F.*E*.*D*. Preface to New Guest Author Briefs **3 & 4**

by *Sophya Dors St. Germain*, co-founder of **F**.*E*.*D*.

The purpose of this preface is to introduce a new, pseudonymous guest author to the users of this website, and to highlight the content of his contributions, posted here, to this site's **Briefs** Page, as **Briefs 3 & 4**.

General comments: This new guest author is a very astute student of the **F**.*E*.*D*. discoveries. He has already, in these two writings, contributed new technical insights regarding the $_NQ$ dialectical arithmetic, insights that are new to the General Council, and to the **Foundation** at large. His stated aim, in the two Briefs, is to make the **F**.*E*.*D*. discoveries *potentially* more accessible, in an introductory way, to a wider public, by means of brief expositions, with a minimum of special terminology and technical detail. The **F**.*E*.*D*. General Council, to our lights, has every reason to believe that he has accomplished his goal. These writings are intended for a wide audience -- they may be the openers for a new, independent website that their author is considering -- and the General Council has decided to facilitate a wider readership for them, to help actualize their intended potential. For one thing, these Briefs actually are "brief" in the very most vernacular sense -- the first is all of eight pages, the second all of five. And they do employ a minimum of the ***Encyclopedia Dialectica*** special terminology. But you, our readers, must be the true evaluators of all such efforts. We look forward, as always, to your feedback.

Specific comments: For more specific commentary on these two Briefs, I have addressed each one separately, below.

Brief 3: Toward Understanding *"A Dialectical Theory of Everything"* -- **A General Summary of Theory**, **Purpose**, **Application**.

This Brief is well-introduced, with several layers of 'contextualizing' background and motivation provided up-front. The three pages of more detailed "**Summary Items**", divided into twelve titled paragraphs, then provide an overview introduction to **(1)** the **F**.*E*.*D*. *"finitary Set of All Sets"' paradigm*, and to its immanent critique of modern mathematics as founded upon Standard Set Theory, to **(2)** *'The Gödelian Dialectic'*, and to **(3)** the **F**.*E*.*D*. *'First Dialectical Arithmetic'*, $_NQ$, which is designed to 'arithmetize' and 'algebra-ize' the *"'Set of All Sets'" dialectic*, and to provide a generic ideographical language for the modeling of dynamical, [self-]expanding ontologies, as the author duly notes.

Indeed, the "standard arithmetics", e.g., those whose "spaces" or "number-sets" are standardly denoted by **N**, **W**, **Z**, **Q**, **R**, **C**, **H**, **O**, etc., reflect *'The Gödelian Dialectic'* in the 'meta-system-atic' transitions from the axioms-system for any one of those spaces to that for the next. These transitions are "driven", conceptually, by *"**undecidable propositions**"* that are well-formed within the meta-language of each such axioms-system. These propositions map to **unsolvable** "diophantine" algebraic **equations** in the object-language. These equations are well-formed, but **unsolvable**, inside the given axioms-system, but **solvable** inside its successor system. Each space and axioms-system in that axioms-systems-progression constitutes the 'aritmetization', or 'number-ization', of sets [of ordered pairs] representing the next higher Russellian-Gödelian "logical type". It is those *"**new kinds** of **numbers**"* -- that *new '**ideo**-ontology'* -- that renders the predecessor systems' unsolvable equations solvable in their successor systems. Each axioms-system in the standard progression of systems of arithmetics set forth above codifies a specific new sub-set of new kinds of number that solve those formerly unsolvable equations. The *"Set of All Sets"* «***ideo-autokinesis***», and the new kinds of 'meta-numbers' that mirror it -- the $_NQ$ -- model, not a single, new "logical type" of set [of ordered pairs], as the new numbers of each successive standard arithmetic do, but, rather, model the entire, transcending 'meta-axioms-systems' movement throughout the axioms-system***s*** that govern the number-spaces from **N**, to **W**, to **Z**, to **Q**, to **R**, to **C**, to **H**, to **O**, and beyond. Our new guest authors' summary items are consonant with this understanding -- in part, explicitly, in part, implicitly.

He duly notes that the 'meta-linearity' of the "non-amalgamative sums" of qualitatively-heterogeneous sub-sets generated by the Seldon Function which expresses the *"'Set of All Sets'"* self-movement, and of the corresponding superpositions of qualitatively-unequal ontological qualifiers generated by Seldon functions of the $_NQ$ 'meta-numbers', point embryonically toward a breach of *'The Nonlinearity Barrier'* -- of the general unsolvability of nonlinear integro-differential equations, especially those that express today's best formulations of the "laws" of nature [i.e., grasped as constituting a higher kind of "diophantine equations", *á la* the recent solution of "Hilbert's Tenth Problem"].

The summary items end by noting the peculiar combination of freedom and constraint that the $_N Q$ language provides, as an heuristic, intensional, intuitional semantic algebra, undergirded by a strictly algorithmic syntactics. He also concludes with notice of the broad applicability of this language as a method of discovery for new hypotheses in the sciences generally ["natural" and "social "alike.].

Each of his twelve summary items, for the benefit of the reader, provides a link to relevant **F**.**_E_**.**D**. web-published writings that develop the item in more detail.

The final section is a **~**page-and-a-half "**Quick Primer**" on the **F**.**_E_**.**D**. Mathematics of Dialectics, which contains what the General Council believes to be several new and important technical insights into the **Q** system**_s_** of dialectical arithmetic, including what we believe to be his independent rediscovery of $\lceil_0$ and of the expanded system of dialectical arithmetic that we call $_w Q$, such that $\lceil_0$ is both the **additive** *identity element* and the **multiplicative** *identity element* of $_w Q$, and hence is also its own **additive** *inverse*, and its own **multiplicative**, *inverse* within $_w Q$. The isomorphisms and [other] analogies that he presents in this final section, between the **Q** spaces and the **N**, **W**, and **R** spaces, open some original, new, and innovative considerations, not previously noted in the **F**.**_E_**.**D**. research to-date. His analogy between $\mathbf{e^n}$ and $\lceil\!\lceil_{\,1}\rceil\!\rceil^{\mathbf n}$ reaches all the way into the new 'ideo-ontology' -- the new algorithmic and 'calculational'/behavioral *'**ideo**-phenomena'* -- first exhibited in the $_z Q$ system in the Gödelian 'meta-system-atic dialectic' of the progression of the **Q** axioms-systems. Finally, our new guest author presents applications of the $_N Q$ dialectical ideography -- a *'meta-model'* of a mathematically-prominent *'**ideo**-onto-dynamasis'*, and a *'meta-model'* of a natural-scientifically-central *'**physio**-onto-dynamasis'* -- which differ from the **_Encyclopedia Dialectica_** standard versions of these 'meta-models' in intriguing ways.

<u>Brief 4</u>: **The Role of Universal Heart in Our Theoretical Models** (specifically in **_A Dialectical "Theory of Everything"_**).
It was, in fact, this second Brief by our new guest author, whose pseudonym for the purposes of these Briefs is *Joy-to-You*, that led him to request that I personally write the **F**.**_E_**.**D**. introductions to his contributions, given a perceived feeling-resonance between our perspectives, based upon my meta-commentary -- specifically, **Meta-Comment γ**. -- in the **Foundation**'s first published book, **_A Dialectical "Theory of Everything"_**. This 'meta-comment' is reproduced in full at the following URL [see **Welcome** Page section entitled '**Postscripts Series**', item entitled '**Third/Final Meta-Comment**…']:

http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Welcome.html

This second Brief, unlike the first, has a very theistic "sound" to my "ear", although our guest author explicitly leaves open a non-theistic, 'human-phenomic' interpretation of his text, as referring to "Heart", "defined as the <u>*common*</u> *love / feelings / thoughts / beliefs and their corresponding active qualities* of each in Humanity".

I think that our new guest author is telling in his assertion, in the first paragraph of this Brief, despite this "<u>*common love*</u>" being so often honored "only in the breach" in human prehistory [Marx] to-date, that: "In any scientific, or thought-based, theory of Reality, the "science" and/or the "mathematics" behind such a theory may often seem devoid of any "human feelings." After all it is these physical and emotional feelings which a major theory is ultimately addressing / redressing as it attempts to ameliorate the human condition. The role of "feelings" as expressed by humans, animals, or some more general class of being, seems completely *un-acknowledged*. Feelings, generally "matters of the heart," simply do not seem "felt" or acknowledged in such theories. This *unAcknowledgment* is surprising, especially when the psychohistory and literature of Mankind is replete with references to "Heart" and matters of Heart."

Perhaps nothing is more symptomatic of the world of the near-total dissolution of social community; of the world of social alienation -- of "the world of strangers" and "the world of estrangement" -- that is the world of our contemporary, prehistoric, [proto-]human society, than is the pervasive fear, among us, of showing our hearts, of revealing the feeling-motivations of our work, of "wearing our hearts on our sleeves", by attesting to the love for the universe, and the love for humanity, that inspires and sustains our efforts to contribute to human and universal progress.

Our guest author's second Brief points to a view of what we tern '**_affective psychohistory_**', about which we have released little to-date, confining our releases, so far, primarily to what we term '**_cognitive psychohistory_**':

http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive//AffectivePsychohistory/AffectivePsychohistory.htm

http://point-of-departure.org/Point-Of-Departure/ClarificationsArchive/CognitivePsychohistory/CognitivePsychohistory.htm

The late Dr. Charles Musès, one of the most profound, and also one of the most problematic, of the early mentors of the **Foundation**, was a mystic of the Western tradition, as well as a mathematician and a scientist, and he consistently championed the centrality of such love in the motivation of truly scientific and mathematical contributions. He also decried the telling absence of the word "love" in the indexes at the backs of so many academic tomes -- and all this despite however often he himself may have honored his own counsel of love "in the breach" in his own personal practice.

Our new guest author is also partially accurate in his perception of a feeling-resonance between he and I. It is true that I came to Karl, and to the co-foundation of this **Foundation**, from and with a background in the doctrines, and in the practices, of the esoteric spiritual traditions of the ancient East and West.

However, the **Foundation** is a **_secular_** monastic order. Our membership is agnostic or **_a_**theistic in its view of *theistic* ideologies, and that description includes me! We are Marxians, working to build further upon the foundation that Karl Marx created, the foundation of the dialectical, immanent critique of the scientific and other ideologies that "lawfully" plague prehistoric proto-humanities -- **_including_** of the **pseudo**-Marxian, totalitarian 'proto-**_state_**-**_capitalist_**' ideologies of Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Mao, etc. -- locating Marx as the greatest psychohistorian that Terran humanity has so far produced [although in my -- admittedly biased -- opinion, Karl H. Seldon is well on his way to attaining such a level of contribution as well!]. It is true that some of our members have a religion, a metaphysics, or a mysticism in their background, but these have all been "left behind" [in the «**_aufheben_**» sense] in their coming to the **Foundation**. It is also true that most of our members engage a daily meditative practice which derives from an ancient yogic tradition. But they pursue this practice for its mind / body strengthening, clarifying, and empowering psychophysiological benefits [see **Welcome** Page section entitled '**Postscripts Series**', item entitled '**About Foundation _Encyclopedia Dialectica_**']:

http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Welcome.html

Karl's late-childhood dream-vision -- which was the seed of all that the **Foundation** has become and will yet become -- even when viewed as the assertion of religion and philosophy «**_aufheben_**»-converted to science, centers upon an "**_equation of everything_**" -- on an equation *as scripture* -- carved into the central, altar-like stone monolith of a church-like gathering-place[see **Welcome** Page section entitled '**Postscripts Series**', item entitled '**About the F.**_E_.**D**. **Logo**']:

http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Welcome.html

We therefore do not condemn those of a theistic persuasion. We condemn crimes against humanity -- overt acts of torture, murder, and mayhem; of power-obsessed sadism and parasitism. *"Thought crime"* is an oxymoron in our lexicon.

We simply remain in dialogue with those who hold to a theistic, mystical, or metaphysical worldview.

We do so precisely *because of* our theoretical differences with them.

Moreover, because those differences are unlikely to be reconciled any time soon -- if ever -- our dialogue with them continues to be a rich source of new 'ideo-ontology', and of new, trenchant metaphor, in our work.

«**_Viva la dialogue_**»**_!_**: Let that dialogue, and that dialectic, continue!

Yours in the spirit of dialectical reason,

Sophya