

## Table of Contents

<b>Jury Verdict</b> .....	128
<b>An Interpretation</b> .....	129
➤ Interpretation of History .....	129
➤ Official Interpretation .....	130
➤ Technodreams .....	130
<b>Pseudopatients</b> .....	131
<b>Dream Police</b> .....	132
<b>Citing Wikipedia</b> .....	133
<b>Flavors of Fact</b> .....	134
➤ Accepting the Diagnosis .....	134
➤ A Thing Done .....	134
➤ Loud Barking .....	135
<b>Five Types of Facts</b> .....	136
<b>Grinding Chic Fact</b> .....	138
Endnotes.....	139

---

*“A mythic map of Australia would show thousands of characters, varying in their importance, but all in some way connected with the land. Some emerged at their specific sites and stayed spiritually in that vicinity. Others came from somewhere else and went somewhere else. Many were shape changing, transformed from or into human beings or natural species, or into natural features such as rocks but all left something of their spiritual essence at the places noted in their stories.” – [The Encyclopaedia of Aboriginal Australia](#)*

---

**Doctor Who:** *Dreams. They’re funny. Ha, ha, ha. They’re disjointed. They’re, they’re silly. They’re full of gaps. But you don’t notice, because the dream protects itself. Stops you asking the right questions.*

– Dr. Who, “Last Christmas” (2014)

---

**Jury Verdict:** During the Age of Reason/Enlightenment and early Scientific Age, the term “interpretation” acquired a slightly negative sense of human fallibility, superstition, irrationality as science, empiricism, and rationality pushed against religion, astrology, numerology, and local superstitions. Yet, despite scientific utopian dreams of a completely rational, logical, empirical, scientific civilization (e.g., Mr. Spock), interpretation remains very much a part of our daily lives, our humanity, our civilization.

Interpretation exists where humans must make decisions or conclusions about things which are not empirically certain, of which we do not have full and complete knowledge, or to which empiricism does not apply. X-rays and radiological films, and other diagnostic tests, are *interpreted* by medical professionals. A *jury verdict* (verdict: to speak the truth) is the conclusion reached from the jury’s interpretation of the direct and circumstantial evidence presented to them during trial and their common background of beliefs, life experiences, memories, and ideals.

- ✓ Science-fiction writers love this stuff; for example, RoboCop’s memory being admissible as evidence, or Philip K. Dick’s short story “The Minority Report” (1956).  
Someday, juries may travel in time to witness the actual events and decide.

The standard of a jury verdict is not absolute certainty, it is either *beyond a reasonable doubt*, or *by clear and convincing evidence*, depending on the matter. And there is not clear evidence that juries adhere to or understand either one, which is why there are appellate procedures. There is no appeal from an erroneous medical interpretation or failure to diagnose, but you can sue them.

---

*“When scientists attempt to formalize the principles of the empirical sciences, they use an interpretation to model reality, in the same way logicians axiomatize the principles of logic. The aim of these attempts is to construct a formal system that will serve as a conceptual model of reality. Predictions or other statements drawn from such a formal system mirror or map the real world only insofar as these scientific models are true.”*

– from Wikipedia article, “Interpretation (philosophy),” captured  
November 30, 2015

---

**An Interpretation:** Interpretations are the means by which life, and particularly intelligent star faring life forms, impose their reality on the local universe.<sup>1</sup> Interpretations are the ‘crack in the door’ through which intelligent life muddles the less than absolute truth of the expanding universe. Interpretations are the labels written in the sand in the sandbox.<sup>2</sup>

The core definition of “interpretation” is the assignment or determination of meanings in relation to something that is under consideration. Daily interpretations are based on intuition and judgment from experience within our cognitive and cultural schemas. Intuition and interpretation intertwine, nearly inseparable, in human intelligence. Interpretation is a primary act of sapience.

- ✓ “The ‘*Biological Brain*’ is a nonlinear tool that has been designed by millions of years of evolution to navigate an external world full of incompressible nonlinear dynamics. The ‘*Emergent Mind*’ is simply a reflection of how the brain is wired up. The brain tries to understand the external world by trying to build abstract nonlinear models; and it does this by trying to best fit the models to the available data (as we say in model speak)... In the real world, we used [sic] abstract models all the time to give us a qualitative understanding of something. A map of the London Underground is a perfect example. [Image of London subway map omitted, but you know what it looks like if you have ever seen an abstract subway, light rail or bus route schedule with a map.] This map is obviously not an exact representation of locations in physical space, but it is nonetheless a good enough model to give us a good understanding of the nature of the underground network. Similarly, at the subconscious level the mind attempts to build a qualitative, or ‘*intuitive*,’ understanding of everything in the external world. And it is the ‘*integration*’ of all this intuitive understanding that results in the ‘*Emergent Conscious Mind*.’...” – Kieran D. Kelly, “The Emergent Mind,” Incompressible Dynamics (blog) (<http://www.kierandkelly.com/>), captured February 16, 2019 (emphasis in original).<sup>3</sup>

- While ‘designed’ is a poor choice of words in the preceding quote, it was not offered here for that purpose. Writers really should not use ‘designed’ and ‘evolution’ in the same sentence in that way. And “wired up” – ugh! I recently mentally kicked myself for using “framed up,” gotta lose the up, keep it level. “Up” has long plagued the English language, Dean Inge used “peopling up” in 1919 in *Outspoken Essays*, “The Future of the English Race.”

GGDM is perhaps such an “abstract nonlinear model” that was necessarily flattened out and made as linear as necessary for the ‘real world’ as a simulation game.

- **Interpretation of History:** The caution with interpretations is the same as the caution with emergences – do not assume that it is always a favorable outcome for humanity either in the given moment or in the long term. History (and the current news) has shown that people will read a page and make it into whatever meaning suits them (unless it is highly technical writing), or as is commonly said, people hear what they want to hear and ignore all else (e.g., Simon & Garfunkel, “The Boxer” (1982)). This will happen in GGDM Interpretations (and even in the rules reading) as much as in the real world. In terms of blame, in each case, would it have made any difference if the writer or speaker were better at their craft, had been clearer in their writing or speaking, or is the blame on the audience? Or on the education system? Or on political ideologies? Or on human selfishness? This is a long debate reaching to all spheres of human civilization; sometimes it is tragicomic.

- ✓ “Like other Presidents, perhaps even more so, Mr. Trump tends to hear what he wants to hear at settings like this, either tuning out contrary voices or disregarding them. Through hard experience, other leaders have concluded that direct confrontation can backfire, so they have taken to soft-pedaling disagreements. Even Trump favorites like Boris Johnson, the populist new Prime Minister of Britain, tread carefully. On Sunday, Mr. Johnson expressed qualms about Mr. Trump’s trade war with China, but appeared to take pains not to offend the easily offended president. ... While the president relishes confrontation, he tends to avoid conflict in person, saving his vitriol for long-distance social media blasts.” – Peter Baker, “Rule 1 at the G7 meeting? Don’t get you-know-who mad,” New York Times, August 26, 2019.
- **Official Interpretation:** This entire game is an interpretation (a vision I offer), just as your life might be someone else’s bad dream. That goes nowhere, so let’s leave it over in the corner for now. Within this game, there are six (or seven, it’s a bit fuzzy) ‘game mechanics’ or ‘game devices’ that are officially considered Interpretations: Fundamental Realities, News Events (including Expose’ special News Events), Writs, Patents, Interventions, Meanings (including Shared Meanings), Collage.<sup>4</sup> An Interpretation must accompany each Power Activation and the default Interpretation is the News Event, for example, if Patent Prosecution fails.
  - ✓ A Thesis Statement issued by one position against another (see Disputation, 2 Reformation, p. 1391, *infra*) is not an official Interpretation. A Collage issued in resolution of a Reformation (see Here I Sit and A Soul from Purgatory Springs, 3 Reformation, pp. 1399, 1401, *infra*) is an Interpretation by the Concierge of Thesis Statements.
  - ✓ The Concierge does not have ‘Power Activations’ and uses Interpretations to guide.
- **Technodreams:** A Patent is only an Interpretation on the turn in which the Patent is successfully prosecuted. Thereafter, the Patent becomes part of the reality of the game. Thus, a position may not cite the use of the Patent on any subsequent turn to fulfill the requirement of having an Interpretation paired with each Power Activation.
  - ✓ For example, a new ship Patent is introduced into the game. On the turn the new ship Patent is introduced, it is an Interpretation and may be used to fulfill the requirements of an Interpretation accompanying the Technology Power Activation for that purpose. However, subsequently, the new ship Patent may not be used as the Interpretation accompanying each Construction Power Activation used to build the new ship type.

---

*“The history of sex-difference research is rife with innumeracy, misinterpretation, publication bias, weak statistical power, inadequate controls and worse. Rippon, a leading voice against the bad neuroscience of sex differences, uncovers so many examples in this ambitious book that she uses a whack-a-mole metaphor to evoke the eternal cycle. A brain study purports to discover a difference between men and women; it is publicized as, ‘At last, the truth!’, taunting political correctness; other researchers expose some hyped extrapolation or fatal design flaw; and, with luck, the faulty claim fades away – until the next post hoc analysis produces another ‘Aha!’ moment and the cycle repeats. As Rippon shows, this hunt for brain differences ‘has been vigorously pursued down the ages with all the techniques that science could muster.’ And it has exploded in the past three decades, since MRI research joined the fray.”*

– Lise Eliot, “Neurosexism: the myth that men and women have different brains,”  
Nature, February 27, 2019

---

*“[David] Rosenhan’s experiment shows how psychiatric and medical diagnoses are related to the labeling theory. This theory states that deviance is a product of external judgements, or labels, that modify the individual’s self-identity and change the way others respond to the labeled person.*

*By negatively labeling those seen as deviant from standard cultural norms, the behavior of individuals may be adjusted to coincide with the terms used to describe them. People actively label certain acts as deviant and others as normal, creating distinct stereotypes. In this article, Rosenhan uses hard labeling to argue that mental illnesses are manifested solely as a result of societal influence.”*

– from Wikipedia article, “David Rosenhan,” captured April 17, 2019 <sup>5</sup>

**Pseudo-patients:** In order to be released, the pseudopatients were required to sign papers agreeing with their psychiatric diagnosis and take anti-psychotic medications, e.g.:

- ✓ “All told, the pseudo-patients were administered nearly 2100 pills ... Only two were swallowed. The rest were either pocketed or deposited in the toilet. The pseudo-patients were not alone in this.” *Id.*

The absurdity of being required to agree with your psychiatric diagnosis is astounding and offensive: Has a cancer patient ever needed to sign a paper agreeing with their diagnosis (though cancer patients can be labeled ‘in remission’) to then be in remission? What if society decided you could be civilly committed or admitted for being an atheist, Luddite,<sup>6</sup> Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Republican, Platonic, Gnostic, Nazi, environmentalist, skeptic, punk-rocker or just being opposed to the government and your own culture (see Soviet diagnosis of “Sluggish schizophrenia” and U.S. DSM-5 “Oppositional Defiant Disorder”), then had to sign a paper admitting to the diagnosis to be ‘in remission’ to be released? THX 1138 anyone?

- ✓ “Despite their public ‘show’ of sanity, the pseudo-patients were never detected. Admitted, except in one case, with a diagnosis of schizophrenia, each was discharged with a diagnosis of schizophrenia ‘in remission.’ The label ‘in remission’ should in no way be dismissed as a formality, for at no time during any hospitalization had any question been raised about any pseudopatient’s simulation. Nor are there any indications in the hospital records that the pseudopatient’s status was suspect. Rather, the evidence is strong that, once labeled schizophrenic, the pseudopatient was stuck with that label. If the pseudopatient was to be discharged, he must naturally be ‘in remission’; but he was not sane, nor, in the institution’s view, had he ever been sane.” – David L. Rosenhan, “On Being Sane in Insane Places,” *Science*, Vol. 179 (Jan. 1973), pp. 250-258.
- ✓ “In a sermon at Tehran’s Mosalla Mosque on January 17, Khamenei – the highest authority in Iran – said those who took to the streets had been victims of deception by foreign media and would not change the opinion of most Iranians.” – “Iran’s Khamenei Defends Military Amid Anger Over Downed Plane,” Radio Free Europe, January 20, 2020.

- This is only about one step away from the Soviet Union, one step away from classifying disagreement with the government as a form of mental illness: Those who are deceived by foreigner media are infirm of mind.

---

*“Since the time of Constantine, in fact, Western history has been plagued by the impossibility of policing belief rather than practice. After all, how do you decide what someone **really** believes, or does not believe?”*

– Prof. Michael Kulikowski (Pennsylvania State University), “Christians were Strangers: How an obscure oriental cult in a corner of Roman Palestine grew to become the dominant religion of the Western world,” Aeon, January 30, 2017 (emphasis in original)

---

**Dream Police:** Interpretations are very powerful things to individual humans as well as the masses. I spent a hot May afternoon working on a community garden with a religiously perfer-vid lady who interpreted everything moment by moment as a personal message from God and shouted it to the world. Frankly, she was driving me nuts, but I held my cool and started thinking about Karl Marx’ famous quote, “Religion is the opium of the masses.” It certainly seemed to apply at that moment. Later, based on circumstance I will not relate, I decided that she is really terrified of dying, despite what she says, and that her behavior was *bravado*.

Most of the time in our society today (in the ‘democratic West’), people are allowed to keep their interpretations – it is impossible to see inside someone’s mind (it drives control freaks nuts) and we can only guess from their actions, behavior, conversations and writings what they *truly believe* (and most people are not clear with themselves about even that point) – and we only try to alter another’s personal interpretations (or civilly commit them) when they are perceived as dangerous to themselves or others. The same problem that occurs in God, treason, romantic love.<sup>7</sup>

The current version of the Western preoccupation (obsession) with what people actually think rather than do – that lead to modern psychological (mental health) sciences as a medical practice and sprawling theory – originates with Christianity, to wit:

- ✓ “Some of these theological works focus on detailing heresies – wrong beliefs – of which there was already a rich variety. Because Christianity centred so much on beliefs rather than ritual behaviours, the policing of what did and did not constitute true and acceptable belief has always preoccupied Christian theologians and been a central dynamic in Christian politics.” *Id.*
- ✓ “Such disputes mattered, not least because Christians who believed the wrong thing would forfeit eternal life – or worse, ensure their own eternal damnation. Right belief, by contrast, opened the path to eternal salvation.” *Id.*
- ✓ “In the divisions of Anabaptism Luther sees a sign of its ungodliness. The Anabaptist limitation of baptism to the believer he considers entirely impossible, since the baptizer cannot look into the heart of a man to see whether he really believes. Such a baptism is a ‘baptism upon adventure’ (Mark 16:16), even if there is talk of ‘the sure faith;’ for the confession of the one to be baptized proves nothing, since he too is not ‘sure’ of his faith since he is of course not free of temptation. (One is impressed with Luther’s rejection of all anchoring of the grace of baptism in a human or emotional

activity such as ‘trusting and building upon oneself and not upon the word of God alone.’)” – from GAMEO<sup>8</sup> wiki article, “Martin Luther,” May 6, 2020.

Or, putting it another way, would modern mental sciences exist in their current form without the triumph of Christianity in the West? Up to about 1300 A.D. medical doctors were required to have clerical training and clergy and medicine, until the age of science, has long been intertwined. Is it then surprising that eventually mental states of humanity (e.g., psychology) – long the obsession of Christianity – became a medical science in the late 19<sup>th</sup> Century? Sanity or normality in modern psychological sciences is nothing more than ‘right belief’ with a new tag, and insanity is another incarnation of “damnation.”

- ✓ “Contrarian Theodore Dalrymple ... has frequently described modern psychology as a modern religion, or pseudo-religion. The medical establishment is the brave new priest class, while the anxious therapy patient replaces the penitent sinner. If so, then Dalrymple must be a heretic of the first order. On March 24, Encounter Books will release his latest ... in which he contends that psychology has done more to impede human self-understanding than to advance it. Moreover, deference to psychology has led to a culture of self-obsession and diminution of personal responsibility.” – Spencer Case, “Doubting Psychology,” [Review of Dalrymple’s Admirable Evasions: How Psychology Undermines Morality (2015)], National Review, March 21, 2015.
- ✓ See power of civilization-level interpretation discussion, 2 Commerce, p. 1205, *infra*.
- ✓ See discussion of emotions, 2 Culture generally, *infra*. See also development of modern concepts of evil and emotions, Modernity Machines, 1 Technology, p. 696, *infra*.

---

*“For example, the fact described by the true statement ‘Paris is the capital city of France’ implies that there is such a place as Paris, there is such a place as France, there are such things as capital cities, as well as that France has a government, that the government of France has the power to define its capital city, and that the French government has chosen Paris to be the capital, that there is such a thing as a place or a government, and so on. The verifiable accuracy of all of these assertions, if facts themselves, may coincide to create the fact that Paris is the capital of France.”*

– from Wikipedia article, “Fact,” captured February 3, 2017

---

**Citing Wikipedia:** There is a general aversion in academia and professional circles to citing to Wikipedia articles, many or most schools and teachers and professional journals will/may not allow Wikipedia citations. Issues with citing to Wikipedia include amateur writing, editorial bias, editorial wars, the fact that the article may be changed later, and oftentimes, lack of verification and sometimes incorrect information. This is understandable, however, the majority of Wikipedia articles are written by unpaid people who are knowledgeable of the subject, and who genuinely care about the subject of their article and producing a good product. Other than hot button political topics, articles about celebrities and living political figures, or about specific products and trademarks, most Wikipedia articles are stable, informative, and generally well written.<sup>9</sup>

Additionally, regardless of your view of Wikipedia, you can look at the quote independent of the source, and see that the quote stands on its own merits for the purpose for which it was offered;

just because it came from Wikipedia doesn't make it incorrect, unusable, or a bad citation. Note also that the Washington Post and other media outlets have been occasionally citing to *Wikipedia articles* in the last few years, see discussion, 1 Diplomacy, EN 2, p. 1107, *infra*.

*“I realize that I’m only one person, telling one person’s story. And I realize that the plural of anecdote is not data. My experiences are largely supported by the data, but they aren’t universal.”*

– Greta Christina, “Puritan Pundits Should Chill Out – Here Are 5 Reasons I’m Happy I’ve Had Lots of Casual Sex,” *Alternet*, August 28, 2011 (emphasis added)

**Flavors of Fact:** Official interpretations should generally be regarded as facts within the current game in the same way that events in a story become facts to the characters in that story and to the audience even though they know or believe it is a work of fiction. Interpretations become ‘official’ by the process of:

- 1) Fitting within the definition and format of a particular interpretation type in the game,
  - 2) Being accepted by the Concierge (a liberal judgment call),
  - 3) And, *if necessary*, by also being ‘published’ in some form within the game.
- Accepting the Diagnosis: Oddly, it seems in the Rosenhan experiment, *ut supra*, that the psychiatric diagnosis only became ‘real’ when the patient accepted it by signing a paper agreeing to the diagnosis (so that they could be released). But medically, it was ‘real’ enough for the hospital to administer medications regardless of whether the patient agreed or not, or even took the medications. This is consistent with the way that mental phenomenon, including dreams, have been treated in the West throughout history, and consistent with the initial basis for the medicalization of mental treatments – they only become ‘real’ when they manifest themselves in either psychosomatic symptoms<sup>10</sup> or socially-criminally deviant behavior, or a threat of injury to self or others. The rest of the time, they are just æther.
- ✓ The acceptance requirement of ‘official interpretations’ by the Concierge is similar to the situation described by Rosenhan in his famous experiment, where the players are the psychiatrists and the Concierge the patient. However, the question has been raised in Skinner Box experiments with pigeons whether the student is training the pigeon or the pigeon is training the student? In GGDM, the position players accept Fundamental Realities dealt by the Concierge (as the psychiatrist must accept as factual in some manner what is being reported by the patient who is being diagnosed) and News Events are ‘accepted’ both when posted by the Concierge and when they can no longer be modified by the players (see 2 Dreamtime generally, *infra*).
- A Thing Done: A fact is a thing which is done, something that has actual existence or occurrence, the quality of being actual, or information that has objective reality.<sup>11</sup>
- Objectivist, positivists, and empiricism insist that facts are independent of humanity (e.g., gravity), however, it is axiomatic that appreciation of facts and application of facts in any way meaningful to us, cannot be independent of human perception and interpretation.<sup>12</sup>
- ✓ Another alternate definition of Fact: “Event, item of information, or state of affairs existing, observed, or known to have happened, and which is confirmed or validated



to such an extent that it is considered ‘reality.’” – Business Dictionary, [businessdictionary.com](http://businessdictionary.com).

This latter part of the definition is particularly relevant to Holocaust deniers, moon landing deniers, and those who think that millions of people voted illegally for the Democrat candidate in the 2016 Presidential election. My only response to these types is a suggestion that they acquaint themselves with the dictionary definition of “fact.”

- **Loud Barking:** Dogmatism is not fact, but is a ubiquitous part of our discourse (that’s a fact).
  - ✓ Oxford Living English Dictionary at *dogmatic*: **1:** Inclined to lay down principles as undeniably true.
    - Raise your hand if you are guilty! (\*raises hand\*)
  - ✓ Merriam-Webster online dictionary at *dogmatic*, **1:** characterized by or given to the expression of opinions very strongly or positively as if they were facts.
    - E.g., “Only humans are made in the image of God, have fallen into sin, and are in need of salvation.” – David F. Coppedge, “Extrasolar planets: a challenge to biblical cosmology?” *Creation* 36(3):42–44, July 2014 ([creation.com](http://creation.com)). ☹ Really????
      - See Cardinal Baronius, 2 *The Sidereal Stage*, p. 117, 119, *supra*, for full quote.

Now ... that said, to what extent are my arguments and assertions in GGDM dogmatic? There is always a certain risk in trying to advance an argument or new possibilities, *to argue, one must very strongly express opinions*. In one of my worst arbitrations, we had a client who turned out to be a wet noodle on the stand; the case had to settle. Additionally, I think there is a fuzzy line between dogmatism and *a priori*; if a statement or assertion is generally accepted as *a priori*, then it is not dogma to those who accept it. Thus to the intelligent design believer and creationist, Mr. Coppedge’s statements may be considered *a priori*, and certainly not dogma. Yet, there are clearly statements and positions that are dogmatic, and a word needed to be invented long ago to describe them as a category of fallacy.

- ✓ Ted Koppel to Sean Hannity on CBS Sunday Morning: “You have attracted people who are determined that ideology is more important than facts.”

---

*“But, if you make opinion and fact synonymous you can do or say whatever you want because, in the immortal words of Jeffrey Lebowski, ‘yeah, well, that’s just like your opinion, man.’ ... Opinions, of course, aren’t facts.”*

– Chris Cillizza, CNN Editor-at-Large, CNN Politics, May 1, 2017 (referring to *The Big Lebowski* (1998))

---

*“Opinion has to earn the status of strict knowledge.”*

– Avi Sion, from abstract for his book *Phenomenology* (2005)

---

**Five Types of Facts:** Facts are not what they seem at first glance, they come in different flavors and shades. Judgment is the process of determining what sorts of facts are being presented and what they mean in the context of what is being decided; what weight or value alleged facts should be given to the matter under consideration.

There are approximately five classes or types of facts: There are Sensory Facts, Repeatable Facts, Accepted Facts, Deduced Facts and Uttered-Disputed Facts.

- ✓ Facts that appear currently in front of you, that is, sensory facts. Whether or not you are dreaming, awake or hallucinating or misapprehending sensory input is irrelevant to you, as, of necessity, what you sense at any moment is accepted as fact, normally without question. Your memory is fact to you, until disproven.
  - Consider this in the context of a broad range of situations such as magician and illusionist performances, movies, storytelling, video games, virtual reality, religion, ventriloquism, alcohol and recreational drug consumption.
    - **Doctor Who:** You know what the big problem is in telling fantasy and reality apart? ... They're both ridiculous. – Dr. Who, “Last Christmas” (2014).
  - I cannot imagine or credit that I wrote every single bit of this preposterous mimicry of intellectual endeavor. Yet, though I do not remember every single thought or keystroke, I know that I wrote and edited every version of GGDM all the way to this Final Version; the temporal continuity (i.e. Temporal Constructural Element) of memories over decades is fact *to me* until disproven. How would my design memory be disproven? Descartes come forth!
- ✓ Facts that can be proven by repeated and repeatable demonstration, such as physical laws, measurements, astronomical observations, and performance specifications.
  - For example, that the Earth is not flat. NASA has checked this out pretty thoroughly and most everyone is satisfied that the Earth is generally spherical.
  - In the dream-like movie Navigator: A Medieval Odyssey (1989), the characters who thought the Earth was flat reasoned that if evil were on one side of the Earth, good must be on the other side (envisioning the Earth like a coin, heads or tails).
- ✓ Things that are accepted as fact (having been actual at the time) due to the weight of other evidence deemed credible such as writings, photographs, artifacts, witness accounts, official papers, oral traditions, and so forth (i.e. history).
  - For example, the ‘fact’ that you were born. It is certain, from the common experience, that you do not remember being born. It is also certain from the common experience that you were born.
  - Here is the peculiar thing: The passage of time quickly renders many factual claims or narratives unfalsifiable. Contemporaneous records are lost, memories are lost, the rains come, people become tombstones. What we have then are narratives that cannot be disproven by any direct means and often compete with or are not quite in synch with other narratives. This is

what keeps historians up at night. We can only decide overall what seems more or less credible and given enough weight, those become ‘historical facts’ by general acceptance.

- ✓ Facts that can be deduced from other facts, or are necessary and fit within the framework of other accepted facts.
  - At law, there are certain claims which do not require direct evidence to prove; circumstantial evidence is sufficient. Courts are not required to be purblind or willfully ignorant when faced with lack of direct evidence. Similarly, early modern physics engaged in much of the same, the existence of subatomic particles was circumstantial.
- ✓ Facts that others uttered a factual claim (sort of meta-facts); where, while the claim may be disputed, that it was uttered or published by a particular actor or author at a particular time and place, is a fact,<sup>13</sup> e.g.:

- “It’s only true that the president said it, not that it was the truth.”<sup>14</sup>

It can also be a fact that someone has or has offered an opinion, but an opinion is not fact and is subject to dispute.<sup>15</sup>

- Those who wish to dispute that certain historical events happened, often resort to this type of argument, the admission that everyone says it happened, that it is “officially” accepted as history, that it is widely believed to have happened, but that it’s all distorted or, worse, made up (usually claimed to be a collusion between the Government and Hollywood). And so on.

There is a very short line at which this would be considered sophistry, for example, the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy article “The Analysis of Knowledge” begins:

- “What does it take to know something? It’s not enough just to believe it – we don’t know the things we’re wrong about.”

I could contend however, that I know the things I believe, and I am not wrong about that.

Of necessity, official Interpretations are ‘facts’ or ‘laws’ in the game universe, they are not just another position’s *opinion*. They must be respected as facts. They are dreamfacts. That is, what are called interpretations and opinions in the ‘real world’ are facts to the speaker and more generally, to civilization, *opinions are fact in the third and fourth orders of natural phenomenon*.

- ✓ “Dreams of war, dreams of liars, dreams of dragon’s fire, and of things that will bite.” – Metallica, “Enter Sandman” (1991).

---

*“Known widely as Nazi chic, it’s different from the skinhead or punk swag you find in the West. The trend stretches beyond Korea – in China it was fashionable to dress up like Nazi officers in wedding photos, and a Hong Kong store once hung Nazi banners throughout their shop. In India, a Hitler boutique (with a swastika dotting the i) opened in Ahmedabad in 2012. In Indonesia, Soldatenkaffee, a bar named after a Parisian Nazi hangout and decked out with Hitler quotes and Third Reich flags, has (despite a temporary closure due to outrage) operated in Bandung since 2011; the Indonesia pop star Ahmad Dhani recently performed at a rally for 2014 presidential candidate Prabowo Subianto in Nazi regalia.*

---

*But the worst offender in Asia is Thailand. In 2007, some Thai students had a Nazi-themed parade, and in 2012 a school held an SS sports rally. Some Thai language books that use Hitler in their exercises [sic], and a Bangkok KFC knockoff briefly called itself Hitler and used the Führer's face in place of Colonel Sanders's. In 2013, the country's top university had to apologize when students painted a giant mural of superheroes that included Hitler, with which they posed **Sieg Heil-ing**. And naturally they have Nazi-themed pop groups as well."*

– Mark Hay, "Nazi Chic: The Asian Fashion Craze That Just Won't Die," *Vice*, February 12, 2015 (emphasis in original)

**Grinding Chic Fact:** *Facts* have a great pull on the human worldview and the ability to suspend disbelief. The two-decade run of grindhouse Nazi-exploitation films demonstrates the matter perfectly; had anyone before 1945 proposed making or actually made such a film, they would have been rejected on the basis of sick insanity, and would have failed in the market due to moral outrage and the inability of the viewers to suspend disbelief because no one would ever do those things, or even want to see them portrayed on film, even knowing it is all fake. But after the second World War, the Nazi-exploitation films of the 1960s and 1970s were still sick, morally outrageous, extremely gross – but there was one important difference: they were based (very loosely) on recent historical facts, the climb to audience suspension of disbelief was much shallower, and there was a fascination in a certain part of the population with portrayal of the sadistic and masochistic acts in pseudohistorical Nazi chic.

- ✓ Compare the foregoing to stories that were written about travel to the moon before any living creature from Earth had experienced the zero-G of low Earth orbit. In 1611, Johannes Kepler wrote a story called *Somnium* which presented a trip to the moon in a dreamlike sequence – because, how else would you get to the moon other than by consulting a demon and having a dream? The unpublished *Somnium* may have led to Kepler's mother – a disrespectful, cantankerous old woman according to Carl Sagan – being charged with witchcraft.
- ✓ By 1898 however, when HG Wells published *War of the Worlds*, the readership had no difficulty suspending disbelief of life on other planets, advanced non-human intelligences, aliens travelling from Mars to Earth, and the existence of microbes. As the story was not morally outrageous (even considering the destruction of cities...and millions of dead...), and a basis of facts, systematic knowledge, and accepted conjecture (e.g., Christiaan Huygens book in 1690 arguing the probability of intelligent life on other planets) existed that made the story acceptable within the worldview of the time, if at the same moment, still quite *avant-garde*.
- ✓ "Last November, the all-girl Korean band Pritz took a ton of flak for performing in provocative outfits. ... But the criticism about these new outfits was different from the normal questions about purity or branding. It was about how much they looked like Nazi uniforms. Pritz's outfits featured sleek-yet-heavy black dresses, high collars, and red armbands with a black cross in the center of a white circle – four short lines away from swastikas. Amid the inevitable castigation from South Koreans and foreigners alike for their insensitivity, the band's managers claimed that no one on their creative team had any idea the getups would be construed as Nazi-esque." *Id.*

*“The Dreaming... provides a moral authority lying outside the individual will and outside human creation... although the Dreaming as an ordering of the cosmos is presumably a product of historical events, such an origin is denied. These human creations are objectified – thrust out – into principles or precedents for the immediate world... Consequently, current action is not understood as the result of human alliances, creations, and choices, but is seen as imposed by an embracing, cosmic order.” – Myers, E. (1986)<sup>16</sup>*

## Endnotes.

<sup>1</sup> Commentary: What letters make up the word cat? Oh? Are you sure about that? When asked the question, “What letters make up the word cat,” many, if not most, literate English speakers will answer c-a-t with a certain indignation. But isn’t the answer really k-a-t? No? Who said so? Or perhaps I could answer t-a-c? Or c-a-a-t would not be more correct or incorrect than c-a-t as they contain the same letters. This goes to the essence of language, which is merely an agreed upon set of interpretations (in written form it is rules, grammar, punctuation, structure, and pronunciation – i.e. orthography of the language), and most of what passes for knowledge is merely language, while language struggles to express the most basic knowledge.

<sup>2</sup> Commentary: I am aware that either I may be accused of promoting “doublethink” or stating that “two plus two equals five” or that this game system might suggest the existence of a supreme being. None of this *matters* in the game.

<sup>3</sup> Commentary: The ability to identify truly emergent minds *in our civilization* is something that humanity is very terrible at currently (IQ tests are woefully inept); we are always caught by surprise (we have enough difficulty understanding the mind as emergent *ipso facto*). Many who are considered gifted, extraordinarily talented, prodigal and are pampered in their youth add nothing remarkable to our society as adults (in fact, the high intelligence of famous serial killers has been a study in fascination, *Google it*), while others who are overlooked, tip the apple carts over later in life, even if just once, when circumstances permit. We attribute this to some mystical wonder of the human mind, by various mechanisms, but in the end, we are lost because we don’t even know where we are. Perhaps there is a hidden boon in this though, because the ability to detect true emergent talents would entail all sorts of risks of oppression, misdirection, and engineering (e.g., *Brave New World* (1932), *Ender’s Game* (1985)) for political, religious and establishment purposes of the moment; no establishment-supported paradigm, organization, business model or arrangement wants its apple cart tipped by some unheard of emergent upstart.

- ✓ “The brain is one of the [most] complex structures we’ve ever tried to understand. It consists of 86 billion interconnected neurons that somehow conspire to bring about our mental lives. They do so by forming networks at various scales: local neural networks are themselves part of larger constellations that in turn form interconnected regions that constitute the brain. The result is a complex, dynamic system that has global properties which cannot be reduced to the properties of its building blocks.” – “Social Cognition and the Brain/The Emergent Mind,” U21 (universitas21.com), captured February 16, 2019.
- ✓ “Over the last 400 years Physics has become the science that we have come to rely on to explain the behaviour of the universe, but in reality the universe has a range of behaviour from simple to complex. And although mathematical physics is good at explaining the obvious linear dynamics of cause and effect, it turns out that it fails quite miserably when it comes to explaining the not-so-obvious nonlinear dynamics of ‘*Natural Evolution and Emergent Complexity*.’.. Physics is, in a sense, a science of linear dynamics, a science of ‘*dynamics without feedback*’; such dynamics are indeed easily compressible, but the real world is a world that abounds with feedback, a ‘*nonlinear*’ world full of ‘*incompressible dynamics*.’.. Fortunately for us Mother Nature long ago figured this out, and evolution set to work designing a biological tool to model complex nonlinear dynamics. [Note: In the simplest possible terms, linear dynamics are dynamics where the effect is proportional to the cause, and nonlinear dynamics are where the effect can be disproportional to the cause.]” – Kieran D. Kelly, “The Emergent Mind,” *Incompressible Dynamics* (blog), (<http://www.kierandkelly.com/>), captured February 16, 2019 (emphasis and note in original).

- While ‘designed’ is perhaps a poor choice of words in the preceding quote, it was not offered here for that purpose. Writers really should not use ‘designed’ and ‘evolution’ in the same sentence in that way.
- ✓ “My purpose in this article is to discuss the bearing of the new theories of mind upon the old and tantalizing mind-body problem. Recent writers do not seem to appreciate how the problem has been shifted, nor how completely the old classical solutions have been superseded. I think that in the future we shall not continue to hear much about interactionism, parallelism, epiphenomenalism, double-aspectism, etc., except as interesting historical theories. It remains, however, to inquire much more carefully and thoroughly than I can in this brief paper, whether the emergent theory will be adequate to cover the facts.

It is my belief that more progress has been made in the past fifteen years in coming to an understanding of the real nature of mind than in all the centuries since Aristotle. We are, indeed, coming back somewhat to his view, which was that the mind is the use, perfection, entelechy of the body. We are accustomed to hear about the points of difference between the Neo-Realists, the Pragmatists, the Freudians, and the Behaviorists, but the points of agreement are more significant. These schools pretty well agree in regarding mind as adaptive behavior, as specific response, as selective control; more exactly, as that integration of vital processes which enables an organism to respond as a unit to a new situation in such a way as to conserve and enhance its well-being....

In defining the mind as that organization of vital processes which makes adaptive behavior possible, it is mind that I am speaking of and not consciousness. Endless confusion and misunderstanding would have been avoided, if psychologists and philosophers had steadfastly used the word ‘mind’ to denote this kind of behavior, this sum of capacities, and not the word ‘consciousness.’ It was most unfortunate that in the last decades of the last century, when suspicion began to attach to the words ‘soul’ and ‘mind,’ psychologists fixed upon the word ‘consciousness’ to stand for the psychological life in general. ... In recent years this relation is becoming clear. I shall refer presently to consciousness in its relation to the body, but at present I am speaking not of consciousness but of mind.

It is, therefore, with a decided feeling of relief or even of emancipation that we discover that the new conception of mind sets us free from all the old so-called ‘solutions’ of the mind-body problem, from interactionism, from parallelism, from epiphenomenalism, from the double-aspect theory, from subjectivism, and from materialism. I believe these ‘isms’ have been superseded. So also probably has the expression theory, the transmission theory, and the instrument theory. The brain is not the instrument of the mind. Rather the brain is the instrument by means of which nature achieves the mind. Mind and body do not interact, as interactionism and dualism teach. The mind is not a form of the mechanical interplay of atoms, as materialism teaches. The body is not a phenomenon or appearance or externalization of mind, as idealism teaches. Mind and body are not parallel as psychophysical parallelism teaches. Neither are they two sides or aspects of the same reality, as the double-aspect theory teaches. You cannot represent the relation of mind and body by any system of parallel lines, whether merely parallel, interconnected, or correlated with a third line, nor by two lines one of which is the shadow of the other. Mind is something which the body achieves, or which nature achieves by means of the body. If you must have a diagram, the ladder will be better than the parallel bars. When nature achieves the molecule, the atom ceases to be the thing of primary importance, worth, or even of reality. When nature achieves the cell, the molecule is eclipsed. When the organism is achieved, the cell is eclipsed. When mind is achieved, the body is eclipsed. Mind is a new reality, gained, achieved, won. It is, in Aristotelian phrase, the form of the body.

Evidently, if we want a name for this new notion of the relation of mind to body, we may call it the emergent theory. Mind emerges from the body. The theory of levels has taken the place of parallelism, interactionism, and the double-aspect view. It is hard to say which of these theories was the most unsatisfactory and the escape from them is wholesome. All the dualistic theories were unconvincing. There is no magic about the number two. Nature having achieved two, goes on to three and four. The monistic theories were little better, although, if mind be the supreme reality, there is a sense of the word ‘reality,’ which admits of a monistic interpretation, a monism of value perhaps. But the pluralistic view of reality is most satisfactory. Mind is real, consciousness is real, body is real, and so are many other things.” – G.T.W. Patrick (George Thomas White Patrick), “The Emergent Theory of the Mind,” *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 19, No. 26 (Dec. 21, 1922), pp. 701-708 (available for free on JSTOR).

- ✓ “Metaphysics, said the late nineteenth-century idealist philosopher Bradley, is the finding of bad reasons for what we believe on instinct; but metaphysics has changed in the meantime, and is now the finding of bad reasons for what we cannot possibly believe however hard we try. All I can say is that the disbelief in the reality of consciousness or personal identity has never prevented anyone from copyrighting his book in which that unreality is argued; and I very much doubt that any author of such a book has ever been completely indifferent as to the bank account into which its royalties were paid.” – Theodore Dalrymple, Admirable Evasions: How Psychology Undermines Morality (2015).

<sup>4</sup> Commentary: Thus, this game is the opposite of a ‘math exercise.’ It is also not a ‘language syntax exercise.’

<sup>5</sup> Commentary: This summary is a fair reading of the original article which I retrieved from the Wayback Machine some years ago.

<sup>6</sup> Commentary & Citation: Soviet Marshal Grigory Kulik is described in Wikipedia as a conservative officer, incompetent, Stalin-sycophant, “murderous buffoon,” who interfered with the modernization of Soviet forces, resisted mechanization and opposed tank production. In a Ranker article, he is described as a “military Luddite” linking to Roger Moorhouse’s The Devil’s Alliance: Hitler’s Pact with Stalin, 1939-1941 (2014) on Google Books where Moorhouse describes him as a “buffoonish liability,” “bullying incompetent,” possessed of “startling incompetence” and “antediluvian attitudes,” and that he “seemingly yearned for the simplicity of an earlier soldiering age.”

- ✓ I worked at a law firm once beginning in 2008 that did not have direct deposit for paychecks, despite years of promises. Their excuse was that it was very difficult to set up and their accountants didn’t know how. I called them out on their nonsense excuses by pointing out that the U.S. Marines instituted mandatory direct deposit when I was in Okinawa, Japan in **1986**. By 2008, 22 years later, direct deposit wasn’t new, or any great mystery and the firm was either lying or incompetent in the most basic, routine administrative tasks.

<sup>7</sup> Commentary: This discussion is continued in Pieces of April and The Happy Hurtle, *et seq.*, 4 Culture, pp. 408-409, *infra*.

<sup>8</sup> Citation: GAMEO – Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online.

<sup>9</sup> Commentary: It is unlikely that the low brains who spend their valuable free time vandalizing and editing certain Wikipedia pages to fit their current political, conspiratorial, sexist, or racist fantasy – instead of reading actual intellectual and educational books – will have heard of topics such as the Taiping Rebellion, metaphysics, the Laws of Logic, Kepler’s Three Laws, or the Dragonfly 44 Galaxy. Thus, those types of pages are probably safe.

<sup>10</sup> Citation: e.g., “One night when Gubara was almost eighty years old, he was woken by a knock on his door. It was a pair of policemen, there to inform him that his studio had been confiscated by the government. Gubara was incredulous; but they’d brought proof. He looked at the letter they showed him, then looked up to the ceiling where moments before a neon lamp had been. Now there was only a thin line of light. The news had caused a psychosomatic reaction referred to as hysterical blindness.” – Nadja Kornith, “The Omega Man – Gadalla Gubara and the half-life of Sudanese cinema,” Bidoun (bidoun.org), Issue 20, Spring 2010.

<sup>11</sup> Citation: Merriam-Webster online dictionary at **1: a & b, 2:, 3:, and 4:**

<sup>12</sup> Commentary: Phenomenology then, appears to be the study of when and how facts occur or the generation of facts, and in what flavors they come. What sets phenomenology apart from what came before is its acceptance of looking and appearance as a *basis of fact*, and thus, fact is embraced in all of the orders of natural phenomenon (see Aspects of Sociology, 2 Culture, p. 371, *et seq.*, *infra*) *equally* to the extent that they can appear to us in some form. Within GGD, official interpretations are the axis of looking and appearance of facts in the game.

- ✓ The problem with third order facts from a medical point of view is that they only appear to the patient. Medicine was made to treat second order phenomena (“the vital organic”) and is not equally suited to the treatment of third order phenomena (“the mental organic”), and is completely unsuitable to address either of the other two orders (“the inorganic” and “the super-organic, or social”). Thus, third order ‘disease’ or ‘disorder’ is only known when it manifests itself in unusual behavior and criminality and has not been accepted as factual otherwise.
  - This second-third order (or in the old sense, perhaps the mind-body division) dichotomy, incidentally, is why mental health treatment has divided into two distinct groups: the medical doctors (i.e. psychiatrist and neurologist) who can prescribe medications render medical opinions, and the non-doctors (i.e. psychologist, therapist, and counselors).

- ✓ I woke up this morning and immediately as I got up started thinking of this (and I have no idea why; was I dreaming it, is the origin external? Almost as if by external prodding?) and it shortly manifested itself in this writing; this is not unusual behavior for me, but may be for much of the rest of humanity, and it's not criminal in most nations unless the thoughts manifesting themselves are against the government, cultural prohibitions or the domestic tranquility and good public order: As James Baldwin pointed out, "A reasonably sensible man is satisfied with thinking."

- Has this phenomenon always been there? In the not too distant past, such 'external prodding' would have been taken as supernatural, divine or satanic, depending on how presented; e.g., Saint Francis of Assisi or St. Ignatius of Loyola, both of whom would likely be placed in a psychiatric hospital now, many Biblical figures (who would be in the same hospital with them), or even people executed for being seers, oracles, witches. Nowadays, it is ancient alien spirits and various other inventions channeled to explain such phenomenon for some individuals or groups, e.g., The Urantia Book.

<sup>13</sup> Commentary: At an arbitration in Manhattan where I was working one day, a witness was shown an excerpt of a Congressional Investigative Report, which was read into the record. The witness did not agree with or like the conclusions of the report, but was forced finally to admit that, yes, those were the words printed on the page and that they had been read correctly, and that it did appear to be a legitimate Congressional report.

<sup>14</sup> Citation: Aaron Blake quoting unnamed source familiar with Sondland's expected testimony, "Gordon Sondland is about to blow a hole in Trump's Ukraine defense," Washington Post, October 13, 2019.

<sup>15</sup> Commentary & Citation: I was fortunate when I asked my Clarence Marsh Case question on the Philosophy Forums in February 2019 (see 2 Culture, EN 9, p. 375-376, *infra*), to find someone who was actually interested in philosophy of social sciences. Over the course of a few days, the thread basically became a conversation between myself and user Galuchat, who is an academic in the south of England and didn't seem to mind my posts quoting from original materials or carefully written arguments. Within a short time after that conversation concluded, I discovered the basic flaw of the Philosophy Forums: The regular posters rarely refer to or quote original material and often don't seem to grasp exactly the issue they are arguing (they also don't fully read what is written before jumping in with knives in each hand, just like regular people, just like I've done in my youth); and they are offended or don't know how to respond when someone quotes source material in making arguments on the forums. Perhaps it was because I was new on the forums arguing in threads with the old boys club (which would also be a problem of human nature), but I am sure that my posts quoting source materials were ignored (or that they offended) because the people arguing there don't know how to respond to well-written posts, they have no source materials of their own to quote and my posts were not in accord with the casual free floating, source-free opinion style of argument on the forums. I came then to appreciate again a bit of Cicero from Rhetorical Theory class:

- ✓ "In fact controversy about a word has long tormented those Greeklings, fonder as they are of argument than of truth." – Marcus Tullius Cicero, Of Oratory (55 B.C.), Bk. 1 (trans. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham) from Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg, The Rhetorical Tradition (1990), p. 207.
- ✓ Alternatively: "A controversy indeed on the word ORATOR has long disturbed the minute Grecians, who are fonder of argument than of truth" – Cicero on Oratory and Orators (1875, reprinted 1970), Translated by Rev. J.S. Watson, p. 18, found on the Internet Archive (archive.org) March 19, 2019.
- ✓ For context, I come from a civil legal professional background. Hardly a paragraph is filed (except for the Complaint) with the court in pleadings without citation to case law, orders, rules, testimony, exhibits, Bates-numbered documents, discovery responses, or prior pleadings in the case. We had an attorney who worked previously as a clerk to a judge; he said that when they received briefs he would skim through the pages to see whether the party cited sufficiently to case law in their arguments, if not, the brief was tossed aside. Briefs without citation to prior case law or rules are useless. Similarly, when going to court, attorneys bring notes, citations, and copies of pleadings and whatever else is needed, they come prepared.

<sup>16</sup> Citation: Myers, E., Pintupi Country, Pintubi Self: Sentiment, Place and Politics among Western Desert Aborigines. Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, Canberra & Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.