

II

- ⑧ Georgescu-Roegen, Nicholas "The Entropy Law and the Economic Process" Harvard U. Press 1971
- ⑨ Heilbroner, Robert L. "An Inquiry into the Human Prospect", Norton and Co. 1974
- ⑩ Heisenberg, Werner "Physics and Philosophy" ~~Harper Torch~~ Harper Torchbooks 1962
- ⑪ Heisenberg, Werner "Across the Frontiers" World Perspectives, Harper & Row 1974
- ⑫ Hoyle, Fred "Encounter with the Future" Credo Perspectives, Simon and Schuster 1968
- ⑬ Hoyle, Fred "The New Face of Science" Perspectives in Humanism, World Publishing Co. 1971
- ⑭ Kuhn, Thomas S. "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" U of Chicago Press 1970

- ⑮ Layzer, David "The Arrow of Time"
Scientific American December 1975
- ⑯ Levinson, Harry "The Exceptional Executive" Mentor Books 1971
- ⑰ Maltz Inagwell "Psycho-Cybernetics"
Midshire Book Co. 1971
- ⑱ Nagel Ernest and Newman, James R.
"Gödel's Proof" New York U. Press
1958
- ⑲ Osborne, Alex F. "Applied Imagination"
Scribners and Sons 1963
- ⑳ Piaget, Jean "Structuralism" Harper
Torchbooks 1971
- ~~21~~ ㉑ Polanyi, Michael "Knowing and Being"
U. of Chicago Press 1969
- ㉒ Singh Jagjit "Great Ideas of Modern
Mathematics: Their Nature and Use"
Dover 1959

IV

(23) Skinner, B.F. "Beyond Freedom and Dignity" Bantam/Vintage Books 1972

(24) Thompson, William Irwin "At the Edge of History" Harper Colophon Books 1972

(25) Tse-Tung, Mao "Four Essays on China and World Communism" Lancer Books 1972

~~(26) Waismann, Fred "Introduction to Mathematical Thinking"~~

~~(26) Waismann, Fred~~

(26) Waismann, Friedrich "Introduction to Mathematical Thinking" Harper Torchbooks 1959

(27) Yukawa, Hideki "Creativity and Intuition" Kodansha International LTD. 1973

(28) Kramers, Edna E. "The Nature and Growth of Modern Mathematics"
Fawcett Premier Books 1974

(29) Gödel, Kurt "On Formally Undecidable Propositions of the Principia Mathematica and Related Systems" ~~Raven Press~~
~~1965~~ pages 3-38 The Undecidable,
~~Raven Press~~ 1965

DESTRUCTION AND CREATION

11 Feb-76

JRB

Goal
Studies

~~DRAFT~~

~~The Dialectic Engine~~

+ A study of human behavior reveals that the actions we undertake as individuals are closely related to survival, more importantly, survival on our own terms. Naturally, such a notion implies that we should be able to act relatively free or independent of any debilitating external influences -- otherwise that very survival might be in jeopardy. In viewing the instinct for survival in this manner we imply that ~~our~~^a basic aim or goal, as individuals is to improve our capacity for independent action. The degree to which we cooperate, or compete, with others is driven by the need to satisfy this basic goal. If we believe that it is not possible to satisfy it alone, and without help from others, history shows us that we will agree to constraints upon our independent action -- in order to collectively pool skills and talents in the form of nations, corporations, labor unions, mafias, etc. -- so that obstacles standing in the way of the basic goal can either be removed or overcome. On the other hand, if the group cannot or does not attempt to overcome obstacles deemed important to many (or possibly any) of it's individual members, the group must risk losing these alienated members. Under these circumstances, the alienated members may dissolve their relationship and remain independent, ~~or~~ form a group of their own, or join another collective body in order to improve their capacity for independent action.

Environment

In a real world of limited resources and skills individuals and groups form, dissolve and reform their cooperative or competitive postures in a continuous struggle to remove or overcome physical and social environmental obstacles. In a co-operative sense, where skills and talents are pooled, the removal or overcoming of obstacles represents an improved capacity for independent action for all concerned. In a competitive sense where individuals and groups compete for scarce resources and skills, an improved capacity for independent action achieved by some individuals or groups constrains that capacity for other individuals or groups. Naturally, such a combination of real world scarcity and goal striving to overcome this scarcity intensifies the struggle of individuals and groups to cope with both their physical and social environments.

Need for Decisions

Against such a background, actions and decisions become critically important. Actions must be taken over and over again and in many different ways. Decisions must be rendered to monitor and determine the [precise] nature of the actions needed that will be compatible with the goal. To make these timely decisions implies that we must be able to form mental concepts of observed reality and be able to change these concepts as observed reality itself changes. The concepts can then be used as decision-models for improving our capacity for independent action. Such a demand for decisions that literally impact our survival causes one to wonder: How do we generate or create the mental concepts to support this decision-making activity?

Creating Concepts

There are two ways in which ^{we} can develop and manipulate mental concepts to represent observed reality: We can start from a comprehensive whole and break it down to its particulars or we can start with the particulars and build towards a comprehensive whole. In other words, we can go from the general-to-specific or from the specific-to-general. A little reflection here reveals that deduction is related to proceeding from the general to specific while induction is related to proceeding from the specific-to-general. In following this line of thought, can we think of other activities that are related to these two opposing ideas? Is not analysis related to proceeding from the general-to-specific? Is not synthesis, the opposite of analysis, related to proceeding from the specific-to-general? Putting all this together: Can we not say that general-to-specific is related to both deduction and analysis, while specific-to-general is related to induction and synthesis? Now, can we think of some examples to fit with these two opposing ideas? We need not look far. The ^dDifferential ^cCalculus proceeds from the general-to-specific -- from a function to its derivative. Hence, ^{use or application of} is not the differential calculus related to deduction and analysis? The integral calculus on the other hand, proceeds in the opposite direction -- from a derivative to the general function. Hence, ^{the use or application of} is not the integral calculus related to induction and synthesis? ^{from this perspective} When viewed ^{in this light} we believe it inappropriate to say "The Calculus is an analytical tool". Otherwise we ^{might} ~~would be forced to conclude that the integral calculus does not exist.~~ ^{application of the} ~~the major application of the~~ ^{apply} Yet many professionals ^{purely} who use the calculus regard it as an

~~analytical tool~~ Summing up once again we see that; general-to-specific is related to deduction, analysis and differentiation. On the other hand specific-to-general is related to induction, synthesis and integration.

Now keeping these two opposing idea chains in mind let us move on a somewhat different tact. Imagine, if you will, a domain (a comprehensive whole) and its constituent elements or parts. Now, imagine another domain and its constituent parts. Once again, ~~image~~^{imagine} even another domain and its constituent parts. Repeating this idea over and over again we can imagine any number of domains and the parts corresponding to each. Naturally, as we go through life we develop concepts of meaning (with included constituents) to represent observed reality. Can we not liken these concepts and their related constituents, that represent observed reality, to the domains and constituents that we have formed in our imagination? Naturally, we can. Keeping this relationship in mind, suppose we shatter the correspondence of each domain or concept with its constituent elements. In other words, we imagine the existence of the parts but pretend that the domains or concepts they were previously associated with do not exist. Result: We have many constituents, or particulars, swimming around in a sea of anarchy. We have uncertainty and disorder in place of meaning and order. Further, we can see such an unstructuring or destruction of many domains -- to break the correspondence of each with its respective constituents -- is related to ^dReduction, ^aAnalysis and ^dDifferentiation. We call this kind of unstructuring a ^ddestructive ^dReduction.

Faced with such disorder or chaos, how can we reconstruct order and meaning? Going back to the idea chain of specific-to-general, induction, synthesis and integration, the thought occurs that a new domain or concept can be formed if we can find some common qualities, attributes, or operations among some or many of these constituents swimming in this sea of anarchy. Through such connecting threads of meaning we synthesize constituents from, hence across, the domains we have just shattered. Linking particulars together in this manner we can form a new domain or concept -- providing, of course, we do not inadvertently use only those "bits and pieces" in the same arrangement that we associated with one of the domains purged from our imagination. Clearly, such a synthesis would indicate we have ^{generated} ~~created~~ something new and different from what previously existed. Going back to our idea chain, it follows that creativity is related to induction, synthesis and integration since we proceeded from unstructured bits and pieces to a new general structure or concept. We call such action a creative or constructive induction. It is important to note that the crucial or key step that permits this creative induction is the separation of the particulars from their previous domains by the ^a ~~Destructive~~ ^d ~~Deduction~~. Without this unstructuring the creation of a new structure cannot proceed -- since the bits and pieces are still tied together as meaning within unchallenged domains or concepts. ~~represent~~

Recalling that we use concepts or mental patterns to ^{represent} ~~describe~~ reality it follows that the unstructuring and restructuring just shown reveals a way for changing our perception of reality. Naturally, such a notion implies that the emerging pattern of

+ ideas and interactions must be internal consistent and ^{ly} match^{up} with reality. To check or verify internal consistency we try ^{matchup} logically to see if we can find our way back to the original constituents that were used in the creative or constructive induction. If we cannot reverse directions the ideas and interactions do not go together in this way without contradiction. Hence, they are not internally consistent. However, this does not necessarily mean we reject and throw away the entire structure. Instead, we should attempt to identify those ideas (particulars) and interactions that seem to hold together in a coherent pattern of activity as distinguished from those ideas that do not seem to fit in. In performing this task we check for reversibility as well as check to see which ideas and interactions match up with our observations of reality. Using those ideas and interactions that pass this test together with any new ^(from new destructive deductions) ideas or other promising ideas that popped out of the original ^{d ^ d} Destructive Deduction we again attempt to find some common qualities, attributes, or operations to ^{re-create} ~~recreate~~ the concept. — ~~re-creates a new concept~~ or create a new concept. Also once again we perform the check for reversibility and match-up with reality. Over and over again this cycle of Destruction and Creation is repeated until we demonstrate internal consistency and a ^{matchup} match^{up} with reality.

+ ^{Suspicion} When this orderly (and pleasant) state is reached the concept becomes a coherent pattern of ideas and intractions that can be used to describe some aspect of observed reality. As a consequence, there is little, or no, further appeal to

alternative ideas and interactions in an effort to either expand,
 complete or modify the concept. Instead, the effort is turned
 inward toward ~~rearranging and~~ fine tuning the ideas and inter-
 actions in order to improve generality and produce a ~~finer grain~~ ^{more precise}
 match of reality with the conceptual pattern. Toward this end,
 the concept -- and its internal workings -- is tested and compared
 against observed phenomena over and over again in many different
 and subtle ways. Such a repeated and an inward oriented effort
 to explain increasingly more subtle aspects of reality suggests
 the disturbing idea that perhaps, at some point, ambiguities,
 uncertainties, anomalies, or apparent inconsistencies may emerge
 to stifle a more general and precise match-up of concept with
 observed reality. Why do we suspect this?

On one hand, we realize that facts, perceptions, ideas,
 impressions, interactions, etc. separated from previous
 observations and thought patterns have been linked together to
 create a new conceptual pattern. On the other hand, we ~~expect~~ ^{suspect}
 that refined observations now underway will eventually exhibit
 either more or a different kind of precision and subtlety than
 the previous observations and thought patterns. Clearly, any
 anticipated difference, or differences, suggest we should
 expect a mismatch between the ^{new} observations and the ^{anticipated} concept
 description of ~~that~~ ^{these} observations. To assume otherwise would be
 tantamount to admitting that previous constituents and inter-
 actions would produce the same synthesis as any newer constituents
 and interactions that exhibit either more or a different kind of

one equals two

precision and subtlety. This would be like admitting $(1=2)$. To avoid such a discomforting position implies that we should anticipate a mismatch between phenomena observation and concept description of that observation. Such a notion is not new and is indicated by the discoveries of Kurt Gödel and Werner Heisenberg.

Incompleteness/Consistency Proof

In 1931 Kurt Gödel created a stir in the World of Mathematics and Logic when he demonstrated that it was impossible to embrace mathematics within a single system of logic. ~~He~~ *q.20* accomplished this by proving, first, that any consistent system - that includes the arithmetic of whole numbers - is incomplete. In other words, there are true statements or concepts within the system that cannot be deduced from the postulates that make-up the system. Next, he proved even though such a system ~~is~~ *is maybe* consistent its consistency cannot be determined within the system.

Such a result does not imply that it is impossible to demonstrate the consistency of a system. It only means that such a proof cannot be accomplished inside the system. As a matter of fact, since Gödel, Gerhard Gentzen and others have shown that a consistency proof of arithmetic can be found by appealing to systems outside that arithmetic. Thus, Gödel's proof indirectly shows *that* ~~that~~ in order to determine the consistency of any new system we must construct or uncover another system beyond it. Over and over this cycle must be repeated to demonstrate the consistency of more and more elaborate systems.

q.20
q.20

Keeping this process in mind let us see how Gödel's results
 impact the effort to improve the ^{matchup} match-up of concept with
 observed reality. To do this we ^{will} ~~must~~ consider two kinds of
 consistency: The consistency of the concept and the consistency
 of ^{the matchup} match-up between observed reality and concept description. In
 this sense, if we assume -- as a result of previous ~~D~~ ^destructive
~~D~~ ^ceduction and ⁱcreative ⁱnduction efforts -- that we have a
 consistent concept and a consistent ^{matchup} match-up, we should see no
 differences between observation and concept description. Yet,
 as we have seen, on one hand we use observations to shape or
 formulate a concept; ^{while?} ~~on~~ ^h on the other hand, we use a concept to
 shape the nature of future inquiries or observations of reality.
 Back and forth, over and over again, we use observations to
 sharpen a concept and a concept to sharpen observations. Under
 these circumstances, a concept must be incomplete since we
 depend upon an ever-changing array of observations to shape or
 formulate it. Likewise, our observations of reality must be
 incomplete since we depend upon a changing concept to shape or
 formulate the nature of new inquiries and observations. There-
 fore, when we probe, back and forth with more precision and
 subtlety, we must admit that we have differences between
 observation and concept description, hence ^{we} ~~h~~ cannot determine the
 consistency of the system - in terms of its concept, and match-
 up with observed reality.

Furthermore, the consistency cannot be determined even when
 the precision and subtlety of observed phenomena approached ^s ~~the~~
 precision and subtlety of the observer ~~who~~ ⁻ who is employing the
 ideas and interactions that play together in the conceptual

+ pattern. This aspect of consistency is accounted for not only by Gödel's Proof but also by the Heisenberg Uncertainty or Indeterminacy Principle.

Indeterminacy Principle

The Indeterminacy Principle uncovered by Werner Heisenberg in 1927 showed that one could not simultaneously fix or determine precisely the velocity and position of a particle or body. (147) Specifically he showed, due to the presence and influence of an observer, that the product of the velocity and position uncertainties, is equal to or greater than a small number (Planck's Constant) divided by the mass of the particle or body being investigated. In other words:

$$\Delta V \cdot \Delta Q \geq h/m$$

where ΔV is velocity uncertainty

ΔQ is position uncertainty

and h/m is Planck's constant (h) divided by observed mass (m).

Examination of Heisenberg's Principle reveals that as mass becomes exceedingly small the uncertainty, or indeterminacy becomes exceedingly large. Now -- in accordance with this relation -- when the precision, or mass, of phenomena being observed, is little, or no different than the precision, or mass, of the observing phenomena the uncertainty values become as large, or larger, than the velocity and size ~~dependent range~~ frame-of-reference associated with the bodies being observed. In this environment, the character or nature of the observer is little, or no different than the character or nature of the phenomena being observed. In essence, then, when the observer and observed become essentially one and the same, the uncertainty values hide or mask phenomena behavior; or put another way, the observer perceives uncertain

or erratic behavior that bounces all over in accordance with the indeterminacy relation. Under these circumstances, the uncertainty values represent the inability to determine the character or nature (consistency) of a system within itself. On the other hand, if the precision and subtlety of the observed phenomena is much less than the precision and subtlety of the observing phenomena the uncertainty values become much smaller than the velocity and size values of the bodies being observed. Under these circumstances, the character or nature of a system can be determined although not exactly - since the uncertainty values do not hide or mask observed phenomena behavior nor indicate significant erratic behavior.

+ Keeping in mind, that the Heisenberg Principle ^{implicitly} depends upon the ^{indeterminate} ~~undetermined~~ presence and influence of an observer, we can now see -- as revealed by the two examples just cited -- that the magnitude of the uncertainty values represent the degree of intrusion by the observer upon the observed. When intrusion is total (that is, when the character or nature of the observer and observed become essentially the same) the uncertainty values indicate erratic behavior. When intrusion is low the uncertainty values do not hide or mask observed phenomena behavior, nor indicate significant erratic behavior. In other words, the uncertainty values not only represent the degree of intrusion by the observer upon the observed but also the degree of confusion and disorder perceived by that observer.

+ Entropy and the Second Law of Thermodynamics
Confusion and disorder are also related to the notion of Entropy and the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Entropy is a

concept that represents the capacity for taking purposeful
 action and the degree of confusion and disorder associated with
 any physical or information activity. High entropy implies a
 low capacity for taking purposeful action or a high degree of
 confusion and disorder. Low entropy implies just the opposite.
 Viewed in this context, the Second Law of Thermodynamics states
 that all observed natural processes generate entropy. From this
 law it follows that entropy must increase in any closed system —
 or, for that matter, in any system that cannot communicate in an
 ordered fashion with other systems or environments external to
 itself. Accordingly, anytime we attempt to take purposeful action
 inside such a system ~~X~~ a concept and its match-up with reality --
 we ~~must~~ ^{should} anticipate an increase in entropy hence an increase in
 confusion and disorder. Naturally, this means we cannot
determine the character or nature (consistency) of such a system
within itself, since the system is moving irreversibly toward a
 higher, yet unknown, state of confusion and disorder.
~~Destruction and Creation~~
 What an interesting outcome! According to Gödel we cannot ~~X~~
 in general ~~X~~ determine the consistency of an abstract system within
 itself. According to Heisenberg and the Second Law of Thermo-
 dynamics any attempt to do so in the real world will expose
 uncertainty and generate disorder. Taken together these three
 notions support the idea that any inward oriented and continued
 effort to improve the ^{match-up} of concept with observed reality
 will only increase the degree of mismatch. Naturally, in this
 environment, uncertainty and disorder will increase, as previously
 indicated by the Heisenberg ^{Indeterminacy} ~~Uncertainty~~ Principle and the Second

Law of Thermodynamics respectively. Put another way, we can expect unexplained and disturbing ambiguities, uncertainties, anomalies, or apparent inconsistencies to emerge more and more often. Furthermore, unless some kind of relief is available, we can expect the confusion ~~and disorder~~ to increase until ~~randomness~~ ^{disorder} approaches chaos ~~or~~ death.

Fortunately, there is a way out. Remember, as previously shown, we can forge a new concept by applying the ^d Destructive ^d Deduction and ^c Creative ⁱ Induction mental operations. Also, remember, in order to perform these dialectic mental operations we must first shatter the rigid conceptual pattern, or patterns, firmly established in our mind. (This should not be too difficult since the rising confusion and disorder is already helping us to undermine any patterns). Next, we must find some common qualities, attributes or operations to link isolated facts, ^{perceptions} ideas, impressions, ^{interactions} observations, etc. together as ~~a~~ possible concepts to represent the real world. Finally, we must repeat this unstructuring and ~~activity~~ restructuring until we develop a concept that begins to ^{matchup} match-up with reality. By doing this - in accordance with Godel, Heisenberg and the Second Law of Thermodynamics - we find that the uncertainty and disorder generated by an inward oriented system talking to itself can be offset by going outside and creating a new system. Simply stated, uncertainty and related disorder ^{can be} is diminished by the direct artifice of creating a higher and ~~or~~ broader more general concept to represent reality.

However, once again, when we begin to turn inward and use the new concept - within its own ^{pattern} framework of ideas and interactions - to produce a finer grain match with observed reality

we note that the new concept and its ^{matchup} match-up with observed reality begins to self destruct just as before. Accordingly, the dialectic cycle of destruction and creation begins to repeat itself once again. In other words, as suggested by Godel's Proof of Incompleteness we imply that the process of Structure, Unstructure, Restructure, Unstructure, Restructure is repeated endlessly in moving to higher and broader levels of elaboration.

+ In this unfolding drama, the alternating cycle of entropy increases toward more and more disorder and the entropy decrease toward more and more order appears to be one part of a control mechanism that literally seems to drive and regulate this alternating cycle

+ of ^d Destruction and ^c Creation toward higher and broader levels of elaboration.

+ Now, in relating this ^d Deductive/ⁱ Inductive activity to the basic goal discussed in the beginning, I believe we have uncovered

+ ^a the Dialectic Engine that permits the construction of feedback decision models needed by individuals and societies for determining and monitoring actions in an effort to improve their capacity for independent action. Furthermore, since this engine is directed toward satisfying this basic aim or goal, it follows that the

+ ~~degree or lack thereof toward reaching the goal~~ ^{seeking effort itself} appears to be

+ the other side of a control mechanism that seems to ^{also} ~~also both~~ drive and regulate the alternating cycle of destruction and

+ creation toward higher and broader levels of elaboration^{ion}. In

+ this context, when acting within a ^{rigid or essentially a} closed system, the goal seeking effort of individuals and societies to improve their capacity for independent action tends to produce disorder towards randomness

and death. On the other hand, as already shown, the increasing disorder generated by the increasing mismatch of the system concept with observed reality opens ~~up~~ or unstructures the system. As the unstructuring or, as we call it, the destructive deduction unfolds it shifts toward a creative induction to stop the trend toward disorder ^{and chaos} to satisfy a goal oriented ^{need} ~~effort~~ for increased order. ^{Paradoxically, then,} ~~Hence,~~ an entropy increase in a closed system ~~is offset by the improved possibilities also offered by this entropy increase which permits both the destruction or unstructuring of the old system and the creation of a new system to nullify the march toward randomness and death.~~

Taken together the entropy notion ^{associated with the Second Law of Thermodynamics} and the basic goal of individuals and societies seem to work in dialectic harmony ~~toward~~ driving and regulating the destructive/creative, or deductive/inductive, action - that we have described herein as a dialectic engine. The result is a changing and expanding universe of mental concepts matched to a changing and expanding universe of observed reality. As indicated earlier these mental concepts are employed as decision models by individuals and societies for determining and monitoring actions needed to cope with their environment - or ^{to} improve their capacity for independent action.

DESTRUCTION AND CREATION

D R A F T

11 Feb 76

JRB

Studies

A study of human behavior reveals that the actions we undertake as individuals are closely related to survival, more importantly, survival on our own terms. Naturally, such a notion implies that we should be able to act relatively free or independent of any debilitating external influences -- otherwise that very survival might be in jeopardy. In viewing the instinct for survival in this manner we imply that ^aour basic aim or goal, as individuals is to improve our capacity for independent action. The degree to which we cooperate, or compete, with others is driven by the need to satisfy this basic goal. If we believe that it is not possible to satisfy it alone and without help from others history shows us that we will agree to constraints upon our independent action -- in order to collectively pool skills and talents in the form of nations, corporations, labor unions, mafias, etc. -- so that obstacles standing in the way of the basic goal can either be removed or overcome. On the other hand, if the group cannot or does not attempt to overcome obstacles deemed important to many (or possibly any) of it's individual members the group must risk losing these alienated members. Under these circumstances, the alienated members may dissolve their relationship and remain independent or form a group of their own or join another collective body in order to improve their capacity for independent action.

In a real world of limited resources and skills individuals and groups form, dissolve and reform their cooperative or competitive postures in a continuous struggle to remove or overcome physical and social environmental obstacles. In a cooperative sense, where skills and talents are pooled, the removal or overcoming of obstacles represents an improved capacity for independent action for all concerned. In a competitive sense where individuals and groups compete for scarce resources and skills, an improved capacity for independent action achieved by some individuals or groups constrains that capacity for other individuals or groups. Naturally, such a combination of real world scarcity and goal striving to overcome this scarcity intensifies the struggle of individuals and groups to cope with both their physical and social environments.

Against such a background, actions and decisions become critically important. Actions must be taken over and over again and in many different ways. Decisions must be rendered to monitor and determine the precise nature of the actions needed that will be compatible with the goal. To make these timely decisions implies that we must be able to form mental concepts of observed reality and be able to change these concepts as observed reality itself changes. The concepts can then be used as decision-models for improving our capacity for independent action. Such a demand for decisions that literally impact our survival causes one to wonder: How do we generate or create the mental concepts to support this decision-making activity.

+ There are two ways in which ^{we} can develop and manipulate mental concepts to represent observed reality: We can start from a comprehensive whole and break it down to its particulars or we can start with the particulars and build towards a comprehensive whole. In other words, we can go from the general to specific or from the specific to general. A little reflection here reveals that deduction is related to proceeding from the general to specific while induction is related to proceeding from the specific to general. In following this line of thought can we think of other activities that are related to these two opposing ideas? Is not analysis related to proceeding from the general to specific? Is not synthesis, the opposite of analysis, related to proceeding from the specific to general? Putting all this together: Can we not say that general to specific is related to both deduction and analysis, while specific-to-general is related to induction and synthesis. Now can we think of some examples to fit with these two opposing ideas? We need not look far. The Differential Calculus proceeds from the general to specific -- from a function to its derivative. Hence is not the differential calculus related to deduction and analysis? The integral calculus on the other hand, proceeds in the opposite direction -- from a derivative to the general function. Hence, is not the integral calculus related to induction and synthesis?

+ When viewed ^{From this perspective} ~~in this light~~ we believe it inappropriate to say "The Calculus is an analytical tool". Otherwise we would be forced to conclude that the integral calculus does not exist.

+ Yet many professionals who use the calculus regard it as an

analytical tool. Summing up once again we see that; general to specific is related to deduction, analysis and differentiation. On the other hand specific to general is related to induction, synthesis and integration.

Now keeping these two opposing idea chains in mind let us move on a somewhat different tact. Imagine, if you will a domain (a comprehensive whole) and its constituent elements or parts. Now, imagine another domain and its constituent parts. Once again, ~~image~~^{imagine} even another domain and its constituent parts. Repeating this idea over and over again we can imagine any number of domains and the parts corresponding to each. Naturally, as we go through life we develop concepts of meaning with included constituents to represent observed reality. Can we not liken these concepts and their related constituents, that represent observed reality, to the domains and constituents that we have formed in our imagination? Naturally, we can. Keeping this relationship in mind suppose we shatter the correspondence of each domain or concept with its constituent elements. In other words, we imagine the existence of the parts but pretend that the domains or concepts they were previously associated with do not exist. Result: We have many constituents, or particulars, swimming around in a sea of anarchy. We have uncertainty and disorder in place of meaning and order. Further, we can see such an unstructuring or destruction of many domains -- to break the correspondence of each with its respective constituents -- is related to Deduction, Analysis and Differentiation. We call this kind of unstructuring a Destructive Deduction.

Faced with such disorder or chaos, how can we reconstruct order and meaning? Going back to the idea chain of specific-to-general, induction, synthesis and integration the thought occurs that a new domain or concept can be formed if we can find some common qualities, attributes, or operations among some or many of these constituents swimming in this sea of anarchy. Through such connecting threads of meaning we synthesize constituents from, hence across, the domains we have just shattered. Linking particulars together in this manner we can form a new domain or concept -- providing, of course, we do not inadvertently use only those "bits and pieces" in the same arrangement that we associated with one of the domains purged from our imagination. Clearly, such a synthesis would indicate we have created something new and different from what previously existed. Going back to our idea chain, it follows that creativity is related to induction, synthesis and integration since we proceeded from unstructured bits and pieces to a new general structure or concept. We call such action a creative or constructive induction. It is important to note that the crucial or key step that permits this creative induction is the separation of the particulars from their previous domains by the Destructive Deduction. Without this unstructuring the creation of a new structure cannot proceed -- since the bits and pieces are still tied together as meaning within unchallenged domains or concepts.

Recalling that we use concepts or mental patterns to describe reality it follows that the unstructuring and restructuring just shown reveals a way for changing our perception of reality. Naturally, such a notion implies that the emerging pattern of

ideas and interactions must be internal^{ly} consistent and match-up[^] with reality. To check or verify internal consistency we try logically to see if we can find our way back to the original constituents that were used in the creative or constructive induction. If we cannot reverse directions the ideas and interactions do not go together in this way without contradiction. Hence, they are not internally consistent. However, this does not necessarily mean we reject and throw away the entire structure. Instead, we should attempt to identify those ideas (particulars) and interactions that seem to hold together in a coherent pattern of activity as distinguished from those ideas that do not seem to fit in. In performing this task we check for reversibility as well as check to see which ideas and interactions match up with our observations of reality. Using those ideas and interactions that pass this test together with any new ideas or other promising ideas that popped out of the original Destructive Deduction we again attempt to find some common qualities, attributes, or operations to recreate the concept. Also once again we perform the check for reversibility and match-up with reality. Over and over again this cycle of Destruction and Creation is repeated until we demonstrate internal consistency and a match-up with reality.

When this orderly (and pleasant) state is reached the concept becomes a coherent pattern of ideas and intractions that can be used to describe some aspect of observed reality. As a consequence, there is little, or no, further appeal to

alternative ideas and interactions in an effort to either expand, complete or modify the concept. Instead, the effort is turned inward ^{Toward} ~~toward rearranging~~ and fine tuning the ideas and interactions in order to improve generality and produce a finer grain match of reality with the conceptual pattern. Toward this end, the concept -- and its internal workings -- is tested and compared against observed phenomena over and over again in many different and subtle ways. Such a repeated and an inward oriented effort to explain increasingly more subtle aspects of reality suggests the disturbing idea that perhaps, at some point, ambiguities, uncertainties, anomalies, or apparent inconsistencies may emerge to stifle a more general and precise match-up of concept with observed reality. Why do we suspect this?

On one hand, we realize that facts, perceptions, ideas, impressions, interactions, etc. separated from previous observations and thought patterns have been linked together to create a new conceptual pattern. On the other hand, we ^{suspect} ~~expect~~ that refined observations now underway will eventually exhibit either more or a different kind of precision and subtlety than the previous observations and thought patterns. Clearly any anticipated difference, or differences, suggest we should expect a mismatch between the ^{new} observations and the ^{anticipated} concept description of ^{these} ~~that~~ observations. To assume otherwise would be tantamount to admitting that previous constituents and interactions would produce the same synthesis as any newer constituents and interactions that exhibit either more or a different kind of

precision and subtlety. This would be like admitting $1=2$. To avoid such a discomfoting position implies that we should anticipate a mismatch between phenomena observation and concept description of that observation. Such a notion is not new and is indicated by the discoveries of Kurt Godel and Werner Heisenberg.

In 1931 Kurt Godel created a stir in the World of Mathematics and logic when he demonstrated that it was impossible to embrace mathematics within a single system of logic. He accomplished this by proving, first, that any consistent system - that includes the arithmetic of whole numbers - is incomplete. In other words, there are true statements or concepts within the system that cannot be deduced from the postulates that make-up the system. Next, he proved even though such a system is consistent its consistency cannot be determined within the system.

Such a result does not imply that it is impossible to demonstrate the consistency of a system. It only means that such a proof cannot be accomplished inside the system. As a matter of fact, since Godel, Gehard Gentzen and others have shown that a consistency proof of arithmetic can be found by appealing to systems outside that arithmetic. Thus Godel's proof indirectly shows: That in order to determine the consistency of any new system we must construct or uncover another system beyond it. Over and over this cycle must be repeated to demonstrate the consistency of more and more elaborate systems.

Keeping this process in mind let us see how Godel's results impact the effort to improve the match-up of concept with observed reality. To do this we must consider two kinds of consistency: The consistency of the concept and the consistency of match-up between observed reality and concept description. In this sense, if we assume -- as a result of previous Destructive Deduction and Creative Induction efforts -- that we have a consistent concept and a consistent match-up; we should see no differences between observation and concept description. Yet, as we have seen, on one hand, we use observations to shape or formulate a concept. On the other hand, we use a concept to shape the nature of future inquiries or observations of reality. Back and forth, over and over again, we use observations to sharpen a concept and a concept to sharpen observations. Under these circumstances, a concept must be incomplete since we depend upon an ever-changing array of observations to shape or formulate it. Likewise our observations of reality must be incomplete since we depend upon a changing concept to shape or formulate the nature of new inquiries and observations. Therefore, when we probe, back and forth with more precision and subtlety, we must admit that we have differences between observation and concept description hence cannot determine the consistency of the system - in terms of its concept, and match-up with observed reality.

Furthermore, the consistency cannot be determined even when the precision and subtlety of observed phenomena approached the precision and subtlety of the observer -- who is employing the ideas and interactions that play together in the conceptual

pattern. This aspect of consistency is accounted for not only by Godel's Proof but also by the Heisenberg Uncertainty or Indeterminacy Principle.

The Indeterminacy Principle uncovered by Werner Heisenberg in 1927 showed that one could not simultaneously fix or determine precisely the velocity and position of a particle or body. Specifically he showed, due to the presence and influence of an observer, that the product of the velocity and position uncertainties, is equal to or greater than a small number (Planck's Constant) divided by the mass of the particle or body being investigated. In other words:

$$\Delta V \cdot \Delta Q \geq h/m$$

where ΔV is velocity uncertainty

ΔQ is position uncertainty

and h/m is Planck's constant (h) divided by observed mass (m).

Examination of Heisenberg's Principle reveals that as mass becomes exceedingly small the uncertainty, or indeterminacy becomes exceedingly large. Now -- in accordance with this relation -- when the precision, or mass, of phenomena being observed, is little, or no different than the precision, or mass, of the observing phenomena the uncertainty values become as large, or larger, than the velocity and size frame-of-reference associated with the bodies being observed. In this environment, the character or nature of the observer is little, or no different than the character or nature of the phenomena being observed. In essence, then, when the observer and observed become essentially one and the same the uncertainty values hide or mask phenomena behavior; or put another way the observer perceives uncertain

or erratic behavior that bounces all over in accordance with the indeterminacy relation. Under these circumstances the uncertainty values represent the inability to determine the character or nature (consistency) of a system within itself. On the other hand, if the precision and subtlety of the observed phenomena is much less than the precision and subtlety of the observing phenomena the uncertainty values become much smaller than the velocity and size values of the bodies being observed. Under these circumstances, the character or nature of a system can be determined although not exactly - since the uncertainty values do not hide or mask observed phenomena behavior nor indicate significant erratic behavior.

+ Keeping in mind, that the Heisenberg Principle implicitly depends upon the ^{indeterminate} ~~undetermined~~ presence and influence of an observer we can now see -- as revealed by the two examples just cited -- that the magnitude of the uncertainty values represent the degree of intrusion by the observer upon the observed. When intrusion is total (that is, when the character or nature of the observer and observed become essentially the same) the uncertainty values indicate erratic behavior. When intrusion is low the uncertainty values do not hide or mask observed phenomena behavior, nor indicate significant erratic behavior. In other words, the uncertainty values not only represent the degree of intrusion by the observer upon the observed but also the degree of confusion and disorder perceived by that observer.

Confusion and disorder are also related to the notion of Entropy and the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Entropy is a

concept that represents the capacity for taking purposeful action and the degree of confusion and disorder associated with any physical or information activity. High entropy implies a low capacity for taking purposeful action or a high degree of confusion and disorder. Low entropy implies just the opposite. Viewed in this context, the Second Law of Thermodynamics states that all observed natural processes generate entropy. From this law it follows that entropy must increase in any closed system - or, for that matter, in any system that cannot communicate in an ordered fashion with other systems or environments external to itself. Accordingly, anytime we attempt to take purposeful action inside such a system - a concept and its match-up with reality - we ~~must~~ ^{should} anticipate an increase in entropy hence an increase in confusion and disorder. Naturally, this means we cannot determine the character or nature (consistency) of such a system within itself, since the system is moving irreversibly toward a higher, yet unknown, state of confusion and disorder.

What an interesting outcome! According to Godel we cannot-in general-determine the consistency of an abstract system within itself. According to Heisenberg and the Second Law of Thermodynamics any attempt to do so in the real world will expose uncertainty and generate disorder. Taken together these three notions support the idea that any inward oriented and continued effort to improve the match-up of concept with observed reality will only increase the degree of mismatch. Naturally, in this environment, uncertainty and disorder will increase, as previously indicated by the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle and the Second

Law of Thermodynamics respectively. Put another way, we can expect unexplained and disturbing ambiguities, uncertainties, anomalies, or apparent inconsistencies to emerge more and more often. Furthermore, unless some kind of relief is available, we can expect ~~the~~ confusion and disorder to increase until randomness approaches chaos or death.

Fortunately, there is a way out. Remember, as previously shown, we can forge a new concept by applying the Destructive Deduction and Creative Induction mental operations. Also, remember, in order to perform these dialectic mental operations we must first shatter the rigid conceptual pattern, or patterns, firmly established in our mind. (This should not be too difficult since the rising confusion and disorder is already helping us to undermine any patterns). Next, we must find some common qualities, attributes or operations to link isolated facts, ideas, impressions, *interactions*, observations, etc. together as a possible concept to represent the real world. Finally, we must repeat this unstructuring and restructuring until we develop a concept that begins to match-up with reality. By doing this - in accordance with Godel, Heisenberg and the Second Law of Thermodynamics - we find that the uncertainty and disorder generated by an inward oriented system talking to itself can be offset by going outside and creating a new system. Simply stated, uncertainty and related disorder is diminished by the direct artifice of creating a higher and/or broader more general concept to represent reality.

However, once again, when we begin to turn inward and use the new concept - within its own framework of ideas and interactions - to produce a finer grain match with observed reality

Page 10/11
WW = wrong word
RW = re-write (usually a phrase)
11 FEB 76
JRB

DESTRUCTION AND CREATION

D R A F T

Studies
+ A study of human behavior reveals that the actions we undertake as individuals are closely related to survival, more importantly, survival on our own terms. Naturally, such a notion implies that we should be able to act relatively free or independent of any debilitating external influences -- otherwise that very survival might be in jeopardy. In viewing
+ the instinct for survival in this manner we imply that ~~our~~ basic aim or goal, as individuals is to improve our capacity for independent action. The degree to which we cooperate, or compete, with others is driven by the need to satisfy this basic goal. If we believe that it is not possible to satisfy it alone, and without help from others, history shows us that we will agree to constraints upon our independent action -- in order to collectively pool skills and talents in the form of nations, corporations, labor unions, mafias, etc. -- so that obstacles standing in the way of the basic goal can either be removed or overcome. On the other hand, if the group cannot or does not attempt to overcome obstacles deemed important to many (or possibly any) of it's individual members, the group must risk losing these alienated members. Under these circumstances, the alienated members may dissolve their relationship and remain independent, ~~or~~ form a group of their own, or join another collective body in order to improve their capacity for independent action.

*In general,
I feel the logic is tight.*

we note that the new concept and its match-up with observed reality begins to self destruct just as before. Accordingly, the dialectic cycle of destruction and creation begins to repeat itself once again. In other words, as suggested by Godel's Proof of Incompleteness we imply that the process of Structure, Unstructure, Restructure, Unstructure, Restructure is repeated endlessly in moving to higher and broader levels of elaboration.

+ In this unfolding drama the alternating cycle of entropy increases toward more and more disorder and the entropy decrease toward more and more order appears to be one part of a control mechanism that literally seems to drive and regulate this alternating cycle of ^d Destruction and ⁱ Creation toward higher and broader levels of elaboration.

+ Now in relating this ^d Deductive/ⁱ Inductive activity to the basic goal discussed in the beginning, ~~I~~ believe we have uncovered ^a the Dialectic Engine that permits the construction of feedback decision models needed by individuals and societies for determining and monitoring actions in an effort to improve their capacity for independent action. Furthermore, since this engine is directed toward satisfying this basic aim or goal, it follows that the degree or lack thereof toward reaching the goal appears to be the other side of a control mechanism that seems to also both drive and regulate the alternating cycle of destruction and creation toward higher and broader levels of elaborateⁱan. In this context, when acting within a closed system, the goal seeking effort of individuals and societies to improve their capacity for independent action tends to produce disorder towards randomness.

and death. On the other hand, as already shown, the increasing disorder generated by the increasing mismatch of the system concept with observed reality opens up or unstructures the system. As the unstructuring or, as we call it, the destructive deduction unfolds it shifts toward a creative induction to stop the trend toward disorder ^{and chaos} to satisfy a goal oriented ^{need} effort for increased order. Hence, an entropy increase in a closed system is offset by the improved possibilities also offered by this entropy increase which permits both the destruction or unstructuring of ^{a closed} the old system and the creation of a new system to nullify the march toward randomness and death.

Taken together the entropy notion and the basic goal of individuals and societies seem to work in dialectic harmony toward driving and regulating the destructive/creative, or deductive/inductive, action - that we have described herein as a dialectic engine. The result is a changing and expanding universe of mental concepts matched to a changing and expanding universe of observed reality. As indicated earlier, these mental concepts are employed as decision models by individuals and societies for determining and monitoring actions needed to cope with their environment - or improve their capacity for independent action.

In a real world of limited resources and skills individuals and groups form, dissolve and reform their cooperative or competitive postures in a continuous struggle to remove or overcome physical and social environmental obstacles. In a cooperative sense, where skills and talents are pooled, ^{this} the removal (or overcoming of obstacles) represents an improved capacity for independent action for all concerned. In a competitive sense where individuals and groups compete for scarce resources and skills, an improved capacity for independent action achieved by some individuals (or groups) constrains that capacity for other individuals (or groups). Naturally, such a combination of real world scarcity and goal striving to overcome this scarcity intensifies the struggle of individuals and groups to cope with both their physical and social environments.

+ Against such a background, actions and decisions become critically important. Actions must be taken over and over again and in many different ways. Decisions must be rendered to monitor and determine the precise nature of the actions needed that will be compatible with the goal. To make these timely decisions implies that we must be able to form mental concepts of observed reality and be able to change these concepts as observed reality itself changes. The concepts can then be used as decision models for improving our capacity for independent action. Such a demand for decisions that literally impact our survival causes one to wonder: How do we generate or create the mental concepts to support this decision-making activity?

There are two ways in which ^{we} can develop and manipulate mental concepts to ^{address} ~~represent~~ observed reality: We can start from a comprehensive whole and break it down to its particulars or we can start with ~~the~~ particulars and build towards a comprehensive whole. In other words, we can go from the general to specific or from the specific to general. A little reflection here reveals that deduction is related to proceeding from the general to specific while induction is related to proceeding from the specific to general. In following this line of thought, can we think of other activities that are related to these two opposing ideas? Is not analysis related to proceeding from the general to specific? Is not synthesis, the opposite of analysis, related to proceeding from the specific to general? Putting all this together: Can we not say that general to specific is related to both deduction and analysis, while specific-to-general is related to induction and synthesis? Now, can we think of some examples to fit with these two opposing ideas? We need not look far. The Differential Calculus proceeds from the general to specific -- from a function to its derivative. Hence is not the differential calculus related to deduction and analysis? The integral calculus on the other hand, proceeds in the opposite direction -- from a derivative to the general function. Hence, is not the integral calculus related to induction and synthesis? When viewed ^{from this perspective} ~~in this light~~ we believe it inappropriate to say "The Calculus is an analytical tool". Otherwise we would be forced to conclude that the integral calculus does not exist. Yet many professionals who use the calculus regard it ^{rarely} as an

analytical tool. Summing up once again we see that; general to specific is related to deduction, analysis and differentiation. On the other hand specific to general is related to induction, synthesis and integration.

I like!

Now keeping these two opposing idea chains in mind let us move on a somewhat different tact. Imagine, if you will, a domain (a comprehensive whole) and its constituent elements ~~or parts~~.

Now, imagine another domain and its constituent ~~parts~~ ^{elements}. Once again, ~~image~~ ^{imagine} even another domain and its constituent ~~parts~~ ^{elements}.

Repeating this idea over and over again we can imagine any number of domains and the ~~parts~~ ^{elements} corresponding to each. Naturally, as we go through life we develop ^{meaningful} ~~concepts of meaning~~ (with included constituents) to represent observed reality. Can we not liken these concepts and their related constituents, that represent observed reality, to the domains and constituents that we have formed in our imagination? Naturally, we can. Keeping this relationship in mind, suppose we shatter the correspondence of each domain or concept with its constituent elements. In other words, we imagine the existence of the parts but pretend that the domains or concepts they were previously associated with do not exist. Result: We have many constituents, or particulars, swimming around in a sea of anarchy. We have uncertainty and disorder in place of meaning and order. Further, we can see such an unstructuring or destruction of many domains -- to break the correspondence of each with its respective constituents -- is related to Deduction, Analysis and Differentiation. We call this kind of unstructuring a Destructive Deduction.

WW's?
(over)
RW
+
Faced with such disorder or chaos, how can we reconstruct order and meaning? Going back to the idea chain of specific-to-general, induction, synthesis and integration, the thought occurs that a new domain or concept can be formed if we can find some common qualities, attributes, or operations among some or many of these constituents swimming in this sea of anarchy. Through such connecting threads of meaning we synthesize constituents from, hence across, the domains we have just shattered. Linking particulars together in this manner we can form a new domain or concept -- providing, of course, we do not inadvertently use only those "bits and pieces" in the same arrangement that we associated with one of the domains purged from our imagination. Clearly, such a synthesis would indicate we have created something new and different from what previously existed. Going back to our idea chain, it follows that creativity is related to induction, synthesis and integration since we proceeded from unstructured bits and pieces to a new general structure or concept. We call such action a "creative" or "constructive" induction. It is important to note that the crucial or key step that permits this creative induction is the ^{sp}separation of the particulars from their previous domains by the Destructive Deduction. Without this unstructuring the creation of a new structure cannot proceed -- since the bits and pieces are still tied together as meaning within unchallenged domains or concepts.

Recalling that we use concepts or mental patterns to describe reality it follows that the unstructuring and restructuring just shown reveals a way for changing our perception of reality. Naturally, such a notion implies that the emerging pattern of

3
3
3
A domain consists of elements
in a specified order. That specified
order can be thought of as an
element too. Then, each domain
will have a unique set of
constituent elements. You can
refer to this element as the
order element.

This makes the concept
easier to deal with !!!

*If you use "match up," don't hyphenate it
when you use it as a verb. ^{ly} align*

+ ideas and interactions must be internal^{ly} consistent and match-up with reality. To check or verify internal consistency we try logically to see if we can find our way back to the original constituents that were used in the creative or constructive induction. If we cannot reverse directions the ideas and interactions do not go together in this way without contradiction. Hence, they are not internally consistent. However, this does not necessarily mean we reject and throw away the entire structure. Instead, we should attempt to identify those ideas (particulars) and interactions that seem to hold together in a coherent pattern of activity as distinguished from those ideas that do not seem to fit in. In performing this task we check for reversibility as well as check to see which ideas and interactions match up with our observations of reality. Using those ideas and interactions that pass this test together with any new ideas or other promising ideas that popped out of the original Destructive Deduction we again attempt to find some common qualities, attributes, or operations to ^{re-create} recreate the concept. Also once again we perform the check for reversibility and match-up with reality. Over and over again this cycle of Destruction and Creation is repeated until we demonstrate internal consistency and a match-up with reality.

When this orderly (and pleasant) state is reached the concept becomes a coherent pattern of ideas and interactions that can be used to describe some aspect of observed reality. As a consequence, there is little, or no, further appeal to

*Purification
↑
Excellent Word*

alternative ideas and interactions in an effort to either expand, complete or modify the concept. Instead, the effort is turned inward toward [?]rearranging and fine tuning the ideas and interactions in order to improve generality and produce a ^{more precise} finer grain match of (reality with the conceptual pattern). Toward this end, the concept -- and its internal workings -- is tested and compared against observed phenomena over and over again in many different and subtle ways. Such a repeated and an inward oriented effort to explain increasingly more subtle aspects of reality suggests the disturbing idea that perhaps, at some point, ambiguities, uncertainties, anomalies, or apparent inconsistencies may emerge to stifle a more general and precise match-up of concept with observed reality. Why do we suspect this?

On one hand, we realize that facts, perceptions, ideas, impressions, interactions, etc. separated from previous observations and thought patterns have been linked together to create a new conceptual pattern. On the other hand, we ^{suspect} ~~expect~~ that refined observations now underway will eventually exhibit either more or a different kind of precision and subtlety than the previous observations and thought patterns. Clearly any anticipated difference, or differences, suggest we should expect a mismatch between the ^{new} observations and the ^{anticipated} concept description ^{being} ~~of that~~ observations. To assume otherwise would be tantamount to admitting that previous constituents and interactions would produce the same synthesis as any newer constituents and interactions that exhibit either more or a different kind of

sarcastic precision and subtlety. This would be like admitting ^{one equals two.} 1=2. To avoid such a discomforting position implies that we should anticipate a mismatch between phenomena observation and concept description of that observation. Such a notion is not new and is indicated by the discoveries of Kurt Godel and Werner Heisenberg.

In 1931 Kurt Godel created a stir in the World of Mathematics and logic when he demonstrated that it was impossible to embrace mathematics within a single system of logic. He accomplished this by proving, first, that any consistent system - that includes the arithmetic of whole numbers - is incomplete. In other words, there are true statements or concepts within the system that cannot be deduced from the postulates that make-up the system. Next, he proved even though such a system ^{maybe} is consistent, its consistency cannot be determined within the system.

re-construct Such a result does not imply that it is impossible to demonstrate the consistency of a system. It only means that such a proof cannot be accomplished inside the system. As a matter of fact, since Godel, Gerhard Gentzen and others have shown that a consistency proof of arithmetic can be found by appealing to systems outside that arithmetic. Thus Godel's proof indirectly shows: That in order to determine the consistency of any new system, we must construct or uncover another system beyond it. Over and over this cycle must be repeated to demonstrate the consistency of more and more elaborate systems.

Keeping this process in mind let us see how Godel's results impact the effort to improve the match-up of concept with observed reality. To do this we must consider two kinds of consistency: ~~the~~ consistency of the concept and the consistency of ~~the~~ match-up between observed reality and concept description. In this sense, if we assume -- as a result of previous Destructive Deduction and Creative Induction efforts -- that we have a consistent concept and a consistent match-up, we should see no differences between observation and concept description. Yet, as we have seen, on one hand, we use observations to shape or formulate a concept; ^{while,} On the other hand, we use a concept to shape the nature of future inquiries or observations of reality. Back and forth, over and over again, we use observations to sharpen a concept and a concept to sharpen observations. Under these circumstances, a concept must be incomplete since we depend upon an ever-changing array of observations to shape or formulate it. Likewise our observations of reality must be incomplete since we depend upon a changing concept to shape or formulate the nature of new inquiries and observations. Therefore, when we probe, back and forth with more precision and subtlety, we must admit that we have differences between observation and concept description; hence, ~~cannot determine~~ the consistency of the system ^{cannot be determined} in terms of its concept, and match-up with observed reality.

Furthermore, the consistency cannot be determined even when the precision and subtlety of observed phenomena approaches ^s the precision and subtlety of the observer, ~~who~~ ^{is} who is employing the ideas and interactions that play together in the conceptual

pattern. This aspect of consistency is accounted for not only by Godel's Proof but also by the Heisenberg Uncertainty or Indeterminacy Principle. *← (Transition) let us briefly address this principle.*

The Indeterminacy Principle uncovered by Werner Heisenberg in 1927 showed that one could not simultaneously fix or determine precisely the velocity and position of a particle or body. Specifically he showed, *that* due to the presence and influence of an observer, ~~that~~ the product of the velocity and position uncertainties, is equal to or greater than a small number (Planck's Constant) divided by the mass of the particle or body being investigated. In other words:

$$\Delta V \cdot \Delta Q \geq h/m$$

where ΔV is velocity uncertainty

ΔQ is position uncertainty

and h/m is Planck's constant (h) divided by observed mass (m).

Examination of Heisenberg's Principle reveals that as mass becomes exceedingly small the uncertainty, or indeterminacy becomes *comparatively* ~~exceedingly~~ large. Now -- in accordance with this relation -- when the precision, or mass, of phenomena being observed, is little, or no different than the precision, or mass, of the observing phenomena the uncertainty values become as large, or larger, than the velocity and size frame-of-reference associated with the bodies being observed. In this environment, the character or nature of the observer is little, or no different than the character or nature of the phenomena being observed. In essence, then, when the observer and observed become essentially one and the same, the uncertainty values hide or mask phenomena behavior; or put another way, the observer perceives uncertain

"dynamic range"
Good EE term.

or erratic behavior that bounces ^{too colloquial} all over in accordance with the indeterminacy relation. Under these circumstances the uncertainty values represent the inability to determine the character or nature (consistency) of a system within itself. On the other hand, if the precision and subtlety of the observed phenomena is much less than the precision and subtlety of the observing phenomena the uncertainty values become much smaller than the velocity and size values of the bodies being observed. Under these circumstances, the character or nature of a system can be determined -- although not exactly -- since the uncertainty values do not hide or mask observed phenomena behavior nor indicate significant erratic behavior.

+ Keeping in mind, that the Heisenberg Principle implicitly depends upon the ^{indeterminate} ~~undetermined~~ presence and influence of an observer we can now see -- as revealed by the two examples just cited -- that the magnitude of the uncertainty values represent the degree of intrusion by the observer upon the observed. When intrusion is total (that is, when the character or nature of the observer and observed become essentially the same) the uncertainty values indicate erratic behavior. When intrusion is low the uncertainty values do not hide or mask observed phenomena behavior, nor indicate significant erratic behavior. In other words, the uncertainty values not only represent the degree of intrusion by the observer upon the observed but also the degree of confusion and disorder perceived by that observer. < Transition? >

Excellent

Confusion and disorder are also related to the notion of Entropy and the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Entropy is a

• concept that represents the capacity for taking purposeful action and the degree of confusion and disorder associated with any physical or information activity. High entropy implies a low capacity for taking purposeful action ~~or~~ a high degree of confusion and disorder. Low entropy implies just the opposite. Viewed in this context, the Second Law of Thermodynamics states that all observed natural processes generate entropy. From this law it follows that entropy must increase in any closed system -- or, for that matter, in any system that cannot communicate in an ordered fashion with other systems or environments external to itself. Accordingly, anytime we attempt to take purposeful action inside such a system -- a concept and its match-up with reality -- we ^{should} ~~must~~ anticipate an increase in entropy hence an increase in confusion and disorder. Naturally, this means we cannot determine the character or nature (consistency) of such a system within itself, since the system is moving irreversibly toward a higher, yet unknown, state of confusion and disorder.

What an interesting outcome! According to Godel we cannot in general determine the consistency of an abstract system within itself. According to Heisenberg and the Second Law of Thermodynamics any attempt to do so in the real world will expose uncertainty and generate disorder. Taken together these three notions support the idea that any inward oriented and continued effort to improve the match-up of concept with observed reality will only increase the degree of mismatch. Naturally, in this environment, uncertainty and disorder will increase, as previously indicated by the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle and the Second

+
RW
Law of Thermodynamics respectively. Put another way, we can expect unexplained and disturbing ambiguities, uncertainties, anomalies, or apparent inconsistencies to emerge more and more often. Furthermore, unless some kind of relief is available, we can expect ~~the~~ confusion and disorder to increase until randomness approaches chaos or death.

1ST TIME USED?!

Fortunately, there is a way out. Remember, as previously shown, we can forge a new concept by applying the Destructive Deduction and Creative Induction mental operations. Also, remember, in order to perform these dialectic mental operations we must first shatter the rigid conceptual pattern, or patterns, firmly established in our mind. (This should not be too difficult since the rising confusion and disorder is already helping us to undermine any patterns). Next, we must find some common qualities, attributes or operations to link isolated facts, ideas, ^{perceptions} impressions, ^{interactions} observations, etc. together as a possible concept to represent the real world. Finally, we must repeat this unstructuring and restructuring ^{process} until we develop a concept that begins to match-up with reality. By doing this-- in accordance with Godel, Heisenberg and the Second Law of Thermodynamics-- we find that the uncertainty and disorder generated by an inward oriented system talking to itself can be offset by going outside and creating a new system. Simply stated, uncertainty and related disorder is diminished by the direct artifice of creating a higher and/or broader more general concept to represent reality.

However, once again, when we begin to turn inward and use the new concept --within its own framework of ideas and interactions --to produce a finer grain match with observed reality

we note that the new concept and its match-up with observed reality begins to self destruct just as before. Accordingly, the dialectic cycle of destruction and creation begins to repeat itself once again. In other words, as suggested by Godel's Proof of Incompleteness we imply that the process of Structure, Unstructure, Restructure, Unstructure, Restructure is repeated endlessly in moving to higher and broader levels of elaboration.

+ In this unfolding drama, the alternating cycle of "entropy increase" toward more and more disorder, and the "entropy decrease" toward more and more order appears to be one part of a control mechanism that literally seems to drive and regulate this alternating cycle of ^d Destruction and ^c Creation toward higher and broader levels of elaboration.

+ Now in relating this ^d Reductive/ⁱ Inductive activity to the basic goal, discussed in the beginning, I believe we have uncovered ^a the Dialectic Engine that permits the construction of feedback decision models needed by individuals and societies for determining and monitoring actions in an effort to improve their capacity for independent action. Furthermore, since this engine is directed

LW degree or lack thereof toward reaching the goal appears to be the other side of a control mechanism that ^{also} seems to also both

to drive and ^{to} regulate the alternating cycle of destruction and creation toward higher and broader levels of elaboration. In this context when acting within a closed system, the goal seeking effort of individuals and societies to improve their capacity for independent action tends to produce disorder towards randomness

and death. On the other hand, as already shown, the increasing disorder generated by the increasing mismatch of the system concept with observed reality opens ~~up~~ ^{and chaos} or unstructures the system. As the unstructuring or, as we call it, the destructive deduction unfolds, it shifts toward a creative induction to stop the trend toward disorder, to satisfy a goal oriented ~~effort~~ ^{need} for increased order. ~~Hence, an entropy increase in a closed system is offset by the improved possibilities also offered by this entropy increase which permits both the destruction or unstructuring of the old system and the creation of a new system to nullify the march toward randomness and death.~~ ^{Paradoxically, then,}

Taken together the entropy notion and the basic goal of individuals and societies seem to work in dialectic harmony ~~toward~~ driving and regulating the destructive/creative, or deductive/inductive, action - that we have described herein as a dialectic engine. The result is a changing and expanding universe of mental concepts matched to a changing and expanding universe of observed reality. As indicated earlier these mental concepts are employed as decision models by individuals and societies for determining and monitoring actions needed to cope with their environment - or ^{to} improve their capacity for independent action.

Intro is imperative.

*Tie the intro to this last part. ↑
(Maybe talk about active decisions rather than re-active decisions)*

Segment 2 Subtitle

I'll try for a chop from my class.

Abstract Destruction and Creation¹⁰²

To comprehend and cope with our environment we develop mental patterns or concepts of meaning. The purpose of this following ~~discussion~~ paper is to sketch out how we ~~then~~ destroy and create these patterns to permit us to both shape and be shaped by a changing environment. In this sense, the discussion also ^{literally} shows ~~why~~ ^{literally} why we cannot avoid this kind of activity if we intend to survive on our own terms.

The activity is dialectic in nature, ~~that~~ generating both order and disorder and order ~~is~~ ^{is} a changing and expanding universe of mental concepts, matched to a changing and expanding universe of observed reality.

generating both disorder and order, that results in a changing and expanding universe of mental concepts matched to a changing and expanding universe of observed reality.

Abstract

Group

DESTRUCTION AND CREATION

D R A F T

A study of human behavior reveals that the actions we undertake as individuals are closely related to survival, more importantly, survival on our own terms. Naturally, such a notion implies that we should be able to act relatively free or independent of any debilitating external influences -- otherwise that very survival might be in jeopardy. In viewing the instinct for survival in this manner we imply that our basic aim or goal, as individuals is to improve our capacity for independent action. The degree to which we cooperate, or compete, with others is driven by the need to satisfy this basic goal. If we believe that it is not possible to satisfy it alone and without help from others history shows us that we will agree to constraints upon our independent action -- in order to collectively pool skills and talents in the form of nations, corporations, labor unions, mafias, etc. -- so that obstacles standing in the way of the basic goal can either be removed or overcome. On the other hand, if the group cannot or does not attempt to overcome obstacles deemed important to many (or possibly any) of its individual members the group must risk losing these alienated members. Under these circumstances, the alienated members may dissolve their relationship and remain independent or form a group of their own or join another collective body in order to improve their capacity for independent action.

Environment

In a real world of limited resources and skills individuals and groups form, dissolve and reform their cooperative or competitive postures in a continuous struggle to remove or overcome physical and social environmental obstacles. In a cooperative sense, where skills and talents are pooled, the removal or overcoming of obstacles represents an improved capacity for independent action for all concerned. In a competitive sense where individuals and groups compete for scarce resources and skills, an improved capacity for independent action achieved by some individuals or groups constrains that capacity for other individuals or groups. Naturally, such a combination of real world scarcity and goal striving to overcome this scarcity intensifies the struggle of individuals and groups to cope with both their physical and social environments.

Need for Decisions

+ Against such a background, actions and decisions become critically important. Actions must be taken over and over again and in many different ways. Decisions must be rendered to monitor and determine the precise nature of the actions needed that will be compatible with the goal. To make these timely decisions implies that we must be able to form mental concepts of observed reality and be able to change these concepts as observed reality itself changes. The concepts can then be used as decision-models for improving our capacity for independent action. Such a demand for decisions that literally impact our survival causes one to wonder: How do we generate or create the mental concepts to support this decision-making activity?

Creating Concepts

There are two ways in which ^{we} can develop and manipulate mental concepts to represent observed reality: We can start from a comprehensive whole and break it down to its particulars or we can start with the particulars and build towards a comprehensive whole. In other words, we can go from the general-to-specific or from the specific-to-general. A little reflection here reveals that deduction is related to proceeding from the general-to-specific while induction is related to proceeding from the specific-to-general. In following this line of thought can we think of other activities that are related to these two opposing ideas? Is not analysis related to proceeding from the general-to-specific? Is not synthesis, the opposite of analysis, related to proceeding from the specific-to-general? Putting all this together: Can we not say that general-to-specific is related to both deduction and analysis, while specific-to-general is related to induction and synthesis? Now, can we think of some examples to fit with these two opposing ideas? We need not look far. The ^dDifferential ^cCalculus proceeds from the general-to-specific -- from a function to its derivative. Hence is not the ^{use or application of} the differential calculus related to deduction and analysis? The integral calculus on the other hand, proceeds in the opposite direction -- from a derivative to the general function. Hence, ^{use or application of the} is not the integral calculus related to induction and synthesis? When viewed in this light we believe it inappropriate to say "The Calculus is an analytical tool". Otherwise we would be forced to conclude that the integral calculus does not exist. Yet many professional who use the calculus regard it as an

~~analytical~~ tool. Summing up once again we see that; general to specific is related to deduction, analysis and differentiation. On the other hand specific-to-general is related to induction, synthesis and integration.

Now keeping these two opposing idea chains in mind let us move on a somewhat different tact. Imagine, if you will, a domain (a comprehensive whole) and its constituent elements or parts. Now, imagine another domain and its constituent parts. Once again, ~~image~~ ^{imagine} even another domain and its constituent parts. Repeating this idea over and over again we can imagine any number of domains and the parts corresponding to each. Naturally, as we go through life we develop concepts of meaning (with included constituents) to represent observed reality. Can we not liken these concepts and their related constituents, that represent observed reality, to the domains and constituents that we have formed in our imagination? Naturally, we can. Keeping this relationship in mind, suppose we shatter the correspondence of each domain or concept with its constituent elements. In other words, we imagine the existence of the parts but pretend that the domains or concepts they were previously associated with do not exist. Result: We have many constituents, or particulars, swimming around in a sea of anarchy. We have uncertainty and disorder in place of meaning and order. Further, we can see such an unstructuring or destruction of many domains -- to break the correspondence of each with its respective constituents -- is related to ^dDeduction, ^aAnalysis and ^dDifferentiation. We call this kind of unstructuring a ^dDestructive ^dDeduction.

Faced with such disorder or chaos, how can we reconstruct order and meaning? Going back to the idea chain of specific-to-general, induction, synthesis and integration the thought occurs that a new domain or concept can be formed if we can find some common qualities, attributes, or operations among some or many of these constituents swimming in this sea of anarchy. Through such connecting threads of meaning we synthesize constituents from, hence across, the domains we have just shattered. Linking particulars together in this manner we can form a new domain or concept -- providing, of course, we do not inadvertently use only those "bits and pieces" in the same arrangement that we associated with one of the domains purged from our imagination. Clearly, such a synthesis would indicate we have ^{generated} ~~created~~ something new and different from what previously existed. Going back to our idea chain, it follows that creativity is related to induction, synthesis and integration since we proceeded from unstructured bits and pieces to a new general structure or concept. We call such action a creative or constructive induction. It is important to note that the crucial or key step that permits this creative induction is the ^a separation of the particulars from their previous domains by the ^d ~~Destructive~~ ^d ~~Reduction~~. Without this unstructuring the creation of a new structure cannot proceed -- since the bits and pieces are still tied together as meaning within unchallenged domains or concepts.

Recalling that we use concepts or mental patterns to ^{represent} ~~describe~~ reality it follows that the unstructuring and restructuring just shown reveals a way for changing our perception of reality. Naturally, such a notion implies that the emerging pattern of

ideas and interactions must be internal^{ly} consistent and ~~match-up~~^{matchup} with reality. To check or verify internal consistency we try logically to see if we can find our way back to the original constituents that were used in the creative or constructive induction. If we cannot reverse directions the ideas and interactions do not go together in this way without contradiction. Hence, they are not internally consistent. However, this does not necessarily mean we reject and throw away the entire structure. Instead, we should attempt to identify those ideas (particulars) and interactions that seem to hold together in a coherent pattern of activity as distinguished from those ideas that do not seem to fit in. In performing this task we check for reversibility as well as check to see which ideas and interactions match up with our observations of reality. Using those ideas and interactions that pass this test together with any new (from new destructive deductions) ideas or other promising ideas that popped out of the original

Destructive Deduction we again attempt to find some common qualities, attributes, or operations to ~~recreate~~^{re-create} the concept -- or create a new concept. Also once again we perform the check for reversibility and match-up with reality. Over and over again this cycle of Destruction and Creation is repeated until we demonstrate internal consistency and a ~~match-up~~^{matchup} with reality.

Suspicion
When this orderly (and pleasant) state is reached the concept becomes a coherent pattern of ideas and intractions that can be used to describe some aspect of observed reality. As a consequence, there is little, or no, further appeal to

alternative ideas and interactions in an effort to either expand, complete or modify the concept. Instead, the effort is turned inward toward ~~rearranging and~~ fine tuning the ideas and interactions in order to improve generality and produce a ~~finer~~ ^{more precise} grain match of reality with the conceptual pattern. Toward this end, the concept -- and its internal workings -- is tested and compared against observed phenomena over and over again in many different and subtle ways. Such a repeated and an inward oriented effort to explain increasingly more subtle aspects of reality suggests the disturbing idea that perhaps, at some point, ambiguities, uncertainties, anomalies, or apparent inconsistencies may emerge to stifle a more general and precise match-up of concept with observed reality. Why do we suspect this?

On one hand, we realize that facts, perceptions, ideas, impressions, interactions, etc. separated from previous observations and thought patterns have been linked together to create a new conceptual pattern. On the other hand, we ~~expect~~ ^{suspect} that refined observations now underway will eventually exhibit either more or a different kind of precision and subtlety than the previous observations and thought patterns. Clearly, any anticipated difference, or differences, suggest we should expect a mismatch between the ^{new} observations and the ^{anticipated} concept description of ~~that~~ ^{these} observations. To assume otherwise would be tantamount to admitting that previous constituents and interactions would produce the same synthesis as any newer constituents and interactions that exhibit either more or a different kind of

one equals two.

precision and subtlety. This would be like admitting $(1=2)$. To avoid such a discomfoting position implies that we should anticipate a mismatch between phenomena observation and concept description of that observation. Such a notion is not new and is indicated by the discoveries of Kurt Gödel and Werner Heisenberg.

Incompleteness/Consistency Proof

In 1931 Kurt Gödel created a stir in the World of Mathematics and Logic when he demonstrated that it was impossible to embrace mathematics within a single system of logic. ^{9.20} He accomplished this by proving, first, that any consistent system ~~that includes~~ the arithmetic of whole numbers - is incomplete. In other words, there are true statements or concepts within the system that cannot be deduced from the postulates that make-up the system. Next, he proved even though such a system is consistent its consistency cannot be determined within the system.

Such a result does not imply that it is impossible to demonstrate the consistency of a system. It only means that such a proof cannot be accomplished inside the system. As a matter of fact, since Gödel, Gerhard Gentzen and others have shown that a consistency proof of arithmetic can be found by appealing to systems outside that arithmetic. Thus, Gödel's proof indirectly shows ^{that} ~~That~~ in order to determine the consistency of any new system we must construct or uncover another system beyond it. Over and over this cycle must be repeated to demonstrate the consistency of more and more elaborate systems.

Keeping this process in mind let us see how Godel's results impact the effort to improve the ^{matchup} match-up of concept with observed reality. To do this we ^{will} ~~must~~ consider two kinds of consistency: The consistency of the concept and the consistency ^{of reality} of ^{the matchup} match-up between observed reality and concept description. In this sense, if we assume -- as a result of previous Destructive ^d Deduction and ^e Creative ⁱ Induction efforts -- that we have a consistent concept and a consistent ^{matchup} match-up, we should see no differences between observation and concept description. Yet, as we have seen, on one hand we use observations to shape or formulate a concept; ^{while, on} the other hand, we use a concept to shape the nature of future inquiries or observations of reality. Back and forth, over and over again, we use observations to sharpen a concept and a concept to sharpen observations. Under these circumstances, a concept must be incomplete since we depend upon an ever-changing array of observations to shape or formulate it. Likewise, our observations of reality must be incomplete since we depend upon a changing concept to shape or formulate the nature of new inquiries and observations. Therefore, when we probe back and forth with more precision and subtlety, we must admit that we have differences between observation and concept description; hence, ^{we} cannot determine the consistency of the system - in terms of its concept, and match-up with observed reality.

Furthermore, the consistency cannot be determined even when the precision and subtlety of observed phenomena approached ^s the precision and subtlety of the observer -- who is employing the ideas and interactions that play together in the conceptual

pattern. This aspect of consistency is accounted for not only by Godel's Proof but also by the Heisenberg Uncertainty or Indeterminacy Principle.

Indeterminacy Principle
The Indeterminacy Principle uncovered by Werner Heisenberg in 1927 showed that one could not simultaneously fix or determine precisely the velocity and position of a particle or body. 11, 7]

Specifically he showed, due to the presence and influence of an observer, that the product of the velocity and position uncertainties, is equal to or greater than a small number (Planck's Constant) divided by the mass of the particle or body being investigated. In other words:

$$\Delta V \cdot \Delta Q \geq h/m$$

where ΔV is velocity uncertainty

ΔQ is position uncertainty

and h/m is Planck's constant (h) divided by observed mass (m).

Examination of Heisenberg's Principle reveals that as mass becomes exceedingly small the uncertainty, or indeterminacy becomes exceedingly large. Now -- in accordance with this relation -- when the precision, or mass, of phenomena being observed, is little, or no different than the precision, or mass, of the observing phenomena the uncertainty values become as large, or larger, than the velocity and size frame-of-reference associated with the bodies being observed. In this environment, the character or nature of the observer is little, or no, different than the character or nature of the phenomena being observed. In essence, then, when the observer and observed become essentially one and the same, the uncertainty values hide or mask phenomena behavior; or put another way, the observer perceives uncertain

or erratic behavior that bounces all over in accordance with the indeterminacy relation. Under these circumstances, the uncertainty values represent the inability to determine the character or nature (consistency) of a system within itself. On the other hand, if the precision and subtlety of the observed phenomena is much less than the precision and subtlety of the observing phenomena the uncertainty values become much smaller than the velocity and size values of the bodies being observed. Under these circumstances, the character or nature of a system can be determined although not exactly - since the uncertainty values do not hide or mask observed phenomena behavior nor indicate significant erratic behavior.

Keeping in mind, that the Heisenberg Principle ^{implicitly} ~~implicitly~~ depends upon the ^{indeterminate} ~~undetermined~~ presence and influence of an observer, we can now see -- as revealed by the two examples just cited -- that the magnitude of the uncertainty values represent the degree of intrusion by the observer upon the observed. When intrusion is total (that is, when the character or nature of the observer and observed become essentially the same) the uncertainty values indicate erratic behavior. When intrusion is low the uncertainty values do not hide or mask observed phenomena behavior, nor indicate significant erratic behavior. In other words, the uncertainty values not only represent the degree of intrusion by the observer upon the observed but also the degree of confusion and disorder perceived by that observer.

Entropy and The Second Law of Thermodynamics
Confusion and disorder are also related to the notion of ^{8.17} Entropy and the Second Law of Thermodynamics. Entropy is a

concept that represents the capacity for taking purposeful action and the degree of confusion and disorder associated with any physical or information activity. High entropy implies a low capacity for taking purposeful action or a high degree of confusion and disorder. Low entropy implies just the opposite. Viewed in this context, the Second Law of Thermodynamics states that all observed natural processes generate entropy. From this law it follows that entropy must increase in any closed system - or, for that matter, in any system that cannot communicate in an ordered fashion with other systems or environments external to itself. Accordingly, anytime we attempt to take purposeful action inside such a system ~~x~~ a concept and its match-up with reality ~~x~~ we ^{should} ~~must~~ anticipate an increase in entropy hence an increase in confusion and disorder. Naturally, this means we cannot determine the character or nature (consistency) of such a system within itself, since the system is moving irreversibly toward a higher, yet unknown, state of confusion and disorder.

Destruction and Creation

What an interesting outcome! According to Godel we cannot in general-determine the consistency of an abstract system within itself. According to Heisenberg and the Second Law of Thermodynamics any attempt to do so in the real world will expose uncertainty and generate disorder. Taken together these three notions support the idea that any inward oriented and continued effort to improve the ^{matchup} ~~match-up~~ of concept with observed reality will only increase the degree of mismatch. Naturally, in this environment, uncertainty and disorder will increase, as previously indicated by the Heisenberg ^{Indeterminacy} ~~Uncertainty~~ Principle and the Second

Law of Thermodynamics respectively. Put another way, we can expect unexplained and disturbing ambiguities, uncertainties, anomalies, or apparent inconsistencies to emerge more and more often. Furthermore, unless some kind of relief is available, we can expect ~~the~~ confusion ~~and disorder~~ to increase until ~~randomness~~ ^{disorder} approaches chaos ~~or~~ death.

Fortunately, there is a way out. Remember, as previously shown, we can forge a new concept by applying the ~~Destructive~~ ^d ~~Reduction~~ and ~~Creative~~ ^c ~~Induction~~ mental operations. Also, remember, in order to perform these dialectic mental operations we must first shatter the rigid conceptual pattern, or patterns, firmly established in our mind. (This should not be too difficult since the rising confusion and disorder is already helping us to undermine any patterns). Next, we must find some common qualities, attributes or operations to link isolated facts, ^{perceptions} ideas, impressions, ^{interactions} observations, etc. together as ~~a~~ possible concepts to represent the real world. Finally, we must repeat this unstructuring and restructuring until we develop a concept that begins to ^{matchup} ~~match up~~ with reality. By doing this - in accordance with Godel, Heisenberg and the Second Law of Thermodynamics - we find that the uncertainty and disorder generated by an inward oriented system talking to itself can be offset by going outside and creating a new system. Simply stated, uncertainty and related disorder ^{can be} ~~is~~ diminished by the direct artifice of creating a higher and ~~or~~ broader more general concept to represent reality.

However, once again, when we begin to turn inward and use the new concept - within its own ~~pattern~~ framework of ideas and interactions - to produce a finer grain match with observed reality

matchup
we note that the new concept and its ~~match-up~~ with observed reality begins to self destruct just as before. Accordingly, the dialectic cycle of destruction and creation begins to repeat itself once again. In other words, as suggested by Godel's Proof of Incompleteness we imply that the process of Structure, Unstructure, Restructure, Unstructure, Restructure *is repeated* endlessly in moving to higher and broader levels of elaboration. In this unfolding *drama*, the alternating cycle of entropy increase toward more and more disorder and the entropy decrease toward more and more order appears to be one part of a control mechanism that literally seems to drive and regulate this alternating cycle of *d* Destruction and *c* Creation toward higher and broader levels of elaboration.

Now, in relating this *d* Deductive/*i* Inductive activity to the basic goal discussed in the beginning, I believe we have uncovered *a* the Dialectic Engine that permits the construction of feedback decision models needed by individuals and societies for determining and monitoring actions in an effort to improve their capacity for independent action. Furthermore, since this engine is directed toward satisfying this basic aim or goal, it follows that the *seeking effort itself* ~~degree or lack thereof toward reaching the goal~~ appears to be the other side of a control mechanism that seems *also* to ~~also~~ both drive and regulate the alternating cycle of destruction and *creation* *construction* toward higher and broader levels of elaboration. In this context when acting within a *rigid or essentially a* closed system, the goal seeking effort of individuals and societies to improve their capacity for independent action tends to produce disorder towards randomness.

and death. On the other hand, as already shown, the increasing disorder generated by the increasing mismatch of the system concept with observed reality opens ~~up~~ or unstructures the system. As the unstructuring or, as we call it, the destructive deduction unfolds it shifts toward a creative induction to stop the trend toward disorder ^{and chaos} to satisfy a goal oriented ^{need} effort for increased order. ^{Paradoxically, then,} Hence, an entropy increase ~~in a closed system~~ ^{is offset by the improved possibilities also offered by this} entropy increase which ^{a closed} permits both the destruction or unstructuring of ~~the old~~ system and the creation of a new system to nullify the march toward randomness and death. ^{associated with the Second Law of Thermodynamics}

Taken together the entropy notion ^{and} the basic goal of individuals and societies seem to work in dialectic harmony ~~toward~~ driving and regulating the destructive/creative, or deductive/inductive, action - that we have described herein as a dialectic engine. The result is a changing and expanding universe of mental concepts matched to a changing and expanding universe of observed reality. As indicated earlier these mental concepts are employed as decision models by individuals and societies for determining and monitoring actions needed to cope with their environment - ^{to} or improve their capacity for independent action.