

## F.E.D. Vignette #23 --

# 'Intra-Duality' is the Cause of Dialectic.

by Karl Seldon.

■ Dialectic is the cause of *time*.

'Intra-Duality' is the cause of dialectic:

[http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Glossary\\_files/Glossary.Definition.%27Intra-Duality%27.04NOV2014.1.jpg](http://www.dialectics.org/dialectics/Glossary_files/Glossary.Definition.%27Intra-Duality%27.04NOV2014.1.jpg).

At the inception of each/any dialectical sub-universe -- as at the so far deepest known inception, or '«arché»-ic ontology', of *the* universe, as *the* totality -- 'intra-duality', 'indiv[is]ible-duality', is that which divulges, by externalizing/manifesting/'visible-izing'/'explicitizing'/'actualizing' it, a formerly only "'internal'", unmanifest, invisible, implicit, potential 'supplementary otherness' to what the '«arché-arithmos»' presented/manifested outwardly.

The 'intra-duality' of the «arché» of each dialectical sub-universe, at length, irrupts out of itself, & thereby "'adds"' to itself, a 'contra-«arithmos»'; a 'contra-«arché», or a 'meta-«arché»' -- a 'contra-thesis', or 'contra-«physis»', content, of new, previously unprecedented ontology, made up out of supplementary 'contra-«monads»', &/or of 'meta-«monads»', 'self-added' to the *original*, '«arché-arithmos», by 'self-hybridizing «auto-aufheben» meta-«monad»-ization' [ $q_{xx}$ ] --

$$x^1 \text{ ---> } x^2 = xx = 'x \text{ "times" } x' = x[x] = 'x \text{ "of" } x' = -x = x + \Delta x = q_x + q_{xx} = q_x + q_y.$$

Then, there being *two* «arithmoi» present, the *two* can interact, and *combine*, to yield yet a *third, hybrid*, "'synthesis"' «arithmos», one *qual*itatively *contra*[ry]/*opposite to both* of the *earlier two*, by a 'complex-unifying, «allo-aufheben» hybrid-«monad»-ization' [ $q_{yx}$ ] [as well as a *fourth*, re-'self-hybridization' of the *previous self-hybridization* [ $q_{yy}$ ] ] --

$$[x + y]^1 \text{ ---> } [x + y]^2 = [x + y][x + y] = '[x + y] \text{ "times" } [x + y]' = [x + y][ [x + y] ] = '[x + y] \text{ "of" } [x + y]' = -[x + y] = [x + y + q_{yx} + q_{yy}].$$

Next, the 'intra-duality' of the *third* «arithmos», & of the *fourth* «arithmos», as well as their interactions with one another, & with the *first two* «arithmoi», can give rise to a further 'self-iteration' of this 'ontological-categorical combinatorics', of this formation of new -- 'self-hybrid' & 'mere hybrid' -- «arithmoi», of this 'onto-dynamasis' -- in short, of this dialectic.

'Intra-Duality' is an empirical, inductive universal.

'Intra-Duality', through its consequences, is encountered ubiquitously throughout *Nature*, including within the most-recent-to-irrupt *part* of *Nature* known to us, *its* most recent outgrowth/'self-extension', namely "'human Nature"'.

And that recurrent 'intra-duality' is the real driver of *the Dialectic of Nature*, of 'cosmological *meta-evolution*'; the real *generator* of *quanto-qualitative change* throughout our *cosmos*.

But how do we *explain* 'intra-duality'?

How do we account for its *universality*, drawing its myriad & *qualitatively diverse* «*species*» into a *unified* «*genos*»?

Why does 'intra-duality' exist at all? Why is its existence so "'necessary"', ineluctable, inescapable?

Why can't our *universe* be just *Boolean*:  $x[x] = x$  -- be just "'*simply reproductive*" of itself, a "*linear equilibrium*"?

Why must *it* be *difficult*, *nonlinear*, 'contra-Boolean', «*aufheben*», *dialectical* --  $x[x] \neq x$ ;  $x[x] = x + \Delta x$ ?

Let us not offer a technical explanation, at this stage.

Let us rather provide a “divination” of ‘intra-duality’, in the sense of a “discovery or conjecture about something obscure by means of intuitive perception, or insight”.

Our best “divination” of the answer to the questions put forward above is close to Hegel’s answer, now some **200** years old --

Finite things “contain” their own **non**-being, their own “**self**-negation”, their own “self-negativity”, their own ‘**not-ness**’, within themselves, from their birth, and as an **inalienable** part of themselves.

Their ‘**is-ness**’ also contains their ‘**is-not-ness**’.

The moment that their life begins, is the moment that their death also begins.

Their agency/‘subject-ness’, and their ‘object-ness’, form two sides of their one “**dialectical eventivity**” -- two sides that do not ‘co-in-[c][s]ide’/“agree”.

Their ‘subject-ness’, their ‘subject-side’, acting upon their ‘object-ness’, their ‘object-side’, does **not simply reproduce** “them”, the “wholeness”, the “one-ness”, of their two sides, *a la* Boole’s “fundamental law”,  $x[x] = x^2 = x$ .

On the contrary, their ‘subject-aspect’, acting upon their ‘object-aspect’, typically **reproduces** them **expandedly**, in their “wholeness”, yes, but together with an **increment** of otherness -- together with a ‘supplementary opposite’ “gain” --

$$x[x] = x^2 = x + \Delta x.$$

If we consider the “being” that is the universe as a whole in these terms, then the **non**-self/**non**-being “contained” in/by such a being might be construed “synchronically”, as meaning that it “contains” the space-content presently outside of itself; that that outside somehow “re-enters” that being’s/that [it]self’s “in-side”, from without it.

But when it comes to the cosmos as *the totality*, which, by definition, has no outside, this supposed “outer”, “synchronic” source of ‘intra-duality’, by definition, does not exist, unless we mean by it non-existence itself/in-general: a kind of abstract, absolute nothingness as the non-existence that is [the] outside [of] the universe, i.e., the outside of everything.

A more apt rendering sees that internal otherness, or ‘self-antithesis’, which such a being/“[it]self” presently, hiddenly “contains”, as a “diachronic”, temporal, historical matter.

Such a rendering sees ‘intra-duality’ in terms of “seeds”; in terms of a present, “occult” [hidden] potential, a potential for future, actual, exoteric expression of ‘supplementary otherness’; in terms of a present potential to produce future, “supplementary”, opposition; in terms of a present potential for future new ontology, for future ‘supplementary being’, new being, “supplementary” to this present “[it]self”/being, that is, at present, yet to be born[e], yet to irrupt, “out” from the “in”[side] of this present “[it]self”/being. ■