

My Garden

Alex Buckley

Central Organizer of New General Management

1/23/25-1/27/25

Dedicated to the Kiwi Farms

I have realized the importance of making clear, both for the outsider and the farmers that work it, what it is that I like to do in my garden. Namely I will be discussing my abstract sign interpretation: what it is, how it works, and why I use it. This model is something that I have constructed: I have gone to great lengths to gather the text arranged before you.

No Information is ever Contained in Anything

This is the first major piece. I know that it is hard to accept. It took me a while to quite figure out the subtle meaning carried by such a simple statement. Maybe the reductionist and materialist philosophies poisoned the well and consequently have made it seem, to the common layperson and scientists alike, that they can accept the assuredness of science as something to take for granted. They, too, and other notable figures among the more advanced of our intelligentsia have fallen for this cheap way of thinking. I suggest, rather, that information is interpreted.

The assumption that I am arguing against can be stated as such: information is some kind of property that is “contained” in a transmitting medium. Examples of this could be: the ideas contained in books, or themes contained in movies, or the meaning contained in a gesture. Obviously, none of this is true.

The problem is multi-faced. One part is that it assumes some kind of objective, maybe physical, quality to information. I can see that this assumption is being made when I hear somebody say something like,

“How could you misunderstand the themes of this book/movie/game? You must not be media literate.”

As if there was only ever one “correct” way of understanding things. And where are people getting these ideas from? Could it be the scientific communicators broadcasting to a world audience the message of “empirical scientific objectivity”?

Another part of the problem is the assumption in the assurance of complete transmission. This is not possible. You will not find in the receipt of a message a completely transmitted idea. As if I could just flash a symbol before someone and have them instantly recognize everything that I am trying to say. I won't delve further into this to spare you my personal anecdotes, but I will say this: this has never happened to me.

A third part of this first problem is the assumption that we all speak the same language: as if any one of us may communicate with any other. Language divides aside, there are still many reasons why somebody wouldn't understand you, and among them could be differences in education, or knowledge of specific subjects, or choice of words. Every field practices its own jargon, and that language is largely unapproachable to those outside the system.

Physics is useful: I'm not denying this. Nor am I denying the fact of physical nature. I am merely suggesting that there exists, besides the physical, parts of nature open to scientific investigation that are not physical.

My claim is that information is not contained in physical objects. We should not claim objective meaning or the false assumption of contained information just because some select few scientists wish to retain their control over their "fundamental reality". We cannot assume that the physical world is everything and that physicalism is the only acceptable means of scientific investigation. They already admit to ignorance of certain natural phenomena: it's not acceptable to claim that metaphysics is being "left behind".

So then how is my informational interpretation model different from the "empirically contained fact" model?

Information is one of those non-physical things. So is knowledge. And ideas. In addition, I could add reasoning, states of mind, and considerations. Thinking, feeling, and emotions like love and hate, exhilaration and sadness, are all non-physical things. If we really wish to describe natural phenomena we should start with that which most closely relates to us. We deal with abstract things every day: I propose to study them scientifically, or in other words, by the system.

My systematic model is abstract. What is abstraction? It's some kind of meta process that acts as a mechanism for living things to turn the gears of substantial reality.¹ It can be worked independently of any individual thing itself and its informational products are interpreted by an actor. An example of abstraction can be code making: the independent assignment of one thing to another by arbitrary symbolism.

And this brings us back to the first part of this chapter: the information supposedly contained in books. How could you, or anyone else, assume to know the meaning behind arbitrary movements made by subjective persons with limited knowledge? The symbolic code and the stuff that it represents are two different things entirely. To assume otherwise is to imagine that the picture is the thing itself, or that the word is the thing that it names. The answer to this question is even more subtle.

You Already Know Everything that You will Ever Know

If you managed to get through the first step, that's good. This next one tends to filter those that make it this far. I didn't understand it myself for quite a while. How could such a thing be possible? Allow me to show you.

The answer has to do with the reception and the recognition of coded signals.

Shannon and Weaver provide us with such a model. It is composed of four parts: the transmitter, the receiver, the channel, and the signal. For us the items of concern are the receiver and the signal.

A significant amount of physical reduction happens during the transmission of physical signals. A large amount of data is compressed into physical forms more readily amenable to long distance transmission, and the reception of the signal is, qualitatively, not the same as the original message. My point here is to make clear that the received signal has nothing to do necessarily with the original message. The chosen signal is arbitrary: so is its “carrying capacity” for information. The point is that the signal is understood. The signal itself serves only as a means of transmission.

When we send someone a message, we want them to “just get it”, to have a clairvoyant moment of recognition. We don't want the receiver to wonder about the meaning of his message. It should be clear to him what it is that he recognizes.

Therefore, we need to already know what he knows. We need to have already realized what he may recognize so that we can craft a message, one that is able to survive reduction, that reaches him only in little pieces, and from this tiny fraction of the original message he is able to see, perfectly and completely, what it is that we have to say to him.

To communicate effectively, we must understand the recipient's foundation of knowledge and experience: their mental library of meanings, symbols, and associations. When we craft a message, we need to ensure its core essence can survive the inevitable loss and distortion that occurs during transmission. Even when only fragments of our intended meaning reach them, if we've built our message on shared understanding, the recipient can reconstruct our complete thought from those fragments, like recognizing an entire constellation from glimpsing just a few stars. The key is to anchor our message in mutual reference points: shared experiences, common knowledge, or already explored parts of God's City.

We encode, very specially, our message to have specific meaning to our receivers. This is arbitrary. There is no necessary reason why someone would encode a piece of information in one way or another: the only necessary cause is the effective communication between two mutually recognized persons.

If somebody flashed you a sign, how would you know its name? When I show you a picture of a dog, the reason why you know the name and meaning of the abstract symbol “dog” is because you have seen a dog before. If it were to show you an alien creature known as a goferswitz, you wouldn't know what image to form in your mind as you've never seen a creature like this before. On the other hand, when I say “dog” you do know what image to form on the basis of *already having known the meaning of the name*.

What we want from messages is the names and their meanings, the message itself isn't so important.

The thesis I'm trying to present is that information is only meaningful to an interpreter that already knows the names of whatever code that they are working with. This implies that some kind of substantial reality sits underneath an interpreter's feat to provide the stability and regularity needed for such an enterprise.

So if the recipient already knows what it is that we want him to know, and if he is only capable of realizing things that he knows, and if "learning new things" is not possible due to the nature of signal transmission, then knowledge, that which is already known, must have something to do with the substantial composition of the person who wishes to understand knowledge. That composition I will discuss next.

The Tripartite Substances

I am here proposing the existence of a tripartite substance-ontological composition of natural reality. I have further thoughts about this, its origin from God, and their interrelations in the co-creation and emergence of the natural world. That will have to wait. Below I will briefly outline the three substances, how they work, and why they presuppose the precognition of knowledge.

The first is sublime, a world of pure signs that is totally unreachable by anything. This is the platonic world of perfect forms. I will note that I tend to believe that the forms are endlessly changing, and not static (I know that this is a kind of heresy). These signs cannot be interacted with by actors at all, but we can feel their influence through the medium of:

The physical world. All of physics acts as a channel or medium by which to conduct the transmission of thought. The meaning of any communication, traveling along the transmission line of physics, will be interpreted by:

The mental world of consciously acting living thinking beings. This world can also be described as symbolic, it is here that I will categorize everything having to do with mind, spirit, soul, thought, ideas, scientific models, theoretical constructions, and the like.

The three different substances interact and from that will emerge all the diversity of natural phenomena that is not purely one thing or another. We as humans, for example, have a physical body, a symbolic mind, and all the virtual constructions that we have ever created in our lives. We are a mix of the three substances, all equal and balanced.

This classification of naturally occurring phenomena can be arranged in two different ways: an emergent linear model from:

sign>physics>mind

or a reticular steady state model, where the mind goes back into the signs. I should note that Roger Penrose offers a slightly different reticular arrangement: the physical informs the mental, the mental informs the platonic, and the platonic informs the physical. The arrangement is simply shifted by one place here.

The above classification of natural phenomena aligns very well with Peirce's tripartite system of semiotics. We will be adopting this form of thought, both for the convenience provided by an already existing theoretical structure but also for its efficiency in its economy of thought.

Peirce's Tripartite Semiotics

The pure substances of natural ontology are not immediately visible to us. This is obvious: the world is such a tangled mess that one of the best forms of philosophy is reductionism. A tool is needed to adequately and efficiently sort out the details.

Peirce's three part semiotics, as opposed to, say, Saussure's two part semiotics, is a natural and convenient placement here. He also has a three part model. His is different, but with a few changes it will suit my purposes.

Peirce suggested a three part system of abstract interpretation based on the:

His sign, again, is something that can't be reached. We have to create an artificial, arbitrary symbol to stand in for something that we can't observe directly, and an index to store and organize these symbols.

Peirce's object serves as the notion of brute, concrete interactions between entities. It serves as the dyadic relation between any two things: it involves the way something external is encountered or experienced as resistant and independent of the subject.

Peirce's interpreter is the actor performing agential action: it's each individual that decides for themselves what it is that they will do. Personal decisions, free will, and action are all related here. Physicists call it the "observer", but that implies such a passive attitude. The living thing is not some disconnected observer, watching the world but not interacting with it. The interaction is the world! The interpreter makes the world that they live in!

This three part system can be overlaid with the substance-ontological model, providing a theoretical framework for understanding it. Peirce's signs overlay with the sublime sign, his object is physics, and the interpretant is the living interpreter that I suggest exists in a world of mind.

And finally, this brings us back to the question: how can we only know what we already know? The answer is through the mechanism of:

Interpretation

This is an action that living beings can make to produce knowledge about the world. The mechanism is somewhat akin to turning a gear: the three part substantial ontology, probably in its reticular form, is "turned" by an abstract meta mechanism overlaying the ontology.

Interpretation is a three part abstract process. I will lay that out below:

Transcription is the transition from the received signal to a symbol familiar to the operator. For me this means the translation from disorganized outsider science into the organization of new general management.

Translation is the transformation from a familiar symbol into an interpreted construct. In my model this means that I need to translate from the language of new general management into abstract sign interpretation.

Expression, the final chance an actor has to have a say over the concern, is the manifestation from a one dimensional string of abstract thoughts into a four dimensional existence. Here I will grow the insider science from abstract sign interpretation.

If the process of interpretation is dependent upon the knowledge of its user over the interpreted message, and if the information could never be contained in that message, then it seems that the requirement of having knowledge rests solely upon the interpreters shoulders. He must rely on the accumulated knowledge he has gathered, the organizational capacity of his system, and the efficiency and economy of thought this provides. He can only know the things he already knows, or through the ability to simulate unknown things: both are dependent upon his imagination and underlying substantial composition, which is itself dependent upon its origin in God. This all seems predisposed.²

This is why I believe that knowledge can't be learned, but only recognized as something that was already known. Now, we need to organize the things that we do know.

Bertalanffy's General System

A way to manage all of these abstract categorizations is available. Fortunately, we have a friend in Herr Bertalanffy. What I have suggested above is already immensely complex, so any further analysis or interpretation needs to halt until the system can be sufficiently organized.

His system is a framework designed to understand and model systems across a wide range of disciplines and interdisciplinary complexes. It emphasizes the interconnectedness and interdependence of parts within a whole. Its focus on organizational capacities highlights how systems maintain coherence, adapt to change, and function effectively as integrated wholes.

This system of organization is highly beneficial to arranging and maintaining the internal integrity of such a highly complex system. I myself have a hard time remembering all the ins and outs of this model, like when I'm required to write about it.

There is another beneficial aspect to this: by rearranging the internal subjects of the system, new relationships, functions, or capacities can emerge, revealing previously unrealized potential. This process of internal reorganization allows for a reconfiguration of the system's components, which may uncover hidden synergies, optimize inefficiencies, or unlock new pathways for growth and adaptation.

I want a totally abstract, hierarchical system that is capable of keeping a very many diverse things maintained in the system, and this model is able to provide that.

He won't get his own chapter, but an honorable mention is here awarded to Monsieur Baudrillard. He seems to have a deep understanding of the nature of knowledge in relation to the organization of things. He should not be dismissed simply because half of his writing is "french hot air".

Salthe's Hierarchy

Salthe suggests an hierarchical arrangement for the organization of complex natural systems and it is highly beneficial in this way. He has a certain model for it, but I will ignore that in favor of my own as yet to be created model: one based on set and category theory. I am not strong enough in these fields as of yet so this section will remain brief.

The hierarchy theory can be briefly stated as such: natural phenomena are differentiated at different organizational "levels". An example could be the organismal organization of your own body, from cells to organs to the self. Each level has specific rules or defining qualities, and higher levels have ontological control over levels, while lower levels spread a subtle influence in higher levels. The levels are not necessarily reducible from one to another in explanation. Salthe's hierarchical suggestions are scalar (mathematical) or specific (Linnaean).

A three part hierarchy helps anchor a theoretical model from reduction up or down. I take this hierarchy to be the tripartite ontology and epistemology suggested above. I have more deeply elaborated upon the complete hierarchical organization in both my "A New Division of Knowledge" and "New General Management".

I will be using this hierarchy theory as a very convenient way to "stack" the ideas organized under a general system. But I want to use it in a different way. I suggest that the hierarchy be totally abstract.

Use of this form shows how change is possible. Things are not reducible either up or down, and they require a tight co-interaction of things to produce emergence.

An excellent tool that can greatly aid in the organizing of complex hierarchical systems is something that I call holistic recapitulation. The concept is posited as such: each part of a system reflects or embodies the characteristics of the whole from which it is derived. I am suggesting that the essence or the structure of the whole is "recapitulated" or re-expressed in its individual components. This can help integrate multi-level systems. The relationship between the parts and the whole is not static. Instead, it evolves and adapts, mirroring the dynamic processes of life, systems, or meaning-making.

Recapitulation often involves recursive or fractal-like patterns, where the same principles are expressed at different levels. This emphasizes that scales are interdependent and that insights at one level can inform understanding of another. The recapitulation occurs through interpretation and it is at this instant that a new sub system is realized. Each newly created part reflects the broader system of meaning that it belongs to.

Modern complexity theory

I believe that modern complexity theory, an outsider physical-reductionist alternative to my system of insider science, is currently wallowing in the same kind of crisis that afflicts the theoretical, or so called “fundamental”, physics: the reliance upon the “for sure” physical material-reductionist foundation.

The bio-semioticians are further along, but they, like the others, flounder upon the same “fundamental” problems and are left gasping for air in the light of this new day.

I admire the work: it's good. But it will simply fail for the same reason the others do too. I don't wish for my system to fail. Therefore I have gone to great lengths to cover and account for natural phenomena that are obvious in our everyday existence and that have yet still to be systematically organized by scientific interests. I hope to survive future criticisms of blindness in acknowledgment of natural phenomena.

Theoretical biology

Current theoretical biology suffers from a lack of abstract understanding. A false god of objectivism is being worshipped and this prevents advancement. I hope that the above argument may serve the theory of biology in finding the things that it already knows, but maybe is afraid to say aloud for the criticism of our peers.

Higher Forms

I propose that there exists, beyond any observational capability that we may conceivably achieve, a world of higher forms, one that is moving and forever changing, that we will never grasp and will never become aware of. A word of warning about these things. Higher beings will have long been watching us before we ever begin to realize them!

Notes

1. I am here, by suggesting “substantial reality”, am referring to the tripartite substance ontology of signs, physics, and mind.

2. I have much more to say about the origin of knowledge, but I don't want to break the flow here. Very briefly I will outline my narrative for such a thing. A long time ago all of us were one. We all existed together, in one place and at one time, and things were perfect. Because we were whole we knew everything that we could ever know, and desire was nonexistent. Then one day some kind of truly devastating calamity happened. It smashed us all into the finest dust imaginable and scattered us to the very corners of the distant cosmos. This dust, what I call glimmer, is how we can recognize one another: the substance that we are is the same as everyone else, and when we recognize identifiable features in someone else what we see is this very fine, shiny dust, blinking at us and remind us of all the things we have lost and forgotten.

Further Reading

Alinsky, S. D. (1989) *Rules for Radicals: A Practical Primer for Realistic Radicals*, Vintage

Francisco, R. A. (1979) *The Political Economy of Collectivized Agriculture: A Comparative Study of Communist and Non-Communist Systems*, Pergamon

Olson, M. (2000) *Power and Prosperity: Outgrowing Communist and Capitalist Dictatorships*, Basic