

THE NEW STYLE AND PHILOSOPHY

NS PHILOSOPHY, ETC.

SUMMARY

Philosopher-in-music:

A distinction I make (vs. “composer”), which is a more accurate description of my role in the New Style, a system of musical symbols designed to express ideas and concept. I have emphasized a “programmatically” basis (the “idea domain”) for my compositions at least as far back as 2005 (against the perceived arbitrariness of the “sound domain”). In 2008 I delved into the history of philosophy and realized that “philosophy seems to provide a domain for many of my deepest questions and is without barrier or medium”. The role of ‘philosopher in music’ liberated me from the aesthetic stereotypes of music, ultimately leading to the “theoretical music” breakthrough in November 2010.

The “NS inversion” takes this a step further, hypothesizing the effect of compositional processes on real-world objects/ideas, and “creative philosophy” reflects music’s influence on my philosophical work, creating new philosophical worlds vs. “describing” the world as it is.

NS as a philosophy is unique because it is expressed in music, which allows it to better reflect the ambiguity of most philosophical issues - it’s the most abstract artistic medium, perfect for these illusive questions. The philosophy starts with Socratic doubt, so I deny a single answer in favor of ambiguity and complexity. I look at truth in layers - for example, everyday practical truths vs. accepted truths, vs. deeper truths that are harder to prove. I’m interested in layers of meaning and connection that surround, for example, a single object (idea web), which to me seems to be a fundamental quality of existence, especially modern existence. Subject-wise, I will begin with personal, subjective issues - “creative philosophy” (aiming to create new worlds), the issues in Opus 1, reality and its limitations, identity, different ways to approach life, nostalgia, humor, death, love, art, aesthetics - set against a backdrop of more general questions (“comprehensive philosophy”), as NS possesses a general impulse to codify all the basic questions of life. NS will ideally approach these questions in its own way, as many of the concepts I’ve developed in music can be used in other disciplines (“generalized I.O.” and “I.O. as approach”)

Pet philosophy:

Affectionately referred to as “pet” philosophy - these are the issues that are given precedence over the list of historic philosophical issues called “comprehensive philosophy” and POTU(G). Every philosopher and artist ‘refracts’ the universe through a unique perspective, focuses on the ideas and issues he feels are relevant, and many of the most unique and influential ways to think and “see” come from an ideology or discipline rather than generic ‘philosophy’. It is part of a “higher solution” - to never have to dwell on the predetermined problems of “generic” philosophy - instead create my own philosophical system, and eventually new worlds in “creative” philosophy. The vehicle for this philosophy is music - the New Style’s system and also in Opus 1.

Pet philosophical issues include: “creative philosophy”, genius, the ‘idea web’, complexity, reality 1 vs. BPC, reality vs. art, stratified truth, the humor context, death, “identity multiplicity”/personal surrogates, memory and nostalgia, religion, humanity/existentialism (dealing with the “givens of life”) “mental spaces”, meta/generalization, and of course music theory itself - many theories in Ideas Original can be applied to other areas/subjects/disciplines.

I.O. as approach (process):

Defining Ideas Original as an approach - its history and inclinations, distilling it to a neutral format for application to any area of knowledge. Ideas Original, being a relatively complete exposition of a discipline, can be used as a blueprint to analyze and advance any discipline - a surprising number of musical principles are able to be generalized to all disciplines - development processes, systematically “exposing out” the subject by naming and creating lists of aspects, the predictable arrival at certain philosophical and physical problems, generating a list of “high” principles at the outset to learn from, the move from learning to theorizing, from the subject to the interdisciplinary etc. This doesn’t imply “shortcuts” as traditionally defined, but does provide direction (thus efficiency) when learning a new subject.

Short Statement:

First, my philosophy is expressed in music, which allows it to better reflect the ambiguity of most philosophical issues.

Second, many of the concepts I’ve developed in music can be used in other disciplines (generalized I.O. and real-world cpt)

My philosophy starts with Socratic doubt, so I deny a single answer in favor of ambiguity and complexity. I look at truth in layers -

For example, everyday practical truths vs. accepted truths, vs. deeper truths that are harder to prove.

I’m interested in layers of meaning and connection that surround, for example, a single object (idea web)

Which to me seems to be a fundamental quality of existence, especially modern existence.

an Apple can be a prop in a skit, the subject of poem (the apple of my eye), can fall on a scientist’s head, can become the logo on millions of devices, could be represented as a chemical formula or a set of dimensions.

Then I’m interested in all the basic questions of life we often ignore, but are always there. (existentialism)

Then I have personal, subjective issues - identity, different ways to approach life, nostalgia, death, love, art, aesthetics.

NS is intended to be a full philosophy - *but symbolizing it all in music is what sets it apart.*

Using musical symbolism is an extension of Wittgenstein’s, “for what you can’t speak of, you must be silent”. Stravinsky said “music is powerless to express anything but itself” - it’s the most abstract artistic medium, perfect for these illusive questions.

Within this framework, I’m still experimenting - I’ll always be experimenting, because of this challenge to represent the impossible.

Comprehensive Philosophy:

First, NS philosophy exists against a background of a normative summary of all philosophy:

1000's of fundamental questions

It must erase the distinction between 'philosophers' and anyone who says something about reality and experience

Many people can be considered philosophers...and, disciplines and BOK's can be considered aggregate philosophies...

Quote documents on all major subjects

Human Universals, etc.

Think of the current pet philo as centers of something larger, expandable - that draws historical concepts to it (chivalry)

Banal compilation of historical philosophical positions = legit under the "Shakespearean anthology" genius task?

What makes philosophy great?

What makes 'packages of thought' great? = extend/generalize 'philo'

'POT' - with some defining limit(s) = single source, published form, classification, form in general

The relationship and relevance to current time

Visionary quality

Rooted in a tangible discipline, esp. a new discipline

What is today?

of the cusp of... what are we on the cusp of...? not just the next 20 years or so...

the inevitabilities of the future, living in the future

Both rooted in present and future, connected to past, universal = 4 dimensions

Relates to stratification, segmentation of philo Universal truths vs. present truths

Then into: philosophical/knowledge forms

This happens naturally during the person's career - how they express their philo

literary forms art forms discipline forms

A central idea or idea(s) sweeping over comprehensive philo (a central mental space?)

Specialization within philosophy: dissertations, etc. - vs. writing a general philosophy, concentrating on certain problems

Detailed examples, extended (Witt Philosophic Investigations)

Aphorism < complete investigation > BOK

etc.

Reified in music:

Philosophy in music (POTU(G)): Against the background of comprehensive philosophy

Why music? (POTU((M))

The most ambiguous artistic medium, + supplemental word-based theoretical domain to tackle concepts unable to be realized

Philosophy is limited by language, hence reification as an alternative

The medium is sound, but the new style deliberately distances itself from traditional music, musicianship and its associated skills

Music (through quantum physics and string theory) is everything - what is the implication of this? "total programmaticism/integration?"

vibrating strings = a "universal harmony" (probably of the counterintuitive kind) = (where every harmony exists)

The philosophy will be communicated through the features of the objects, their placement and interaction

The nature of the philosophy is Socratic questioning and stoic objectivity = "zero-truth", investigatory, etc.

Emphasis on ambiguity, unknowing and the complex system as truth in reality 1

"The most truthful system of belief is denying the possibility of objective truth, instead ceding the world to complexity and ambiguity."

Is counterintuitive in this way, because most art is about asserting a belief system

Barrier theory as integral: how truth is dissolved

"Unknowing" "Militantly about change" (denying permanence)

"Myths of knowledge/philosophy" - the things philosophy is incapable of

The world as "unsolvable paradox" (hence beyond problem context)

Versus assertion and definite conclusion, *denial of reductionism* - especially in regard to the most profound questions

The complex system is the height (manifestation) of 'reality 1' theories

"Reification of the complex system"

Basic "truth" is addressed by the domain of science first (deny responsibility for some issues - *cede them to science*)

But transcends it with irreducible complexity, ambiguity, mystery, new worlds

Barrier theory: meta - portraying argument (struggles with truth) rather than asserting

Philosophical constructs that transcend the limits of humans and our universe: reality 1, beyond problem context, multiverse

"Cracks in the façade" of reality 1 and its perceived authority "Speculative, imaginative philo" = creative

as there is a vulgarity to reductionist "knowledge" (some questions can be answered on basic levels but not higher ones)

+ subjects chosen as relevant (comprehensive philosophy) = "grand subjects" for the variation modules ("important" subjects)

"Highlighting" certain areas of philosophy

Inputs from all sources and disciplines

Ideas Original as the base for the philosophy = a philosophical system in itself

Ideas Original can be defined as an approach - its history and inclinations, distilling it to a neutral format for application to any area of knowledge. Ideas Original, being a relatively complete exposition of a discipline, can be used as a blueprint to analyze and advance any discipline - a surprising number of musical principles are able to be generalized to all disciplines - development processes, systematically "exposing out" the subject by naming and creating lists of aspects, the predictable arrival at certain philosophical and physical problems, generating a list of "high" principles at the outset to learn from, the move from learning to theorizing, from the subject to the interdisciplinary etc.

Also how NS theories approach 'real-world counterpoint' (see glossary)

Meanwhile, **the structure of the New Style** offers a near-perfect analogue with which to structure my philosophy:

Using NS structure to create comprehensive philosophy:

NS-Proper as 'formalized domain' where pre-NS would contain... General form would be POT's

Totalization/generalization as the BOK, present/historically about the issue - w/ my personal philo in relief

Using NS structure as analogy/precedent for philo structure:

Historical POV's assimilated, or all POV's as 'background'. Would all historical POV's be considered normative?

POV's as they apply to general subjects? As POTU(G)? POTU(G) differentiated from comprehensive philo?

POTU(G) as a realization of the idea web, connectedness of all things

As in NS-Proper, especially at its higher levels, cross-pollinating the philo pet issues = the next step...

Stratification (philosophy):

An explicit acknowledgement of stratification within my philosophy, parallel to the disparate approaches and levels in my music/NS. Stratified philosophy is diligent in defining the scope and domain of its assertions, via use of explicit definition and disclaimers, and like NS, each assertion is subject to counterarguments from other perspectives, and implicitly from other "levels of truth", where a different standard for truth exists. In these levels or definitions of truth, the assertion is held to different standards - for example, practical truth, cultural truth, religious truth, scientific truth, logical or mathematical truth, artistic truth, subjective truth, willful truth, ultimate truth, even future truth. Standards of knowledge range from colloquial to scientific, common to formal.

Continuing the example, the meta-level describes these truth battles, thus attaining a higher solution - "barrier arguments" for example, where ideologies disagree on the nature of concepts about the extremes/totality of our being/world/universe.

It makes sense to draw distinctions between approaches that apply to, for example, the many pet and comprehensive philosophy questions that are very subjective and human, and the scientific rigor inherent in other searches for meaning. Those should be distinguished from "creative philosophy" and the NS inversion, which belong in different category that doesn't look to describe the world accurately or for utilitarian purpose.

Disclaimers: against generalization, historical 'truth', objective/subjective, language, present knowledge vs. future

Supersession will allow me to explore many levels simultaneously without one destroying the other

"Reconciliation through subversion"

The point of the new style is to subvert itself - so the idea of a "coherent, consistent philosophy" is nullified in the assertive sense.

For instance, the idea of "everything as cute" and clichéd is valid in its context, but is also superseded by the type of change possible as exhibited in Connections. The "death problem" is both true in a profound existential sense and made juvenile by the romanticized immortality in teen vampire movies. Abstraction is true, desirable and detached from the beauty of tonal music. Songlike melodies are both better and worse than symphonic melodies. Immortality is desirable and impractical, attainable and impossible. Death and the limited lifespan can be seen as tragically unfair and romantically fleeting in a Debussian sense. Both stability and revolution is usually needed, money is an evil and sometimes a reflection of your achievement's value, pedantic and the building block for human enterprise. A statement can be clichéd, sincere and timely. The artist has a need for both isolation and involvement in the world. Many styles and genres in music are equally appealing. We deserve things but they are possibly unsustainable (universal health care). Artists are both legitimately forging ahead in music and forgetting their heritage.

A work of art can be alike and perfectly unique (= different levels of differentiation)

“PET PHILOSOPHY”

“**Pet issues**”, the philosopher’s personal decision to focus attention on certain areas, allows him to supersede conventional categories and define his world using these “custom” ideas.
 “Pet issues” adding up, weaving together into a comprehensive fiber
 Ultimately I have to be a “fighter” for certain issues that you feel don’t get enough attention, or are stigmatized, etc.
 Deny responsibility for some issues - *cede them to science*
 Again, though, we arrive at the “comprehensive” vs. “personal” artist - the truly heroic duty of summarizing everything vs. staying focused on subjectively chosen areas. My objective is the hybrid - define comprehensively using personal concepts against a “universal” background of hard and theoretical science. Then the artist in me will subvert both of them with the value of new and alternate worlds, as well as the “promise” of the future.

Genius (see Genius document, Gateway theory)

Music, with “Problems of Music” as a sub-category

Makes sense - musical problems as subcategory of philosophical problems - in POTU(M), to address musical barriers in context
 Aesthetics: Could be the vastest part of the philosophy, or could be omitted (Ideas Original, 100 Problems of Music, etc.)

The complex system:

The complex system is the ultimate truth, the “results of interactions at multiple levels”
 It *supersedes* arguments between science and religion
 It even supersedes the dissolution of truth?
 = Must be the (2nd) highest level of POTU (or 2nd highest, to “stillness”, silence or objective forms = “beyond” problem context)
 Above traditional philosophical arguments about “truth” and “the way the world is” etc. (which makes up the “lower” POTU)
 Butterfly effect, total connectivity, layering, ambiguity, lack of sovereignty
 A very difficult language (the most difficult?)
 i.e. POTU as a musical representation must try hard to portray the complex system in action
 + Multiverses = Refractions and developments of the *entire* portrait
 = “Unknowability”, mystery, ambiguity
 “Willfull assertion of complexity and inability to define the world”

Though 2 years later I moved past “descriptive” philosophy in late August 2011, in August 2009 I deemed the complex system “the most truthful way to see the world”. Complexity, a churning, evolving dialogue of diverse entities with unpredictability and emergent phenomena, seemed to match my observations: its vastness seemed to corroborate Socrates’ humble approach to knowledge (one can “harness but not control” complexity, it forcefully refutes simple understandings/descriptions of the world, as “irreducible complexity” triumphs over reductionism, NS a “willful assertion of complexity and inability to define the world”). The world is, objectively put, the “results of interactions at multiple levels”. Emergence seemed to describe genius and embraced change. It is certainly an imposing role-model for the New Style - it retains its abstract-art and variation-form origins but elevates toward complexity: it is a hybrid between scientific isolation/academic categorization/artistic conceptualization on one end, and the complex system on the other, though there may be higher domains in NS, such as “stillness”, silence or objective forms (“beyond” problem context)

Idea Web:

A concept describing the interrelatedness and complexity seen in “the world” as such. It is a cornerstone of POTU(G), the research project that accompanies the New Style. It owes some to Burke’s Connections documentaries, but is more derived from my general sense of wonder at the myriad uses, references and perspectives surrounding a “thing”, and how these seemingly infinite “things” interact, each carrying with it a ‘package’ of associations from millions of different perspectives. The world is not just a web of physically interacting forces and objects - it is our ideas about them, and uses for them, plus the things we create that reference them. We also reference ideas in ideas, create ideas and things in abstract, we develop/discover entire ideologies and disciplines that reinterpret sets of what already exists, using thousands of “idea forms”. It is a miraculous, multilayered, complex process.

Perhaps the highest goal of NS is to mirror this set of processes - when creating a reification, the prompt-based architecture is designed to mimic the unforeseeable flexibility of invention and discovery - a reification has no hard-and-fast restrictions on what it can be. Then, the ‘body of knowledge’ (attached to/“around” the reif) represents all the information/reference/knowledge relevant to the reification. The variation set interprets the object from many perspectives and uses it in new ways (see “variation tasks”), while the ‘language exposition’ codifies and explores the object by exhibiting its “language” in use - applying its perspective to other objects and disciplines (further codifying the language). A “tone-edit” is like a single ideology “smoothing” disparate objects of the world through providing a coherent explanation, or like art representing the world through a unified aesthetic. More layers of interaction create NS’s “complex domain”. NS can transcend this interaction, but will ultimately be ‘pulled back’ by conflicting viewpoints/contexts (see “barriers” (philosophical)).

Reality 1:

The physical domain of our world and universe and its associated limitations, especially as a heuristic or “stereotype”. It is a loose collection of aspects of the tangible reality we live in - survival, the implied utilitarianism, need for pragmatic use, stable truth, functionality, and “descriptive philosophy” that represents the world accurately. It is also defined by “what is believed to be impossible”, and is defined elsewhere as “the societal marketplace”, “where ideas are collectively judged and valued, per the ideal of democracy and equality”. It also represents death, at the personal, planetary and universal level.

Reality 1 is juxtaposed with the theoretical, hypothetical and imaginary, Socratic questioning, alternate realities, the mythic, disproved theories of reality, artistic/aesthetic worlds, the ‘beyond problem context’ construct (the universe as “conflict/problem solving”), as well as the impossible and nonexistent, but is most often used in terms of the individual vs. the limitations reality imposes, and how he can “break” reality 1 in various ways. “Barrier theory”, “beyond problem context”, “esotericism”, “genius”, “stratified truth”, “gateway theory”, “identity multiplicity”, and “creative philosophy” all dissolve reality 1. The rigidity of reality 1 is often pitted against the “artist domain” and its malleability - the ultimate manifestation of this is in the NS inversion, where reality is deconstructed into material for the compositional procedures of music.

Barriers, philosophical: A philosophical concept/category, containing/dealing with the following:

- The extremes of reality - the where a parameter of reality can't be expanded any more in a particular direction
- The limitations of reality - what cannot occur or exist (and whether this is real/true) - and ideas proven to be untrue (myth, mystery)
- Totalizing concepts and/or worldviews that use the vernacular of barriers - infinity, since the beginning of time, “all things” etc., “truth” (and the conflicts between worldviews with incompatible claims about these kinds of real-world barriers)
- Generalization terminology - “all”, “none” etc.

“Barrier theory” is a key concept in all of my projects - because my philosophy, art and aesthetics are all concerned with the malleability of the limitations of life and art. My philosophy is in part a polemic against the barriers of “real life” (death, single identity, truth, impossibility), and against those who create worldviews and philosophies predicated on barriers (religion, for example). Barrier theory is simultaneously an extension and response to “100 problems of music” - it extends “problems”, many of which are barriers to real life, but also empowers art to break the barriers of reality using tools native to art - metaphor, the creation, description and portrayal of alternate worlds, meta-reference. Art proves that reality is more malleable than a materialist would assume: The “humor context” has power to devalue barriers, and “mind and imagination” have the ability to posit and explore the impossible, key powers in The New Style.

Philosophical barrier theory is analogous to music's barriers/extremes investigation. The musical version came first, then the concept was extended to life itself.

BPC:

A philosophical “pet issue”, an acronym for “beyond problem context”. Based on a model of the world as a series of conflicting/dialectical forces and ‘problems’, and observing that human life has been largely dedicated to solving problems both at the historical and daily level. This view is extended into the future in the “human universals” analysis (that human universals will remain central to our lives far into the future, though technology will change). With the physical domain of our universe (and its barriers) defined as “reality 1”, BPC asks how we can transcend this reality - how to “break” reality 1, and exalts art, mind and imagination as the primary means of doing so (“non-physical approaches”), but also entertains multiverse theory - the very notion that “things could be different” (i.e. reality could have manifested and constructed itself in a different way) as a “crack in the tyranny” of reality 1.

This not a lighthearted investigation - it is meant to be highly polemical, political and rebellious against the constraints of physical reality and any limitation. Its influence can be seen in the birth of NS's “theoretical composition” that breaks all musical barriers - the quote that “NS must not be limited in any way”.

Identity pluralism:

The result of applying barrier theory, “beyond problem context”, and the choice problem to human identity. Humans are limited and restricted in many ways by their singular identity in ‘reality 1’, physical reality. Though, like “100 problems”, we find ways to explore different sides and potentialities of our personality, many states of being are unable to be experienced, potential in certain areas is unable to be explored sufficiently or actualized, we are unable to escape our limitations...plainly, at many levels we can't be who we want or do what we want. “Identity pluralism”, then, is an attempt within creative philosophy to “break” this problem - imagining identity in multiplicity, analogous to the many axioms of music, mental states of art or roles of an actor - a trait of hypothetical ‘universal’ genius.

Creative philosophy:

The philosophical break from “descriptive” and “prescriptive” philosophy”, late August 2011:

“NS has strong scientific and philosophical influences, but is primarily artistic. It is the artist quality that allows it to venture outside of truth battles and create its own worlds. It is the artistic quality that allows potential flaws to be poeticized. Limitations of NS take on a bittersweet existential feel, while attempts to transcend them become artistically valid. The invention is artistic invention.

A non-prescriptive philosophy, or willed philosophy, shouldn't be called philosophy - alternatives could be ‘aesthetics’, ‘mental spaces’ - a new discipline altogether. Philosophy carries the burden of normative truth, investigation and observation of reality¹, and comprehensive philo suggests tackling all normative philosophical questions and giving your ‘opinion’. The philosophy I've written often displays a willed/defiant aesthetic that you know doesn't hold up morally in any agreed-upon definition, but has its merits in other ways. You don't want everyone living this way, so it differs from most public philosophical works, religion too. It is a “creative philosophy”, trying to define and explore certain ‘aesthetics’. Once called aesthetics/mental spaces, they can be wielded/codified, even optimized. Unlike philosophy, which is held to a standard of ‘accuracy’ in its description of and conclusions about real-world phenomena, ‘aesthetics’ would creatively manipulate chosen aspects of the world for certain purposes. This draws a clear parallel to NS's inversion's ‘discipline cpt’.

It is apparent today that ‘truth’ is often bigger than the individual thinker - institutions, science, cultures, movements, events themselves, real-time webs and communities (and such) are able to tell us much more about reality than any one person. Recasting these things with an artistic eye, rather than “reportage”, reinvigorates them. Similarly, my descriptive philosophy has all of its main components - Socratic doubt, complexity, irreducibility, human universals, scientific method, etc., meaning that it's about as aligned with reality as it can get - but alignment with reality isn't an individualistic property. It's simply parallel with the vanguard of all professional disciplines in aggregate.” Finally, descriptive philosophy is also known as “assertive philosophy”, which, though valid at certain truth-strata (see “stratification”, often crumbles under full rigor of science, logic and argument, to “zero-truth” Socratic doubt.

“A non-prescriptive philosophy, or willed philo shouldn't be called philosophy - how about ‘aesthetics’, ‘mental spaces’ or another name? A new discipline altogether, so no more ‘philosopher in music’. Philo carries the burden of normative truth, investigation and observation of reality¹, and comprehensive philo suggests tackling all normative philo questions and giving your ‘opinion’. The philo you've written displays an obviously willed and defiant aesthetic that you know doesn't hold up morally in any agreed-upon definition, but has its merits in other ways. You don't want everyone living this way, so it differs from most public philosophical works, religion too. Similarly, what is philo is you're writing for yourself, to yourself? More like trying to define and explore certain ‘aesthetics’. Once called aesthetics/mental spaces, they can be wielded/codified, even optimized. Unlike philo, which is held to a standard of ‘accuracy’ in its description of and conclusions about real-world phenomena, ‘aesthetics’ would creatively manipulate chosen aspects of the world for certain purposes. This draws a clear parallel to NS's inversion's ‘discipline cpt’.

This is also why it irked you to tell people you're a philosopher - b/c they expect some great truths they can use, along the lines of religion. Also, it is so apparent that ‘truth’ is bigger than the individual thinker - institutions, scientists, cultures, movements, events themselves, real-time webs and communities (and such) are able to tell us much more about reality than any one person. (Thus my philo inadvertently cancels out the role of individual philosopher and general philo...)

My descriptive philosophy has hit a wall - Socratic, complexity, irreducibility, HU, scientific method, etc., means that it's about as aligned with reality as it can get - but alignment with reality isn't an individualistic property. It's simply parallel with the vanguard of all professional disciplines in aggregate.

fundamental dichotomy: descriptive vs. creative philosophy could be supplemental

so, the question isn't discovery or investigation - most things are a given...

but the most important aspect is that it's personal and willful

even recasting your current philo as aesthetics could reinvigorate them.

the question is no longer correctness or legitimacy, or correspondence to real life.

even the creative philo step may seem obvious, but remember almost all ‘historical actors’ and regular citizens base their lives on ‘correctness’:

religion, science, journalism, any artist with a message/manifesto, business, personal relationships, politics, and great philosophers.

not a list of mental spaces: it's one mental space, yours, that you build and explore with philo segmentation”

Descriptive philosophy:

“Truth-based”, traditional philosophy - philosophy (and other disciplines) whose main task is to “describe the world” accurately and perceptively. A profound yet utilitarian function of philosophy. Juxtaposed with “creative philosophy”, a break made in August 2011. NS has a mix of both aspirations (POTU(G) reification signals the former - BPC, Opus 1 and personal aesthetics the latter)

First man on earth' thought experiment:

In the "genius" impulse, trying to derive strategies for visionary inventions in the future, I imagined the "first man on earth" and all the thoughts, connections and actions he would have had to make in order to create everything that exists today. A historical timeline aided me. Could he have foreseen everything that happened and was invented? How? Generally, he is the symbol of the ultimate inventor and creative individual. The findings can be helpful to the individual now, trying to foresee the next 1000's of years - we are cavemen to a more advanced culture, and this moment is the past to all future history. This work led to "human universals" and "hypothetical innovations", among other statements and concepts:

First Man on Earth/notes about the future:

This present moment is the future for all history so far.

This moment is the past to all future history.

Technology doesn't seem to fundamentally change things - it does progress or slow momentum of its target - what humans already do.

Broad categories will always exist, though particular incarnations of it may not

('war' but not a certain way of fighting, 'disease' but not a cured one)

Human universals (HU's) underlie all of human history, and will continue to.

Crises are constant.

Each generation wants the right to experience human universals.

Humans have an evolving supply of whatever we've had in the past (how movie stars emerge, for instance)

A certain human universal may be exaggerated in an era, positive or negative (or may be deficient)

The particular incarnation and its traits created the 'flavor' of the age.

There was probably another era that parallels the present in some way, perhaps with more intense versions of some aspects.

The same problems existed in the past, but in different particularizations.

This is actually a challenge - to see how today's problems manifested themselves in any era.

Outside of the 'ages' of man (bronze > iron > Western progress > today) we see that man and his progress is in jeopardy.

Inside the ages, progress seems inevitable if irregular ("dark ages" etc.)

How humans deal with human universals in different but often has parallels (increased humaneness in treating the mentally ill)

A certain idea may have always been around but not in the forefront (enlightenment principles)

= brought to fruition by the American Revolution/Bill of Rights

Changing human universals would fundamentally change the otherwise incremental nature of history

A continuity would be lost, and the "generational right"

You'll hear about tech, but only in retrospect will you really be able to summarize how much it changed things

Most people don't "opt out" of new tech forever, though they may at first (comps, cellphones, Facebook) (becomes very difficult)

Though the HU is the same ("kind") the progress is what's startling ("degree")

The problems make easier/non-existent, esp. to someone who's whole life/time was saturated with those probs, almost 'givens'

All the greats used the latest tech of their time? (even you, though reluctantly)

Everyone becomes a 'historical artifact'

The full-commitment 'negative criticisms' explain the attitude toward future abilities - the present's limitations.

All technology is an extension of something humans already did or would do...

Most bodies of knowledge (BOK's) come from an external 'thing',

but inventing a body of knowledge around a reification would come from your own ideas...much more difficult.

Music theory = list of observations about phenomena in music as all of knowledge is observation of life. (NS metaphor)

The "self vs. other" distinction is central in 'first man':

specialization, invention teaching/learning trial/error

war criticism sex/family/population population-based systems

communication ethics negative effects of large populations

Conceptualized and formalizing/expanding = 2 main tasks of 'first man'

"Coming up" with a concept is feasible for first man, but not in a *technical* way (space flight)

POTU(G) functions as a list of concepts the first man would have to conceive of - some obvious, some radical, some are so veiled from him that he'd need many steps beforehand, yet are simultaneously extensions of his primitive inclinations

In reality, the burden is diluted by many actors

Thus Euclid didn't need to think up 'axiom' - he borrows it from philosophers. Formal systems are often borrowed.

Elements refined, compiled and revised use of axioms, etc. = Plato

Actions/modes of thought you wouldn't think were valid on first look - surrealism, art theory, existentialism

At first, anything that didn't directly help you survive would be rejected (art > impractical codification = surrealism is a luxury)

Non-physical

The idea of 'naming' modes of thought, 'naming' in general

You wouldn't be aware of your potential - it wouldn't be apparent to you = still the case today.

Moods of first man = analogous to moods of an age (jazz age, renaissance) a day = an age?

All of human progress is implicit in the single caveman

To the detail to the treatise, dissertation, blueprint, technical manual.

Technical manual for all components of a complicated technological achievement (space shuttle)

Some of man's most impressive achievements are systems in light of the population

interrelated systems groups of entities (stock market) global trade

cities logistics world infrastructure air travel

Ulysses/Finnegan's (as complicated interaction of BOK's) the internet twitter

governments/gov't systems/programs

First man problem: misconceptions that he would elaborate and build upon.

Human Universals: (HU's)

A result of the August 2011 philosophy work, "human universals" is a partial answer to the question "how much of the future can we predict?" Both profound and obvious, the timeless aspects of human beings - their needs and wants, their traits and tendencies, their ideals and flaws, underlie all of human history, and will continue to - the human aspect of history is indeed cyclic, and each generation experiences them and in some ways wants the right to. The overt technological and scientific progress we see today is in some ways a non-sequitur to humanity - they may exaggerate or reduce a certain human universal within an era, positive or negative. The particular valences of each of the universals at the time create the 'flavor' of the age. The HU investigation also contributed to the "genius" investigation (processes/tasks) - that significantly modifying, eliminating or introducing an HU would fundamentally change the otherwise incremental nature of history and would be highly genius (though potentially destabilizing and dangerous - see "hypothetical innovations").

The list itself is incomplete - "human nature", of course, is up for debate, but I consider them as "generally true".

"Human nature", of course, is up for debate. "observational method"
To project into the future - the future incarnations of HU's

communication speed of communication/face-to-face as "the standard"
 need for empathy empathy
 love
 sex reproduction
 family
 religion
 war violence crime/law conflict between good and evil 'death drive' killing/aggression
 destruction rebellion
 conflict between rational and irrational inequality of rationality and intelligence (some "behind") ignorance
 limited information limited education limitation of intelligence superstition misunderstanding
 xenophobia us vs. "them" fear judging other people social comparison to define self
 lying
 self-aggrandizement/ego self vs. external need for attention
 boundaries of sanity
 disease battle for resources rich vs. poor food clothing shelter
 need for new culture
 uncertainty about future
 human rights
 means of transportation/travel
 need to understand the world (need for worldview) curiosity creativity invention trial and error
 thought introspection analysis dissatisfaction and problem identification problem solving
 humor
 need to preserve aspects of the past 'continuity'
 ideological battles
 freedom vs. authority/leadership (balancing both)
 interest/'chatter' about current events and especially people
 vulnerability to external events/phenomena
 tendency to view the present negatively (vs. ideal past, etc.)
 choice responsibility on some but not all choice imperfect/subjective means of making choices
 death fixed life span premature death aging
 symbolic immortality (art, writing, organizations) belief in literal immortality (life after death, medicine)
 need to personalize life
 emotionality (see rational/irrational)
 need for hope
 assimilation of negative aspects of situation (resilience) ability to survive under adverse conditions
 maintenance of appearance self-consciousness adherence to fashion, to varying degrees
 nationalism belonging to groups need to identify with a group
 security
 need to differentiate self from others
 need for the trivial/diversion need for entertainment need for downtime
 need for the profound
 need for nature
 storytelling collecting mementos and memories
 ability to fight for a cause/freedom
 response to simplicity and usability/clarity

Normative person:

A philosophical investigation in Fall 2011, inspired by prescriptive psychology. After the study of genius, lasting more than 2 years, I wanted a document defining the ideal "normal" person, to juxtapose with the aforementioned radicalism and idiosyncrasy (it represents a dualism in my philosophy, a tension between 'reality 1' and beyond). The list uses psychology as a source to define "normal" action and thought. It is part of a group of lists that looked into humanity around that time - "human universals", "negative absolutes", "hypothetical innovations". see: "pet philosophy", "optimistic ideals", "human universals", "negative absolutes", "reality 1"

Negative absolutes:

Part of a philosophical investigation of the conditions of humanity, done in summer 2011, resulting in several documents that spanned the full spectrum, from “beauty of life” aesthetic, optimistic thinking, the permanence of “human universals”, the “normative person” as defined by psychology, to the opposite: the extreme negatives of life and existence, “negative absolutes”. When taken as a whole, it represents a comprehensive “worst case scenario” of existence.

It was somewhat inspired by a pragmatic existentialist recommendation: that one must build life and identity upon a foundation of stark reality. Whereas most people build their worldview based on ideals and principles that may waver or crumble (youth ages, ability fades or fails, religious tenets can be questioned, even living itself yields to death), negative absolutes objectively exist as “defaults” - ‘the givens’ of existence’, and can function as “anchors”. NS analyzes and questions this assertion, through juxtaposing the absolutes with objects from more optimistic and beautiful mental spaces.

Death domain:

A main philosophical issue, a large subject for reification in NS/NS domain-group, main theme in Opus 1, involving:

- the mental and emotional climate surrounding death - “in light of death”, the “transfigured world”
- the implications of death, the barrier of a fixed life span on the individual
- the extension of individual death to planetary and universal death, the relationship between them
- “beyond problem context” and reality polemics attacking death
- a personal named aesthetic
- the “death” of the New Style itself, the “end” of NS in linear form (?)

Practically and most personally, NS is a self-proclaimed “lifetime work”, so the presence of death limits the New Style itself, and only a fraction of its potential can be explored within my lifespan, especially at the individual reification/concept-level and combinatorics-level.

Planetary/universal death:

Included in the death domain, superseding the death of individual.

Artistically, it contributes to the great artist’s duty to anthologize the world in light of its eventual nonexistence.

“The new style contains both abstraction and an anthological programmatic ambition that is the motivator for POTU(M). It is not so much that the work is limited to representing “our world/universe”, but that in light of the greatest artists of the past, of personal death and planetary death, it is the burden of the genius artist to refract universal totality through his work, existence and the far larger world of nonexistent, impossible and imaginary. It is the work of the artist on his deathbed, clamoring to preserve everything he has seen, known, thought and imagined, with the tragic knowledge that the human race will someday similarly vanish (along with everything that they created).”

Humor context:

Applying the perspective of humor to everything, a comic filter - humor’s approach reinterprets its target: it can parody it, reveal truth or lie within it, render it impotent, destroy or supersede it, reduce it to the point of absurdity, distort, exaggerate or exalt it, misinterpret it, and much more. Humor has infinite manifestations. It is the sharpest of the “counterintuition” inclinations and is essential to the New Style: it possesses some of the most overarching power in NS - the power to reinterpret the entirety of the NS universe, using its unique set of strategies.

It functions on many levels:

- A near-mandatory variation task in IP - to humble a (self-)serious work through parody (in variation and holistically)
- To question and dissect an asserted perspective/opinion of a reification (usually in the variation set and in tone-edits)
 - (thus a safeguard against “assertion”, distinguishing it from the vast majority of art (which use unqualified assertion))
- Some of the sharpest exhibitions of genius and conceptualization
- An NS domain where everything is reinterpreted through humorous perspectives (both benign and ruthless)
- A holistic tone-edit, refracting NS in its entirety, even questioning its basic premises and goals.
 - (a safeguard against the high potential for pretentiousness in NS, the “genius” goals etc.)
- A philosophical concept, closely related to Socratic doubt and dissection, superseding “reality 1”

The humor context is also an important episode in Opus 1, a period where the lead begins to see humor in everything, “disarming” his environment (though it is ephemeral - he cannot maintain it).

PET ISSUES, OTHER:

Aesthetics

“Applied art” as bridge from artistic domain

Beneficial vs. retarding influences on civilization

Bergson: subjective experience of time metaphor/analogy

Boredom Ability to escape boredom awareness of boredom

Cliché vs. human universals

Deconstruction and questioning of dichotomies

Defense of solitude, the concept of ‘non-participation’

‘Dehumanizing’ philosophy - bringing aspects of it out of human-centric orientation

Distortions/dangers to truth Religion

Gateway theory: formalizing new domains, creating terminology, etc.

Generalization, totality, totalities, sets

“Higher solution” in general (generalized from I.O.)

History - history at a more general level than is susceptible to distortion

Holism > complex systems/systems thinking irreducibility “no easy theory” = put parts into larger context = good theory

Idea web > real-time web > historical web

Learning methods

Loss, dealing with profound loss

Mental states as legitimate - manifested in arts, philosophy, visionary innovation in all disciplines

Monetization

Multiplicity and choice = high stratification level (reality1/barrier philosophy)

Myths of philosophy - what philosophy can't do make real life your art = ‘creativity’ with life as medium

Nostalgia, memory

Philosophic generalization to cover “all possible” = “idealization” (see comprehensive philo header from I.O. generalization)

Process philosophy: being and becoming, flux, change

Reprioritizing life (esp. in light of the negative values of much of today's culture(s))

Segmentation Sovereignty

Self-actualization

Specialization pros/cons, vs. universal genius in light of history

Sublimity (as defined by Schopenhauer)

Suicide: as introverted universal death > vs. external universal death = mirror inversion

Technology and science as a bastion of hope

The ‘power’ aspect (‘neural’ power) of complex systems

The balance of future vs. past

The base-level stratification = Descartes’ ‘discard all not absolutely certain’, “write as if no one has written on these matters before”

The inherent interrelatedness of all disciplines and all things = idea web, interdisciplinary as fact.

The introverted world = inversion of external vastness

The laws of nature, phenomena

The miracles of science (fine structure constant, the human body, brain, ecosystem, vastness of universe, quantum)

The way innovation moves toward zero in certain parameters (what's the curve called? asymptote, “limits”?)

Traits of God secularized into genius objectives (Prometheus)

“Trying to understand life”, etc. (the “problem context”)