

“‘THE Dialectic’” -- ‘Generic Dialectic’ per the N_Q Dialectical Ideography. by Karl Seldon.

“‘THE Dialectic’” -- ‘generic dialectic’, or ‘dialectic-in-general’ -- to the degree that *it* is captured in the idiom of OUR N_Q ‘arithmetic for dialectic’, the second system of dialectical arithmetic in OUR “slow”, primer method of presentation of the ‘meta-systematic dialectical’ systems₋progression of OUR axioms₋systems of ‘dialectic arithmetics’, can be defined as follows, for stage **h ≥ 3**:

$$\mathbb{H}_h = \left[\mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_1} \right]^{2^h} = \mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_1} \text{---} \mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_2} \text{---} \mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_3} \text{---} \dots \text{---} \mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_h}$$

The right-hand side [RHS] of the ‘dialectical equation’ above -- of the ‘where unity is equal to multiplicity’, or ‘meta-genealogical’, ‘qualitative equation’ above -- represents a systems₋progression, or an ontological-categorical progression, of opposite [‘---’] categories, or at least of categories whose units exhibit qualitative differences, i.e., feature qualities that are ‘NOT-qualities’ of those of other categories in their progression.

In short, that RHS represents a progression of “‘dynamical systems’”, and/or of ontological categories -- which are inter-mutually contrary, or at least qualitatively divergent, but which are also, nonetheless, of ‘meta-genealogically-related’ “‘kinds’” -- using the consecutivity properties of Natural numbers arithmetic, **N**.

That RHS is expressed as a “‘non-amalgamative sum’” [cf. Musès], a “‘heterogeneous sum’” [‘---’], of consecutive [‘. . .’] terms standing for said systems/categories, ordered according to the historical, or the systematic, order of irruption or of evocation of these ontological categories/systems, or “‘ontologies’”.

The first term, ‘ $\mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_1}$ ’, represents, generically, the category or system which is the «arché», “‘cell-form’”, “‘seed-form’”, “‘governing source’”, “‘ever-present deep-past origin/most-abstract systematic starting point’”, or ‘ultimate meta-genealogical ancestor’ of the entire progression.

The second term, ‘ $\mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_2}$ ’, represents, generically, typically, the ‘first contra-category’, or ‘first contra-system’, to that which ‘ $\mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_1}$ ’ represents, whose units are, typically, «aufheben» ‘meta-units’, each one made up out of [some of the] units of the «arché» category or «arché» system.

The third term, ‘ $\mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_3}$ ’, represents, generically, the first uni-category, or ‘first uni-system’, uniting, that is, synthesizing, that which ‘ $\mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_1}$ ’ represents, with that which ‘ $\mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_2}$ ’ represents, to produce, and to net-*yield*, that which $\mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_{1+2}} = \mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_{2+1}} = \mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_3}$ represents, whose units are, typically, an «aufheben» ‘combination’ of [some of the] units [the ‘meta-units’] of the second category/system, with [some of the] units of the «arché» category/system, or a process and/or a formation that conducts the conversion of the one kind into the other.

Using **v** as the ‘adicity’ variable, the equation above is ‘generalizeable’, again for **h ≥ 3**, to --

$$\mathbb{H}_h = \left[\mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_1} \right]^{v^h} = \mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_1} \text{---} \mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_2} \text{---} \mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_3} \text{---} \dots \text{---} \mathbb{N}_{\mathbb{U}_v^h}$$

-- to encompass ‘dialectical meta-models’, e.g., featuring ‘triadicity’, **v = 3**, or ‘tetradicity’, **v = 4**, when such ‘higher adicity’ produces more fitting such ‘dialectical meta-models’, vis-a-vis what the **v = 2** ‘dyadicity’ -- that of the ‘dialectical meta-models’ that **we** have most commonly presented publicly, to-date -- produces.

Two Examples. Our solutions, based upon ‘connotational entailments’ from a stipulated <arché> [ideo-]ontological category.

Viewed Synchronically. [Meta-]Systematic Dialectic of the F.E.D. Axioms-Systems for ‘Dialectical Arithmetics’, ‘#’.
Solve [‘#’] for up to presentation Step s = 2 --

$$\# \text{H} (2) = \left(\# \text{N} \right)^{2^2} = \# \text{N} \oplus \# \text{NN} \oplus \# \text{NNN} \oplus \# \text{NNNN} ;$$

Given: $\# \text{N} \equiv \text{N}_\# \equiv \text{1st order "Peano Postulates" axiom-system for the "Natural" numbers arithmetic,}$
a “purely”-quantitative arithmetic of ‘unqualified quantifiers’;

Solve: $\# \text{NN} \equiv \text{Q}_\# \equiv \text{1st order axiom-system for "not-quantifier" "meta-numbers" in the form of a "purely" Qualitative}$
arithmetic of ‘unquantifiable ontological Qualifiers’, ‘unquantifiable’ via its additive idempotency
axiom $\text{N}_n \boxplus \text{N}_n = \text{N}_n$, each typical Q unit, N_n a ‘meta-unit’ containing n N units;

Solve: $\# \text{NNN} \equiv \text{U}_\# \equiv \text{1st order axiom-system for a "combined, "qualo-quantitative" arithmetic}$

of ‘quantifiable monadic qualifiers’, of the form $\text{u}_n(\text{t}) \otimes \hat{\text{u}}_n$, with
 $\hat{\text{u}}_n$ denoting the generic unit/«monad» of the nth ontological category, & with
 $\text{u}_n(\text{t})$ denoting the count of such «monads» extant as of the given time index;

Solve: $\# \text{NNNN} \equiv \text{M}_\# \equiv \text{1st order axiom-system for "not-quantifier" & "not-ontological Qualifier"}$
‘meta-numbers’ in the form of an arithmetic for a “purely” qualitative
[and, explicitly, “non-compounded”] ‘unquantifiable Metrical qualifier’ unit,
‘made up out of’ all of the diverse ontological category units whose description
requires its “dimension”, i.e., its “dimensional unit”, e.g., sec., gm., cm., etc.

Viewed Diachronically. Historical Dialectic of the ‘Meta-Evolution’ of human-social formation(s), ‘pre-subscript’ f.
Solve [‘#’] for up to epoch τ = 2 --

$$\# \text{X} (2) = \left(\# \text{f}_b \right)^{2^2} = \text{f}_b \oplus \text{f}_{bb} \oplus \text{f}_{bbb} \oplus \text{f}_{bbbb} ;$$

Given: $\# \text{f}_b \equiv \text{b}_f \equiv \text{"socio-ontological category" for "extended family", nomadic, hunting & gathering bands;}$

Solve: $\# \text{f}_{bb} \equiv \text{c}_f \equiv \text{"social formations category" for "not-bands" in the form of "semi-sedentary" Camps units,}$
each one <aufheben>-made-up-out-of a heterogeneous multiplicity of [former] bands units;

Solve: $\# \text{f}_{bbb} \equiv \text{cb}_f \equiv \text{"complex unities" of Camps units & bands units; interactions of the two kinds of units;}$
processes converting one kind into the other kind, and/or vice versa;

Solve: $\# \text{f}_{bbbb} \equiv \text{v}_f \equiv \text{"social formations category" of "not-bands" & "not-camps" in the form of "settled"}$
[e.g., agricultural] village units, each one initially <aufheben>-made-up-out-of
a heterogeneous multiplicity of coalesced [former] Camps units.