SUP WITH THE DEVIL WITH A LONG SPOON

Before going back to Mr Hyparxis I have to talk about 'examples'. They depend on who one is talking to. If I were to give examples about particle physics or hypertext or whatever, if the person did not know about these things and have experience of them the examples would not mean much. The **number-systems** such as triad, tetrad, etc. are based on concrete material in what JGB called 'organised complexity'. They start with the monad which is pure content, a cluster of experience. Unless one goes into this content – 'lives in the medium' as JGB pointed out – then what comes after will not mean much.

A spoon looks like a nice simple case accessible to all but that is to confuse the object-label 'spoon' with any depth of experience. We all **know** spoons but it is another thing to understand what they might mean. Of course, a spoon is a bowl joined with a handle – a 'triad' – but this is so obvious who cares? An answer would be a **designer** aiming at a new form of the spoon (why not put the handle inside the bowl?). There are methods such as TRIZ which in fact are quite near to systematics in approach. But it takes some creative thinking to follow it through.

As I mentioned, Simon Weightman and I produced the 192 triads of language but it would make little sense to anyone who had not questioned language (besides the embarrassing point that we lost all the notes we made). In brief, examples are no good to anyone who has not produced some of their own. Systems can't really be taught but have to be self-generated.

The monad is not just made of inert 'data'. It contains interest, purpose, concern, questing, etc. This is because all the systems have to come from will. This marks the shift to understanding from knowledge. The monad is not an object or thing. Many people who have dallied with systematics never took the step of working on the monad, the starting point, so remain within the orbit of their pre-conceptions and labelling. Systematics is indeed a form of creative thinking. I suppose that JGB saw it as a mode of G's 'active mentation'.

As far as triads in particular are concerned one can find lists of them. They won't come in JGB format though. JGB's approach is like a composer using quarter and eight tone intervals, which the unpractised will not hear.

In JGB's scheme for whatever it is worth everything starts from will. Only, one understands that this is not restricted to the will of a 'person'. The framework conditions limit what can exist which thus make it possible in the first place. These conditions are the 'self-limitation of will' - a reflection of the theological notion of the privation of God. It is just like one can only play a game if there are rules. In other words, **nothing can happen if anything can happen**. The 'laws' we hear of in physics all define what *cannot* happen.

The key is the question of the starting point.