Confusing Figureheads for Fountainheads

Physical reality is not what is being commonly discussed in Western civilized discourse.
Logical, pseudo-reality or semantic reality is the default Western discursive reality.
What is the difference?

The physical reality of our actual natural experience is 'relational'. That is, our experience is of inclusion within a transforming relational continuum that gathers within itself relational features which are NOT independent of the relational continuum, but local organizing activities within it. These local organizing activities manifestly local, visible and tangible, as with a storm-cell of organizing activity within a flow.

Organizing is a familiar relational experience which is situationally [epigenetically] induced. Within the relational dynamic in which we are situationally included, an obvious need actualizes our creative potentials and we 'rise to the occasion' so that our actions are the 'genetic expression' actualized by epigenetic/situational inductive influence. 'Organizations' as 'things-in-themselves' are something entirely different and instead of associating with a feeling of freely rising to the occasion and letting our creative potentials blossom forth to fillfull and satisfy the situationally shaped receptacle, 'organization' as a fixed structure dictates, drives and directs the actions of its participants.

It is noun-and-verb Indo-European/scientific language-and-grammar that reduces organizing activity to organizations. Our semantic formulations focus in on local organizing activity and impute to it, logically [i.e. psychologically] independent existence. This interposing of being on relational activity opens the way for the construction of semantic realities featuring independent things and the actions of independent things. In other words, local organizing activity within the flow-continuum is psychologically separated out of its purely relational inhabitant-habitat non-duality and psychologically endowed with independent being and with

1

the notional internal powers of authoring its own development and its own actions [epigenetic inductive influence is exorcised in this psychological revisualizing (a mind-draw referred to as the banishment of the Goddess whose rightful rule was usurped by Yahweh, the upstart son)].

In order to make logical 'sense' or 'ensure logical consistency' in the simplified view in which the natural primacy of situational relations is psychologically ignored, it is necessary, in the case of those local organizing activities we call 'organisms', to impute the existence of internal centres of intelligence and purpose to explain the sourcing of their now-independent and thus self-authoring development and behaviour.

The unfolding fortunes of an agricultural community, as a local organizing activity within the transforming relational continuum, are in no way 'under the control' of the members of the community. Global relational dynamics [epigenetic influences] are not only orchestrating and shaping the dynamics in the community, they are the source of this local organizing activity. As Emerson puts it in 'The Method of Nature', the genius of nature not only inhabits the organism, it creates it.

In earlier times in agricultural communities, a harvest king and/or harvest queen was selected as a 'token' or 'figurehead' of the divine forces that were shaping the unfolding [largely agricultural] fortunes of the community. The people could invest in these tokens, their hopes and aspirations for a safe passage through the dark and dying days of winter and a healthy spring renewal that would bring back abundance and prosperity.

In the physical reality of our actual experience, there is no doubt that a local centre of organizing activity lacks 'control' over its unfolding fortunes within the non-dual inhabitant-habitat relational dynamic, since the inhabitant [as a local organizing activity] is not only shaped by the habitat [the transforming relational continuum] it is situationally included in but is engendered by it.

Once the local organizing activity is RE-presented, psychologically, as an independently existing organization/system/thing-in-itself, there is no longer any acknowledgement of its susceptibility to outside-inward epigenetic influences that are innately 'beyond its control', and the constructed 'semantic reality' which RE-presents the local organizing activity as an independent organizational system, is seen as being fully and solely responsible for its own development and actions and thus fully and solely responsible for its unfolding good or bad fortunes.

In this psychological re-mapping of the relational physical terrain, logical consistency demands that there must be internal authorship of the organizational machine-dynamic that will be responsible for the unfolding good or bad fortunes of the independent mechanical organization.

The [psycho-]logical construction of a hierarchical leadership structure is a popular thinking tool for keeping this logical model of the independent organization 'hanging together'. The intelligence and purpose of the leadership thus plays the same sort of role of harvest queen and/or harvest king. The people participating in the local organizing activity can invest their hopes and aspirations in their political leaders, who compete to be crowned as supreme leader by expounding on how they will be able to slay the dragons and ensure abundance in the community's unfolding fortunes.

As with the harvest kings and queens, political leaders are figureheads rather than fountainheads. They are not in control of the unfolding fortunes of a local organizing activity [aka 'community' or 'organization'] any more than the 'genes' in an organism are in control of the unfolding fortunes of the organism; i.e. 'situation' is in a natural precedence over 'intention' in the non-duality of intention [genetic expression] and situation [epigenetic inductive influence that actualizes genetic expression]; e.g;

As is described by Nijhout, genes are 'not self-emergent,' that

is genes can not turn themselves on or off. If genes can't control their own expression, how can they control the behavior of the cell? Nijhout further emphasizes that genes are regulated by 'environmental signals.' Consequently, it is the environment that controls gene expression. Rather than endorsing the Primacy of DNA, we must acknowledge the Primacy of the Environment!

Bruce Lipton, 'The New Biology'

The troubles begin when leaders as figureheads perceive themselves as fountainheads; i.e. when they begin to believe that their infusions of intelligence and purpose, which they drive and direct from out of the control centre of the independent community-machine] are the full and sole causal authoring influences that are determining the unfolding fortunes of the community. I.e. the troubles begin when the leaders and their followers believe the leaders to be the authors of good or bad unfolding fortunes and being praising and rewarding or reproaching and punishing them for whatever unfolds 'on their watch'; i.e. this is where the buffoonery begins.

The notion of 'leadership having control' over the unfolding fortunes of a local organizing activity exists only in the logical 'semantic realities' constructed using noun-and-verb language-and-grammar. It is not that the so-called 'intelligence and purpose' of leaders and followers do not 'make a difference', ... it is that they [intelligence and purpose] do not even exist in the physical reality of our actual experience. How could they? They are the notional properties of notional 'independent beings', abstractions that appear only in the RE-presentations of languages with noun-and-verb architecture.

In relational languages, local organizing activities are relational forms in the transforming relational continuum; i.e. they are not 'independent things-in-themselves' that are synthetically animated by verbs and grammar. And relational forms do not have development and behaviour directed from out of the central interior of their 'independent being'. As

Emerson says, relational forms are inhabited by the genius of nature which is at the same time engendering the relational forms in the manner that the flow of the atmosphere inhabits the storm-cell and is at the same time engendering it. Only if we were to impute 'independent existence' to the storm-cell would we be logically obliged to add to that lie by imputing the existence of an internal authoring/animating source responsible for its development and behaviour; i.e. imputing the existence of an internal seat of 'intelligence' and 'purpose' as a director of development and behaviour is a logical imperative in order to make sense out of the initial imputing of 'independent being' to a relational form in the transforming relational continuum.

Independent being is not supported by the physical reality of our actual, natural, relational experience. Sure, we can use quantitative measurements to limit the spatial extension of a storm-cell to agree with our visual observations, and thus abstract the notion of its local independent existence, ... but our intuition understands full well that the storm-cell organizing activity is actualized as a genetic expression by the inductive influence of the epigenetic field in which it is situationally included. To use noun-and-verb language to measure and limit it and endow it with independent thing-in-itself being is idealization, ... pragmatic idealization that can be useful to discourse, but is nevertheless idealization that gets its convenience and economy of thought by ignoring the natural primacy of relations over things in our actual physical experience.

The noun-and-verb language-and-grammar that we use to construct logical 'semantic realities' based on notional 'independently-existing things-in-themselves' constitutes 'psychological conditioning' that puts us into an alternative reality that is radically unlike the physical reality of our actual experience. As Nietzsche observes;

In its origin language belongs in the age of the most rudimentary form of psychology. We enter a realm of crude

fetishism when we summon before consciousness the basic presuppositions of the metaphysics of language, in plain talk, the presuppositions of reason. Everywhere it sees a doer and doing; it believes in will as the cause; it believes in the ego, in the ego as being, in the ego as substance, and it projects this faith in the ego-substance upon all things — only thereby does it first create the concept of "thing." Everywhere "being" is projected by thought, pushed underneath, as the cause; the concept of being follows, and is a derivative of, the concept of ego. In the beginning there is that great calamity of an error that the will is something which is effective, that will is a faculty. Today we know that it is only a word.

Twilight of the Idols

The intelligence and purpose of independent individuals and independent sovereign states are logical concepts that we are logically obliged to invent once we have invented independent being to substitute for relational organizing activity within the transforming relational continuum. We are obliged to invent them because the local organizing activity which we have turned into an independent mechano-logical system needs to have something inside it to drive and direct its development and actions now that we are no longer acknowledging that the relational influence of Nature is not only inhabiting it but engendering it [i.e. as in the non-duality of epigenetic inductive influence that actualizes genetic expression wherein the local, visible and material manifesting of genetic expression is secondary appearance]

This Western worldview that depicts relational forms in the transforming relational continuum as 'independent mechano-logical systems-in-themselves' leaves the notional internal leadership who are using their notional 'intelligence' and 'purpose' to drive and direct the mechano-logical system, 'no slack' in the determining of the unfolding fortunes of the notional 'independent mechano-logical organization'. The inherently beyond-local-control epigenetic inductive influ-

ence that both inhabits and engenders the local organizing activity is 'deleted from the picture' in the same fell stroke as the imposing of a seat of intelligence and purpose in the central interior of the notional 'thing-in-itself'. In other words, if one chooses to use noun-and-verb language-and-grammar to reduce the non-duality of relational forms in a transforming relational continuum to the dualist notion of a collection of 'independently-existing material objects/organisms/systems, one is forced to invent internal seats of 'intelligence and purpose' within the notionally 'independent' material entities to compensate for the disappearance [in the thing-based semantic model] of the epigenetic/situational inductive influence.

What matters now [after the reduction of relational organizing activity to 'independent mechano-logical being] is 'genetic expression' on its own, as in Darwinism [Lamarckism, on the other hand, assumes the primacy of epigenetic inductive influence that excites and actualizes genetic expression]. In the Darwinist view, 'intention' prevails over 'situation', in contradiction to our physical experience and in contradiction to psychological experiment wherein situation demonstrably prevails over 'intention' [e.g. the Milgram and Zimbardo experiments as also affirmed by common experience].

Do Empires go into decline because of faulty leadership even though the people still have 'the right stuff'? Or are Empires local relational organizing activity that is in a non-dual relationship with the global relational social dynamic? Is the performance of the hitter in reciprocal complement with the performance of the fielding? Can improvements in fielding lead to the decline of established high-performing hitters? Perhaps the epigenetic inductive influence immanent in the fielding actualizes the hitting, as in a field-effect transistor, and as in Lamarck's understanding of evolution [relational transformation] wherein *les fluides incontenables* which are everywhere at the same time are exciting genetic expression

that manifests as the development and organizing activity of *les fluides contenables.*

There are some very basic issues/questions here that are relevant to an understanding of 'leadership'.

We would not even consider 'leadership' in the terms we do [in Western society] were it not for our noun-and-verb language-and-grammar architecture which, as Nietzsche says in the above citation, recasts the relational world of our physical experience in terms of the independent existence, actions and interactions of notional local things-in-themselves. This 're-packaging' of the reality of our physical experience as a logical 'semantic reality' was initially a religious belief tradition in Western European society; e.g. in the teaching of the Christian Church, as in this excerpt from the Vatican Archives;

> "*Man is rational and therefore like God; he is created with free will and is master over his acts.*
>
> *.*
>
> *1731 Freedom is the power, rooted in reason and will, to act or not to act, to do this or that, and so to perform deliberate actions on one's own responsibility. By free will one shapes one's own life. Human freedom is a force for growth and maturity in truth and goodness; it attains its perfection when directed toward God, our beatitude.*
>
> *.*
>
> *1732 As long as freedom has not bound itself definitively to its ultimate good which is God, there is the possibility of choosing between good and evil, and thus of growing in perfection or of failing and sinning. This freedom characterizes properly human acts. It is the basis of praise or blame, merit or reproach.*
>
> The Catholic Catechism.

This idealization of the 'independent being' who is fully and solely responsible for his/her own actions and results, which is the basis for 'rewards' and 'punishments' in Western

society, derives from noun-and-verb language architecture. Indigenous aboriginals with relational language architectures never evolved a moral judgement [of independent beings] based 'retributive' justice system [they did not have the concept of 'independent being']. They instead evolved 'restorative justice' since it is impossible in a transforming relational continuum, to isolate first cause authorship and responsibility' for unfolding 'results' ["It takes a whole community to raise a (whatever)"]. However, the isolating of first cause is quickly and easily done when one is using noun-and-verb language-and-grammar architecture which assumes [or invents] 'things-in-themselves' as the basic operative units.

Noun-and-verb language-and-grammar with its assumption [invention] of 'things-in-themselves' as the basic operative units is also 'where Newtonian science came from', as linguistic research has shown;

"It is sometimes stated that Newtonian space, time, and matter are sensed by everyone intuitively, whereupon relativity is cited as showing how mathematical analysis can prove intuition wrong. This, besides being unfair to intuition, is an attempt to answer offhand question (1) put at the outset of this paper, to answer which this research was undertaken. Presentation of the findings now nears its end, and I think the answer is clear. The offhand answer, laying the blame upon intuition for our slowness in discovering mysteries of the Cosmos, such as relativity, is the wrong one. The right answer is: Newtonian space, time, and matter are no intuitions. They are receipts from culture and language. That is where Newton got them." – Benjamin Whorf, 'The Relation of Habitual Thought and Behavior to Language'

Meanwhile, we are living in a now-globalized Western society which has elevated logic-based [independent being-based] 'semantic reality' to our default 'operative reality' so that 'leadership' as the token 'internal central source of 'intelligence' and 'purpose'' that is purportedly responsible for the

'genetic expression' [assertive actions] of the 'independent [mechano-logical] organization', is taken to be more than tokens-as-figureheads in which to invest one's hopes and aspirations for favourable unfolding fortunes.

In the relational worldview, such unfolding fortunes are inherently beyond our/anyone's control. That is, 'leadership' is MISconstrued as the internal, centrally sourcing 'fountain-head' of 'intelligence' and 'purpose' that is responsible for the 'genetic expression' [material performance] of the 'independent [mechano-logical] organization'.

The current campaigning of the two candidates for election to the seat of Supreme power that sits in the internal centre of the most powerful 'independently-existing political organization' in the world, the 'United States', build their respective 'semantic realities' on this basis, as if they shall perform as 'fountainheads' rather than 'figureheads', promising to slay the dragons and to assure the coming of prosperity and greatness, as if this notional mechano-logical organizational machine were capable of fulfilling whatever intentions it might ambitiously dream of; i.e. as if its 'intentions' as an 'independent organizational entity' could prevail over the epigenetic influences associated with its situational inclusion in a transforming relational continuum. Meanwhile, in the relational view [and in the physical reality of our actual experience], epigenetic inductive influence inhabits and engenders local organizing activity; i.e. in the relational physical reality that logic-based semantic reality 'wallpapers over the top of' with its convenient, economy-of-thought delivering reductions to 'independent being', epigenetic/situational influence prevails over genetic/intentional expression.

What is real?

Let there be no mistake. I am questioning the realness of semantic reality which we, in Western society are employing as our operative reality. I am saying that it is NOT physical reality, it is merely a notional independent-thing based

'logical RE-presentation of the physical reality of our actual relational experience'. It does not 'make sense' to leave in the lurch and otherwise forget about the fact that we have reduced, semantically, relational forms in the transforming relational continuum to idealized 'independently-existing local organizational systems-in-themselves'. our language-and-grammar does this to those local organizing activities we call 'communities' and 'organizations' and 'states'. Those reductions of the relational features of our physically real experience to logical elements that we use to construct the logical propositions of our 'semantic realities', impact us psychologically (a psychological impact that brings schizo-phrenia to mind).

If we are in a hurricane and turn on the television news and see the hurricane (satellite imagery) out there in front of us on the screen and listen to people talking about 'the hurricane' as if it is a thing-in-itself [personifying it as an independently-existing system-in-itself that is developing and acting on its own], we have to choose between 'realities'. As Schroedinger observes, the world is given only once, not one perceived and one experienced.

> *The world is given to me only once, not one existing and one perceived. Subject and object are only one. The barrier between them cannot be said to have broken down as a result of recent experience in the physical sciences, for this barrier does not exist.*

<div align="right">Erwin Schroedinger</div>

On the television are 'REPRESENTATIONS' of the one world in which we are situationally included; i.e. the one transforming relational continuum. Then there is our physical experience of relational situational inclusion in the world. There is only one physical reality. The RE-presentation based reality is a logical element based 'semantic reality' that we may choose to use as our 'operative reality' and this is the reality used by Western 'leadership'. This RE-presentation is

achieved by using noun-and-verb constructs to impute fixed thing-in-itself 'identity' to relational forms in the transforming relational continuum. In this pseudo-object-based reality where we speak in terms of 'independent entities' and 'what they do', we may construct a representation in which we see and talk about Saddam doing things we don't like in the Middle East. We may have video-footage that we present on the television screen in front of us. If we send in a drone and watch as Saddam [and nearby passersby] are eliminated, are we, as voyeur [excluded] observers involved 'physically'?

In a logical representation where the forms that are eliminated are independently-existing material entities that reside, operate and interact in a space/habitat that is notionally 'independent' of the inhabitants that reside, operate and interact within it, we are not physically involved. On the other hand, in the physical reality of our actual relational experience, our relations with one another and the common living space are simultaneously transformed [relations transform in the continuing present and relational fields (gravity, electromagnetism) are 'everywhere at the same time'].

By the principle of Occam's razor, physicists and philosophers prefer ideas that can explain the same phenomena with the fewest assumptions. In this case you can construct a perfectly valid theory by positing the existence of certain relations without additionally assuming individual things. So proponents of ontic structural realism say we might as well dispense with things and assume that the world is made of [relational-spatial] structures, or nets of relations.

Meinard Kuhlmann, 'What is Real',
Scientific American, August 2013

Which is the real reality? Is it the transforming of relations? [McLuhan suggests that the logical view in terms of material dynamics matters little and the transforming of the relational medium is the 'real' message]. Or, is the real reality constrained to the abrupt discontinuation of assertive actions

aka 'deed-doing' of those "independent material entities" that are killed?

If Saddam has a relative living across the street from the person who launched the drone, that person would probably be 'watching his back'. In fact, a huge number of relations are simultaneously transformed in the event of an individuals death. In some cultures, that's who the individual 'is'; i.e. the bundle of relational influences that he is constituted by, as come together in his 'cosmic fetalization'; i.e. the outside-inward relational-situational 'epigenetic' influences inductively actualize the inside-outward asserting 'genetic expression' aka the individual as a relational form in the transforming relational continuum [an inhabitant-habitat non-duality]. Viewing the individual as an intention-driven independent thing-in-itself doer-of-deeds is the logical 'semantic reality' version of the individual. This simple, non-relational view is convenient and delivers 'economy of thought' [Mach] that the relational view does not.

Because the logic-based 'semantic reality' is so subjectively selective and incomplete, logical propositions, which can be proved 'true', fail to capture what is 'really going on' in such interventions, and the physically real relational dynamics that accompany the intervention which were not addressed in the logical proposition [the removal of Saddam] are termed 'externalities'. The propositions of logic-based 'semantic reality' are radically subjective and incomplete. Science will affirm the 'truth' of the logical proposition that a certain pharmaceutical remedy will 'eliminate your headache' but such 'truth' does not speak to the 125 'side-effects' or 'externalities' that associate with the intervention, as associate with the transforming of relations. Which is the 'real' 'reality', the elimination of the headache? Or, the transforming of relations that associates with it that manifest as externalities?

The 'externalities' associated with the intervention to eliminate Saddam have overshadowed the elimination of

Saddam. Likewise, if the intervention to eliminate a headache associates with cancer-engendering externalities, the decision to employ logic-based 'semantic reality' as our operative reality to guide and direct our individual and collective behaviour appears suspect. In fact, it is the source of what Bohm terms 'incoherence' in our noun-and-verb, language-and-grammar using Western society, and points to the need for a 'relational language' that avoids reducing the relational inhabitant-habitat non-duality, to a one-sided dualist substitute which depicts 'inhabitants' as independently existing material entities that are fully and solely responsible for their own development and behaviour.

Western leadership employs logic-based semantic reality as its operative reality in spite of unaddressed externalities that are over-shadowing the fulfilling of logical goals due to constructing "reality" by reducing relational forms in the transforming relational continuum [a non-duality] to the dualism of notional 'independently-existing material entities-in-themselves and their actions within a notional absolute space and absolute time measuring/containing reference frame. Western political leaders are continuing to employ a logic-based 'semantic reality' as their operative reality in spite of the rising incoherence associated with unaddressed 'externalities'; e.g.

> So I reject the notion that the American moment has passed. I dismiss the cynics who say that this new century cannot be another when, in the words of President Franklin Roosevelt, we lead the world in battling immediate evils and promoting the ultimate good.
> I still believe that America is the last, best hope of Earth. We just have to show the world why this is so. ...
> Remarks of Senator Barack Obama to the Chicago Council on Global Affairs, April 23, 2007

The elimination of evil and the promotion of good leads to logic-based interventions that trigger unaddressed 'exter-

nalities' because of the artificiality of reducing relational forms in the transforming relational continuum to idealized 'local, material things-in-themselves which are [seen as being] fully and solely responsible for their own actions, as in both Western religious traditional belief and as in Western mainstream scientific realism.

Conclusions:
The Western concept of leadership is built dependently on the reduction of relational organizing activities to notional 'organizations', logical machines that 'do deeds' as if driven and directed from the centre of their own interiors by an internal source of intelligence and purpose.

The hole or empty seat into which a s/elected source of intelligence and purpose slots into is what is understood as the 'leadership opening' which political candidates compete for. The 'followers' of the leader commit to becoming a logical machine under the direction of the 'leadership', and the 'leaders' promise to drive and direct this believing-follower based machinery to, for example; "lead the world in battling immediate evils and promoting the ultimate good" [Barack Obama].

The world seen in terms of a collection of independently-existing material entities which are fully and solely responsible for their own development and behaviour is a logic-based "semantic reality", which radically departs from the physical reality of our actual experience of situational inclusion within a transforming relational continuum.

Western style leadership, which employs logic-based "semantic reality" as the "operative reality" intervenes into the transforming relational continuum, as if it "really were" a collection of independently existing material entities residing, operating and interacting in a space/habitat that is notionally "independent" of the inhabitants that reside, operate and interact within it.

This "pragmatic idealization" is convenient and delivers great "economy of thought", but it is not "the physically real world of our experience". As a result, leadership that treats it as the real world fails to address the relational complexities of physical reality and thus such leadership"s over-simplistic logical proposition based interventions, which are inherently subjective and incomplete, incur unanticipated and unaddressed "externaliities" which are "physically real".

These "externalities" that arise from the "disconnect" between a "semantic operative reality" and the physical reality of our relational experience are overshadowing the logical, rational, scientific "successes" as proposed within logic-based "semantic reality"; e.g. "DDT kills mosquitoes", "this pill eliminates headaches", "this military intervention eliminates unwanted foreign leaders". All of these logical propositions can be fulfilled and proven true. However, all of them are radically subjective and incomplete in that they fail to capture the relational complexity within which the interventions transpire. When logical propositions are employed to drive and direct our behaviour, unaddressed externalities are incurred. That is, logical propositions are tautological abstractions that say nothing of the relational complexity of the physical reality of our actual natural experience.

> *The propositions of logic are tautologies (6.1), and hence say nothing (6.11). Any attempt to give content to logical propositions is misguided. That they are true shows itself in their structure, and this structure helps us to understand the formal properties of language and the world (6.12). We cannot express anything by means of logical propositions.*
>
> Wittgenstein

Western leadership, which is an artefact of imputing 'independent existence' to purely relational local organizing activity, RE-presents relational organizing in terms of 'organizations' semantically described as logical machinery that is

driven and directed by an internal central seat of 'intelligence' and 'purpose'. Such leadership is portrayed in Western society, as a dualist 'substitute' for the epigenetic inductive influence deriving from the transforming relational continuum [the energy-charged plenum aka 'universe']. Leadership is thus presented as the direct author of 'genetic expression' instead of epigenetic/situational influence. Attribution (credit and blame) for genetic expression (creative actions) is, in this Western view of leadership, ... seen as tracking back to, and being attributable to, the purported internal central sources of intelligence and purpose in the 'independent organization'; i.e. attribution for results is traced back to the Western conception of 'leadership', instead of to epigenetic/situational influence.

Western noun-and-verb language-and-grammar introduces the abstract concept of 'independent being' [noun-subject] in combination with action verbs to replace relational organizing activity within the transforming relational continuum. Within the semantically reified concept of 'organization', the 'leader' becomes the figurehead author of genetic expression. Harvest kings and harvest queens were selected in medieval pagan communities as 'stand-ins' or 'tokens' for epigenetic influences that impacted the unfolding fortunes of the community.

Unfortunately, Western science and Western religious belief conceives of these leadership figureheads as real fountainheads. This upgrade from the leader as figurehead to the leader as fountainhead derives from, and is sustained by ego;

> *In its origin language belongs in the age of the most rudimentary form of psychology. We enter a realm of crude fetishism when we summon before consciousness the basic presuppositions of the metaphysics of language, in plain talk, the presuppositions of reason. Everywhere it sees a doer and doing; it believes in will as the cause; it believes in the ego, in the ego as being, in the ego as substance, and it projects this faith in the ego-substance upon all things — only thereby*

does it first create the concept of 'thing.' Everywhere 'being' is projected by thought, pushed underneath, as the cause; the concept of being follows, and is a derivative of, the concept of ego. In the beginning there is that great calamity of an error that the will is something which is effective, that will is a faculty. Today we know that it is only a word.

Nietzsche, 'Twilight of the Idols'

The leader-as-fountainhead may truly believe that his intelligence and purpose [both abstract concepts that must be logically invented to make logical sense of the abstract concept of an 'independently-existing organism'] can determine a desired future state of affairs; e.g. "by promoting good and eliminating evil", ... however, logical interventions of this nature are subjective and incomplete and the real physical result is instead complex, relational 'externalities' that are unanticipated and unaddressed in the logic-based semantic realities that are employed by leaders-as-fountainheads as 'operative realities'.

What is presented here is a kind of collective cultural 'schizophrenia' which is so 'insulting' and 'ego-deflating' to the supporters of the culture-as-it-is, that it tends to be summarily dismissed. Leaders-as-figureheads who see themselves as leaders-as-fountainheads do not take kindly to the suggestion that their ego is inflating their purely symbolic powers to 'real powers'.

The followers of Western political leaders may encourage them in this insanity and help them to fulfill their logical propositions [at the cost of engendering massive unanticipated and unaddressed externalities], but just as in the case of harvest kings and harvest queens, leaders are merely tokens for Gods and Goddesses, ... figureheads rather than fountainheads. Therefore, mobilizing the forces of inside-outward asserting intention [genetic expression] in an attempt to over-ride the epigenetic inductive influence of relational

situation, …as Western leadership commonly does, is a non-starter in terms of physical reality. The unfolding fortunes of the community that is electing leaders that promise to 'make them great again' will continue to experience unfolding fortunes that are inductively actualized by the epigenetic fields of influence in which they are situationally included.

Among the most dangerous leaders are those whose egos are most confident as to the strength and wisdom in their 'intelligence and purpose' and who most firmly believe that leaders are fountainheads rather than figureheads, for it is those leaders who will be generating the most massive unanticipated externalities in the course of pursuing the fulfillment of logical objectives as arise within the semantic realities that they employ as their 'operative reality'.

Tags:
anarchy
philosophy
non-duality

Comments
LR   Thu, 09/29/2016 - 07:18
While I think it's sometimes useful and noble (and perhaps most importantly, more accurate and less sloppy) to use the principles you champion - such as those of Mach, Whorf, Bohm, etc. that you constantly bring up - I don't think that it's possible or sensible to attempt to communicate with language as if all of them were true and applicable all the time. That would destroy language.
But I think that even you are not employing them consistently. Sometimes you write like individual beings don't exist, and are merely a coalescing cluster of influences and processes already underway. And then in another breath you write about them as if they were absolutely individual, as in the subject of "among the

most dangerous leaders".
I would like to challenge you to express, in a single sentence, what your motivation for communicating (with strangers on sites such as this) is.

Anonymous   Thu, 09/29/2016 - 10:35
"That would destroy language."
Not willing to be a mouthpiece of the supermassive troll the author is, but that wouldn't be a bad idea to destroy language, and would cause some civilizational collapse like no other in history. But hey that's just pipedream idealism only leftist activists could rival. Not going to happen.

B   Thu, 09/29/2016 - 11:14
Question for Emile
When did you first start thinking along these lines?

emile   Thu, 09/29/2016 - 12:58
intuitively, distrust in fixed identity has been with me always
exposure to indigenous aboriginal (anarchist) views on identity (cosmic fetalizing) resonated, wherein inhabitant and habitat are understood in non-dual terms. physics findings further supported matter and field non-duality, and my own research into exception-ally performing teams (they let the relational dynamics they are included in inductively actualize their creative potentials, letting their identity 'flex' in the gap between the outside-inward epigen-etic/situational influences that they allow to inductively actualize their creative potentials aka 'genetic expression').
i realized over twenty years ago that noun-and-verb language was the artificial grounding for 'fixed identity' and that the ego 'got off' on the idea of seeing the self as an 'independent being' with God-like powers of jumpstart genetic expression driven and directed by the notion of one's locally, internally incipient 'intelligence' and 'will'.
exploring the philosophical literature showed up many others with the same understanding, going back to Heraclitus and Lao Tsu, but always resisted by our Western culture with its deep-rooted belief

in the 'Creation' of local, independent 'life forms' in an otherwise 'dead' universe, which continues to be the orthodox belief built into Western moral judgement based culture and Western mainstream science which searches for 'other forms of life "out there"', wandering around like ourselves in a dead universe and stuck here on the third rock out from the sun [no sense of cosmic inclusion and cosmic fetalization here, as there is in cultures with relational languages].

LR   Thu, 09/29/2016 - 11:13
Well, yeah, I wouldn't mind if language were caused to disappear entirely...I'm down for interactions based on touch, gesture and intuition.
But that's absolutely nowhere near likely happening, and in the meantime, I want to use language to interact with people to discuss values and methods for obtaining/protecting those values, and liberatory lifeways in general.
That's WHY I made the point to Emile that while I see some of his ideas as valuable, the overall approach negates that, in my view.

emile   Thu, 09/29/2016 - 12:34
how about; ... collapse in 'belief' in language content?
it is evident in our society that there is a 'collapse' in trust in politicians' promises [the content of the semantic realities they construct and promote], ... and there is a rising sense that political rhetoric is increasingly self-serving sprachspiel spoken for effect and without meaningful content-in-itself.
current US election campaign diatribes have reached a new high ['low'] in this regard. many people no longer give a shit as to what their candidate is saying; i.e. they accept it as bullshit intended to draw votes and focus instead on whether the candidate 'will think and act like me', so that there is underway, a collapse in 'belief in language'.
so, what is 'language' if there is no meaning in it which we can 'believe in' and depend on so we can use it to orchestrate and shape our individual and collective behaviours? the sounds are still there,

but they no longer have as much content based meaning, they are like the braying of the donkey or the purring or hissing of the cat, ... their message is no longer coming from content, only from situational context [NOT 'read my lips' but instead 'catch my drift']. the proverbial 85% of conveyed content-independent information coming from non-discursive aspects of linguistic communications is rising towards 100% as the content is also reduced to contextual inference in the manner of purrs and growls. trump's "blood coming out of her wherever" ...alludes to the unfolding situational-relational context and the word-content is not intended to have meaning in its own right; i.e. such words are used as sniffs and growls and all literal interpretations of content will be denied.

is this collapse of belief in 'language content-in-itself' the harbinger of civilizational collapse? [not saying that would be a bad thing]. it would appear to be a collapse in the unnaturally inverted elevating of 'reason' over 'intuition', and signs of restoring the natural elevating of experience-based intuition over reason. i.e. 'reason' is shared by way of language content, and 'reason' can no longer be the 'standard currency' of social organizing without being able to trust the content of language.

the point is that 'reason' doesn't work in the physically real relational world. it is too subjective and incomplete. so what if our reasoned logical propositions "we can kill mosquitoes with DDT" and "we can kill terrorists with drones" can be demonstrated to be 'true', ... "promoting good and eliminating evil" has diddly squat to do with the unfolding relational dynamics we are situationally included in, as our experience-based intuition is screaming out to us.

Anonymous   Fri, 09/30/2016 - 11:50
I second lr's challenge to Emile. I can guess what the response will be, if there even is one. Some verbose rendition of: "indigenous anarchists would never be so limited in their non-dualist language"

LR   Fri, 09/30/2016 - 13:40
He already DID respond, with one long (maybe even deliberately overlong) meandering sentence that I was barely able to parse, and

WAS NOT able to summon enough will to want to respond to, given that it didn't SAY anything I care about, despite its length.

emile   Sat, 10/01/2016 - 01:26
Isn't that the point? what you care about determines 'reality'?
it seems evident to me, and i am basing this on my 'actual experi-
ence' which may or may not have something in common with
yours, that groups of people construct 'semantic realities' on the
basis of what they care about and what feels good to them. i.e. is
there any 'real reality'? how would we know there was one, if there
was one?
*The fact of the matter is that the 'real world' is to a large extent
unconsciously built up on the language habits of the group . . . We see
and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the
language habits of our community predispose certain choices of
interpretation.* – Edward Sapir
reason and scientific thinking constructs semantic realities from
categories of independently-existing things and what these things do.
if i reason that people who are rejecting sovereigntism in the Middle
East and going instead with brotherhood or 'Caliphate', are on a
sensible tack and i am tired of the continuous murderous repression
authored by Euro-American colonial powers who are committed to
controlling the way people live in the middle east; i.e. under the
thumb of sovereign state dictators, ... Then there will be many people
who 'do not care for such views', just as you select which of my views
you care to engage with and which you do not, a piecemeal rather
than holistic inquiry.
I am not suggesting you should care [it is beside the point]. Like
Sapir, my view is that groups of people construct semantic realities
that they feel comfortable with. The semantic realities of the rich are
very different from the semantic realities of the poor, and likewise
the semantic realities of blacks tend to be very different from
semantic realities of whites.
Like indigenous aboriginals, and like Nietzsche and Emerson, I
don't believe that reason-based realities aka 'semantic realities' are
grounded in the physical reality of our actual experience. Semantic

realities are constructed by groups of people on the basis of what they 'care about' and how they like to interpret the same data.

I don't doubt that you have your circle of friends who co-construct a semantic reality that is consistent with what you care about and what your group feels comfortable with. As Sapir says; *We see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation.*

My essay and my comments are not made with the intention of promoting a reason-based reality aka 'semantic reality' that will attract a large enough following to compete with competing 'semantic realities' constructed by other groups.

My essay and my comments have the same orientation as Nietzsche's and indigenous aboriginals in rejecting the notional existence of a 'correct reality' that can be more or less closely approached by the different and competing semantic realities of different groups. There is no 'reality' other than the subjective and incomplete 'semantic realities' constructed by different groups on the basis of 'what they care about'.

In other words, 'reason' which is the stuff debated in rational group discussions aimed at settling 'what is the correct reality' is always going to be exposed to subjectivity and incompleteness which is putty in the hands of different people and different groups who co-construct a 'semantic reality' that is comfortable for them. The rich and powerful have their 'semantic reality' and the poor and marginalized have their 'semantic reality' and, just as you have challenged me, i challenge you to share your view on whether you believe there is a 'correct reality' and whether you and those who agree with you have been able to tie down and establish what the 'real reality' actually is; i.e. the one we should all be using as our common 'operative reality', as is the goal of politics.

Can you answer that question? Will you answer that question?

I will tell you my answer. There is no 'reality' other than the semantic realities constructed by groups of people on the basis of what they care about. I am with nietzsche and sapir; i.e. the language habits of our group or community predispose certain choices of

interpretation

Oh, that's right, ... You are a person who comments only on 'what you care about'. That is a wise move to keep from having to change the reality that you and others who share what you care about, have constructed by cherry-picking the subject data on the basis of what you care about and stone-walling the inputs of others who are bringing what they care about to the table, making the carefully reasoned constructions of semantic reality subjective and incomplete.

Cultures with relational languages that acknowledge the non-duality of physical phenomena put experience-based intuition into natural precedence over co-constructed 'semantic realities' which are put into competition with each other, the winner being selected by the principle of lafontaine; "*la raison du plus fort est toujours la meilleure*".

That is, cultures with relational languages acknowledge the impossibility of the existence of one 'real reality' that is a 'reality' for everyone. there is no such thing. there can be no such thing. therefore, the management of relational social dynamics must put intuition in precedence over reason and the idealized concept of an 'objective reality' need not come into it. as with animal and ecosystem communities, relational balance and harmony is a pre-literate form of understanding that does not require the mediation of a common 'reality'.

Reason' and 'semantic reality' are of secondary utility. to put them into unnatural precedence over intuition is Western civilization's great mistake, that is my intuition and Nietzsche's. think about it. 'reason' and 'semantic reality' would have it that Middle East rebels who are pushing back from centuries of Euro-American colonialism are doing it because they are 'evil'. While millions of colonizer-oppressed indigenous peoples would laugh out loud at such a bullshit 'semantic reality', it is the currently winning 'operative reality'. why? because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation

In this case, the language habits of the group in question support the notion of 'independently existing things-in-themselves' that come in two binary flavours; EITHER 'good' OR 'evil'.

If the savages laugh out loud at that, as would be entirely appropriate, they may themselves be branded as 'evil' by the binary reasoners. so, I ask you just one question [the rest are rhetorical] along with its corollary; "Do you believe that this thing we refer to as 'reality' really exists?". If not, why do we spend so much time debating whose version of 'reality' is the most correct? for extra points; "Was John Wilkes Booth really responsible for the death of Lincoln?" And, no, I am not throwing reason out the window with this line of commentary, ... simply contending, as Nietzsche and others have, that 'reason' is pragmatic idealization that is convenient and delivers economy of thought, but is inherently subjective and incomplete and is in no way homing in on a 'reality that describes the way things really are that should serve to orchestrate and shape our individual and collective behaviour [e.g. the reality that North Vietnam (Iraq etc.) is a clear and present danger that must be pre-emptively neutralized].

As you have pointed out, your reality is shaped by what you care about. In constructing our portrait of the terrain of reality, how do we separate the meaning in 'what is really going on out there' and the meaning that comes from the caring of the observer in what is going on out there? Maybe these are not two separate things. Maybe there is no reality 'on its own' without a conscious and caring observer. Did the universe exist before the arrival of human observers? Did the turbulent flow of the atmosphere exist before the storm-cell arrived to experience it? Or, are subject and object only one, as Schroedinger contends?

What point is there in putting semantic realities into competition and debating which 'best captures the true situation' if they are all innately subjective and incomplete and constructed by groups on the basis of what the people in the group care about? We are doing this all the time [what are forums for?], so we should have an answer, right?

LR   Sat, 10/01/2016 - 01:52
Answers for Emile
1."...i challenge you to share your view on whether you believe there is a 'correct reality' and whether you and those who agree with you

have been able to tie down and establish what the 'real reality' actually is"

I believe that there is, in one sense, an objective reality, but that we are limited in our abilities to perceive and understand it, so all we are left with are our own 'reality tunnels', as R.A.W. liked to say. I think there are ways we can measure the probable accuracy of these reality tunnels, which is another way of saying that I do NOT think that all realities are equally valid. In terms of getting to grips with the world, I quite like Karl Poppers 'falsificationist' approach. I probably don't apply it as consistently as I would like, but it seems to me to be on firmer ground than other methods.

2. "...Do you believe that this thing we refer to as 'reality' really exists? If not, why do we spend so much time debating whose version of 'reality' is the most correct? for extra points, was John Wilkes Booth really responsible for the death of Lincoln?..."

Yes, I believe that there is a reality independent of any consciousness. We debate the relative merits of our reality tunnels because we live in a society of constant power struggle, not in organic consentient communities of life. Language has become the key to power, and perhaps always was.

And yes, I believe that people are responsible for their actions, so even though a large number of factors led to JWB being in his firing position, he was the one that chose to pull the trigger. I asked you in another place about indeterminism, so I'll pick up on that based your answer there.

3. "how do we separate the meaning in 'what is really going on out there' and the meaning that comes from the caring of the observer in what is going on out there?"

We admit that we are fallible, and let our respective cares play out through our wills and our actions.

4. "Did the universe exist before the arrival of human observers?"
Of course it did. Existence precedes consciousness.

5. "Did the turbulent flow of the atmosphere exist before the storm-cell arrived to experience it? Or, are subject and object only one, as Schroedinger contends?"

I don't understand enough about this, and I choose to ignore it

because it does not seem relevant to a critique of social interactions. In fact, it seems like the same kind of science-as-religion that 'scientists' have been engaging in for at least the last 150 years.
6. "What point is there in putting semantic realities into competition and debating which 'best captures the true situation' if they are all innately subjective and incomplete and constructed by groups on the basis of what the people in the group care about?"
We each gain more information about the alternative semantic realities in order to shape our experience, our thoughts, and our decision. I've changed my mind on plenty of things by this method. Presumably you weren't born with a liking for Sapir-Whorf?
7. "We are doing this all the time [what are forums for?], so we should have an answer, right?"
Actually, the efficiency of forums in generating the kind of information I mentioned before is very low, due to entrenched positions, trolling, bad faith arguments, etc.
I've always been honest and straightforward towards you, and you towards me, despite our differences. But both of us are generally reviled on this site because we offer alternatives to the stale communist ideology that has pervaded the anarchist movement for its entire history.

emile   Sun, 10/02/2016 - 00:54
hi l r, thanks for your thoughtful, open comments.
as i see it, your views and my views on 'what is real' differ in the manner described by 'dualism and realism' (yours) and 'non-dualism and pragmatic idealization' (mine).
you express this directly in your comment number 4;
4. "Did the universe exist before the arrival of human observers?"
"Of course it did. Existence precedes consciousness."
there are those of us who intuit that the world is given just once, as a transforming relational continuum that consciousness is immanent within this one thing. in philosophies such as nietzsche's, the animating force, call it 'Der Wille zur Macht' or 'The Great Spirit' is an 'epigenetic, inductive influence that is actualizing genetic expression. as with the energized flow of the atmosphere which is induc-

tively actualizing, in the continuing present, the gathering and regathering of relational forms. thus, 'der Wille zur Macht' is the animating field that is, like fields of gravity and electromagnetism, 'everywhere at the same time'. This purely relational topology also shows up in Einstein's suggestion that 'field theory' is sufficient and that we don't need a separate 'matter theory', since 'matter' is simply a secondary, relational feature within the field. this view of inhabitant (matter) and habitat (field) as a non-duality, as in Nietzsche's, Mach's and Schroedinger's philosophy, also comes to me directly from experience-based intuition.

for example, in geophysics, it is evident that what we call 'continents' are relational features within a larger relational dynamic which is essentially unbounded or 'indefinitely deferred' [as in relational transformation that unfolds and enfolds into itself as in fluid flow]. that is, the 'transforming relational continuum' aka 'epigenetic inductive influence field that is actualizing genetic expression (local, visible, material forms) is 'one thing'. In this purely relational topology, a 'continent' is not really a 'thing-in-itself', it is 'only a word'. i.e. a continent is continually being melted down and continually accreting new solid substance, it is a 'relational activity' and it cannot have a persisting 'thing-in-itself' identity other than by the naming and defining conventions of noun-and-verb language-and-grammar, where we give 'the continents' names and define them by measurements [as if we have an absolute space and time reference grid that gives our measurements absolute defining powers]. then we construct semantic realities such as 'Africa and North America are drifting apart' and 'The Pacific Plate is colliding with the North American plate'. as John Stuart Mill asserted; "every definition implies an axiom, that in which we affirm the existence of the object defined".

One can visualize 'the continents drifting apart' and 'the plates colliding' on the surface of a flat earth [on diagrams on flat paper pages] but such visualization 'doesn't work' within a fluid spherical space wherein things which are drifting apart are, at the same time, drifting towards each other; i.e. 'divergence' and 'convergence' are not two separate processes within a spherical space but are a non-duality as in 'relational transformation'. Convection cells are

another exemplar of non-duality; i.e. they are variations in the relational structure of a fluid space; i.e. the doughnut-shaped [toroidal] flowing only appears to be a 'thing-in-itself'; i.e. it is instead variations in a continually transforming relational flow. It is an 'activity' rather than a 'thing-that-does-stuff' and only in a language with noun-and-verb architecture is an 'activity' replaced, notionally, with 'being' [a notional independently-existing thing-in-itself] plus a verb. Nietzsche uses the example of 'lightning flashes'. The imputing of 'being' that authors action to a relational activity gives a psychological impression that instead of the animating influence being non-local, non-visible and non-material as in a 'field' that is 'everywhere at the same time', rescues our thinking from the uncertainty of indefinite deferral of the animating source, and allows us to think in terms of local causal agency.

This 'sprachspiel' is convenient and it delivers 'economy of thought' and in my terms (and Mach's et al) it is 'pragmatic idealization'. Of course, my experience based intuition informs that if a group of bullies set up relational social tensions that open up all kinds of opportunity space for selected cronies and suffocate selected others, one of those who is oppressed by hit tolerance threshold and erupt in violence. To depict this 'relational activity' in terms of 'being-plus-verb', the rebel exploded, as Western semantic reality construction does and as Western justice does, is 'making a fountainhead out of a figurehead'; i.e. the source of the violence does not jump-start within the rebel, it is sourced by the relational tensions that associate with imbalance in access to the essential resources of our common living space. Our experience-based intuition would have us understand that replacing an activity within a relational space with 'being-plus-verb' is a convenient, 'pragmatic idealization' which, meanwhile, departs radically from the physical reality of our actual in-the-now relational experience.

meanwhile, in our Western society, the standard practice is to equate 'semantic constructions' such as 'the man erupted in violence', LITERALLY, as if we could lift the man out of the complex of relations he is in, place him inside of an absolute space and absolute time measuring/reference frame, and capture his movements

relative to the absolute frame as if the source of his movements derived exclusively from his own interior. this may be convenient, pragmatic idealization but it is sure as hell not 'reality' that jibes with the physical reality of our actual relational experience. we are dropping out the inductive influence of relational dynamics and presenting a purely mechanical RE-presentation of 'what is real'. so, let's be sure that we don't confuse the 'semantic realities' we construct by replacing relational activities with beings-plus-verbs, for the physical reality of our actual experience; i.e. as Mach says;

"Purely mechanical phenomena do not exist. The production of mutual accelerations in masses is, to all appearances, a purely dynamical phenomenon. But with these dynamical results are always associated thermal, magnetic, electrical, and chemical phenomena, and the former are always modified in proportion as the latter are asserted. On the other hand, thermal, magnetic, electrical, and chemical conditions also can produce motions. Purely mechanical phenomena, accordingly, are abstractions, made, either intentionally or from necessity, for facilitating our comprehension of things". …

"We … should beware lest the intellectual machinery, employed in the representation of the world on the stage of thought, be regarded as the basis of the real world."

Let's be clear. noun-and-verb constructs are depictions of 'purely mechanical phenomena'. they are depictions of 'what independent things do' as if in an operating space that is independent of the 'independent things' that reside, operate and interact within it. such mechanics do not exist, … they are 'pragmatic idealizations'. there is no such thing as 'continents drifting apart' and there is not such thing as 'plates/continents colliding [pure mechanical phenomena]. PURELY MECHANICAL PHENOMENA DO NOT EXIST. WE SHOULD BEWARE LEST THE INTELLECTUAL MACHINERY, EMPLOYED IN THE REPRESENTATION OF THE WORLD ON THE STAGE OF THOUGHT, BE REGARDED AS THE BASIS OF THE REAL WORLD." – ERNST MACH.

my experience-based intuition affirms this rejection of the 'reality' of 'purely mechanical phenomena'. when we move things, we simultaneously transform field [relational influence] and when we

transform field [relational influence], we simultaneously move things.

'semantic reality' based on subject-verb-predicate constructs depicts 'purely mechanical phenomena' or 'what things do' as if in a non-participating operating theatre/containing space, which is impossible. if the storm-cell is, as we say, 'growing larger and stronger', this is just our subjective focus on what is local, visible and tangible 'mechanized' and put in terms of 'what some thing is doing', when what we are actually experiencing is situational inclusion within a transforming relational dynamic.

you say;

3. "how do we separate the meaning in 'what is really going on out there' and the meaning that comes from the caring of the observer in what is going on out there?"

We admit that we are fallible, and let our respective cares play out through our wills and our actions."

if you and your group are angry at a long list of others and embark on a program to take them out with drones [that is what you 'care about'] and each of them has 50 to 100 friends whose behaviours will be inductively actualized to retaliate in some way, is your 'doer-of-deeds' report on progress in eliminating your list of enemies meaningful? or would you say that the 'externalities' that are engendered by your drone interventions which involve thousands of people relationally entangled with your targeted victims who you don't know and don't care about, speak more to the physical reality of your actual experience?

every intervention inductively actualizes relational transformation that you can't possibly know, so what do your rational plans; e.g. to eliminate those on your hit list, have to do with the 'physical reality of your actual experience'? as McLuhan has pointed out, very little; i.e. the transforming relational medium is the message.

you say;

4. "Did the universe exist before the arrival of human observers?"

"Of course it did. Existence precedes consciousness."

The belief that the existence of matter preceded consciousness and that consciousness developed within complex material 'life-forms',

dividing the world into 'inorganic' and 'organic' realms stands in stark opposition to the understanding that 'the world is given only once' and that the animating influence in immanent in energy-charged plenum [Bohm, Mach et al]. This debate cropped up in the early 1900's in regard to how to interpret Marxist 'material dialectic', and Lenin wrote a book on it, 'Materialism and Emiprio-Criticism for the express purpose of purging the Macheans from the revolutionary collective.

Nikolai Bukharin (1888-1938), a Marxist theoretician and primary contributor to the materialist 'New Economic Policy' (NEP), summed it up this way;

Organic nature grew out of dead nature; living nature produced a form capable of thought. First, we had matter, incapable of thought; out of which developed thinking matter, man. If this is the case we know it is, from natural science is plain that matter is the mother of mind; mind is not the mother of matter. Children are never older than their parents. 'Mind' comes later, and we must therefore consider it the offspring, and not the parent existed before the appearance of a thinking human; the earth existed long before the appearance of any kind of 'mind' on its surface. In other words, matter exists objectively, independently of 'mind.' But the psychic phenomena, the so-called 'mind,' never and nowhere exists without matter, were never independent of matter. Thought does not exist without a brain; desires are impossible unless there is a desiring organism other words: psychic phenomena, the phenomena of consciousness, are simply a property of matter organised in a certain manner, a 'function' of such matter.

Of course, the Macheans in Russia such as Bogdanov, held that matter was a secondary phenomenon, ... a view that set Einstein on the road to 'general relativity'. Clearly, there is an entire cultural worldview that pivots from this question of consciousness and matter, which comes before the other, and Lenin's book was to dispel the Machean view; In Lenin's clearly expressed line of argument in *Materialism and Empirio Criticism*;

Bazarov, Bogdanov, Yushkevich, Valentinov, Chernov16 and other Machians. I shall use this latter term throughout as a synonym for "empirio-criticist" because it is shorter and simpler and has already

acquired rights of citizenship in Russian literature. That Ernst Mach is the most popular representative of empirio-criticism today is universally acknowledged in philosophical literature,17 while Bogdanov's and Yushkevich's departures from "pure" Machism are of absolutely secondary importance, as will be shown later.

The materialists, we are told, recognise something unthinkable and unknowable — "things-in-themselves" — matter "outside of experience" and outside of our knowledge. They lapse into genuine mysticism by admitting the existence of something beyond, something transcending the bounds of "experience" and knowledge. When they say that matter, by acting upon our sense-organs, produces sensations, the materialists take as their basis the "unknown," nothingness; for do they not themselves declare our sensations to be the only source of knowledge? The materialists lapse into "Kantianism" (Plekhanov, by recognising the existence of "things-in-themselves," i.e., things outside of our consciousness); they "double" the world and preach "dualism," for the materialists hold that beyond the appearance there is the thing-in-itself; beyond the immediate sense data there is something else, some fetish, an "idol," an absolute, a source of "metaphysics," a double of religion ("holy matter," as Bazarov says).

Such are the arguments levelled by the Machians against materialism, as repeated and retold in varying keys by the afore-mentioned writers.

we are engaging on the same issue. and my view is that matter is secondary and not a precursor to consciousness; i.e. consciousness, as Schroedinger contends in 'What is Life?' is like 'field', immanent in the world.

in your following comment, you use the term 'social interactions' which seems to imply dynamics transacted between a multiplicity of 'independent beings' within a non-participating space. we are back again to 'purely mechanical phenomena'

5. "Did the turbulent flow of the atmosphere exist before the storm-cell arrived to experience it? Or, are subject and object only one, as Schroedinger contends?"

I don't understand enough about this, and I choose to ignore it because it does not seem relevant to a critique of social interactions. In fact, it seems like the same kind of science-as-religion that 'scien-

tists' have been engaging in for at least the last 150 years.
you say;
6. "What point is there in putting semantic realities into competition and debating which 'best captures the true situation' if they are all innately subjective and incomplete and constructed by groups on the basis of what the people in the group care about?"
.We each gain more information about the alternative semantic realities in order to shape our experience, our thoughts, and our decision. I've changed my mind on plenty of things by this method. Presumably you weren't born with a liking for Sapir-Whorf?
so far, in my life experience, my gaining of more information has made me more aware of what i do not know about the world. there are many people in the world with ideas and understandings different to my own, so that my interventions inductively actualize transformations of relations that i cannot anticipate and which are not addressed in my 'semantic reality'. thus it hardly makes sense to employ my 'semantic reality', or anyone else's, as a common 'operative reality'. it makes more sense to me, to orient to cultivating and sustaining relational balance and harmony than to use some or other 'semantic operative reality' to drive and direct individual and collective behaviour as is the purely mechanical approach which ignores the inevitable 'externalities' engendered by the purely mechanical 'things and what things do' approach.
you say;
7. "We are doing this all the time [what are forums for?], so we should have an answer, right?"
.Actually, the efficiency of forums in generating the kind of information I mentioned before is very low, due to entrenched positions, trolling, bad faith arguments, etc.
supposing we were to accept that people's 'semantic realities' are going to differ, like yours and mine, and we accept that and simply orient to sustaining balance and harmony in our relations. we would be 'like the animals' and the 'ecosystems' in this case; i.e. we would have no need of a common 'semantic reality' to drive and direct our collective behaviours [not that we couldnt continue to use it as a support tool]. in other words, we would restore experi-

ence-based intuition to its natural precedence over reason, as
Nietzsche suggests.
make any sense to you?
the 'downside' for egotists is the giving up on dreams of controlling
things and letting go of the 'little sagacity ego-self sense our selves
as fountainheads rather than figureheads; i.e. our actions would be
inductively actualized by the relational dynamics we are situation-
ally included in. i.e. we would be 'vents' or 'figureheads' that
transmit influences from the vast, beyond understandable relation-
al dynamics that we are included in.

Lone Raven   Sun, 10/02/2016 - 02:17
"as i see it, your views and my views on 'what is real' differ in the
manner described by 'dualism and realism' (yours) and 'non-dual-
ism and pragmatic idealization' (mine)"
Not realism, nominalism. As for dualism, I spent an hour or so
researching ALL the different kinds of dualism, and I'm at a loss as
to how exactly I am 'dualistic', but whatever, I don't think it's so
important.
If you mean that my way of looking at things tends not to focus on
holistic 'transforming sets', then sure.
- - -
This directly relates to my own 'position' in this 'transforming set',
as well to the history of my kind.
YOUR QUESTION: 4. "Did the universe exist before the arrival of
human observers?"
MY ANSWER: Of course it did. Existence precedes consciousness."
YOUR RESPONSE focused on "there are those of us who intuit that
the world is given just once, as a transforming relational continuum
that consciousness is immanent within this one thing."
--> Well that's a theory, but it seems like this approach ignores that
at some point in the past (or in a previous order of things, if you
want to dispense with time) in this continuum, there was no
human consciousness, and I'm acutely aware that there was time
when that continuum did not contain my own consciousness. Hard
evidence shows this, and I take that as one of my starting points. I

am an individual entity (or feature of the continuum) that is connected in many ways to a great many other beings, but is also separate in the sense that my own life is finite and when I have turned into nitrogen and flowed into other life that outlives me, my individuality is gone. I am no longer separate. You could say that I began as not-separate (made from component parts of two other organisms, and nutrients they took from the wider world), but at the moment of my conception, something new was born, and with the development of my volition in my childhood, I became able to act according to my own mind. It is I that chooses whether or not to continue conversations on this forum, for example, and for how long, and precisely what to write, and wheher of nit to make deliberate speling mistakes.

"let's be clear. noun-and-verb constructs are depictions of 'purely mechanical phenomena'. they are depictions of 'what independent things do' as if in an operating space that is independent of the 'independent things' that reside, operate and interact within it."

I don't see how SVO conflicts inherently with the idea of a continuum. It's just that I am an individual part of a wider world that has free will. The sentence 'Fred makes a cake', is subjective, but once a person understands the full reality behind it better, they will understand that it does NOT mean 'Fred is entirely responsible for conjuring a dessert into being' and instead means 'Fred prepares a sweer food stuff from ingredients which each have their own deep, almost infinite paths that trace back further than he can see, but he's not always all that concerned with that, because his focus stays on wanting to eat cake'.

It seems that your metaphysics places such a huge demand on the individual to understand every part of this continuum so as to see how it connects with each 'eventuality', or 'development', or whatever you are calling things instead of volition-led actions.

To me, it's just a classic case of the Parable of the Poisoned Arrow. If I can establish that the ingredients for the cake came from my locality and were gathered without coercion or creating negative externalities for anyone else, I'm just not gonna worry too much about what event in the distant past of the woman who gave/sold

me the eggs led her to become a chicken farmer, or how sugar came to be grown in that part of England having not been originally 'indigenous', etc. etc. With your metaphysics, there is an unlimited amount of time one could spend trying to see the continuum in greater and greater detail. I want to focus on the practical matter of living my own life and creating values for myself and keeping them. This might be termed 'soft egoism', but in all honesty I'm just about ready to jettison my use of the term forever. I'll let you know when I come up with better language for it.

YOUR QUESTION: 3. "how do we separate the meaning in 'what is really going on out there' and the meaning that comes from the caring of the observer in what is going on out there?"

MY ANSWER: "We admit that we are fallible, and let our respective cares play out through our wills and our actions."

YOUR RESPONSE: "if you and your group are angry at a long list of others and embark on a program to take them out with drones [that is what you 'care about'] and each of them has 50 to 100 friends whose behaviours will be inductively actualized to retaliate in some way, is your 'doer-of-deeds' report on progress in eliminating your list of enemies meaningful? or would you say that the 'externalities' that are engendered by your drone interventions which involve thousands of people relationally entangled with your targeted victims who you don't know and don't care about, speak more to the physical reality of your actual experience?"

--> Come back with an example that doesn't involve me kiling people with drones, which I would never do.

As for your perspective, the most interesting part is this:-

EMILE: "so far, in my life experience, my gaining of more information has made me more aware of what i do not know about the world. there are many people in the world with ideas and understandings different to my own, so that my interventions inductively actualize transformations of relations that i cannot anticipate and which are not addressed in my 'semantic reality'. thus it hardly makes sense to employ my 'semantic reality', or anyone else's, as a common 'operative reality. it makes more sense to me, to orient to cultivating and sustaining relational balance and harmony than to use some or

other 'semantic operative reality' to drive and direct individual and collective behaviour as is the purely mechanical approach which ignores the inevitable 'externalities' engendered by the purely mechanical 'things and what things do' approach."

Well, all I see is an argument FOR one way of acting, based on perceived outcomes. Personally, I think that the outcomes for me will be no worse for 'employing my semantic reality', provided that I do what I can to make it as error-free as possible. I do NOT think it is possible for any 'reality' I might 'employ' to be free of error, whether it is based on 'individual entities connected within transforming sets' or an approach that does away with the individuality altogether.

Plus, you know, from my ontological perspective individuality is an axiom, and your posting of this comment confirms it. So you can say all you like that you want to dispense with individuality and volition, but to me, THAT makes no sense. We are both pursuing that which makes sense to us, based on our experience, and I would say that I am happy with my overall approach (there are a few things that could be 'ironed out') and I would not be happy with yours, even if you are.

EMILE: "supposing we were to accept that people's 'semantic realities' are going to differ, like yours and mine, and we accept that and simply orient to sustaining balance and harmony in our relations. we would be 'like the animals' and the 'ecosystems' in this case; i.e. we would have no need of a common 'semantic reality' to drive and direct our collective behaviours [not that we couldnt continue to use it as a support tool]. in other words, we would restore experience-based intuition to its natural precedence over reason, as Nietzsche suggests...make any sense to you?"

Yes, I agree. I would be happy sharing my life with anyone, whatever their semantic reality, without the need for it to be the same as mine, provided that their ultimate approach to values were compatible, so I could feel that my own values were relatively safe. Not only is there no need for a shared semantic reality, but such a thing is probably impossible.

"the 'downside' for egotists is the giving up on dreams of controlling things and letting go of the 'little sagacity ego-self sense our selves

as fountainheads rather than figureheads; i.e. our actions would be inductively actualized by the relational dynamics we are situationally included in. i.e. we would be 'vents' or 'figureheads' that transmit influences from the vast, beyond understandable relational dynamics that we are included in."

I think that's a logical leap. While we are not the sole masters of our destinies, we are not powerless either. The habitat effects us, yes, but we have free will, and can shape our habitats accordingly, we shape each other in the way we treat each other, and we can move to another space if we want to.

I don't think you answered my question on 'indeterminism' directly, but I think I got my answer.

Thanks for the discussion. Ciao.

emile   Sun, 10/02/2016 - 10:17
fitting the data to the theory (semantic reality) is the problem
In reasoned debate, the goal is to fit the data (including data in each new argument in the cycles of thrusts and parries, to one's preferred theory. thus, the arguments are never settled.and this discussion is exposed to falling into the same dysfunctional pattern. you are cherry-picking those of my remarks which "you care for"; i.e. which you feel will help you promote your own theory and ignore other points that are more difficult to deal with, saying that you don't care about those points or that they are meaningless points to you points out the arbitrariness of person 'semantic realities'. science by consensus; i.e. by getting a large group to support a certain semantic reality does nothing to improve the quality of 'semantic reality'. after a majority has affirmed the reliability of the 'semantic reality' in which Saddam is making weapons of mass destruction' and later reflected on the error, then it will become apparent that enlarging the concensus support for a 'semantic reality' does nothing to improve the correctness of the 'semantic reality'.

.you defend your own personal semantic reality and its appropriateness as an 'operative reality' to drive and direct your behaviour.
i would just like to make clear that my view is that 'defending one's

personal semantic reality is the problem of 'incoherence' in the relational social dynamic. in saying this, i am not trying to put forth a semantic reality that is closer to some notional 'correct semantic reality' because in my view there is no correct semantic reality [the tao that can be told is not the true tao].

that is my 'view' and it is NOT a portrait of reality in materialistic terms, but a view that argues for putting situational-relational experience-based intuition into precedence over some or other selected 'semantic reality' as the common orchestrator and shaper of individual and collective behaviour.

you misinterpret my comments where you interpret me as arguing "FOR one way of actiing based on perceived outcomes". to put oneself in the service of cultivating and sustaining relational balance and harmony is not "basing one's behaviour on perceived outcomes". putting relations-balancing/harmonizing into precedence over the dogged pursuit of 'individual' self-interest 'LETS GO OF' targeted outcomes. Its an approach that optimizes the harmony of a journey to who-the-hell-knows-where, as a sailor in weather he can't control whose continual course corrections ignore 'destination' and let it unfold as a non-deliberately determined 'outcome' of keeping the journey harmonious.

this is very different from seeing oneself' as an independent being with free will who fixes his notional destination [future desired state as depicted in his semantic reality] and puts his behaviour in the service of achieving/realizing that destination; i.e. in your case,, your 'semantic reality' that is as error-free as possible.

in my suspending of belief in the abstractions of independent being and free will, it seems to me that you are mistaking my position on 'individuality' where you interpret what i am saying as "an approach that does away with the individuality altogether."

your definition of 'individual' seems to be built DEPENDENTLY upon the notion of 'free will'. to me, 'free will' is a bullshit abstraction that comes logically bundled with 'independent being'. my understanding of 'individual' is in no way built on the abstract concept of 'independence' nor does an 'individual' have 'free will' that makes him a 'fountainhead' of his own behaviour;

1. Individual as sailboating individual: he is situationally included in a relational dynamics that is greater than his individual dynamic and which is continually inductively actualizing his creative potentials and shaping who he is [giving form to his sails]. As Joseph Campbell puts it;

"*We must be willing to let go of the life we planned so as to have the life that is waiting for us.*" … "*If you can see your path laid out in front of you step by step, you know it's not your path. Your own path you make with every step you take. That's why it's your path.*"
and then again, john lennon;

"Life is something that happens to us while we are busy making other plans"

... and Goethe,

the moment one definitely commits oneself, then Providence moves too. All sorts of things occur to help one that would never otherwise have occurred. A whole stream of events issues from the decision, raising in one's favor all manner of unforeseen incidents and meetings and material assistance, which no man could have dreamed would have come his way. ... Boldness has genius, power, and magic in it.
—*Goethe's Faust* (transl. by John Anster)

This 'sailboating' individual is a relational form undergoing his own unique cosmic fetalizing that lives 'on the edge of chaos'; i.e. in the gap between the epigenetic inductive influence that is inviting him to rise to the occasion, and the actualizing of his creative potentials that manifest as genetic expression. he doesn't know 'what is to become of him' but his 'amor fati' carries him through. he is a figurehead or "*vent that transmits influences from the vast and universal to the point on which his genius can act*" [Emerson]

2. Individual as powerboating individual; he is not seen as being situationally included in any ambient dynamic whose powers are greater than his own, that he cannot ride roughshod over. he is independent, with free will, and so is fully in control of himself and has the power to determine and attain his own destination. He can see his path laid out in front of him, step by step, and is capable of following his plans and achieving his desired future outcomes.
the 'individual' of Western religions and Western science is the

individual in (2.). the 'individual' as 'uebermensch' is the sailboat-
ing individual as in (1.). to suspend imposing the abstractions of
'independent being' and 'free will' on ourselves and acknowledge
that we are inclusions within a dynamic that is, at the same time,
'greater than us' and at the same time 'is us' [the wind that was
always there] as in (1.) is not to 'abandon individuality' but to
celebrate it with loving acceptance [amor fati] as our own unique
cosmic fetalizing.

so, at the bottom of our exchange are very different views of 'who
we are'. your comments imply who you think you are;

"While we are not the sole masters of our destinies, we are not
powerless either. The habitat effects us, yes, but we have free will,
and can shape our habitats accordingly, we shape each other in the
way we treat each other, and we can move to another space if we
want to." [the fountainhead]

and mine imply who i understand i am; i.e. the sailboater in (1.); i.e.
the inhabitant-habitat non-dual relational activity aka 'figurehead'
or 'vent' for transmitting powerful influences that are not uniquely
ours but which derive from the transforming relational continuum
that we are uniquely situationally included in.

in my view, 'semantic reality' constructing is a RE-PRESENTA-
TIONAL tool that we take along on the trip with us, it does not
describe the trip [the dynamic world that the storm-cell is experi-
ence is inseparable from the dynamic of the storm-cell's unfolding
experience].. as R. D. Laing puts it;

"The life that I am reaching out to embrace is the 'me' who is
reaching out to embrace it" – R. D. Laing

this suspending of the abstract concepts of 'independent being' and
'free will' [= fountainhead status] is NOT an abandonment of
individuality but a celebration of our inclusion in the one world
and our 'agent of transformation' roles within it.

L R   Sun, 10/02/2016 - 10:46
Sorry, you've lost me. There is no way I can integrate almost all of
what you wrote, sorry.
The one part that was clear was you calling free will a bullshit

abstraction, which in my mind is hardly "reasoned debate".
You wrote: "this suspending of the abstract concepts of 'indepen-
dent being' and 'free will' [= fountainhead status] is NOT an
abandonment of individuality but a celebration of our inclusion in
the one world and our 'agent of transformation' roles within it."
I guess the way I look at it is that "a celebration of our inclusion in
the one world and our 'agent of transformation' roles within it" is
not mutually exclusive with free will or independent being, in the
sense that I understand independent and free.
But our discussion styles are not well-suited to this medium, I feel.
If you want to have a discussion over Skype, I promise I will really
listen to what you're saying and try to make sense of it. It may be
easier for me hearing your voice.
Besides that, I don't know what else to suggest. 'Non-dualism', as
you are calling it, is interesting to me, but 'computing it' feels like
pouring wet sand in my ear.

emile   Sun, 10/02/2016 - 14:23
the 'reasoning' in 'reasoned debate' is over-eulogized
i appreciate what i feel to be a genuine openness in your manner of
engaging.
what i am feeling is that we are in a place where logical reasoning
lacks the power to bridge the gap, or rather expand the scope of the
container to bring us back together; e.g;
"I have endeavored to explain as clearly and as impartially as I could
the nature of the divergences between the two schools of mathema-
ticians. And it seems to me that we can already perceive the true
cause. The scientists of the two schools have opposite mental
tendencies. Those whom I have called pragmatists are idealists, and
the Cantorians are realists. . . . . At all times, there have been
opposite tendencies in philosophy and it does not seem that these
tendencies are on the verge of being reconciled. It is no doubt
because there are different souls and that we cannot change any-
thing in these souls. There is therefore no hope of seeing harmony
established between the pragmatists and the Cantorians. Men do
not agree because they do not speak the same language, and there

are languages which cannot be learned." -- Henri Poincaré, 'Dernières Pensées', Les Mathématiques et la Logique

what Poincaré is saying is that 'reason' aka 'logic' cannot get one out of a logically consistent paradigm, it is up to 'intuition' to make that 'quantum leap'. such is the case with getting back and forth from 'realism' to 'pragmatic idealism'.

in regard to these logically internally consistent paradigms of materialism and relativity, which Poincare compares with a polynomial of degree one and a polynomial of degree two, one cannot get traction within a linear space geometry in order to make sense of curved space topology. for example, indigenous aboriginal traditionalists, with their relational or curved space way of understanding dynamics, see a circular [non-dual] relationship between the social dynamic as the 'habitat' [a transforming matrix of relations] and the individual 'inhabitant' dynamic [an element within an interdependent relational matrix aka 'strand in the web-of-life'].

thus the animating influence for something like the 9/11 is, in the 'second order' or 'nonlinear' view [non-Euclidian curved space view, as in Poincaré's reference to a 'polynomial of degree two space'. the same 9/11 dynamic is, in the 'first order' or 'linear' view [Euclidian flat space view, as in Poincaré's reference to a 'polynomial of degree one space'], is seen in simple jumpstart cause-effect terms as the attack of a pathogen [the same linear view as in Western (allopathic) medical science].

The 'logically consistent package' in the case of the linear view imputes 'independent existence' and 'free will' to the 'attacking pathogen' and ignores what the 'nonlinear view' assumes, which is that the space is an energy-charged relational space that is animating source of everything; i.e. the transforming relational space sources inductive influence that actualizes genetic potentials within it, so that in the case of 9/11 relational social tensions are the DEEPER source that is actualizing the 'genetic expression' that manifests as the violent actions of terrorists.

"Space is not empty. It is full, a plenum as opposed to a vacuum, and is the ground for the existence of everything, including ourselves."
— David Bohm

so, there is no way that 'reasoned debate' is going to bridge the gap
between those with the polynomial of degree one 'pathogen-sourc-
ing' view of 9/11 and those with the polynomial of degree two
'relational tension sourcing' view. this is like moving from one orbit
to another; i.e. it requires an intuitive 'quantum leap'.
for the nonlinear observer/experient, the linear view is seen as
'pragmatic idealization' but for the linear observer/experient, the
linear view is seen as 'what is really going on'.
so, while i appreciate your suggestion of direct voice engaging in skype,
i am not sure that that will 'bridge the gap'; i.e. when i engage with
those who see 9/11 as the simple attack of evil pathogens, as is the
standard Western linear view, reasoned debate is not capable of
bringing them around to seeing the indigenous aboriginal tradition-
ist's [and my own and Bohm and Mach's] nonlinear view where the
transforming relational plenum is the deeper animating source within
which the simple attack of pathogen perception is the superficial
appearance [Schroedinger's 'schaumkommen'] which is abstractly
concretized by noun-and-verb language-and-grammar, as also the case
in going with the local, visible, material manifesting of a storm-cell in
the atmosphere, whereby we shift the animating source over from the
transforming relational flow-plenum, notionally, to the notional
'storm-cell-thing-in-itself' imputing it to be the 'fountainhead' of
pathogenic action rather than the figurehead that channels and vents
influences from the non-local, non-visible, non-material relational
dynamics in which it is an included relational feature.
the standard linear view of Western society comes with an emo-
tional anchor, that of certainty and the possibility of control [by
rounding up and incarcerating potential pathogens] that associates
with the linear view but not with the nonlinear view where we have
to negotiate with a rich diversity of otherness, by pursuing nothing
more than the sustaining of balance and harmony and foregoing
'control'.

emile   Thu, 09/29/2016 - 10:31
inviting reflection on how dualist recuperation screws us up
Continuing relational-social 'incoherence' is inviting us to reflect

on the damage that is coming from letting egotist others set our agenda for us, picking the 'important' questions and 'issues' which we, like obedient children, 'must' pick up on; questions and issues that inevitably attempt the orthodox 'dualist recuperation' with its subjective and incomplete KISS inquiry that shuts out the intuitive reflection needed to wrest us from the bewitchment of logic-based semantic realities so that we may 're-ground' in the physical reality of our actual relational experience.

Anonymous   Fri, 09/30/2016 - 12:01

I am gardening, I see a beautiful snake and move closer to observe better. It is a rattlesnake, and I get bitten. After recovering, I am back in the garden. I see a similar snake. I decide to avoid it. Is that not a form of "rational" thought? Yes, memory, learning, survival instinct, and any number of other factors are also at play.
Point? Simply that complete dismissal of logic/rational thought is absurd, just as is complete dismissal of "relational" or non-dualist thought. Emile spends so much time promoting one and dismissing the other, that it seems a completely binary, dualist approach.

L R   Fri, 09/30/2016 - 13:46

He might not want to get rid of all of it, but there is no place in his metaphysics for individual free will, as far as I can see. Perhaps I'm wrong. I just know that he is the one person whom if I asked the question "Do you believe in free will?" would likely describe the concepts 'you', 'belief', and 'free' as semantic abominations or something.
I really get how we should avoid nonsensical language. I've written at length about how sentences like "The US threatened Iran" make no sense whatsoever. I've argued for a more refined approach like "The group of people calling their selves 'the US government' today broadcast a message intended for their 'Iranian' counterparts..."
TLDR: I agree there is no single formula for what is 'rational', but there sure as hell are rationales that 'work' and some that end only in Derrida-esque noodlings.

emile   Fri, 09/30/2016 - 13:53

Accepting the early death of non-dualist threads like this one
Within a collection of people who are energized in 'dualist' mode
with its binary moral judgement of people and groups and its
rallying of energies wherein people attempt to;

"lead the world in battling immediate evils and promoting the
ultimate good" -- Barack Obama

there is only passing interest in trying on the thinking and acting
apparel of non-duality.

The appeal of duality is the appeal that comes with thinking of
oneself as a fountainhead rather than a figurehead. This is a firmly
entrenched cultural programming that makes Western civilization
what it is.

As Heraclitus was saying 2500 years ago, it is as if people wake up,
hear and understand that 'everything is in flux' [non-dualism] and
then promptly fall asleep again, forgetting everything that they
have just heard and understood and reverting to 'belief in the fixed
and persisting identities of independently-existing things-in-them-
selves that EITHER 'are' OR 'are not' [dualism].

If it were not that way, Western civilization as we know it, would lift
away like a fog bank vaporized by the morning sun, but that is not
about to happen; i.e. the dualist psychology of Western society is not
going transform into the same sort of non-dualist psychology (like
that of relational language using cultures) overnight, because noun-
and-verb language-and-grammar is the dualist 'anchor' that facilitates
immediate regression into dualism [the 'falling asleep' back into
dualism after having awoken and heard and understood non-dualism].

As F. David Peat and others have noted (Piaget, Vygotsky), our
concept development, from childhood to adulthood proceeds from
the more complex to the more simple, from a good grasp of what
might be called 'polynomials of higher degree to polynomials of first
degree'. As infants, we understand 'topology' which is purely relation-
al and has no dependency on 'things' and then we 'shift gears' and
move on to 'geometry' with its concepts of local invariable closed
form solids (things-in-themselves), ... so that if the infant looks down
into the flowing river and sees a whirlpool skittling across the flow,

his topological sense understands this as an inhabitant (whirlpool cell) - habitat (flow) non-duality which is purely relational, ... while in his adulthood, after becoming proficient in noun and verb language, he will see and understand this in dualist, geometric terms as an 'inhabitant' (whirlpool cell) in a separate containing 'habitat' (flow). That this, the dynamic he saw as an infant was one of transforming relations without any 'multiplicity of things' while as noun-and-verb language-speaking adult, he sees the same dynamic in terms of two separate things, one of which is contained in the other in the manner of the Matrewshky, the Russian doll which contains a nested multi-plicity of dolls, one inside the other. For the topology orienting infant, the nesting was purely one of relational forms within relational forms, as in a fluid dynamic;

" "*Big whorls have little whorls,*
Which feed on their velocity;
And little whorls have lesser whorls,
And so on to viscosity."   L.F. Richardson, meteorologist
Adults have to work their way back to understanding the world in a purely relational (non-dual) context. It is like being 'stuck in a low gear' and not being able to shift back out of it. The thing-based understanding enabled by geometry has such an appealing simplic-ity and 'economy of thought' that it buries and covers over the more realist relational [non-dualist] understanding enabled by topology.
""To the infant's developing mind, topology comes before geometry. In general, deeper and more fundamental logical operations are developed earlier than more specific rules and applications. The history of mathematics, which is generally taken as a process of moving towards deeper and more general levels of thought, could also be thought of as a process of excavation which attempts to uncover the earliest operations of thought in infancy. According to this argument, the very first operations exist at a pre-conscious level [i.e. 'pre-intellectualizing' level in the conscious and intuitive infant] so that the more fundamental a logical operation happens to be, the earlier it was developed by the infant and the deeper it has become buried in the mind." – F. David Peat, 'Mathematics and the Language of Nature'

This excavation wherein we uncover the relational non-dualism we have buried by our continued use of dualist thing-based discourse, 'fills right in again' immediately after we have excavated it, as we return to our usual dualist thing-based noun-and-verb discourse. That is, we live in a collective where everyone is using dualist thing-based discourse and in order to get back 'in phase' with those around us, we quickly 'fall asleep' to the non-dualist topological understanding and 're-awaken' in the dualist geometrical under-standing wherein we remount our Rocinante and commit once again, to;

"lead the world in battling immediate evils and promoting the ultimate good"

In this dualist psychological paradigm, we envisage the causal authorship of actions as jumpstarting from 'independent beings', hence the concept of 'good-doers' that deserve rewarding and 'evil-doers' that deserve punishing. This contrasts with the purely relational non-dualist understanding wherein the source of causal authorship is indefinitely deferred within the transforming rela-tional continuum; e.g;

"In the book 'Causality and Chance in Modern Physics' Bohm argued that the way science viewed causality was also much too limited. Most effects were thought of as having only one or several causes. However, Bohm felt that an effect could have an infinite number of causes. For example, if you asked someone what caused Abraham Lincoln's death, they might answer that it was the bullet in John Wilkes Booth's gun. But a complete list of all the causes that contributed to Lincoln's death would have to include all of the events that led to the development of the gun, all of the factors that caused Booth to want to kill Lincoln, all of the steps in the evolu-tion of the human race that allowed for the development of a hand capable of holding a gun, and so on, and so on. Bohm conceded that most of the time one could ignore the vast cascade of causes that had led to any given effect, but he still felt it was important for scientists to remember that no single cause-and-effect relationship was ever really separate from the universe as a whole."

It is easy to see the simplifications that result from going back

inside the dualist psychological paradigm. For one thing, there is no concept of 'time' in the purely relational-topological, non-dualist understanding [a transforming relational continuum is 'all there is' and its non-dual inhabitants are relational forms that are continually gathering and regathering within it].

In the dualist psychological paradigm, 'time' as a linearly advancing progression of things, allows us to arrange events 'one after the other' so that we can isolate 'single events' within a notional 'interval of time' [like the shooting of Lincoln] and then analyze what went on WITHIN THE TIME INTERVAL as if that would provide a meaningful understanding-in-itself ['knowledge' = 'understanding-in-itself' that can be documented and moved around as an independent package of understanding].

Dualist 'forensic science' that establishes 'causation and responsibility' is a formalization of the dualist psychological paradigm and it builds upon this psychological concept of temporal 'duration', or an 'interval of time' which has no meaning in pre-literate or relational language employing communities, and no meaning in modern physics. As Bohm alluded to in the above cited quote on 'what killed Lincoln', causal authorship and responsibility blur into the overall transforming relational continuum, and our assumptions of local in space and time causal authorship are approximations of convenience.

Differential calculus imputes meaning to what goes on in tiny intervals of space and time, and we use such mathematics to break the world down into small parts and then 'integrate' and put it back together from the tiny parts which constructs a world which is much easier to understand than the physically real world wherein everything is dependent on everything, as in a transforming relational continuum where 'field' and 'matter' are a non-duality (field is an energy-charged fluid 'habitat' which inductively actualizes local, visible, tangible 'relational activities' aka 'inhabitants'). As Einstein puts it;

" “We cannot build physics on the basis of the matter-concept alone. But the division into matter and field is, after the recognition of the equivalence of mass and energy, something artificial and not clearly

defined. Could we not reject the concept of matter and build a pure field physics? What impresses our senses as matter is really a great concentration of energy into a comparatively small space. We could regard matter as the regions in space where the field is extremely strong. In this way a new philosophical background could be created." – Einstein and Infeld, 'Evolution of Physics'

The 'new philosophical background' that Einstein and Infeld refer to corresponds to the 'early' topological understanding of the infant, before this understanding is 'covered over' by the language games of geometry with its local independent geometrical objects that stand in for relational forms in the transforming relational continuum.

The simplifying assumptions we make to divide the world dynamic up into little bits with space and time dimensions and then integrate those to get our world view, are also buried beneath the noun-and-verb, past-and-future architecture of language. If we start 'digging around' we may find and excavate the burial site and remind ourselves of these buried assumptions; e.g;

"Origin of Mathematical Physics. Let us go further and study more closely the conditions which have assisted the development of mathematical physics. We recognise at the outset the efforts of men of science have always tended to resolve the complex phenomenon given directly by experiment into a very large number of elementary phenomena, and that in three different ways.

.First, with respect to time. Instead of embracing in its entirety the progressive development of a phenomenon, we simply try to connect each moment with the one immediately preceding. We admit that the present state of the world only depends on the immediate past, without being directly influenced, so to speak, by the recollection of a more distant past. Thanks to this postulate, instead of studying directly the whole succession of phenomena, we may confine ourselves to writing down its differential equation; for the laws of Kepler we substitute the law of Newton.

.Next, we try to decompose the phenomena in space. What experiment gives us is a confused aggregate of facts spread over a scene of considerable extent. We must try to deduce the elementary phe-

nomenon, which will still be localised in a very small region of space. — Henri Poincaré, 'Science and Hypothesis', Chapter IX, Hypotheses in Physics"

Ok, we did our excavating and we remind ourselves that the structure of the world that we are using as our 'operative reality' is a simplified structure that we invented because of its simplicity and the 'economy of thought' that it delivers. However, by employing this semantically simplified structure as our 'operative reality', our interventions into the world dynamic are not the logical interventions of our semantic reality, but are relational interventions into the transforming relational continuum, which actualize 'externalities' which are neither anticipated nor addressed within the simplified semantic reality of our digitized RE-presentation of the world. Poincaré addresses the social problem that derives from people being divided as to whether to regard the 'digitized RE-presentation' of the world as 'real' or as 'pragmatic idealization' and labels the two opposing camps 'Cantorian realists' and 'pragmatist idealists'. The problem issue boils down to the fact that the purely relational non-dual understanding cannot be explicitly articulated in terms of 'things' and 'what things do' since relational forms and the relational flow they are included in are in continual, interdependent flux and there is no 'fixed identity' to anchor 'local, visible, material' beings to. In other words, that which is local, visible and tangible/material is as Schroedinger would say; 'schaumkommen', variations in the structure of relational space. Cantorian realists insist that we must anchor our 'reality' to these local, visible, tangible forms while pragmatist idealists hold that while that can be useful in the sense of a finger pointing to the moon that is not the moon, the physical reality of our actual experience lies beyond such 'pragmatic idealization';

"At all times, there have been opposite tendencies in philosophy and it does not seem that these tendencies are on the verge of being reconciled. It is no doubt because there are different souls and that we cannot change anything in these souls. There is therefore no hope of seeing harmony established between the pragmatists [pragmatist-idealists] and the Cantorians [Cantorian realists]. Men

do not agree because they do not speak the same language, and there are languages which cannot be learned." — Henri Poincaré, Dernières Pensées Chapter V, Mathematics and Logic

The languages that cannot be learned are those of 'intuition' which are purely relational; i.e. they are understandings suggested by relational confluences wherein the relations are the basis of things, rather than things being the basis of relations.

Conclusion:
I wanted to include this comment on;
Accepting the early death of non-dualist threads like this one as a kind of footnote to explain why it is that the general Western civilized public can 'wake up' and participate in excavating the 'analogue' [non-dualist] relational understanding capabilities [topological] which are innate in us which we have 'covered over' with simpler 'digital' [dualist] approximative understanding capabilities [geometrical] and then immediately 'falling asleep' and letting go of such understanding; i.e. reverting to a being-based semantic reality that we have got accustomed to employing as our 'operative reality' as gives modern Western civilization the familiar character that it currently has; i.e. employing logic and scientific reasoning to direct behaviour and make a real mess of things [spawn externalities that are unanticipated and unaddressed within the simplistic subjective and incomplete logical propositions such as 'our military science and technology can take out evil leaders; i.e. those opposed to we who are in the business of promoting ultimate good'].

Currently, Western civilization is locked into the practice of "doing the same thing and expecting a different result" [formulating and fulfilling logical propositions in the belief that, 'this time', the fulfillment will be achieved without the associated 'externalities' that screw up the very dynamics we were intervening so as to improve]. This familiar dysfunction is Einstein's definition of 'insanity', described by Nietzsche as the misguided elevating of reason over intuition [geometry over topology].

This thread and non-dualist threads in general, die an early death for the above-described reasons; i.e. our common language is

founded in dualism and when we are speaking it or writing it, we are constantly constructing the same over-simplified dualist, being-based 'semantic realities' that we employ as our 'operative reality' that we use to drive and direct our individual and collective assertive behaviours. The dualist semantic reality that we picture as being 'out there in front of us' with its windmills that we are tilting at, is nothing like the non-dualist physical reality of our actual relational experience.

""Philosophy is a battle against the bewitchment of our understanding by the medium of language" ("Die Philosophie ist ein Kampf gegen die Verhexung unsres Verstandnes durch die Mittel unserer Sprache" P.U. 109)

."A picture held us captive. And we could not get outside it, for it lay in our language and language seemed to repeat it to us inexorably." ("Ein Bild hielt uns gefangen. Und heraus konnten wir nicht, denn es lag in unsrer Sprache, und sie scheint es uns nur unerbittlich zu wiederholen" P.U. 115).   Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*

What is being repeated over and over again is the picture of 'being' which becomes the cornerstone, in our psychological dynamics, for our 'operative reality'. This delusion is foundational in Western civilization; as Nietzsche puts it;

And what a nice delusion we had perpetrated with this "empirical evidence;" we interpreted the real world as a world of causes, a world of wills, a world of spirits. The most ancient and enduring psychology was at work here: it simply interpreted everything that happened in the world as an act, as the effect of a will; the world was inhabited with a multiplicity of wills; an agent (a "subject") was slipped under the surface of events. It was out of himself that man projected his three most unquestioned "inner facts" — the will, the spirit, the ego. He even took the concept of being from the concept of the ego; he interpreted "things" as "being" in accordance with his concept of the ego as a cause. Small wonder that later he always found in things what he had already put into them. The thing itself, the concept of thing is a mere extension of the faith in the ego as cause. And even your atom, my dear materialists and physicists — how much error,

how much rudimentary psychology still resides in your atom! Not to mention the "thing-in-itself," the horrendum pudendum of metaphysicians! The "spirit as cause" mistaken for reality! And made the very measure of reality! And called God!

The Twilight of the Idols

Spirituality in dualism evokes the notion of a 'fountainhead' tied to the concept of a Being directed by internal intelligence and will; *Man is rational and therefore like God; he is created with free will and is master over his acts.* Vatican

Spirituality in non-dualism evokes the notion of a 'figurehead' that is tied to the concept of a relational form within a transforming relational continuum. As Emerson suggests, it is only too easy to slip from our understanding of self as a non-dual figurehead to that of a dualist fountainhead;

Whilst a necessity so great caused the man to exist, his health and erectness consist in the fidelity with which he transmits influences from the vast and universal to the point on which his genius can act. The ends are momentary: they are vents for the current of inward life which increases as it is spent. A man's wisdom is to know that all ends are momentary, that the best end must be superseded by a better. But there is a mischievous tendency in him to transfer his thought from the life to the ends, to quit his agency and rest in his acts: the tools run away with the workman, the human with the divine. Emerson

So, we are held captive by language, a language that RE-presents us as a fountainhead rather than a figurehead. If people filter into a discussion forum and hear Spanish being spoken over here and French being spoken over there and English over there, ... people will congregate within their language group and while a non-dualist thread makes nominal use of dualist language, it is far easier for those of us brought up on dualism to understanding the discussions on world/social dynamics going on in dualist discussion threads, based as they are, on convenient and economy-of-thought delivering Euclidian geometry;

"Finally, our Euclidean geometry is itself only a sort of convention of language; mechanical facts might be enunciated with reference to a non-Euclidean space which would be a guide less convenient than,

but just as legitimate as, our ordinary space ; the enunciation would thus become much more complicated, but it would remain possible. Thus absolute space, absolute time, geometry itself, are not conditions which impose themselves on dynamics ; all these things are no more antecedent to dynamics than the French language is logically anteced-ent to the verities one expresses in French."

Henri Poincare, Science and Hypothesis

Only when a person begins to distrust what their dualist language is holding them captive to [our 'little sagacity sense of 'ego-self'' that depicts us as an intelligence-and-will driven 'fountainhead' or 'replica of God'] will there be more than momentary interest in the non-dualist (relational, topological) approach to understanding [where the 'big sagacity natural sense of Self has us understand ourselves as a figurehead of an immanent actualizing power within the transforming relational continuum].

meanwhile, given implicit trust in the competency of language as a vehicle for expressing oneself, there will be a preponderance of philosophical explorers that will seek out the language groups that they can most easily participate in.

In the interest of showcasing not only the formal writings of anarchists (or the anarchist-friendly), but also the intelligence that happens in dialog, even (or sometimes especially) in dialog with anonymous strangers, anarchistnews.org presents this series: a collection of interesting original pieces, followed by some of the best of the responses to them from commenters on the website.

$3