


## September 2021 Entry - The Babble-on Project

Well, I finally completed this little project; it took much longer than it should have, which is what happens when you are only [SQ+13](#). My little [Babble-on Project](#) ([download](#)  here) is an exploratory adjunct (as in Google Dictionary: “a thing added to something else as a supplementary rather than an essential part”) collection of quotes with citations and GGDM commentaries relating them to the rules and themes of the game. Like all of my other projects, it is eternally free to download and enjoy – as long as there is an internet, which is something like saying, ‘the center of infinity.’

This project is a merger of the two major elements of GGDM. GGDM is a game by any reasonable standard or definition, and I am an old gamer, a lot of effort was put into creating a new set of interesting game mechanics that was capable of producing an emergent variety of game universes and situations (e.g., Constructural Elements, Power Activations, Fuzzy Groups, News Events). You will not see it’s like anywhere else, GGDM is cranked to the theoretical max of human simulation gaming (as [Spinrad](#) might say). GGDM is also a running commentary on human civilization and a heterodox form of macrosociology, with the game structures acting as a practical demonstration. In the end, GGDM is the [kenophobia](#) of space-opera, interstellar sci-fi simulation gaming, just as I am the [Henri Darger](#) (1892-1973) of simulation game design.

The following sections offer a few of my favorite examples found inside the [Babble-on Project document](#) .

\*\*\*

(on Social Constructionism)

“Against that positivism which stops before phenomena, saying ‘there are only facts,’ I should say: no, it is precisely facts that do not exist, only interpretations.” – [Friedrich Nietzsche, Notebooks, Summer 1886 – Fall 1887](#).

*GGDM Commentary: The purpose of this entry is not to argue about Nietzsche, for one, I haven’t the expertise. A Philosophy Stack Exchange user suggested this is similar to Kant’s ‘we can’t know the noumenon, we only know the phenomena.’ Ok?*

*No, instead, part of this quote was offered in the Wikipedia article on [Social Constructionism](#), and it then occurred to me that first, GGDM contains elements of social constructionism (e.g., interpretations, Constructural Elements even!) and might be mistaken for a work in social constructionism, and second, that if anyone in [France](#) ever read it, it is possible that GGDM might be slightly more popular in France than in the [Anglosphere](#) (cross-culture popularity with local obscurity is not an unknown phenomenon in popular music, art, performance, and literary fiction).*

*I do not consider GGDM a social constructionist work, though it has elements which I arrived at either by my own thinking or by absorption from late [Cold War](#) and*

Copyright September 2021, this blog entry is from the Periodic Public Space blog that is published in relation to Gestalt Genesis/Day Million, a macrosocial simulation game. The blog entry can be found at <http://gestaltgenesis-daymillion.net/#pps>; this PDF is for convenience of the reader.

millennial cultural milieu. I stake my territory out in Spaces, et seq., [4 Beginnings](#), where I state that reality to humans is a compromise between the objective (empirical) and subjective (mental, cultural) realities, and this is the reason for Galactic Space and Public Space duality representing civilization in the game.

Further, in *Flavors of Fact and Five Types of Fact*, [1 Dreamtime](#), while introducing Interpretations into the game, I simultaneously reinforce empirical fact and offer a category breakdown of the spectrum of facts that straddles between empirical, repeatable facts and facts which are simply facts because they are agreed upon. This is precisely consistent with the stance taken in *4 Beginnings* and the duality carries through the rest of the game, where positions are defined by hard, empirical, objective reality of their place in Galactic Space and just as much by what is on the Public Space representing the collective culture, consciousness of civilization.

\*\*\*

(on happiness Meta-Aspect)

“At the neurological level, negative emotions far outnumber the positive emotions that humans can use during interaction (indeed, four of at least the five primary emotions that have been elaborated by hominin neurology are negative [anger, fear, sadness, disgust] whereas one is positive [happiness]).” – [Jonathan H. Turner](#) and Seth Abrutyn, “Returning the ‘Social’ to Evolutionary Sociology: Reconsidering Spencer, Durkheim, and Marx’s Models of ‘Natural’ Selection,” *Sociological Perspectives*, 2017, Vol. 60(3) 529–556 (p. 544).

*GGDM Commentary:* We were all put here against our will, there is no argument that can or has ever been made that somehow we consented to being here. This is the essence of [religion](#), even though most people who practice, believe, preach their religion don’t understand that this is in fact, the sole issue of religion. Religion must address the fundamental unfairness, wrongness of us having been ‘placed’ here against our will and having to endure the annoyance and harms of life in this universe, including [death and loss](#). To do this, religions construct grand cosmic schemes, [creation stories](#), God’s plan, incorporating ethical and moral structures, community beliefs and rituals, the afterlife, and so forth, all to create a balm and buffer against the Existential Void so that their followers are happy. That is the fundamental and essence of the [happiness meta-aspect of humanity](#) as a counter against our sprawling consciousness.

I personally refuse to accept that there is any grand or beneficent purpose to having been placed here against my will or that there is any grand scheme to the petty annoyances and pain of my life. I refuse to pretend that I am [happy](#), and I am sure that is evident in GGDM. Would the world be better, would humanity be better, if we refused to pretend to be happy, if we took off the [blinkers](#)? That is the [rhetorical question](#) of GGDM.

Copyright September 2021, this blog entry is from the Periodic Public Space blog that is published in relation to Gestalt Genesis/Day Million, a macrosocial simulation game. The blog entry can be found at <http://gestaltgenesis-daymillion.net/#pps>; this PDF is for convenience of the reader.

\*\*\*

(on Social Selection)

“Religion, according to this argument, has been preserved, and not eliminated, through social selection, because optimism is a more successful frame of mind than pessimism, and it is his trust in the help of higher powers and his belief in a heavenly hope even when every earthly good seemed lost, which has made of man the unconquerable battler against every wind of circumstance. But that attitude of mind is in its very essence religious, and therefore it is that religion, whether true, in the metaphysical sense, or merely a beneficent illusion, ‘has proved to be a working philosophy of life.’ It is a postulate which works out constructively and successfully in experience, and is consequently, in the view of the present writer, of precisely the same validity as the theory of electrons or any other working hypothesis of science.” – Clarence Marsh Case, “Religion and the Concept of Progress,” *The Journal of Religion*, March 1921, Volume 1, Number 2, pp. 160-173.

*GGDM Commentary: It is the final sentence of the preceding quote in which he advances another argument for equality of sociology and the physical sciences: Consistent common experience of history is the same as any empirical law of physics. It is notable that history is considered in most places to be an ‘empirical science’ and [Jared Diamond](#) described it in terms of ‘natural experiments’ (see Jared Diamond quote, [3 Constructural Elements](#), p. 210) and J.B. Bury insisted on it in 1930:*

• “I may remind you that history is not a branch of literature. The facts of history, like the facts of geology or astronomy, can supply material for literary art; for manifest reasons they lend themselves to artistic representation far more readily than those of the natural sciences; but to clothe the story of human society in a literary dress is no more the part of a historian as a historian, than it is the part of an astronomer as an astronomer to present in an artistic shape the story of the stars.” – [J. B. Bury](#), “The Science of History,” *Selected Essays*, 1930 (text available on Google Books).

• Notice that in the paragraph above, Professor Case uses the term, ‘social selection,’ demonstrating that by 1921, the concepts of [evolutionary natural selection](#) had already been ported to sociology – where social forces select for or against developments to solve problems – a process now known as [social dynamics](#). Professors Jonathan Turner and Seth Abrutyn have subsequently divided social selection forces and processes into [Durkheimian](#), [Marxian](#), and [Spencerian](#) selection forces and noted that religion has the ability to cut across all classes, stratifications and corporate units.

Thus, Clarence Marsh Case insists that sociology is the equal of any science when it notes historical experience. And since, as he, [Jared Diamond](#), and [Ludwig von Mises](#) argued, human experiences are not repeatable like lab experiments, history must in most cases be the basis of sociology.

\*\*\*

Copyright September 2021, this blog entry is from the Periodic Public Space blog that is published in relation to Gestalt Genesis/Day Million, a macrosocial simulation game. The blog entry can be found at <http://gestaltgenesis-daymillion.net/#pps>; this PDF is for convenience of the reader.

(on praxeology)

“Praxiology, occasionally praxeology and rarely praxæology, is from the Greek praxis meaning goal-directed action, and logos in the sense of knowledge or information. Apparently having stipulative origins in French, namely, praxéologie (Mitcham), the lexical term praxiology was introduced by Tadeuz Kotarbiński (1886–1981) in 1965. Polish philosopher and co-founder, with Jan Łukasiewicz and Stanislaw Leśniewski of the Warsaw Center of Logical Research (Warsaw Circle), Kotarbiński used praxiology to reference an area in the philosophy of action that was distinguished from other such areas by its focus on efficient action. With adaptations to engineering, business, law, and more, and with discussions relating efficient action to mathematics, the natural sciences, technology, and ethics, praxiology has developed along three major lines: Kotarbińskian, analytic, and synthetic.” – [Taft H. Broome, Jr.](#) (Professor of Civil Engineering, Howard University), from [Encyclopedia.com](#) article, “[Praxeology](#),” captured April 8, 2021.

*GGDM Commentary: GGDM does a very poor job of separating praxeology generally from [Ludwig von Mises](#)’ ‘praxiological economics.’ Id. I have surveyed about a half dozen articles in April 2021 on the subject of ‘what is praxeology’ and I felt that the [encyclopedia.com](#) article was the most comprehensive and the best; putting everything (including Mises) in proper places within the praxeology framework and not placing the emphasis too much on the [Austrian School](#) (as many other sites do).*

*But I also found the approach to explaining ‘what is praxeology’ to be widely variable, for example, I thought the opening sentence of “[What the Hell is Praxeology](#)” from [praxeology.net](#) contained an important point (this emphasizes the analytic category outlined by Broome, above): • “Praxeology is the study of those aspects of human action that can be grasped a priori; in other words, it is concerned with the conceptual analysis and logical implications of preference, choice, means-end schemes, and so forth.”*

*Note the emphasis on ‘a priori’ instead of a posteriori, [libertarianism.org](#) notes in its [praxeology article](#):*

• “There is a sense in which Misesian praxeology was a definitive, if delayed, solution to the 19th-century Methodenstreit between Austrian economists, principally Carl Menger, and the Prussian Historical School. Proponents of historicism, according to Mises, ‘tried to deny the value and usefulness of economic theory. Historicism aimed at replacing it by economic history.’”

*While finally, the [Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy](#) [praxeology article](#), written by Bengt Molander, seems to be a complete outlier in placing praxeology origins in Scandinavia rather than farther south:*

• “Praxeology started in Norway and Denmark and is still strongest in the Scandinavian philosophical community, though it has also had a considerable

Copyright September 2021, this blog entry is from the Periodic Public Space blog that is published in relation to Gestalt Genesis/Day Million, a macrosocial simulation game. The blog entry can be found at <http://gestaltgenesis-daymillion.net/#pps>; this PDF is for convenience of the reader.

*influence in the German speaking world. It began in the 1960s as a discursive, analytical practice in the circle around the Norwegian philosopher Jakob Meløe (1927-), which later, in the 1970s, came to be known as ‘praxeology.’”*

*[Meløe](#) is not mentioned in any other article on the origin or definition of praxeology.*

*• I thought it notable that the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy has no entry for praxeology; it is possible that they do not consider it properly a philosophic subject, or it is more likely that they don’t know what to call it and no one has volunteered to write an article on it that is acceptable to the encyclopedia board.*

*The second aspect of GGDM and praxeology is that GGDM parallels Misesian praxeology in that the Axiom of Human Meaning – humans need meaning – is the starting point of ‘reconstruction’ of macrosociology in GGDM from which all else flows (e.g., the Existential Void, culture, interpretations, fuzzy groups), while in [Austrian Economics](#), the [Axiom of Human Action](#) (“One of the implications that can be logically deduced from the irrefutably true axiom of human action is that human action is purposeful (or conscious) action – action that is directed at attaining certain ends.” – [Thorsten Polleit](#), Mises Institute, 2011) is the font from which Mises reconstructed economics “as a formal-logical science.” Id.*

*It is thus that while GGDM (and me personally) do not reject empiricism per se, it is important to understand the attempt that is made by GGDM to construct a single axiomatic basis for human society, culture, and civilization. Possibly I am in error in classifying the axiomatic approach I have taken as ‘macrosociology’ but I don’t think anyone has invented a different term and I don’t have any better right now either.*

\*\*\*

(on social selection dynamics)

*“To highlight the differences in types of natural selection, we have chosen to name them by invoking social scientists whose work overlaps with Darwin’s. We will thus distinguish among Darwinian, Spencerian, Durkheimian, and Marxian selection as a means of highlighting both the convergence and divergence of Spencerian, Durkheimian, and Marxian natural selection from Darwinian natural selection.”  
– [Jonathan H. Turner](#) and Seth Abrutyn, “Returning the ‘Social’ to Evolutionary Sociology: Reconsidering Spencer, Durkheim, and Marx’s Models of ‘Natural’ Selection,” [Sociological Perspectives](#), 2017, Vol. 60(3) 529–556.*

*[GGDM Commentary](#): GGDM does not directly engage with selection forces in the same way as Professors Turner and Abrutyn do in their work on social dynamics, but selection forces are ‘indirectly’ simulated in the game in the form of, for example, inactivation of [Constructural Elements](#), [conflict checks for and changing of Government Titles](#), isolation and drift mechanics, and [Writs](#) and [Fuzzy Group activations](#). Participants may, however, consider selection forces identified here (and*

Copyright September 2021, this blog entry is from the Periodic Public Space blog that is published in relation to Gestalt Genesis/Day Million, a macrosocial simulation game. The blog entry can be found at <http://gestaltgenesis-daymillion.net/#pps>; this PDF is for convenience of the reader.

in other works by other authors) as part of weighing changes to civilizations in the game.

\*\*\*

(on corporation social responsibility)

Marty Schenker: Yeah, but then you look at Big Tech and you see that they're very socially responsible, responsive to a lot of these issues. You know, it may be that the third party in the U.S. are actually corporations; there are the Democrats, the Republicans and there's corporations. And they're going to kind of battle it out to seek public support. – Bloomberg Quicktake, “McConnell Threatens Businesses That Get Involved in Political Issues,” Bloomberg Quicktake: Now YouTube Channel, April 6, 2021.

*GGDM Commentary: The issue of corporate (and elite) social responsibility and activism certainly is not a new creature in our time and corporate boards have always insisted that their only responsibility is the make a profit for the shareholders (of which they are, incidentally, usually the majority shareholders – a conundrum that drives liberal activists to fits), but the events of recent years have raised a new clamor and there seems to be a feeling that the ground is shifting slightly (a process described in Artifice, 2 [Constructural Elements](#)) and expectations are changing with a new generation (GGDM addresses generational turnover in a couple of different ways). The peculiar way that GGDM treats [Corporations](#) and [MegaCorporations \(via Special Writs\)](#) makes them very much entwined with their civilization and not separate from it, and the conversation above is offered as an example for GGDM participants to consider.*

• *In an interview with [Poppy Harlow](#) on CNN on April 9, 2021, Levi & Strauss CEO, Chip Berg also cited the diversity of stakeholders as another reason why his company is engaging on social issues. When asked, however, about Levi & Strauss' relationship with China and China's 'genocide' of the [Uighurs](#), he danced around the question, but gave a reasonable satisfactory answer: He minimized the importance of China as a market and supplier for his company (3% he said at one point) and said they don't do business with that province (to avoid the possibility of forced labor in their products).*

*The final comment by Marty Schenker about how corporations are the 'third party' in our political system epitomizes the [Estate Government Title](#), in this sense, 'corporate America' could be called an Estate Government Title in GGDM terms to the extent that they actively – whether under the old [Milton Friedman](#) de-regulation model or the new 'woke' model – cohesively act to assert their positional power over their civilization. If corporate America suddenly displays great cohesion in the new woke model, or there is a marked long-term change in how it addresses social issues, does the Estate Title of the Milton Friedman model morph into a [Social Title](#) instead? Questions for GGDM participants to consider.*

Copyright September 2021, this blog entry is from the Periodic Public Space blog that is published in relation to Gestalt Genesis/Day Million, a macrosocial simulation game. The blog entry can be found at <http://gestaltgenesis-daymillion.net/#pps>; this PDF is for convenience of the reader.

\*\*\*

(on mathematics)

“Well, it [mathematics] is extraordinarily precise and in different areas, more precise, in some areas, we know less about it. But I think people often find it puzzling that something abstract like mathematics really describe reality as we understand it. I mean, reality, you think of something like a chair or something, something made of solid stuff and then you say, what’s our best scientific understanding of what that is? Well, you say it’s made of fibers and cells and so on, and these are made of molecules and those molecules are made of atoms, those atoms are made out of nuclei, and electrons going around. And then you say, what’s a nucleus, and you say, well it’s a protons and neutrons and they’re held together by things called gluons and then neutrons and protons are made of things called quarks and so on. And then you say well then, what is an electron and what’s a quark? And at that stage, the best you can do is to describe some mathematical structure, you say, they’re things that satisfy the Dirac equation, or something like that which you can’t understand what that means without mathematics. I mean the mathematical description of reality is where we’re always led and these equations are fantastically accurate.” – [Sir Roger Penrose](#) interview by host [Robert Lawrence Kuhn](#), “Is Mathematics Invented or Discovered?” [Closer to Truth](#), Ep. 48, 2009.

*GGDM Commentary: I could not help but to wonder what is it that would allow us to describe human civilization in terms comparable to (but not the same as, because that can never happen) the way mathematics describes the universe? I really have no idea, and my head nearly explodes trying to catch even a momentary glimpse of it. Apparently our understanding of human civilization (the social sciences, history) is comparable currently to something less than [Ancient Greek](#) or [Babylonian mathematics](#). It may also be that my attempt to reorient macrosociology along axiomatic terms may be a doomed distraction.*

*I suppose that if I were more artful and literary, I could make a compelling story outlining this idea, but that’s not my style, I tend to be rather plainly blunt about it. It seems to me again to be some vague sort of parallel, our mastery of physics and mathematics of the first order of natural phenomenon (physics, inorganic matter in the words of Clarence Marsh Case), along with increasing mastery of the second order (biology, organic matter), along with the beginnings of or an inkling of third order (mental organic, psychology) and fourth order (social, super-organic) suggests that ‘advancing’ sapient civilizations move along the lines of mastering the four orders of natural phenomena. That said then, we might reach a level of development or understanding in psychology and sociology concurrent with our current level of understanding in physics in maybe two to five centuries hence. What that looks like, nobody knows, but it’s not [post-human](#) or [transhuman](#), it’s not what transhumanist are really discussing at all. As a corollary, this suggests a serious shortcoming in future and alien contact sci-fi films which usually just show us (or alien versions of us)*

Copyright September 2021, this blog entry is from the Periodic Public Space blog that is published in relation to Gestalt Genesis/Day Million, a macrosocial simulation game. The blog entry can be found at <http://gestaltgenesis-daymillion.net/#pps>; this PDF is for convenience of the reader.

with more technology, but basically unchanged (or as [Norman Spinrad](#) noted, very little of science fiction shows a better humanity in the future, a better future).

\*\*\*

(on GGDM's axiomatic approach to macrosociology)

“Agreeing with this, one might note that RI [The Responsibility of Intellectuals] seems to presuppose that exposing political truths has a certain kind of instrumental value, namely that it will tend to make the world a better place by changing people's political views. In fact, Chomsky's position on this question is more nuanced. In an interview he said ‘I don't have faith that the truth will prevail if it becomes known, but we have no alternative to proceeding on that assumption,’ and he has often endorsed Gramsci's ‘optimism of the will’ as a necessary corollary to pessimism of the intellect.” – [Nicholas Allot](#), “The responsibility of intellectuals in the era of bounded rationality and Democracy for Realists,” [The Responsibility of Intellectuals](#) (2019), Ed. Nicholas Allott, Chris Knight and Neil Smith, p. 32.

*GGDM Commentary: I agree with [Chomsky's](#) above statements about the truth and that certainly applies to GGDM. The nuance here is that people will mistake GGDM's axiomatic approach to macrosocial-civilization-whatever, for ‘[pessimism](#) of the intellect.’ That is, the Axiom of Human Meaning (‘humans need meaning’) carried through the GGDM simulation to its logical conclusions, will be called pessimistic if you are feeling kind, otherwise, many will call it [nihilistic](#). Push aside the veils, take another view.*

By Charles W. Phillips