

Table of Contents

The Key to the Singularity	22
➤ Does the Existential Void Actually Exist?.....	22
➤ Fembots	22
Humans Need Meaning	23
➤ We Hold These Truths to be Self-Evident	24
People Aren't Little Stones	25
Logotherapy	26
Crack in the Temple	27
➤ Empirically Provable	27
➤ Sapience	28
➤ Symbols & Abstractions.....	29
➤ A Posteriori	29
Expected Ice Cream, Waiter Brought Sorbet	30
Endnotes	31

“The beginning was a delicate time.”

– Princess Irulan, “Dune” opening narration (1984)

The Key to the Singularity: The existential void is the key to the Singularity.

Page | 22

No one of our species can see the whole existential void but we know it’s there and we name and define shades and glimpses of the void; what we do in defining the void determines who we are.

The existential void stretches before us. We can now see space, galaxies, the universe, for what it is, devoid of fancies, the inherent despair of meaninglessness of our existence. The existential void is the curse of intelligence; the more intelligent, the more, longer and deeper we stare into the void, parting the curtains, seeking a higher meaning. The ability to fill and stretch across this void will determine our future evolution and failures.

Math as most of us know it, consists of progressions and equations; in which there can be nothing there that wasn’t there to begin with, so math is insufficient to describe what is greater than its parts, for which we need a new way of thinking.

The Gestalt Structure is the balance and answer to the void. Life and living intelligence knows without speaking that the void can only be filled when the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.¹ Civilization – which is everything we do and what we are – is our own peculiar Gestalt Structure and catalyst for or to trans-evolution. Trans-human evolution began the first time that a human ancestor who should have died of any natural cause, did not die, and in fact survived and prospered enough to successfully propagate the species.

- Does the Existential Void Actually Exist?: It does now. In your head.^{2[Definition]}
 - ✓ “By an ‘appearance’ is meant any existent which impinges on consciousness, anything cognized, irrespective of any judgment as to whether it be ‘real’ or ‘illusory.’ ... Knowledge develops from appearances, which may be: (a) objects of perception, i.e. concrete phenomena in the physical or mental domains; (b) objects of intuition, i.e. one’s subjective self, cognitions, volitions and valuations (non-phenomenal concretes); and/or (c) objects of conception, i.e. simple or complex abstracts of preceding appearances” – Avi Sion, abstract of Phenomenology (2005).
- Did the Existential Void exist before someone gave it a name? It doesn’t matter unless you are one who insists that either reality is completely objective (i.e. the only reality is the objective reality), or that objective reality is superior to subjective reality.
 - ✓ See Aspects of Sociology, 2 Culture, p. 371, *infra*.
- Fembots: Can an intelligence exist that is not also sapient? Can humans recognize intelligence that is not sapient? These are questions that have bedeviled literature, philosophy and technology since Western culture first realized the possibility of artificial intelligence (and collective intelligence of eusocial insects).
 - ✓ Isn’t it interesting, this fascination we have with female human-looking robots? Studies show that the more human a robot appears, the more uncomfortable we are with it. Yet we continue making human looking robots, for example, the Chinese fembot Yangyang (who looks eerily like Sarah Palin) or Olivia (modeled after Scarlett Johansson), made in Hong Kong. And the technology will likely only improve, adding

facial expressions (the Professor Einstein Robot is really creepy), voice inflections, and intelligence to a machine with a human face. Sharon, dear, where are you?

- ✓ In October 2017, *in a move that is as strange as it is stupid*, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia made the fembot Sophia (modeled after Audrey Hepburn), who has facial expressions, and had said she wanted to destroy humans (look up the inane video interview), the first robot with full citizenship in any country; immediately this provoked a backlash as Saudi women’s rights campaigners noted that the fembot Sophia would have more rights than Saudi women.

“The Swiss psychologist Carl Jung once remarked that human beings could withstand almost any amount [of] suffering so long as they felt the suffering possessed meaning. And this need for meaning is as fundamental as the need for shelter, food, and companionship.”

– Mark Goddard, “The Human Need for Meaning,” Health Guidance, October 27, 2018

“As human beings, we need to make meaning of our existence. Meaning gives definition to our life and our life path. This search for meaning is often challenging. How do we make sense of who we are within a world that seems out of balance with poverty, war, and famine on the one hand and tremendous privilege on the other? Religions and philosophies have pondered the question of meaning as a core tenet for their framework of beliefs. There are as many answers, from materialism to community to spirituality, as there are humans to think of them. A key aim of the Existential-Humanistic perspective is to discover what your authentic meaning is.”

– Bob Edelstein, L.M.F.T., M.F.T., “The Need for Authentic Meaning,” Psychology Today, October 15, 2012 (emphasis in original)

Humans Need Meaning: *A priori.* Suppose I offer as an axiom ‘Humans need meaning.’ The wording of this is careful, I could have said ‘Humans create meaning’ – which I believe is true – but that has long been an issue in science and philosophy – most famously Plato’s essences and the positivists. So the most that can be said, reflectively and without controversy is that ‘Humans need meaning’ avoiding the issue of whether the universe has objective meaning or whether we can know what action is without having seen action.

- ✓ “It is through work that human beings realize the self, through work that we become fully human. We differ from all other life on earth in that we realize our imaginations in action on the external world. For humans, the work process is a unity of imagination and action.” – Frank Elwell, Macro Social Theory (2009), Kindle Edition, p. 36.
 - This succinctly describes my struggle with GGDM – to give my imagination effect on the external world. The struggle of every parent, teacher.

Actually, the original ancient argument was about whether truth, wisdom was objective, e.g., Plato’s Gorgias (380 B.C.) which charges that a skilled orator who is not a philosopher can create false knowledge in the minds of the listeners – and that argument is still going on today but has been quite muddled by observer relativity and collapsing wave functions. However, the argument about whether knowledge is objective (as in the physical laws of the universe and absolute morality) becomes muddled with the argument about whether meaning is also objective, because the modern concept of God includes everything – creation, objective knowledge, objective meaning in the form of its very existence, absolute good, benevolence, moral right, truth.

Even in ‘truth’ one has to be careful as the word has many meanings depending on context, sometimes literal factual truth (vs. lying or distortions), sometimes truth is also metaphysical, textual, religious, esoteric, self-aware, allegorical, satirical, or comedic. So what truth was Plato talking about? His own view of things naturally; all else was falsehood. To hold that Plato was talking about truth absolutely objectively is nonsense; no, Gorgias was an ideological document, but the discussion has value, and that is why it is still required reading in many studies.

Can you deny my offered axiom, can it be refuted? What irreconcilable intellectual contradiction is created by the denial, what is the consequence? To refute it, you’d have to say that ‘Humans don’t need meaning.’ Now, you are not going to be struck by lightning for saying that but what can be offered as an alternative to explain the entirety of human civilization, or at least, music, literature, language, religion, ideology, worldview? Is worldview not a meaning imposed?

- ✓ In order to even understand the axiom and to refute it, you need meanings, for example, you must be able to read and comprehend the symbols, and groupings of symbols (i.e. written words), of my language to which we have arbitrarily and systematically assigned meanings. You must share some worldview with me.
 - This is similar to Descartes’s existence; to know I exist, I must have thought of it, therefore I must exist, because if I didn’t exist, I’d have no thoughts. Famously, “I think therefore I am.”
- ✓ The fact that we argue from definitions, that we need definitions to make sense strongly implies both that humans need meanings and that meanings and worldviews are imposed. If they were not, the universe would be self-evident, *a priori* – it is only us who are confused and in need of definitions.

So in this case, the alternative to the offered axiom is nothingness, the Existential Void, the vacuum. *Reductio ad absurdum*. This is not new, it is not rocket science, any more than “humans act” was new in Ludwig von Mises’ time; the acts of men (especially purposeful acts) had long been a concern of philosophy, religion, history, criminal law, politics, war, and rhetoric.

- ✓ The *a priori* process within GGDM at least consists of offering an allegedly irrefutable deductive structure of civilizations and then defending it to conclusion and corollaries. An *a priori* science (e.g., Austrian School Economics) is the process of building corollaries and hierarchical relationships from initial *a priori* propositions.

The axiom of ‘humans need meaning’ may even tag along with Ludwig von Mises human action axiom like a pesky, unwanted little brother. The human meaning axiom sheds light on the primal ends and the motivations of human action, though strictly speaking, the Austrian School does not care about the motives or values of concrete ends sought, so as to avoid non-mathematical, non-logical discussions of morality, philosophy and psychology. Human meaning is the pesky little brother to human action because it answers a different question than the Austrian School asks.

- ✓ I maintain that this is not a strawman that I am beating here; as the remainder of GGDM will demonstrate, I regard this as the core issue of humanity and it needs examination every generation, just as we teach children to count, read, write, get along.
- We Hold These Truths to be Self-Evident: *A priori* is closely connected with ‘self-evident’ (which everyone remembers from the Declaration of Independence in primary school); Merriam-Webster online dictionary defines *self-evident* as “evident without proof or reasoning” and in the classic definitions of *a priori*, ‘proof’ would include observation and evidence.³

So in this sense, some definitions can make terms *a priori*, for example, in baseball, awarding a Run Batted In requires (drumroll please) ... the run to be batted in! Thus, no RBI is awarded if the runner on third scores on a wild pitch, passed ball, balk, or steals home. The run, of course, still counts. Similarly, on a sac fly, the batter still gets a RBI without getting a hit, which is a different thing as well. It thus would create an insoluble intellectual contradiction to award a RBI when the run was not batted in, or to not award a RBI just because it is an unearned run due to a previous error.⁴ After 120 years of professional baseball, Run Batted In remains self-evident even in modern baseball; it can be described as one of the *a priori* terms of baseball.

- ✓ So back to the old Declaration of Independence... is it an ideological document or a set of *a priori* statements? Everyone has heard the opening lines, “We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal...” Is that *a priori*? What are the consequences of disagreeing, of *refuting* the offered axiom or Kantian synthetic *a priori* proposition? What insoluble intellectual contradiction is caused by *refuting* the statement? Now, to brush silliness aside, it is generally interpreted that the writers did not mean literally created equal in any sense, they meant created equal before the law (even though African slavery existed in all of the colonies at that time, and they had displaced the Native Americans, neither of whom were equal before the law, ever) of God and man – but that is not what the statement says, they could have added a couple of words... They then support this assertion with some mythopoeic ramble about being endowed by the Creator also offered as *a priori* – something of which they couldn’t possibly know or deduce anything about....

“When Ludwig von Mises began to establish a systematic theory of economics, he insisted on what he called the principle of methodological dualism: the scientific methods of the hard sciences are great to study rocks, stars, atoms, and molecules, but they should not be applied to the study of human beings. In stating this principle, he was voicing opposition to the introduction into economics of concepts such as ‘market equilibrium,’ which were largely inspired by the physical sciences, and were perhaps motivated by a desire on the part of some economists to establish their field as a science on par with physics.

Mises remarked that human beings distinguish themselves from other natural things by making intentional (and usually rational) choices when they act, which is not the case for stones falling to the ground or animals acting on instinct. The sciences of human affairs therefore deserve their own methods and should not be tempted to apply the tools of the physical sciences willy-nilly. In that respect, Mises agreed with Aristotle’s famous dictum that ‘It is the mark of an educated man to look for precision in each class of things just so far as the nature of the subject admits.’”

– Michael Accad, M.D., “An introduction to praxeology and Austrian school economics,” alertandoriented.com (blog), April 13, 2016

People Aren’t Little Stones: The structure of GGDM is inherently deductive rather than inductive, which makes it more philosophy than science. GGDM takes this thing, this phenomenon called humanity, civilization, human civilization, and reduces it to its necessary parts in the form of a game.

- ✓ Ludwig von Mises was in the cohort with Prof. Clarence Marsh Case on this issue, and their threads meet in *Aspects of Sociology, et seq.*, 2 Culture, pp. 371-373, *infra*.

GGDM is not inductive in the sense that it takes a group of observable, empirical phenomenon and tries to find a ‘natural law’ governing their behavior which can be tested repeatedly for confirmation.

Humans don’t work that way:

- ✓ “People are not little stones, or keys in someone’s pocket, that can be moved from one place to another just like that...” – Colonel-General Ratko Mladić, 1992 (see full quote, 4 Expansion, EN 4, pp. 929-930, *infra*).

“From that premise, and from a few other empirical and essentially self-evident propositions (e.g., that there is a diversity of ends that human beings choose for themselves, that there is a diversity of means in nature, and other basic notions such as these), Austrian economists develop an economic theory and identify ‘economic law’ that include the laws of utility and laws of returns. They then go on to develop an elaborate theory of money, of interest, and of the business cycle.”

– Michael Accad, M.D., “An introduction to praxeology and Austrian school economics,” alertandoriented.com (blog), April 13, 2016

Logotherapy: The praxeology of GGDM might be summarized thus:

- ✓ That due to human awareness, our sapience, an existential void either exists subjectively, collectively for humans or if objective, it is that we can see it better than other creatures who are less sapient (and even better than our own children, part of ‘growing up’ is this realization); that this would be true of any sapient intelligence.
- ✓ That human acts, behavior, conduct, and our entire civilization is predicated to avoid the existential void, even to avoid contemplating it; economic acts⁵ are as related to this void as religion, social etiquette, music and literature.
- ✓ That the sum total of human actions against the existential void is emergent; emergence is not empirically testable (for the most part, that seems to be the consensus issue in recognizing it) yet the phenomenon is clearly there before us, every day: Life, Human civilization, possibly even the universe is emergent from something else.
- ✓ The players in GGDM, within the game, will naturally demonstrate all of these points; emergent narrative naturally forms as part of any gaming experience.

Praxeology specifies only that humans act with purpose or purposefully and thus express preferences and choices, but that says nothing about whether the acts are either rational or moral or their opposites, it is just as valid either way in the considerations of both Praxeology and Logotherapy (sort of like an absolute value in math or physics that works both ways temporally, see also *Homo economicus*, Big Endian, Little Endian, 6 Diplomacy, p. 1174, *infra*). It is true that GGDM’s praxeology might be stung by the same ‘amoral’ criticism against logotherapy:

- ✓ “In 1982 the highly cited scholar and holocaust analyst Lawrence L. Langer, who while also critical of Frankl’s distortions on the true experience of those at Auschwitz, and Frankl’s amoral focus on ‘meaning’ that could just as equally be applied to Nazis ‘finding meaning in making the world free from Jews,’ would go on to write ‘if this [logo-therapy] doctrine had been more succinctly worded, the Nazis might have

substituted it for the cruel mockery of Arbeit Macht Frei [‘work sets free,’ read by those entering Auschwitz].” – from Wikipedia article, “Viktor Frankl,” citing to Thomas Szasz, Suicide Prohibition: The Shame of Medicine (2011), pp. 60-62 and Lawrence Langer, Versions of Survival: The Holocaust and the Human Spirit (1982), p. 24.

However meaning and the existential void should not be confused, in any direct sense, with morality – which is exactly what I believe happened due to Frankl’s unfortunate association with the Göring Institute (f/k/a Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute⁶) in 1937-1938 and later confused claims that his theory originated in the concentration camp at Auschwitz. Moralities aside, not all meanings are equal and some create a clearly self-destructive course under certain circumstances – if you were a gladiator and your meaning in life were measured by how many opponents you killed in the arena, then you must keep fighting and someday, probably sooner rather than later, you will die of your own meanings. And it will be all for nothing. Just like Nazi Germany.

If, as in Langer’s criticism, one found meaning in killing all the Jews in Europe – well, we know what happened at Nuremberg.⁷ So, I believe the morality aspect of it takes care of itself eventually in finding meanings, but the two should not be confused even as they are kissing cousins.

“Consider the proposition: ‘If George V reigned at least four days, then he reigned more than three days.’ This is something that one knows a priori, because it expresses a statement that one can derive by reason alone.”

– from Wikipedia article, “A priori and a posteriori,” July 24, 2019

Crack in the Temple: *A priori* statements, propositions, have long been the bedrock of human knowledge. *A priori* is by definition, unassailable, inarguable, indisputable, and thus the only things we can be certain are absolutely true; even history, which is empirical and rhetorical can be a lie in the facts recorded by our ancestors. *A priori* was as unmovable as the Earth to our ancient ancestors, though we have since noted that the Earth moves constantly, that it is a non-Euclidian surface, and that fact is relative to the observer.

This ancient temple bedrock has some cracks and conditions that few expect. For example, the feature quote *a priori* proposition seems extremely simple to us, but not to the tribesmen in the Clan of the Cave Bear (1986) – except for the shaman, they couldn’t count to four. What if the recipient of the proposition had to lay out stones in parallel lines to see that it is true? From this, there are a number of corollaries that follow:

- **Empirically Provable:** An *a priori* statement must ultimately be empirically provable, and if that is necessary, then there is no distinction between an *a priori* statement and an *a posteriori* statement:⁸
 - ✓ Cf. “Compare this with the proposition expressed by the sentence: ‘George V reigned from 1910 to 1936.’ This is something that (if true) one must come to know *a posteriori*, because it expresses an empirical fact unknowable by reason alone.” *Id.*

For most people the truth of the first proposition is evident because of memorization of our counting system, that is, because of our counting system, where 4 comes before 5. It’s a shortcut to *a priori*. That is, we don’t count stones or make tick marks in the sand or even in our heads to figure out that four days is less than five and thus the statement is true by side by

side comparison. The smaller amount is always part of the larger amount, by definition; thus we count time passage.

- ✓ If you knew that our counting system represented amounts and that each number is larger than the previous, larger than all previous numbers, but not what the numbers actually represented, you could arrive at the truth of the proposition by simply following the order of the numbers, where 4 comes before 5, therefore the latter is larger.

Having to count stones and compare lines renders *a priori* moot (but not non-existent).

- ✓ “The word ‘calculus’ comes from ‘rock,’ and also means a stone formed in a body. People in ancient times did arithmetic with piles of stones, so a particular method of computation in mathematics came to be known as calculus.” – Jon Davidson, “What is Calculus,” Southern State Community College (Ohio), undated article.

Just because the truth of an *a priori* proposition can be seen by reasoning alone and does not require empirical evidence does not mean that the *a priori* proposition cannot be empirically proven or does not rely on empirical proof, even if that reasoning is in the form of counting stones in your head instead of on the ground. I think this point is often overlooked in attempting to clearly explain the difference between *a priori* and not *a priori* and the omission is deceptive about the nature of *a priori* statements and of human cognition: It suggests that there is such a thing as deduction alone, as if thought can exist *per se* in a vacuum.

- Sapience: This then suggests that what we consider *a priori* is a function of what we call sapience, and that *a priori* is dependent on intelligence; thus, what is *a priori* to creatures with higher SQ (Sentience Quotient), advanced alien intelligences, or to God if you like, is *a posteriori* to us. This is important to keep in mind when dealing with pets, animals, people, and probably with the development of artificial intelligences: Is there any way for us to determine what, if anything, a deep learning AI sees as *a priori*? Can a computer ‘see’ or understand that the shortest distance between two points on a flat surface is a straight line? Or does the computer need to measure it, or be told to ignore the problem by the coders? Does something become *a priori* to a person by expert training? In fact, that is why we rely on experts, not just for their knowledge, but for their insights; what is *a priori* to a medical doctor is news to me. I don’t (or reasonably shouldn’t) rely on my caddie for a medical opinion!
 - ✓ I do not believe that my cats know that if I have fed them four times today, I have fed them three times today. Or even that I have fed them already today. What is *a priori* to me never impinges on their conscience.

There are implications to this in Abrahamic religion: That it is likely that God is damning us for transgressions that it considers *a priori* but that we cannot comprehend, even *a posteriori*. The same way that we scold children with the exception that we have a direct parental relationship with our children who will soon grow up to be adults with the same comprehension that we possess. So God’s relationship to humanity is more akin to humans scolding pets, who will never comprehend the reasons, will barely comprehend the immediate cause, but conform to avoid pain and reproach and value our affection and companionship.

- ✓ “We must question the story logic of having an all-knowing all-powerful God, who creates faulty Humans, and then blames them for his own mistakes.” – Gene Roddenberry, quoted by Michael Guillen, Can A Smart Person Believe in God? (2004), p. 90.

- The fundamental rift problem of all Abrahamic religion is the imperfect attempt to mash two stories together; the first being the creation story of how man and everything came to be, and the second being a set of spiritualized ethics for social control of behavior, tied together by concepts of eternal justice and reward in the afterlife.

➤ Symbols & Abstractions: To what extent does *a priori* depend on symbols and abstractions? There is nothing in the Arabic numeral symbol **4** that would inherently suggest that it is more than **3**, they are just two unrelated figures someone drew and could be placed in any order.

- ✓ In the Roman numerals system, an extended tally system, one might actually get confused because III has more figures in it than IV and thus it might be considered as *a priori* that III is more than IV – I mean, it's obvious that III sticks are more than II sticks or maybe the V counts as II sticks and thus III and IV are the same number?⁹
- ✓ Why would X sets of X, or X times X = C? Why does X times V = L? What is intuitive about that? Yet $10 \times 5 = 50$ and $10 \times 10 = 100$ are intuitive, and further, from zeros, we get the concept of *orders of magnitude*. How did the Romans describe that?

Thus, the symbol **4** (or four) represents an amount one greater than **3** (or three) *simply because* our ancestors agreed on the ordering of symbols at some point corresponding to a number of stones in creating the position notation system we use now. You know *a priori* that 4 days is greater than 3 days, without having to lay out stones in lines, simply because of that shortcut. Computer scientists and mathematicians early on discovered the value of shortcuts and symbols in processing information, and *a priori* without having to resort to empirical testing (making it *a posteriori*) is a result of symbols, shortcuts (in many cases this shortcut is memory, such as memorized place notation multiplication tables), and abstractions.

➤ A Posteriori: From time immemorial, or at least since ancient times (and what is the difference, practically?) human knowledge has been divided between *a priori* and *a posteriori*; that which was not *a priori* (i.e. could be deduced, tested with predictability) was necessarily *a posteriori* (i.e. observed, experienced, recorded). Those seemed to learned men the only two ways, but was there a third? We only ask the question of a third when the two are not always sufficient to explain the entirety of our experiences.

- ✓ For example, dreams while sleeping; one cannot deduce a dream, they are not *a priori*, so one must experience a dream, but in the *a posteriori* of a dream, it cannot be proven outside of your own head, and even you may doubt it or forget it. Thus, is a dream really empirical? Not in the strictest sense.
- ✓ While we can observe the moment of conception now, our ancestors could not. Life was not *a priori*, one could not logically deduce their way to conception. Eventually, they got the idea generally of what was going on, we now call it reproductive consciousness, but again, the cycle of life, birth, is *a posteriori* except that no one remembers the experience of being alive – either during conception or because they are dead, in between you know nothing else but being alive and have no comparable contrast to the sensation, you have no experience at not being alive. No one does.

These two examples alone seem a reasonable explanation for the development of divinity and mystic thought in ancient civilizations (not to be confused with mythopoeic explanations).

“A constant element of enjoyment must be mingled with our studies, so that we think of learning as a game rather than a form of drudgery, for no activity can be continued for long if it does not to some extent afford pleasure to the participant.”

– Desiderius Erasmus

Expected Ice Cream, Waiter Brought Sorbet: You probably expected to be reading game rules? I once saw a comic about, basically, how to be a total jerk on a dinner date at a fancy dining experience restaurant. The waiter brought sorbet ‘to cleanse the palette’ and the guy went off on a rant, caused a scene, embarrassing his date, because they didn’t serve ice cream.

- ✓ Most intellectuals have viewed or understood gaming as an important intellectual tool, alongside and sharing values with literary storytelling (or religious histories and parables), hypotheticals, and hypothesis. This seems to be truer in the later centuries, and the ‘rise’ of gaming in war, economics, histories, and such probably results from the print revolution almost five centuries ago. Over the last two centuries, our games have increased in complexity corresponding with our developing intellectual abilities, widespread education, and our increased material and technological prowess. The days of my youth when I was informed that grown men should not be paid money to play a child’s game (e.g., baseball) or that games were child’s things that a man puts away (while apparently mythopoeic religion isn’t), have quickly faded.
- ✓ Without having played a single turn of GGDM (since 1997 when it was a vastly different game), GGDM’s evolution has been my personal *intellectual vehicle* for structure, understanding and education, designing GGDM has been a form of solitaire ‘play’ for me which allowed thinking and learning to continue to be ‘fun’ (though the ontological quality of that ‘play’ and ‘fun’ has changed over time) into midlife.
 - “The different subtitles given to The Navigator (1988) since its release suggests the problem in classifying this film as belonging to any particular genre or, indeed, any genre at all. Its original subtitle – A Medieval Odyssey – was replaced with An Odyssey Across Time for the American release, then changed again to A Time-Travel Adventure for the DVD release. The original subtitle holds no suggestion of science fiction and it is clear that, for the American market, the generic undertones in the form of time-travel needed to be played up. The Navigator is certainly a time-travel adventure – of sorts. Director Vincent Ward’s talent for creating haunting visual poetry is on full display in this film about the healing power of dreamers.” – Nigel Honeybone, “Film Review: The Navigator: A Medieval Odyssey (1988),” HNN, March 8, 2019.

Like Navigator: A Medieval Odyssey, one of my favorite time-travel movies, GGDM’s cover page has gone through a number of subtitles over the years – even the game title went through half a dozen changes as it evolved up to 2006 – as I tried to figure out what exactly I was doing: Writing a game? Writing a social theory? Writing a treatise on human civilizations? Writing a doctoral dissertation? In 2019, I finally settled on the fact that I had created a ‘literary game.’ But it is important to remember when reading GGDM that *the game always came first*; the game was the frame work

on which has been built the enlightening commentary, educational quotes, and profound arguments that evolved, drifted, into a ‘literary game.’

- “Sometimes young writers are worried they have to develop their own prose style, but that’s not true. Whatever you write will turn into you.” – Annie Dillard quoted by Lawrence Malcolm, “Lunch with Annie Dillard,” April 30, 1982 (free online).

GGDM will be all that is left of me when I am finished, like Plato’s works. It is the capsule of my mental existence.

- ✓ “I think any life experience does – that’s the way you happen, unconsciously or consciously, to use a lot of experience to inform your work. But I’d say the two most obvious ways – studying medicine gave me all the sixties, while I was at university, to indulge the things I was interested in. I was very interested in art, I was very interested in the movies, I used to do a lot of painting and drawing and cartooning, and stuff like that.” – George Miller as quoted by Anne Billson, “George Miller Talks about Mad Max, Heroes & Tina Turner: The 1985 Interview,” previously unpublished interview published on Multiglom: The Anne Billson Blog, May 12, 2015.

Most people like their recreational games to be escapist fantasy. Whether GGDM is an escapist fantasy depends on the personality of each participant, each reader of these rules. On one hand, you do have godlike control of a nascent interstellar civilization surrounded by potentially hostile aliens. But as you can tell from reading just this far, GGDM has in it a reflection of our current world, futures, and much history. For some, that is not escapist. You might sense there is something here that is more than a game; raise your hand if you are an overachiever. That is the personality of GGDM.

- ✓ “Even when created to critique or raise awareness, entertainment is escapism, allowing us to explore new worlds and experiences...letting us take the roles of soldiers, fantasy warriors, and goats.” – Max Eddy & Matthew Buzzi, “The Most Niche Simulation PC Games We Could Find,” PC Magazine, March 15, 2019.

Soup and sherry have been served, the dishes removed. The relevés – the rules – begin on the next page accompanied by lively adult table conversation; later, entremêts will be served with fresh glasses of chilled wine. Then gaming will commence.

“For a small child there is no division between playing and learning; between the things he or she does ‘just for fun’ and things that are ‘educational.’ The child learns while living and any part of living that is enjoyable is also play.”

– Penelope Leach (child developmental psychologist)

Endnotes.

¹ Commentary: Rhetorical Question: What is the difference between a Gestalt Structure and an Emergence?

² Commentary: The Existential Void is a philosophical term meaning the inherent meaningless of the universe/life from the human perspective. It should not be confused with the astronomy term or that we live in the KBC Void.

³ Commentary & Citation: Self-evident is insulting when it is not, cf. “[Alexander] Cain tosses this kind of statement out as if it was self-evident. It’s not. It needs to be argued for, but this will be par for the course for Cain.” – Nick Peters, “A Brief Look At Alexander Cain,” May 6, 2015 (forum post, TheologyWeb, www.theologyweb.com).

⁴ **Commentary:** Big errors and little errors are the same, they are both errors. Just the same way that winning by an overwhelming score is the same as winning by one point, it's still a W, or in the reverse case, an L. In baseball, they tell the players that a win in April is the same as a win in September, they all count the same (though it doesn't *feel* that way); this is so in any regular season team sport, hockey, football, basketball, etc. Then someone decided to introduce 'tiebreakers,' 'scoring differentials,' and 'strength of schedule'...

⁵ **Citation:** "Ludwig von Mises (1881–1973) reconstructed economics as an axiomatic science, which he called praxeology: the science of the logic of human action. The central element of praxeology is the *axiom of human action*."

The axiom of human action basically says that human beings act. This may sound trivial at first glance. However, at second glance it becomes obvious that Mises's axiom of human action and its implications are far from being trivial:

To start with, an *axiom* is a (set of) proposition(s) presumed to be *true* on the basis of logical necessity; it serves as presenting different subject matters as formal and coherent theories, all of which are propositions which can be deduced from the axiom. For instance, Pythagoras's theorem is deducible from the axioms of Euclidian geometry.

The axiom of human action is of a special nature: It represents a synthetic a priori proposition, to use the terminology of Immanuel Kant (1724–1804). A synthetic a priori proposition is knowledge that (1) cannot be denied without running into an intellectual contradiction, and (2) is derived from *reflection* rather than observation.

The axiom of human action cannot be denied without running into an insoluble contradiction. This is because denying the axiom of human action implies human action – that is the human act of denying. Arguing that humans cannot act is thus a contradiction in itself, an absurdity.

Further, the axiom of action is derived from human reflection: it is independent of experience. This is because one cannot observe humans making an action per se. In order to know what 'action' means, one has to know what action is – which implies that knowledge about action exists prior to action.

That said, the axiom of human action fulfills both of Immanuel Kant's requirements for qualifying as an a priori synthetic proposition: it is self-evidently true, and it is derived from reflection. That said, logical deductions from the axiom of human action must be also absolutely, or *apodictically*, true as well.

By developing praxeology, Mises showed that economic theory is the formal logic of the irrefutably true axiom of human action. According to Mises, economic theory is not concerned with psychology, but with the implications of the axiom of human action." – Thorsten Polleit, "What Can the Law of Diminishing Marginal Utility Teach Us?" Mises Institute, February 11, 2011 (emphasis in original).

⁶ **Citation:** "In 1925, Eitingon became chair of the new International Training Committee of the International Psychoanalytic Association. The Eitingon model remains standard today. The Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute itself was founded in 1923. Ernst Simmel, Hanns Sachs, Franz Alexander, Sándor Radó, Karen Horney, Siegfried Bernfeld, Otto Fenichel, Theodor Reik, Wilhelm Reich and Melanie Klein were among the many psychoanalysts who worked at the Institute. As a Jew, Eitingon's position became precarious after the Nazi ascent to power in 1933. Freud's books were burned in Berlin. By then some members had already left Berlin for the USA. Eitingon resigned in August 1933; he later moved to Palestine and founded the Palestine Psychoanalytic Association in 1934 in Jerusalem. The Palestine Association saw itself as the heir of the Berlin Institute; even the furniture from the Berlin Institute ended up in Jerusalem.

On 23 August 1933, Sigmund Freud wrote to Ernest Jones, 'Berlin is lost.' Edith Jacobson was arrested by the Nazis in 1935; one of her patients was a known Communist. Felix Boehm [de], who with fellow non-Jew Carl Müller-Braunschweig [de] had taken control of the Institute after Eitingon's departure, refused to intervene on Jacobson's behalf, on the grounds that by associating herself with Communism she had endangered the Institute's survival. In 1936 the Institute was annexed to the *Deutsches Institut für psychologische Forschung und Psychotherapie e.v.* (the so-called Göring Institute). Its director Matthias Göring was a cousin of Field Marshal Hermann Göring. Göring, Boehm and Müller-Braunschweig collaborated for a number of years; fourteen non-Jewish German psychoanalysts continued to operate within the new Institute. The one remaining copy of Freud's works was kept in a locked cupboard referred to as the 'poison cabinet.' John Rittmeister [de], a physician and psychoanalyst associated with the Institute, as well as resistance fighter against Nazism, was sentenced to death and executed in May 1943." – from Wikipedia article, "Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute," captured July 10, 2019.

⁷ **Commentary & Citation:** And this is not to make light of the entire Holocaust tragedy, I do not deny or diminish their unjust suffering in any sense (and with this clear statement, I don't expect to be the target of any silly accusations of Holocaust denial – you don't know the stupidity I witnessed with my own young eyes). Rather, the macro- and holistic-approach taken by GGDM entails a bit of what is called 'pragmatic ethics':

- ✓ "Pragmatic ethics is a theory of normative philosophical ethics. Ethical pragmatists such as John Dewey believe that some societies have progressed morally in much the way they have attained progress in science. Scientists can pursue inquiry into the truth of a hypothesis and accept the hypothesis, in the sense that they act as though the hypothesis were true; nonetheless, they think that future generations can advance science, and thus future generations can refine or replace (at least some of) their accepted hypotheses. Similarly, ethical pragmatists think that norms, principles, and moral criteria are likely to be improved as a result of inquiry. ... ethical pragmatists acknowledge that it can be appropriate to practice a variety of other normative approaches (e.g., consequentialism, deontological ethics, and virtue ethics), yet acknowledge the need for mechanisms which allow society to advance beyond such approaches, a freedom for discourse which does not take any such theory as assumed. Thus, aimed at social innovation, the practice of pragmatic ethics supplements the practice of other normative approaches with what John Stuart Mill called 'experiments of living.'" – from Wikipedia article, "Pragmatic ethics," July 10, 2019.

⁸ **Commentary:** Is this an *a priori* statement? I think that one can deduce it to be true without having to check every possible *a priori* statement (an impossible task). Or is it more of a Kantian synthetic *a priori* proposition in that from one or two cases, reflectively we can offer *a priori* that it is true of all *a priori* statements?

- ✓ It is possible that this will set some logicians' minds running, and I am nothing of the caliber of Saul Kripke (and that is *a priori*), so if I missed something and there are *a priori* statements that are not empirically provable ... my examples are sufficient for the point of the argument I am making here.
- ✓ Nor do I believe any of my arguments in this section are probably new to the science (nor is much of anything else in GGDM new under the sun), but as I have not read them anywhere else – and there are a million vital works I should have read but have not – they are new to me when I am thinking of them independently while considering the issues in GGDM's context. Thus, there may already be well-developed, famous, and even forgotten arguments written on this issue from millennia past.

⁹ **Commentary:** As I worked through the end of the final edit of GGDM, I had the opportunity to become acquainted with the Roman tally counting system. As I forced myself to relearn Roman counting, it became apparent that there were certain things that would have been intuitive to literate Romans that are not to us, for example, two Vs make an X, and I would guess that is how X came to represent 10. In many cases, simple math involved just inserting a V or I in the previous Roman numeral, in the appropriate place to add or subtract, for example, XV minus I is XIV or XI plus V is XVI. Just as any educated person in the *place notation* system knows that 9 plus 5 = 14 and 9 minus 5 = 4. We don't have to think too hard about it; through practice and neural plasticity, we just know it.

- ✓ "Much of the world, including Europe, also lacked an efficient numbering system such as that developed in the Hindu and Arabic cultures. (Try long division, for example, using Roman numerals.)" – Jon Davidson, "What is Calculus," Southern State Community College (Ohio), undated article.

The phenomenological progression of additive Roman digits is cyclic: Starting with nothing, add (I), add (II), add (III), pinch (IV), subtract/slide left (V), add (VI), add (VII), add (VIII), crash (IX), subtract/slide left (X), start over. I wonder if this is how they taught their young to count to ten, which is always the hardest part of learning to count? It works at least up to five on one hand, finger, finger, finger, pinch thumb and finger, then V with thumb and fingers sideways. This also mirrors the appearance of consecutive Roman numbers down the page, a wavy pattern of ballooning and deflating; grow, grow, grow, shrink, grow, grow, grow, shrink, grow, grow, crash, grow, etc.; a sub-rhythm, a thumbs rhythm of 4s and 9s exists in Roman Numerals. Difficult to say, but this may have some bearing on the Roman worldview; one could make some satirical case for it in social and historical cycles. It may even mirror the 'progress' or evolution of the GGDM design over the years.

I wonder how different the world looked to someone with an educated Roman cognition? With a counting system that was an extension of the tally system compared to our place notation? Was it a function of a priest-like class to be able to perform the more complex arithmetic (i.e. multiplication and division as opposed to adding and subtracting) in Roman numerals? The Romans are famous for engineering, which they did with Roman numerals. In the end process of numbering the Appendix sections, I usually took a shortcut through Arabic-Hindu math when using Roman Numerals. Would I be a math genius among Romans because I memorized the *place notation multiplication* tables when I was in grade school and would simply have to translate the results to Roman numerals for them?