

## The Principle of Immanent Critique as Self-Critique.

Central to the ideographical symbolizations native to the NQ dialectical ideography, are expressions of a shape that can be described as ‘x beside itself’, or ‘x next to itself’, or ‘x juxtaposed to itself’, or ‘x seeing itself’, or ‘x looking into itself’, ‘x confronting itself’, or ‘x transforming itself’.

Given that ‘ $\rightarrow$ ’ denotes the phrase ‘moves up to’; ‘ $\hookrightarrow$ ’ the phrase ‘[self-]«aufheben» [self-]negation of’, & ‘ $\Delta x$ ’ the phrase ‘[ideo-]ontological increment to/‘self-hybrid’ of x’, we can exhibit the great multiplicity of such expressions, in general, by means of the following, algebraical, single expression --

$$\underline{x} \rightarrow \underline{xx} = \underline{x}(\underline{x}) \equiv \hookrightarrow(\underline{x}) \equiv \underline{x}^2 = \underline{x} \oplus \Delta \underline{x}, \quad \ddagger \quad \underline{x}, \text{ because } \Delta \underline{x} \quad \ddagger \quad \underline{x}$$

We interpret such expressions as connoting a ‘critique of x by x itself’, a ‘self-critique of x’, which, because x is the source of the criteria of any such x-critique of x, is thus also interpreted, by us, as connoting an internal or immanent critique of x.

Consider for a moment a dialectical-systematic presentation of a categorial-progression ‘theorization’ for a synchronic Domain, or ‘[sub-]totality’, of human experience/experiment.

Therein, the categories progressively presented have no existence independent of/outside the human mind.

Instead, they reside in the linguistically-mediated collective of human minds, the ‘human phenome’.

These “‘memes’”/concepts can only have conscious life, can only exist as such, within the medium of a human mind. They are animated -- given life -- by the human subjects, the human agents, who form them in mind, & “hold” them in mind. They live only via the human-mental subjectivity “loaned” to these idea-objects -- i.e., in actuality, bestowed upon them -- by the human agents who “form” them & “hold” them in mind. It is human minds that act as those ideas, that ‘mentally-embody them’, masquerade as them.

Thus, the action of category x upon category x itself is actually the action of one or more human mind(s).

Each such mind is forming & holding x in mind, & comparing that subjective “copy” of x with some objectified -- e.g., some remembered, or written down -- other copy of x, & noting the differences, the discrepancies, that thereby come into mental view.

There is thereby discerned to be, typically, latent potential in the subjective idea of x with respect to which its present, e.g., written-out objectification, falls short.

Subjectively-held x “means/connotes more” than does its present objectification.

There is, typically, an occulted ‘intra-dual’ meaning, detectable within the subjectively-held meaning of x, that is missing from any explicitude in x’s present objectification.

Thus, for *example*, *within* the *subjectively-held concept/intension* of the *first-order* “**N**atural” *numbers*, **N**, there may be *detected* an ‘*intra-duality*’, an “‘*in[ternal]-tension*’”, a *hidden face*, of a *Janus-faced body* of *meaning*. Thereby, *outwardly*, *only* the *nature* of *these numbers* as ‘*ordinal quantifiers*’ [e.g., {*first, second, third, ...*}] is stressed. Their *nature* as *also* “‘*ordinal qualifiers*’”, as *expressive* of *ordinal quality* [e.g., of {*first-ness, second-ness, third-ness, ...*}], is, at first, *submerged* into *implicitude*.

The *immanent critique* of **N** thus brings this, *ordinal quality*, ‘*other face*’ of the “**N**atural” *numbers also outward*, into *explicit*, *externalized focus*. Thus, *we write* --  $\underline{\mathbf{N}}(\underline{\mathbf{N}}) = \underline{\mathbf{N}} \otimes \underline{\mathbf{N}} = \underline{\mathbf{N}} \oplus \Delta \underline{\mathbf{N}} = \underline{\mathbf{N}} \oplus \underline{\mathbf{N}}_{\mathbf{Q}}$ .

In the *cases* of *dialectical histories*, of *dialectical chronologies* -- of ‘*diachronic dialectic*’ -- *involving also physically-sensuous objects/“eventities”*, we do not have “critique”, or “self-critique”, or “immanent critique” in the sentient, conscious sense that arrives only with the advent of the *h[uman[oid]] ontology*.

But *we still write*  $\underline{\mathbf{x}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{x}}\underline{\mathbf{x}} = \underline{\mathbf{x}}\langle \underline{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \equiv \ulcorner \langle \underline{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \equiv \underline{\mathbf{x}}^2$ , to *mean* that there may exist some latent *potential*, as yet *unmanifest*, in the local *populations represented* by the *category-symbol* **x**.

This *potential* may be *brought* into *manifestation* by ‘*quantitative change becoming qualitative change*’.

*More specifically*, it might be manifested by means of a ‘*quantitative growth of one ontology suddenly giving rise to qualitative, ontological growth, in the form of the irruption, from out of the densest cores, the ‘ontological innovation nucleation zones’*, of the *type x* local *populations of units*, of *new* local *populations*, of a *new kind* of *units, represented*, as a *category-symbol*, by the *symbol*  $\Delta \underline{\mathbf{x}}$ , or, *given* that  $\underline{\mathbf{x}} \equiv \underline{\mathbf{q}}_{\underline{\mathbf{x}}}$ , by  $\underline{\mathbf{q}}_{\underline{\mathbf{x}}\underline{\mathbf{x}}}$ .

The *ontology-state* **x** *represents, generically*, the *period* of *natural history* during which the *population* of *type x units* is ‘*sustainedly*’ *expandedly reproducing itself, quantitatively*, thus *manifesting its Darwinian*, or ‘*meta-Darwinian*’, *fitness*, but *during* which the *main environment* of a *typical type x unit* is still, primarily, made up out of **x**’s *predecessor type units*.

A “‘*critical mass*’”, “‘*critical onto-mass density*’”, or ‘*critical physical-spatial concentration*’, of *type x units*, is reached, locally, when the *main environment* of the *typical type x unit* of the given locality, or locus -- at least within **x**’s ‘*ontological innovation nucleation zones*’ -- is now, instead, made out of *other type x units*.

We call this condition the ‘*self-environment*’ of the *type x units*.

In that condition, in such a locus, the *frequency* of *interactions* of *type x units* with *other type x units begins* to *predominate* over the *frequency* of the *interaction* of *x type units* with their *predecessor type(s)* of *units*.

This is the momentaneous *ontology-state* that we *represent* by  $\underline{\mathbf{x}}\underline{\mathbf{x}}$ ,  $\underline{\mathbf{x}}\langle \underline{\mathbf{x}} \rangle$ ,  $\ulcorner \langle \underline{\mathbf{x}} \rangle$ , and  $\underline{\mathbf{x}}^2$ .

This *ontology-state* typically *gives rise to* the *irruption* of an *increment* of *new-type ontology*, which we *denote* by  $\Delta \underline{\mathbf{x}}$ . The *whole process*, from the *quantitative self-expansion* of a *given ontology-type population, x*, to *its ontological self-change, irrupting* as  $\Delta \underline{\mathbf{x}}$ , we *symbolize* by [given that ‘ $\rightarrow$ ’ denotes the word “becomes”, & ‘ $\ulcorner$ ’ the phrase ‘[*self*]-«*aufheben*» [*self*]-negation of’, & ‘ $\Delta \underline{\mathbf{x}}$ ’ the phrase ‘ontological increment/‘self-hybrid’ of **x**’] --  $\underline{\mathbf{x}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathbf{x}}\underline{\mathbf{x}} = \underline{\mathbf{x}}\langle \underline{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \equiv \ulcorner \langle \underline{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \equiv \underline{\mathbf{x}}^2 = \underline{\mathbf{x}} \oplus \Delta \underline{\mathbf{x}}$ .  $\frac{\ulcorner}{\ulcorner} \underline{\mathbf{x}}$ , *because*  $\Delta \underline{\mathbf{x}}$   $\frac{\ulcorner}{\ulcorner} \underline{\mathbf{x}}$ .

For *example*, consider the ‘atom<sup>i</sup>c clouds’ that first formed in *our cosmos* from the atom<sup>i</sup>c mass-ejection products of stellar self-demise, whereby evolved atom<sup>i</sup>c material was poured forth into the interstellar medium by nucleosynthesizing stars, especially massively during their self-termination stages.

As more & more atom<sup>s</sup>, of more & more *different kinds* / atom<sup>i</sup>c *species*, thus accumulated in the interstellar ‘atom<sup>i</sup>c gas clouds’, the interior cores of those clouds darkened -- shading them from star-light -- hence cooled, & self-gravitationally self-contracted. Thereby, they ‘self-densified’, or self-concentrated, ‘physical-spatially’.

The resulting ‘self-environment’, ‘self-surroundment’, or ‘self-envelopment’ -- *of a*tom<sup>s</sup>, *by a*tom<sup>s</sup> -- ‘frequented’ the inter-atom<sup>i</sup>c interactions, which lead to chemical bonding, & to mol<sup>e</sup>cule<sup>s</sup>-formation: the interstellar ‘atom<sup>i</sup>c clouds’ converted themselves into “mol<sup>e</sup>cule<sup>s</sup> clouds”, also the birthplaces of new stars.

Once sufficient “‘metallic’” atom<sup>s</sup>-enrichment of the interstellar medium had developed, this led to the birthing of new planets as well as of, and together with, new stars. Said another way --

$$\underline{a} \rightarrow \underline{aa} = \underline{a} \langle \underline{a} \rangle \equiv \underline{a} \langle \underline{a} \rangle \equiv \underline{a}^2 = \underline{a} \oplus \triangle \underline{a} \vdash \equiv \underline{a} \oplus \underline{m}, \frac{\vdash}{\vdash} \underline{a}, \text{ because } \underline{m} \frac{\vdash}{\vdash} \underline{a}.$$

[using ‘ $\vdash \equiv$ ’ to signify ‘solution assertion’].

Such processes do *not* yet qualify as ‘human-level’, self-consciousness-presupposing, immanent *critique*, or self-*critique*, e.g., of *idea*-systems.

But they are processes of the immanent causation, i.e., of the self-causation, of new ontology irruption, that reflect latent potentialities, & internal tensions -- ‘*progressive instabilities*’ -- in predecessor leading ontology.

With sufficient quantitative self-development of a given ontology -- i.e., with the self-expansion of its population ‘onto-mass’ -- it gives birth, out of itself, to new ontology -- to *new kinds* of ‘onto-mass’.

The *two kinds* of *processes* -- *synchronic* & *diachronic*, ‘*ideo*’ & ‘*physio*’ -- of *dialectical*, *self-determinate self-negation* are *analogous*, albeit far from *identical*.