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ABSTRACT

This poster presents a diagram by David Scienceman, in only one page, of the basic story of the origins of the religious doctrine of Christianity as seen by an average Christian, using the Emergy Systems Language of H.T. Odum. Explanatory text is added, to follow up on previous papers, such as "The Jewish Pattern of History," Chapter 39 of Emergy Synthesis 9. Collins discusses whether the forgiveness response versus eye-for-eye response leads to feedback loops that increase transformity; as well as the possible relevance of the Collins Aero Cube S4 Group Theory blocks that show the equivalence of four major computation methods. Scienceman points out that eye-for-eye is a step upward from "Hit back ten times harder" according to Dimont. Frequently there is loss of accuracy in hitting back ten times harder, so that a couple innocent people may be hit. If these people also adopt the "ten times harder" strategy, it may set off a chain reaction that increases negative feedback and decreases transformity of the system in comparison. For example, the Norsemen tried to hunt down the indigenous eskimo-type people instead of learning from them how to live off the environment and so died out when ships could not replenish iron tools. On the other hand, Pilgrims benefited from the cooperation with Squanto in the 1620's increasing transformity of the system. Scienceman also raises the question of the transformity of the average Christian, for example the Norsemen versus Pilgrims, who started stealing corn from the Indians but managed to get a questionable peace treaty with Squanto as interpreter, perhaps leading to a comparison of transformity of Squanto versus Pilgrim.

INTRODUCTION

As with previous efforts together, the first part of the paper is due to David Scienceman and the second part (which might be termed Moral Codes IV) to Dennis Collins. The two parts are connected by Scienceman’s question, what is the transformity of the average Christian. After Scienceman’s diagram and text, dealing with an H.T. Odum-like treatment of the development of Christianity, the transformity question is taken up. In particular two-and three-person versions of the 10-level Moral Code I paper by Collins are presented. Behavior by a typical Christian arose in dialogue about Collins’ paper “PeaceMovement Paradox” (hopefully included in his paper “Emergy and Econophysics” in Emergy Synthesis 9) at his 55th High School Reunion August 5, 2017. In that paper the possibility that war could develop as a Newtonian action-reaction or tit-for-tat mechanism was challenged by former Merrillville, IN class High School Principal Mr. James G. Bovard, who stated “Whoa—humans aren’t limited to one response; they have free will to choose how they respond." Thus, instead of only the tit-for-tat or eye-for-eye reaction, ten responses corresponding to the 10 levels of Moral Codes I are considered. By untimely circumstance, Collins was never able to communicate with Mr. Bovard again after the class reunion and Mr. Bovard passed away Oct. 26, 2017 shortly after his 90th Birthday. Thus, the Collins portion of this paper may be dedicated to him.
The purpose of this poster is an attempt to display a diagram, in only one page, of the basic story of the origin of the religious doctrine of Christianity as seen by an average Christian using the Energy Systems Language of H.T. Odum.

1. The top of the diagram is a circle labelled God in heaven, the source of everything. Father Son and Holy Spirit, united in a Trinity of love. The lines are flows of love. The usual heat sinks display all the human activities including the miracles.

2. The producer symbol is the baby Jesus (bJ), the product of God, Holy Spirit (HS) and the virgin Mary (vM)

3. The first switch symbol displays the anointing of Jesus man (Jm) by John the Baptist (JB) using water or oil to create the Messiah Jesus Christ (JC)
4. The second switch shows the death by crucifixion of (Jm) on a wooden cross ordered by the Roman Pontius Pilate (PP) for sedition, after his rejection by the Jewish Rabbi Pharisees (PH) for blasphemy, and subsequently his transformation into The Son of God (SG) and return to God in heaven around the love loop.

5. The lower part of the diagram refers to Saul (Sa), and his amplifying transformation (AM) conversion on the road to Damascus into Paul (Pa) after a sitting of the resurrected SG, and the later contribution of Peter (Pe) into the religious doctrine of Christianity (CHR).

**MODEL**

The model of this paper extends the Collins 10-level moral code to a two-dimensional matrix form, suitable for game theory competition between a Self and an Other, and also a three-dimensional drama triangle version suitable for interaction between an AGGRESSOR, and a VICTIM and a RESCUER. Thus, of interest are the transitions between the 10 states of the 10-point moral code, later the 100 (=10x10) states of the matrix, and lastly the 1000 (=10x10x10) states of the 3-dimensional model. In quantum theory, such transition rates are called Einstein coefficients. By possibly fortunate happenstance, the last cases are compatible with the 2006 study of evolutionary multiagent models by Eguchi et al, which seems to show that “more Christian” behavior indeed leads to higher levels of achievement and thus higher transformity. Remark: Eguchi does not work specifically with the numerical levels attributed to his work. Table 1 shows the 10-level case from the 2001 Collins study’; Figure 2 shows the 100 states of the 2-Dim model and Figure 3 indicates the 1000 states of the 3-Dim model. The 1000 cases could correspond to 1001 plots of the “1001 Nights” story. As before there is a temperature transition, so that as temperature goes very high, probability in general tends to be equal over each state.

The flip transition (n ->9 – n) reverses the ordering (The last shall be first.). At a certain point helping your enemy is treason. The government transition tries to move actions to the middle 4-5 of the chart (Let the government handle it.). In some cases, the government allows level 6 (Collins) self-defense or level 3 (Collins) separation (Build a wall.). The repentence transition is to a lower level (Collins). The backsliding (recidivism) transition is to higher levels (Collins). The high temperature transition tends to fill out all levels.

**Table 1.** Ten levels (Collins 2001, 2011). The Eguchi chart (2006) lists levels upside-down, listing best result at top or to right, and worst result at bottom or to left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collins (2001)</th>
<th>FLIP transition</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>SELF ACTION AS RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eguchi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>mass murder, treason, holes in dike</td>
<td>destroy system for eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>murder</td>
<td>10 eyes for eye, 10 times harder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assault, violent crime</td>
<td>2 eyes for eye (Dimont)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>stealing, property crime</td>
<td>eye-for-eye, tit-for-tat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>lying, swearing, word crime</td>
<td>lock up for eye, criminal proc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>coveting, thought crime</td>
<td>money for eye, civil proceeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>good will, honors parents</td>
<td>separation for eye, restr. order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>service oriented, productive citizen</td>
<td>forgiveness for eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“Good Samaritan,” risk self to help</td>
<td>forgive for 2eyes, other cheek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Saint, making everyone better</td>
<td>love, help enemy for eye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2. Two-dimensional game theory chart of moral code (MC) values with Collins values on outside edges. With self as horizontal axis and other as vertical coordinate, in Harm (self,other)=(9,9) as extreme; in Predation (self, other) = (9,0) as extreme; in Altruism (self, other) = (0,9) as extreme; in Mutualism (self, other)=(0,0) as extreme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Predation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mutualism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Harm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Altruism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9 self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Three dimensional state in Life (SIL) chart. Please see below. The objective is to move SIL levels away from (0,0,0) where everyone is near death toward the (9,9,9) point where everyone has vast wealth and power.

The above cases suppose the actors have free will or choice what to do. However, there is a component, role in life, say SIL (state in life), which is not easily changed. Again, there will be a 10 or 11 point scale, with 0 to 4 indicating the actor is dependent (think tax return) and 5 to 10 indicating the actor has some independence. This scale could be considered a simplified transforntiy scale, or also measuring distance away from death as the value goes from 0 to 10 as follows:
SIL  Status in Life Classification
10  god, cannot die, powerful
  person of vast power and wealth
  well-off person, in general with some control over others
  person with steady employment or other income, generally owns house
  active person, can afford public transportation or car, support family, perhaps mortgage
  independent person, can support himself or herself, access car or public transportation, perhaps renting
  dependent person, although may be seeking work, some possible restriction on movement
  person with limited mobility and freedom of action, say in hospital or nursing home or prison
  person with only weeks or months to live, say lacking food
  person with only hours or days to live, say lacking clothing in freezing temperature or water
  person near death with only second or minutes to live, say lacking oxygen or baby in very hot car

In terms of the thermodynamic classification, 0 to 3 would be solid, 4 to 5 liquid and 6 to 9 gas.
It is also possible to consider the scale in terms of Maslow’s hierarchy.

Now it is possible to track a person’s SIL (or state in life) over time, which would in general have
a parabola-shaped form, starting from close to 0 as a baby, hopefully rising above level 5 as an adult
and again returning to 0 with old age.

It is also possible to track the trajectory of each player in 2-person game theory or 3-dimensional
drama triangle, basically as a result of each play of the game. Typically, in game theory the payoff to
each actor is put in the rectangle where the given plays intersect. Thus if I give my old car worth $500
to my neighbor, in the lower right box close to the word “Altruism,” the payoff would be, (self,other)
=(-500,500). The payoff could also be stated in change in SIL values, or simply in the new or resulting
SIL values. For example, in the early 1970’s, the neighbor kid shot my Father through the window,
claiming he was shooting at a bird. This changed my Father’s SIL from active person 6 down to a
person bleeding to death with only minutes to live SIL level 0. As my Father was able to call the kid’s
Mother who drove him to the Emergency Room, where he was later released (although not removing
the bullet), and my Father decided to forgive, leaving the kid’s SIL at 4 (dependent child), the payoff
could be written change SIL or delta SIL = (Father, kid) = (-6,0) or as a SIL trajectory (Father, kid) =
(6,4) before incident and SIL (Father, kid) = (0,4) after incident, (3,4) while recovering, and (weeks
later), (6,4) after recovered. If my Father had not forgiven and charged the kid, the kid might have faced
reform school with SIL (Father, kid) = (6,4) to (0,4) to (3,4) to (6,4) to (6,3) with kid suffering delta SIL
= -1 or SIL 4 to 3. Unless otherwise stated, only SIL values will be given as payoffs.

Thus, it is possible to consider each player as starting with a given SIL or state in life, selecting a
moral code level MC and ending up with a new SIL after the play. Thus, overall one can plot the SIL
trajectory of the players vector and also the trajectory of the moral codes vector MC, which is a kind of
velocity vector. The SIL trajectory can be considered as tracking the payoffs of the game progress.

**EXAMPLE 1.** From a recent news story, two girls Aggressor A and Victim V are on a bridge and
the Aggressor girl pushes the Victim girl off the bridge with Rescuer police/medical P, say, helping get
the girl to the hospital. Then at stage 1, SIL of A and V are 4, and P is 8, then MC of A is 7, V is 3 and
P is 1.

The resultant SIL is A is 4, V is 1, and P is 8.

Then it is possible to plot the SILs of each actor at each stage and his or her level of moral code
attitude or response MC to the specific situation or to a list of various issues, say what to do to the
Aggressor, the Victim, the Rescuer. The basic moral codes level of each actor could be a default number
in case there is no further information.
As a start the above Example 1. Could have the following levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>SIL(A,V,P)</th>
<th>MC(A,V,P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4,3,8)</td>
<td>(7,3,1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(4,1,8)</td>
<td>(5,5,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3,3,8)</td>
<td>(5,5,3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(3,4,8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here for example the interest could be in the drop of the moral codes level MC of the Aggressor girl from 7 (assault) to 5 (lying about event—The Victim girl asked me to do it.) in stages 2 and 3. This change could be attributed to a fear of police or government which tends to pull moral code values to the middle 4-5 range, to a repentance movement which tends to pull moral code values to a lower level, or to a cooling off tendency which tends to move moral code values to a less energetic level. Apparently the Aggressor girl faces some kind of legal action at present, which would restrict her mobility to SIL 4, and the Victim girl has correspondingly raised her moral code response to MC 5, which would request lock up 5 for the Aggressor girl action assault MC 7 at Stage 1. The Victim’s SIL is listed as 3 at Stage 1 since she couldn’t get out of the way. Current status of the Clark Co. Washington State case is as of March 27, 2019 that the aggressor girl Taylor Smith pleaded guilty to reckless endangerment for pushing victim Jordan Holgrson and received a sentence of 2 days in jail and 38 days on a work crew, compatible with tit-for-tat versus 3 days in hospital of Jordan.

**MORAL CODE “WEATHER” EQUATION**

The goal of a “moral code weather equation” would be to have an equation, similar to equations which predict the weather, say velocity field or wind velocity, including various terms to predict the effect of the various above-mentioned moral code forces. This equation would be a generalized form of Levin’s equation $B = f(P,E)$ that behavior is a function of the person $P$ and the environment $E$. Here the person’s free will $P$ allows the person to select moral code level MC, while the person’s status in life SIL or environment E restricts scope of action.

A typical weather equation is the following for the rate of change of velocity $U$ (wind) with respect to time:

$$\frac{dU}{dt} = -2WxU-(1/\rho)(\text{grad } p) + F +g^* - Wx(Wxr)$$

Here the curl operator $x$ has to do with rotation effect, $\rho$ is pressure, $g$ is gravity and so on. In the drama triangle case, the quantity of interest is change of moral code level with respect to time, as well as, of course, the change of SIL values with respect to time, which would involve another equation. As the rate of change of $U$ can depend on $U$, the rate of change of moral code level $MC$ can depend on $MC$, as well as the SIL value (say the $W$ in the formula). Here the variables of the MC problem will be different from the weather prediction problem, but there does seem to be a rotation effect, as in drama triangle cycling. A society with only dependents (SIL < 5) as for example the early Norsemen in America dependent on supply ships from Europe, and with high MC levels of violence (MC > 5) will tend to spiral down SIL values and die out. Since the main effect of high MC levels of violence (MC>6) is to reduce SIL levels, the result of keeping MC values low, as by cooperation, sharing and forgiveness, is to raise SIL values to higher independence and prosperity (SIL>5), allowing the Pilgrims to survive by cooperation with Squanto, who by tradition had converted to Christianity. Considerations of symmetry (“We are all one species.”—Garry Davis) to treat everyone equally lead to attempt to keep MC levels below 5 (the “New Man” or Born Again).
The two Collins papers of the Emergy Synthesis 10 Conference have to do with the effects of free will, either selecting method of puzzle solving or moral code response level. As a start it was found helpful to try a weather equation with only the SIL level involved and not the free-will moral code MC level. As stated above, the SIL trajectory has typically the form of a parabola, which can be obtained, as in elementary physics as the result of a gravity central force, pulling objects down to a 0 height, or in the SIL case a “death” central force. On the other hand, the government tries to pull people up to about a 4.5 SIL level, for example by finding jobs or providing medical care or help to people who have been attacked or suffered accidents. The government does this effort by collecting taxes, which tends to pull people who have independent status down toward a 4.5 level, or by locking up people who obtain high SIL level by unlawful means, again pulling them down toward or below 4.5 level. Overall the government can be considered a central force toward SIL level 4.5. Thus, there is a two central force model, toward 0 and 4.5, which may be termed a “death and taxes” model, after the saying “The only sure things are death and taxes.”

What about the equations—From Newton's laws of motion as in elementary physics \( F=ma \), the parabola can be modeled from \( y''[x] = -mg, y[0]=0, y'[0] =v_0 \). Since the MC response is not being considered, the government force is only modeled as a periodic force, which sometimes pulls the person's SIL level up and sometimes down.

Then it is possible to arrive at the equation \( y''[x] = -0.01 -1.3 \left( \pi/8 \right)^2 \sin\left( \pi/8 \right)x \), where the first term on the right is the death term and the second term is the taxes term, which gives 5 up-down cycles between \( x=0 \) (birth) and \( x=80 \) (death), in short a wavy parabola with 5 peaks.

The trajectory, which goes from 0 over SIL level 8 and back to 0, is roughly modeled after the life of Cornelius Vanderbilt, who lived somewhat over 80 years 1794-1877, with about 5 major ups and downs, say a cycle every 16 years. Sometimes the government helped Vanderbilt as with railroad subsidies and sometimes pulled down his wealth and power through taxes and being attacked as a monopolist. He also equipped a ship to combat the Confederate ironclad during the Civil War and contributed Vanderbilt University in Tennessee after the war. Vanderbilt also suffered SIL lows due to health problems and for example the Panic of 1873.

The equation can be solved (as a two-point value problem) through the MATHEMATICA program:

\[
\text{DSolve}\{y''[x]==-.01-1.3*(\pi/8)^2*\sin\left(\pi/8\right)x, y[0]==0, y[80]==0\}, y[x],x\} \quad \text{with solution} \quad \{y[x] -> .4x -.005 x*2 + 1.3 \sin[.392699 x]\}.
\]

The graph can be viewed by the command:

\[
\text{Plot}\left[1.3*\sin\left(\pi/8\right)x+.4*x-(1/200)*x^2, \{x,0,80\}\right]
\]

By adding and subtracting terms, the same curve can be obtained from the initial-value program:

\[
\text{DSolve}\{y''[x]=-(\pi/8)^2*(y[x]-4.5) - .01 +(\pi/8)^2*(-4.5+.4*x-(1/200)*x^2), y[0]==0, y'[0]==1.3*(\pi/8)+.4\}, y[x],x\}.
\]

Here the first term on the right is the taxes term as a central force around 4.5 and the second term is the death term -.01. To balance the equation there is necessary an added parabolic time force term; however, the cyclic term does not explicitly appear.
Although not considered in this equation, it is evident that Cornelius Vanderbilt had many levels of moral code MC reaction: He is credited with punching people out (level 7), trying to extort money to get a monopoly and tit-for-tat competition with business rivals (level 6), swearing (level 5), coveting other railroads and spending much effort in civil proceedings (level 4), being good to family (level 3),
being a productive citizen in building transportation grid (level 2), and returning good for evil in trying to rebuild the South by starting Vanderbilt University (level 1).

At some point it might be possible to consider moral code MC levels of government, whether it is corrupt, foments violence and so on.

It is known that the 3-dimensional trajectory of a 3-dim central force is in many cases a plane ellipse, which is compatible with drama triangle cycling. More forces lead possibly to “basins of attraction.”
R. BUCKMINSTER FULLER: BUCKY’S TWIST

In the case of weather, the rotation of the curl terms comes substantially from the Coriolis force of the Earth’s rotation, as evidenced in versions of Newton’s second law. Thus, the question arises, where do the rotation terms come from in the moral codes study.

Part of the answer may lie in R. Buckminster Fuller’s 2 volumes of Synergetics. Curiously, more or less contradicting Newton’s third law of motion that to each action there is an equal and opposite reaction, Fuller argues that the reaction is never at 180 degrees in the opposite direction. Certainly, in cartoons there is an element of surprise if the reaction is 180 degrees opposite the action, for example if the missile launched by Wiley Cayote somehow returns to hit him.

Nonetheless in the moral codes case, tit-for-tat or reaction in the opposite direction seems to pass for justice in many cases (as in the Wiley Cayote cartoon). A recent TV report on a girl who was beaten and stabbed to within an inch of her life and took 6 years to recover, followed by indirectly identifying her attacker, saw the attacker pleading guilty by plea bargain and being sentenced to 6 years in prison, which the girl and her relatives viewed as some kind of justice, i.e. 6 years recovery for 6 years in prison, tit-for-tat. Currently in the Trump case, there is drama if Trump will get fired from the Presidency in opposite reaction to firing so many people.

Anyway, Fuller carefully considered how much free will people have in action-reaction decisions. Apparently he saw the Universe as progressing by action-reaction-resultant cycles, permitting 6 moves that can be made in 12 optional directions, cf. p. 104 Figure 401.01 D of Volume 1, where the 6 moves correspond to the 6 edges of a basic tetrahedron, traversed in opposite directions to get 12. Here a basic tetrahedron is formed by the three sides of an action-reaction-resultant open “triangle spiral,” which fills in to a tetrahedron on connecting the four involved points, which then form the vertices (or “corners”) of the tetrahedron. Since the reaction never retraces the action in his theory, the tetrahedron never collapses to a planar figure.

To try to understand the 12 moves, think of a ping pong ball (corresponding to a person) in the middle of the tetrahedron. There is a line from the center (ping pong ball) to each of the four vertices of the tetrahedron. Each line from the center (action) meets three planar surfaces creating 3 edges at the vertex. Thus, for each of 4 actions (line from the center), there are 3 reactions (edges) that can follow, for a total of 12 options. Each of the 6 edges of the tetrahedron connects 2 vertices, say A and B. One path could go from the center to vertex A, then along the edge to vertex B. Another path could go from the center to vertex B, then in the opposite or negative direction to vertex A along the edge. Apparently, the choice whether A to B or B to A is positive is arbitrary without further information. Also, in either case the resultant goes off somewhere, creating a new action-reaction-resultant tetrahedron with a new center. In terms of moral codes, it seems if A to B increases moral code level, B to A would involve a decrease of moral code level.

Synergetics quote 537 (Freedom and Will).52, p.137-138go vol. 2: “It is clear to me that most humans tend to think in a linear, Go-or-No-go, greenlight-redlight manner. To me WILL is an optionally exercisable control by mind over brain—by wisdom over conditioned reflex—that becomes realizable when mind is adequately convinced regarding which of the 12 alternatives will produce the most comprehensively considerate vital advantage for all.

The simplest drama triangle Bucky cycle would go from the center to say vertex A (action) to vertex B (reaction) back to the center again (resultant). However, Bucky would not consider this path a valid trajectory since it only creates a flat space (triangle) and does not create 3-dim volume. Thus, a valid drama triangle would have to have at least four lines, as in the trinity study below.
Definitions:

An Aggressor is an agent whose action decreases SIL level of a possible other.

A Victim is an agent whose SIL level is decreased.

A Rescuer is an agent whose action increases the SIL level of a possible other.

DYNAMICS OF THE TRINITY

The trajectory of Jesus is seen to be an expanded and extreme form of the SIL trajectory of a typical person that starts at level 10 (God), comes down to earth as vulnerable level 1 (baby, Christmas), then has a roughly parabola-shaped form, reaching above independence level 5 to say level 8 of some control and recognition of power, then dropping to 0, death or near death at the Crucifixion, perhaps even below level 0, then being raised from the dead back above level 5 eventually back to level 10 (God). The purpose is apparently to teach humans to forgive or in general to live below moral code level 5 while attaining very high SIL level, say 8 or 9, although at times like Jesus reduced to low SIL levels.

So can the Trinity be fit into the drama triangle mold--A possible argument is as follows:

Old Testament: Father is aggressor, judging and punishing people
Spirit is victim, dependent carrying out orders of Father, say as angel
Son is rescuer, Messiah in waiting to save mankind from punishment

Jesus Lifetime: Father is rescuer, raising Jesus from death
Spirit is aggressor, pulling people from livelihoods as say fishermen (SIL=>5), to follow Jesus as dependents (SIL <5)
Son Jesus is victim, crucified to death for teaching and role model

After resurrection: Father is victim, power curtailed by embarrassing death of Son, must hold back on punishment on recommendation of Son
Spirit is rescuer, giving people power to rise above (SIL =>5) dependence on Sin, may pull people away from harmful activities
Son is aggressor, given right to judge others, according to how they treated people in his status

Overall there is a tendency to return to the original roles. Thus, the Persons of the Trinity cycle through the roles of Aggressor, Victim, Rescuer as in the drama triangle. Many no doubt would argue with this interpretation.
One of the questions at the 10th Biennial Emergy Research Conference involved what might be called “background” transformity. In his presentation Tom Abel apparently said you could ignore it. The following more-or-less extends that idea, based on the book The Reflexive Universe pp.86-87 of Arthur M. Young and a poster by Len Troncale at the 52nd Annual Meeting of the International Society of Systems Science in Madison, WI July 15, 2008. Basically, the idea is to work with negative exponents, letting solar transformity \( T = 10^0 \) have an exponent 0 and more primitive forms of energy have
negative exponents back to the Big Bang. This follows up on the (Scienceman and Collins 2013) statement p. 76 Chapter 9 of Emergy Synthesis 7 Religion Science Amalgam (Reliscience) “. . . it would be interesting to estimate the transformity of the various stages of cosmogenesis after the Big Bang (Graphical Timeline of the Big Bang, 2013) and of the Big Bang itself.”

Young shows $7 \times 7 = 49$ stages of evolution.

Troncale lists 26 stages with the formation of the solar system coming about 9 stages in. Putting solar radiation at exponent 0 allows $26 - 9 = 17$ stages for further evolution, which is roughly compatible with DNA at E+17 on the chart of transformity levels on p.5 of “The Transformity of personal action” at resilience.org/stories/2013-09-23 (accessed 10-1-18).

Then Troncale’s poster would have the following:

- $E^{-10}$ cosmic seed
- $E^{-9}$ Big Bang
- $E^{-8}$ quark
- $E^{-7}$ hadron
- $E^{-6}$ atomic nuclei
- $E^{-5}$ matter and energy separate
- $E^{-4}$ H and He formed
- $E^{-3}$ clusters of nebulae form
- $E^{-2}$ massive stars form with fission
- $E^{-1}$ nuclear fusion with diversity of heavy atoms
- $E^0$ first generation of stars with planets and solar system, solar transformity

Thus, precursor forms can be more-or-less ignored as can be the cents on the other side of the dollar sign. It seems the SIL levels are mostly compatible with the “Transformity of personal action” chart up to level 9.

For reference the remaining positive exponents as approximated from the Troncale poster are listed in somewhat simplified form:

- $E^1$ aggregation and diversity of inorganic geomorphs
- $E^2$ organic monomers and diversity
- $E^3$ polymer aggregation, diversity and self-organization
- $E^4$ proto-bionic concentration and diversity
- $E^5$ short metabolic pathways and diversity
- $E^6$ nucleic acid (RNA) and protein paths, diversity of genetic codes
- $E^7$ RNA information integrated in the DNA genome
- $E^8$ integration of metabolics and genes, diversity of unicell types
- $E^9$ unicell populations and diversity
- $E^{10}$ communities of unicell populations and diversity
- $E^{11}$ unicell communities to ecological nets and diversity
- $E^{12}$ complex genomes to nuclei and diversity
- $E^{13}$ aggregates to organelles and diversity
- $E^{14}$ cells to colonies and diversity of multicell species
- $E^{15}$ appearance of complex multicell development plans and diversity
- $E^{16}$ neural nets into brains
DRAMA TRIANGLE CYCLING AND THE ENVIRONMENT

It is apparent that environmentalists have become involved with something like drama triangle cycling. People such as H.T. Odum and Rachell Carson portrayed the environment as underrepresented VICTIM versus capitalist greedy AGGRESSORS. To some extent the U.S. and other governments were brought in as RESCUERS. However recently environmentalists have seen themselves portrayed as AGGRESSORS against ignorant government VICTIMS, with the greedy capitalists coming in as RESCUERS. A suggestion for the Emergy Society is to study the dynamics of drama triangle cycling to see what plan might work out to save the environment. In any case such study will probably not hurt.

CONCLUSION

Scienceman applies H.T. Odum’s Emergy Systems Language to display a chart of Christian theology. Collins works with Moral Codes (MC) and Status in Life (SIL) classifications to start to show how reducing MC level (New Man) can increase SIL level, or basically transformity level.
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