terms of relationships, we already and *a priori* know that, for instance, lying is not good and we start not from some experience from our past, but from that truth or value we knew from our childhood: earlier we intuitively knew

a value beyond modes of time (past, present, future) that to be honest is normal state and lying is corrupted, contradictory behavior that may satisfy us in our immediate future but may cause more problems in a long run. And that *ignition* is kind of order (so far as it is the notion, or concept like geometrical figure except the fact it lasts in time, not in space). Our reader may understand better the concepts if they are familiar with Alfred North Whitehead use of notion ‘satisfaction,’ which I suggest to understand here as similar to process of ordering (Whitehead, 1978), borrowing it from his *Process and Reality*. And it would be advised to read Henry Bergson’s *Creative Evolution* (1911).

As for the motivation, which is partly the concept of power, we see from the table that to achieve some progress on physical pole progress starts from lesser degree of order to higher one (say, we are feeling ourselves healthy but not strong physically and want to be stronger than we are). So, the order here and chaos are similar to the definition of the good and evil by Aurelius Augustinus Hipponensis (2017) who did not consider good and evil as opposites (otherwise it would be difficult for him to prove that the God is almighty) but as different degrees of the same good (what God creates is good): evil does not exist as the cheese does not exist in its holes. In the same piece of cheese we have holes which are part of it as what we normally evaluate as an evil in the world created by God. Those empty spaces, Augustine writes, do not harm cheese, they are just lesser degrees of the of cheese’s existence. So is what we consider as evil – it does not harm the world created by God since evil is just a lack of good.

Following this Augustine’s logic (or rather theological rhetoric) we may explain the ordering on physical pole. That is, being motivated we want to achieve what we don’t have. As for the motivation on mental pole, we are likely to avoid something. For instance, deciding to have a good reputation (‘positive history’ – what sometimes is more important than amount of money on bank account when it comes to visa issues), we are making conclusion about something non-material (relationships are evaluated as concepts good/bad, they can be proved by deeds in material world but inherently, they are not something we can touch, physically feel, put in a storage etc.

Borrowing another type of definition from Medieval philosophy we can define moral or immoral relationships as so-called third mode of existence

Chapter «Philosophical sciences»

of things according to Thomas Aquinas. This “mode” meant that things in their second mode (material, experiential, real things) are decaying but go to its third mode – they remain in memory. This is what we can call *value of relationships* – it persists more continuously not being decayed (except that memory is not affected by mental disease) as real things conditioned by their chemical and physical features. So, motivation on mental pole is qualitatively different so far as it is not a “progress” but rather kind of “rejection” of some circumstances. For instance, we do not striving to get an education just to know more but to avoid the void of ignorance in our epoch that puts us into the situation where we are limited in our human dignity when we a priori know we must be equal in that.

That is, motivation on mental pole works as maintenance, protection, ability to abide with values and categories *a priori* inherent to us, not as a progress to something what we had not before. With, say, education, or skills in art and science, we can do something specific and better than others but as for the motivation, it is not what motivates. What motivates here is just memory of what we would like to keep for us – respect for freedom, unbiased opinion, love without strings attached. In terms of metaphysics, Monadology is best example here: Leibniz (1991) argues that substance is qualitatively equal, but plural and never identical (people are different but must be equal in their rights with opportunity to speak out their opinion). It would be difficult to find any better example than his image of multiple mirrors that reflect the whole city from different perspectives.

	Physical pole	Mental pole
Mode of existence/ operation in the pole	Chaos to order (<i>progress towards</i> what is not given before, change)	Order to order (<i>preserving</i> values given <i>a priori</i>)
Motivation	+ (to <i>achieve</i> some progress)	- (to <i>avoid</i> adversity)
Categories	<i>Freedom</i> (to choose the direction of progress), <i>possibility</i>	<i>Necessity</i> (of given circumstances) and <i>freedom</i> (of choosing values)
Modality	Degrees of order in the progress	Contingency of chaos

If we consider categories that prevail on physical and mental poles, then it is supposed that they also operate in different way on each pole. On the physical one, the power evolves in terms of possibilities of surroundings (family, society, financial opportunities, genes etc.) and relative freedom to

choose the way of the progress (the vector): to build a house, to learn better driving skills, to become an athlete etc. That is, *physical pole is a vector of evolvement or ordering reality which is not our Self*. While on conceptual one, we react on the “necessity” (in terms of German philosophy: Kant, Fichte, Hegel) of the events beyond our Self and freely choose values to follow in that circumstances. For instance, we may see unpleasant situation of abuse in public (outside our Self) but it is inside our Self where we decide to react in certain way, or to ignore. Philosophers may argue whether we are really freely make this choice or not, but in our example we simplify the case by saying that we know people will behave differently and this is why we borrow the category of *freedom* (for the sake of simplicity, though).

Lastly, power, its source or root, could be exemplified on the poles mentioned in terms of their modality. By this word – modality – we mean the *mode* where the “triggering” case happens and very motivation takes place. That is, we must differentiate how ordering, or the power of ordering, happens on these polarities. On physical one, as we mentioned above, it goes from lower degrees to higher degrees of ordering while on mental one it is sheer interplay between chaotic contingency and the very order. As we noted above, the source of “poet’s power” (not appropriate word combination, unfortunately, but we have to maintain certain level of simplicity) is contingent, cannot be planned by the Self (unless it is technical skill in usage of grammar and vocabulary), cannot be “*progressive*” or move from one degree of order to more complex.

It could be argued, though, that there is a progress in any poetic enterprise: a creator advances in their choice of word combinations, finds *better* metaphors, *more* powerful arguments than others, and poet cannot be recognized as a poet without that qualitatively different (“better”) contribution in comparison to others. But in our description, both poetry and philosophy, as well as any other intellectual enterprise, makes an advance in its form only (form in which the idea is presented): more or less sophisticated lines of the verse, more or less elegant mathematical formula, more or less adequate cosmology. And when we try to consider the essence of *power*, we have to remember that the *form* of this category is not what is meant by this category: power can be demonstrated in quite different forms, sometimes opposite to each other (let us remember the case with prominent mathematician in ancient Greece (Archimedes) who was making his

calculations on the sand at the moment when an armored militant came to him and ordered him to go away. Physical strength of occupant and his armor and weapon is one form of the power but the reaction of the mathematician who ignored his order and had strength (mental and voluntary) to continue develop his ideas supposed to be another, quite opposite form of power. And since the mathematician abode with his ideas, not being disturbed by deadly order, he could be considered stronger or as having more power in terms of its root sense, not in its form only exemplified before Roman soldier back in 212-211 BCE: *Noli turbare circulos meos!*

Now, the category of power, as seen, is different from forms of power in the way like thing in itself is different from its appearance. And to ask about power as category is to ask about core of something we abstractly understand as *power*, about its unchangeable entity, the root. And hence we may fail because such a category as *power* is still not only splits onto physical and mental, onto power as aesthetical (see below) and ethical category, it has rather binary root. We described that power of any action starts as motivation to achieve an order. And what is the root of motivation? It lies rather on both physical and mental poles. When it comes to achieve particular order and considered as power to achieve something what is expected, the “root” of it or primary cause lies on opposite category – *dependence* (in Kant’s terminology) or *being affected* (Aristotle). Without this there is no point for ordering as achievement expected or favorable state of things (in Bergson’s definition of ‘order’) because nothing is *expected*. We *expect* something on that physical pole or *suppose* certain rules (or principles) on mental one when it comes to consider ethics, religion, or social life. If nothing is expected or the world outside of our Self does not contradict what we suppose to be then there is no need in such a *tool* as power (and power is nothing more than an instrument or tool, it is rather secondary category and hence it is relative to *being affected* or *dependence*).

That is really the case – if you are not being affected, you have any other vectors to grow but not a power. Being affected for poet means they were not necessarily suffered physically, but came to understanding of something important and grave that normal people in similar situation just ignore. Could we voluntarily come to that awareness of something what is important and yet not pleasant because it affects us morally, emotionally, rationally psychologically? It does not seem plausible because life is full

of other opportunities and data so there is no need to consciously being aware of something that is not really important. To be *really* affected has *contingent* nature: it is not rooted in our mental order and that is why it is outside the area where we could move from lower degree to higher degree of order. But it certainly in something outside the *progress* – in opposite contingent event that causes an affection.

From this point of view, we may come to conclusion that the movement from degrees to degrees is a kind of derivative form of power, limited case on the full circle when small steps from degree to degree seem to be a straight linear change (when on the full scale it is a movement on the circle which under certain perspective is equal to pendulum movement with its point of seemingly “absolute” stillness (say, on the left and right sides) and with the point of maximum speed (at the centre on the line that follows pendulum trajectory, or on the “top” and “bottom” of the circle). So, the source of power is a qualitative change from category of being affected to the category of doing (and it is necessarily contingent).

3. Power and aesthetics: two more types of order

We may say that there is such thing like the power of beauty, something that is less or more beautiful, more or less perfect etc. This is not the power in strict sense of the category already described but it is also kind of back and forth movement from opposites. For the sake of simplicity, let's consider beauty in terms of order and chaos.

Beauty is rather order than disorder. But has this assumption any explanation? Consider two primitive examples of order and disorder – a straight line and a patch (stain) pictured in the surface. Of course, we may find any ideas associated with the shape of patch and find some beauty in it. This type of disorder is getting ordered by our imagination. But speaking strictly, these two objects, taken on its own, are different and certainly, a straight line would seem more beautiful than chaotic patch (if without any associations that make it looking ordered). This can be explained by the fact that the order of the line – a clear and obvious in comparison to just chaotic patch or stain – is exemplifying in it the order in continuous and contingent (thus, not ordered in terms of perception, data), world in perception. So, in line drawn, an idea meets perception or order meets chaos. This interplay of the balanced order and chaos create kind of intensity that evokes a feeling

similar to the feeling of beauty (very primitive, though, in our example). This beauty can be aided with interplay of colors, the balance between them or their tones on monochrome image. What is essential here is a balance between order and chaos that give rise to the feeling of something beautiful in perception.

Now, why a spot or patch, a stain fails in that? It can be explained in similar way in terms of order and chaos: in the world of perception (which is initially always chaotic, contingent until it reaches consciousness) the chaos of the random patch meets the chaos of the world beyond the Self. Thus, presumably, in our view, it is imbalance of order and chaos what creates feeling of disharmony that, in its turn, does not produce the feeling of the Beauty. To prove that the balance of order and chaos is what evolves the feeling of beauty and it is the disharmony provoked by imbalance “chaos-chaos” we can consider some trends in web-design.

The web images are looking neat and clean. They became popular with the emergence of information computer technology. Now we are not experiencing an emergence of ICT (information computer technology) but rather consume it every day and sometimes most of the day. No wonder that “neat” and “clean” digital design gradually perceived as too simplistic, unnatural, “glassy.” With this perception of banal “glassy” images another trend became popular – a lo-fi (low fidelity). It entered not only glassy digital images but also music production: a supposed “warmth” added to the sound by simulation of the so-called tube-compressors, vinyl sound that remind analog, not that precise CD quality. To put it simple, a kind of noise, hissing and other forms of distortions added to the sound design that close to analog (in our terminology – chaotic, not that perfect and precise) devices, not CPU calculations. And as for the web-design or digital painting, lines and patterns are often filtered by some patches that simulate old paper, wood so that texture looked a bit worn out and thus, more real (closer to contingency, chaotic character of continuous perceivable world outside our Self), So, the bottom line here: even achieving its perfection or better quality, or, in other words, moving from lesser degree of order to higher, still it needs a kind of qualitative, not progressive, balance between opposites such as order and chaos (and the more these opposites are balanced, the more *powerful* impact that beauty produces).

The power of beauty can be based on different types of order. One type of order can be called geometrical. Egyptian, geometric-like art looks beautiful owing to its geographical and temporal surrounding: amidst waves of the deserts and flows of historical relationships geometrically resembled art “balances” volatile world. But that architecture would not look beautiful in contemporary Duesseldorf (Germany): in the age of information and digital era we have too much straight lines. Thus, it is quite natural that more emotional (i.e., *less ordered*) French environment borrows an architectural element similar to pyramid (i.e., *more ordered*) in its architectural ensemble that “balances” that environment, but in rational German city we find rather “shaking,” “folded” architecture on its embankment that have no hint about any straight lines (but remind Deleuze’s *le pli*). On both Louvre and Duesseldorf we may find the same principle in terms of our description: these areas are both and equally finding the ways to aesthetically balance their environment with specific styles in architecture.

This does not mean that styles in architecture will persist forever simply because French are more emotional and German people are more rational. Like in the example with digital art emergence, what we perceive aesthetically depends on the time-space continuum of perception: with contingency prevailing we want more clarity (geometrical order) and when everything is too clear it becomes boring and we prefer more irregular (chaotic) things in our perception. Once we have architecture, say, in Louvre and Duesseldorf that balances perception and mentality, it already brings different element to the previous state that was prior to those buildings and this is not achievement but process. These processes, after some elements in our perception and mentality are being balanced by creation of the new ones, continue: new elements that add balance change the very feeling of balance – beautiful and elegant dresses come to fashion after the wars and they balance that useful and practical lack of aesthetics in our appearance during the war time. Yet, those new elegant dresses are perceived to be too whimsical when the balance is reached on the time scale of that environment and opposite elements in dressing take place: more practical and comfortable, less extravagant etc. This last stage is the same process of balancing between order and chaos in our awareness and perception of objects, phenomena, processes.

From examples above we have a guess that it is not only when idea (say, geometry) meets chaos, or meaning found in the painting or in the set off sounds balance achieved and beauty might take place with such and such power (with such and such “degree” would be more proper word here, though) but also the reverse process takes place: too much order (a higher degree of it) destroys harmony and “weakens” beauty. For instance, in the complexity of our organisms we mostly prefer symmetry in the body and in the face and consider it as more beautiful than distorted, not proportional body building. This is when complexity of our body balanced by this, say, geometrical element such as symmetry. Well, when symmetry reaches its “perfection,” it disappoints us or even frightens. More than normally symmetrical face looks not natural, like a mask and sometimes like a dead one. So, some asymmetry (chaos) is needed again and at this feeling that we need a bit of asymmetry is another stage of the same process of balancing between order and chaos.

This continuous balancing is, perhaps, also the reason why we noticed not only principle of the symmetry in the nature but golden mean as well. A golden mean (ratio) is, probably, conceptually and at aesthetical level aids the idea of symmetry where symmetry is an image of order, asymmetry is an image of chaos (disorder), and golden mean is another type of order, after symmetrical one prevails too much. That is, a golden mean might be considered as a dynamical principle of the balance between order and chaos (disorder), and order in its process or, perhaps, in Whitehead’s terminology, it is kind of ‘superorder’ in the way Whitehead introduces his ‘superject’ in his *Process and Reality* (1978).

4. Non-visual ordering: a case with music theory

We have considered visual examples of the interplay between order and chaos. What if the initial chaotic perceptual visual data is not given? That is, is there any need for balance and is there any possibility for beauty when our perception does not start from what we see or touch? The good example here is music. Sound is also has empirical characteristics (the features related to contingency and chaos until the data outside our self reaches consciousness and ordered there by relevant notions). But it has much less that continuous empirical texture than painting and most visual data. So, we are not likely to start create order on the relatively chaotic texture when it comes to music. Music is rather pure form and sound sometimes can

draw and ‘picture’ more ‘realistic’ impression (that rather tends to have conceptual nature): it is often peeled away from other forms of experience and applied to ours only (has the reader ever been disappointed by the video released for their favorite melody? That disappointment is often the case – we were *living in* our melody and had first-hand experience ‘applied’ to that melody, and with new video we see that the same melody brings something alien to us, it sounds ‘contaminated’ with something irrelevant to those our near and dear first-hand impressions).

And more people rather agree than disagree that pure nature of the sound is ordered sequence of the tones. So far as it is ordered sequence, that means that we, presumably, start from the order than chaos. It is only partly true. Music is itself an exemplification of the balance because it normally follows the principles of *uniformity* and *variety*, where by uniformity we can consider an *order*, and by variety – *chaos* (also, *novelty*, *interest* etc.). These are two opposites and in good music they are balanced (sound designers would also add that not only the melody line must follow this principle but frequencies used must compensate each other, that is, it is ok for pleasant experience to play just middle C octave, but if we go to upper octave – keys with brighter sounds, higher frequencies – we have to compensate that sound with lower keys, bass line (and the further we go on the right side of the keyboard, the further we have to go on the left side).

The chaos in music (variety) provides listener with novelty – it feels like something interesting is playing – but if it is not compensated with order (uniformity), the melody sounds not comprehensible, misunderstood and thus – alien to us, too chaotic. So, a curiosity or interest loses its value in the light of the absence of the ground – a solid texture, often presented in not sophisticated bass line. Similarly, if the bass line is more sophisticated than usual arpeggio, the upper keys must be as simple as possible – two-three notes. This is another example of how self-sufficient form of art – music – still needs to be balanced and based on the categories we choose as primary ones (order and chaos, harmony, balance).

The principle where order must be balanced with chaos could be found not only in the range of keyboard and frequencies, not only on “vertical dimension” of the music (melody) and its “horizontal” (rhythm) but also in the ratio between tones and semitones – in the scales. It is well known that there are major (bright to brighter) scales and minor (dark to darker) scales.

Now, for the music to be comprehensible, a composer normally uses only one scale where tones and notes balance each other or they are in discord to the idea of that music otherwise.

Sometimes change in the scale happens intentionally – a variety (chaos) added to well conceivable musical picture. To use the same scale it is the “rule”, however, rule is an order and what if there is too much order? Particular scale makes melody uniform in its mood and the melody, like a picture of photo, must create some definite mood by its filter or plugin applied. In music, when the rule dominates, the depth, or feeling of mystery can be added by change in harmony from positive to negative. To put it simple, a “wrong” note from the opposite scale is played intentionally.

Scales also resemble “parallel degrees” in which the most “parallel” are Aeolian and Ionian scales (minor and major). So, a dominant note from one scale played in opposite scale can be used to “balance” an impression created by the mood (it is like in a good story where depth of thought is achieved by description of obvious, superficial things).

5. Conclusion

We demonstrated here that order and chaos, if they are existing in balance, produce the feeling of beauty (in its broad meaning) where the category of power is just derivative from wider category – order – and its intensity is derivative from – chaos (contingency) or, in terminology of other philosophers, from being affected (Aristotle) or efficacy (Kant).

The branching of the concept of balance leads us to consideration of the category of power and the analysis of this category necessarily leads us to understanding that both at the level of formal logic and physical data (art, aesthetics) the balance is not only where power comes from, but the power, as a category, can be justified when it balanced by (a) its opposite categories and (b) contrary physical data to what we perceive as ‘powerful’ (appealing, inspiring, touching etc.).

Power, as category, can be applied to different areas which, in their turn, may seem contrary to themselves (military and intellectual power, power of action and power of self-restriction etc.).

The perspective we see at this stage owing to this overview, is that our next researches in balance can be focused on more examples from science and art since it is most evident example in digital era. Science and art are

themselves kind of counterpart of philosophical consideration since they are more concrete and philosophy is more abstract. This method in combination of art, science and philosophy, being another evidence of balance *per se*, hopefully provide reader with more opportunities to develop projects on sustainable development, less ambiguous management, more logical decision-making, better future for different types of mentality.

References:

1. Augustine A. (2017) *Confessions: A New Translation by Sarah Ruden*. New York: Modern Library.
2. Bergson H. (1911) *Creative Evolution*. tr. Arthur Mitchell, Henry Holt and Company.
3. Gehry F. Duesseldorf Architecture: Retrieved May, 24, 2023 from <https://www.pinterest.com/pin/3237030969087086/>
4. Whitehead A.N. (1978) *Process and Reality*. New York: Free Press.
5. Rescher N. (1991) *G. W. Leibniz's Monadology*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
6. Zhadaiiev D. (2018) Aesthetics as a Manifestation of Balance. *Orpheus' Glimpse. Selected papers on process psychology. The Fontarèches meetings, 2002–2017*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Les Éditions Chromatika, pp. 299–308.
7. Zhadaiiev D. (2011) From the Climate Change to Changing Sceptics: "Genus' Point of View". *Proceedings of Eco-Sophia Symposium 2011 – 8th International Whitehead Conference—Creativity and Harmony: The way of Eco-Sophia for the Future of Civilization*. Tokyo: Sofia University, pp. 341–350.
8. Zhadaiiev D. (2014) The Notion of Balance. Part 1: Balance out of Chaosmos? *Chromatikon X. Annales de la philosophie en process. Yearbook of Philosophy in Process*. Sous la direction de Michel Weber et de Vincent Berne. Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgique, pp. 209–219.
9. Zhadaiiev D. (2015) Back from Quantity to Quality, from Appearance to Reality? *For Our Common Home: Process-Relational Responses to Laudato Si'*. John B Cobb Jr (Author), Ignacio Castuera (Process Century Press (August 25, 2015), pp. 387–396.
10. Zhadaiiev D. (2019) *Ideas of Harmony in Whitehead and Hartmann Comparative Study* [Abstract] Golden Jubilee (1969–2019) International Conference. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/38876288/Denys_Zhadaiiev_Ideas_of_Harmony_in_Whitehead_and_Hartmann_Comparative_Study_abstract
11. Zhadaiiev D. (2019) *Ideas of Harmony in Whitehead and Hartmann: Comparative Study* [Slides]. Harmony: Interface of cosmic, Ethical and Religious Orders Bangalore, India 09-12 Jan 2019. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/38875801/Zhadaiiev_D_Ideas_of_Harmony_in_Whitehead_and_Hartmann_Comparative_Study_Harmony_Interface_of_cosmic_Ethical_and_Religious_Orders_Bangalore_India_09_12_Jan_2019
12. Zhadaiiev D. (2020) The Notion of Balance: Overcoming Alienation from Nature. *Variations on Process Metaphysics. European Studies in Process Thought*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 160–177.