

Mind and the Nature of Interpreted Thought

Fourth Edition

Alex Buckley

Dedicated to the Kiwi Farms, to the workers in our community

A subject related to the discussion that I have been conducting: the nature of mind. There is great concern over who we are and what it means to be. None yet have the answers that I can provide. Here I will detail a new organization of ideas and I will name the new categories self-created therein.

God, His Substance, and Natural Function

My only excuse is a consilience of related ideas and an inspiration from a deep religious faith.

When asking ultimate questions about the universe the simplest answer is that it is all one. Despite the great variety of things that we can experience, all of them are differences or deviations from the whole true thing.

Reality is simply the real fact of God and His being. Nonreal and antireal things are a discussion that I will save for some time later. God simply Is and nature is His self expression.

I don't believe that creation is such a problem as it seems readily apparent to me that life is self created out of the creation of being that is God: an act of acquisition seized by the soul from the potentiality that God provides (and of this issue I will discuss further at another point). When people talk about "making a baby" I think they are a little confused. It's not like a man and a woman come together and build the baby like a lego set, or even that the baby comes down the conveyor belt with the pieces bolted on like a Ford. No, the baby creates itself! The conditions for life are made available for its seizure by agential action. Once taken the agent finds itself on a real position, this hill itself being a nightmare of past history and still ongoing becoming. Fortunately the height provides the perfect scene for the conduct of life: the actor on a stage for the world to see, an audience of those around and at a lesser position, and God high above. Life is the self expression of the agent, and requires no direct special creation or random natural happenstance. You have always been responsible, all throughout your development. Nobody was required to step in and command the very matter of reality to be except yourself; it's just that it is and you are, existing through nature by being, performing an act of self expression.

The nature of God's substance seems to readily bring about the self creation of life. Whatever this natural matter is, it is self directed, recapitulatory, recursive, autopoietic, hierarchical, structured in abstract general systems, and spoken of in the terms of semiotic language. God does not need to be responsible for the life his substance generates when it already is so for itself. God is *free* and has time for His own activities.

Each little piece of what God is, and all of it together, contribute to the natural life that we see today. Peirce claims that the nonliving matter is just life that is yet to be, and I believe him. I tend to believe that all natural matter is alive.

Mind

There are now known, in nature, at least two and most likely three different primary substances of agential existence. The first two are physics and mind, the third is virtual. I will investigate the nature of mind.

I am here classifying the following ideas as belonging to the set of mind: soul, spirit, self, agency, and thought. These are highly abstract things and what exactly they are is outside the range of our current discussion although I do intend to deal with each of them later. For now we must be satisfied that these things are real.

Briefly, I should mention why physical nature stands out to us so strongly. A metaphor. The fisherman stands at the shore and claims to be catching fish with his net. The metaphysician stops and asks him, certainly there are fish that your net doesn't catch? The fisherman shrugs dismissively, and responds that the fish he catches with his net are the only that he is concerned with. Man's sense organs are all physical in nature, being composed of the substance of and performing a function by physics, leaving him to feel that physical nature is the most immediate and consequential. The problem here is that nature can only return what you ask of it: asking a physical question is sure to receive a physical response.

Mind is a symbolic tool. For some reason, unknown to me and most likely not yet known by neuroscientists, physics has developed through an evolving matter into a highly complex organ capable of abstract symbolic thought. There is some kind of connection between the movement of sodium ions back and forth between neurons and abstract thinking. This is all very confusing and this particular issue lies outside the study of my thought for the time being: this subject is known as cognition.

Symbolic Objects

Symbolic objects, like physical particles, have many properties that are instantly recognizable to us: they occupy a place in space and time, although where this is I do not know; they are organisable and thereby consumable. Symbolic objects live, breathe, and die: they evolve and develop in an ecology of other ideas.

Symbolic objects come in a three part classification: Signs, Indexes, and Symbols. Signs are mysterious things, they are sublime and thereby unobservable. An index is a reference for the organization of symbols. Symbols are the abstract associations assigned to the carried physical objects that man directly interacts with. Symbols are always (?) conveyed by physics: this is the purpose of physics, to conduct the transmission of meaning.

This three part classification closely aligns with the three part division of semiology, that of the sign, the signified and the signifier. Sublime divine natural objects are signs. Physical

particles are the signifieds, the carriers of the sign. The signifier is you, the self aware agent. Notice also that the sublime is related to the sign, the signified with the symbol, and the index with the signifier.

Symbols on their own have no meaning, they only represent the sign of which itself cannot be observed due to its sublime nature. Man interprets the symbol, and thereby derives the meaning related to the sign that is useful to him.

Man interacts with the objects of his mind in a similar way to that with which he handles physical objects, just not with his hands. When imagining the mind, you may be tempted to localize it in the brain on account of your bodily senses. This is not necessarily so. Man exists in his being to his furthest reaches, his mind a part with others. This is most obvious in the spread of learned knowledge, or in man's tools: where man needs the aid of a calculator for an operation that he would rather not perform himself. To do the operation by hand is another example of the extended mind: if man's mind simply existed in his skull then there must be an explanation for the need of an external tool. Does the tool exist outside man's mind? Where exactly *is* man's mind? I answer in the firmest realism possible, a naive acceptance of what is.

Place

Man's mind stands separate from physical nature. This has already been understood, but it has not been known why exactly this is, or what the interrelationship between mind and matter could be. My assertion is that physical nature is one part of three. The symbolic is a division of nature, much like the physical, that is fully explorable by man and the most cunning members of his race.

Symbolic nature, like physical nature, has a place and exists in space and time. Thoughts, ideas, and signs all can be found at some location, though not here in the physical world.

When man thinks he explores a symbolic nature of which only he knows the way. Signs, despite their abstract nature, are real things with individuality that live a life of the developing organism evolving in an ecology of other individuals. Symbolic interactions are localized in a place relative to all others and are related to all others.

I believe that when man explores his mind he is actually traveling to an abstract place that exists in relation to all other abstract places and the physical division of nature. Man, in his being, is in his mind a map of the places he has been and their relation to each other, and with this man decides how best to make his next decision.

This is very much like a city, where individuals find their lives tangled in a mesh of all other individuals, both local and distant. These interactions weave a patterned quilt that gives rise to emergent properties and higher levels of order. Abstract understanding is required to correctly identify and name this phenomena. This knowledge is obviously a highly personal, subjective knowledge.

Subjectivity

This is an intensely difficult nature. Deeply metaphysical problems originate here. The absolute whole, the many parts, and the individual. Each single entity, while being their own individual thing, together are a single whole. Picking boundaries here is impossible.

How is man or any organism to know the correct answer to any question, any judgment of character or choice of action? He can't. The whole would have the answer: if man had access to the whole object then he would be able to provide objective answers. Remember that the only true objective in the universe is the absolute being of God: an objective claim could only be made and judged by God. You were not born of a virgin, you are not the perfect Christ, of whom would know.

Caprice

The answer, for us, is provided here! There is no answer but one's own opinion, one's own arbitrary choice. Poor is the man who relies on others for his interpretation! (*laughter*)

The outsider to this semiological way of thought imagines himself a reliable and universal measure of nature, a thing that can be wielded as a weapon against the insider. How weak is his position! What are his values? Physical materialism, reductionism, dualism! Despite such claims they themselves always return to their own personal flavors of arbitration and merely cloak their position in a more favorable form.

Thought

This arbitrary self exploration of nature by nature through itself I call thought! The smaller recapitulates the larger by derivation, integration, and complexification. What something is will be what it has always been because it already was and is through itself the reality from which it came!

Interpretation

No information is ever contained in any symbolic signified! This is an impossible condition and a misunderstanding of nature! An example of this. As you read my text, you understand my words and the thought flashes in your mind. You already know everything that I tell you! You shouldn't need to be given a parcel of information from which you absorb some knowledge: you already knew all of this! Maybe the pieces had yet to be arranged, but how could you understand the description that I give to you if you had not yet to experience the name of the thing that I describe? I am telling you nothing new! What you can understand has already been there all along: what I am doing is reminding you of what you already know! I am simply naming what is already realized!

Every organism must always interpret for itself its own meaning. The deciding agent is not allowed a privileged position in nature: while he comes from nature he is not the same as the whole of nature. If nature really were viewing itself, like some foolish cosmologists believe,

there would be no need for truth because the nature-agent is simply itself and would have no need for awareness as there would be nothing besides itself to be aware of. There is no mirror! Nature must be interpreted!

Abstract semiological interpretation is the action that agents perform in deriving meaning from statements. Beyond that I have no explanation for the mechanism of nature and my search continues. Interpretation, like nature, is of three parts!

Transcription

Transcription is the first step of interpretation, the assignment of signified to sign. Here the message is converted from an abstract sign into a physical signified. The transcript is a message carrying physical object.

Translation

Translation is the second step of interpretation, the conversion from signified to signifier.

Expression

Expression is the final stage of interpretation, when the idea of the sign gains its concrete reality. It is when the agent decides on the representation that his meaning will take on. It is also the agent's final chance at having a say in interpretation. I will at some later time more fully describe this representation. The real interest in expression is the conversion from a one dimensional string of signs into a three dimensional physical object. Obviously there are spacetime relativity concerns here: I will explore this in the future.

Codes

A code is a connection between two abstract things related by a signifier. The abstract things being related have no necessary reason for being compared: it is all arbitrary. The signifier identifies and interprets the signified and understands the abstract concept being pointed too. A code can be composed of any two things and a relation between them. Codes are organized ontologies of theoretical concepts formalized for communication between two speakers of the code.

Symbolic Ideologic

Nature plays a fantastic game of semiology across an infinity of semiotic codes and interpretation. This is very similar to signals processing and network analysis. I am yet to have a name for this. Sometimes I call it seance. This is where I wish to make my home.

Symbolic Legitimacy

I would like here to make note of a disturbing trend that is being insisted upon by members of our society. Such foolish behavior as playing victim in an enemies game, becoming

a fatal accomplice in their criminal activity: this cannot be accepted! You should know better! There is no objective, no rule set that must be followed! Nature is interpreted! If you wish to have your own place, your own way, then must perform your own interpretation! Do not let others describe to you your own history, do not let them tell you who you are!

To allow others such power is devastating, especially to a young organism. Can the thing not insist for itself its own legitimacy? Must it be sold out to those that offer the easiest answer? And what exactly is gained in this exchange? By playing their games what exactly is the goal? What is being suggested is really to surrender, to accept the enemies story at the expense of telling one's own! Foolish pathetic behavior! (*Cheering, applause*) Such weakness will never be accepted by anybody, not on this local scene and neither abroad! (*The people are cheering*) How can you expect recognition if you fail to order it yourself? (*Applause, standing ovation*)

Further Reading

- Barbieri, M. (1985) *The Semantic Theory of Evolution*. Harwood
- Barbieri, M. (2003) *Organic Codes: An Introduction to Semantic Biology*, Cambridge
- Baudrillard, J. (1994) *Simulacra and Simulation*, Michigan
- Bertalanffy, L. v. (1933) *Modern Theories of Development: An Introduction to Theoretical Biology*, Harper
- Bertalanffy, L. v. (1968) *General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications*, George Braziller
- Bridgman, P. W. (1936) *The Nature of Physical Theory*, Dover
- Buss, L. W. (1987) *The Evolution of Individuality*, Princeton
- Houser, N., Kloesel, C. (1992) *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings, Vol I* Indiana
- Heisenberg, W. (1962) *Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science*, Harper
- Heinemann, F. H. (1958) *Existentialism and the Modern Predicament*, Harper
- Hicks, S, R. C. (2004) *Explaining Postmodernism: Skepticism and Socialism from Rousseau to Foucault*, Scholargy
- Jammer, M. (1960) *Concepts of Space: The History of the Theories of Space in Physics*, Harper
- Quine, W. V., Ullian, J. S. (1978) *The Web of Belief*, Mcgraw-Hill 2nd Edition
- Quine, W. V. (1990) *Pursuit of Truth*, Harvard
- Reichenbach, H. (1951) *The Rise of Scientific Philosophy*, University of California Press
- Scheffler, I. (1967) *Science and Subjectivity*, Bobbs-Merrill
- Sheldon, H. H. (1935) *Space, Time, and Relativity*, The University Society
- Watson, W. H. (1959) *On Understanding Physics*, Harper