

It is presently accepted that the "outer world" enters the "inner world" through stimuli that are undifferentiated and neutral in that the brain receives quanta of electric shocks of similar "quality" no matter ~~of~~ what organ of the body is stimulated. This neutrality of stimulus is modified in the following respects:

- 1) different organization of receptor portions of the brain.
- 2) habituation to constant stimuli patterns = "self-instruction" in the absolute meaning. ~~the~~ This process the individual relies on built-in categories or universals such as chronologizing, unconditioned reflexes, the "logic" of sorting stimuli which is a priori unconscious & uncontrolled (as e.g. a stimulus is brought to mind as repetitive and a pattern of generalization begins to be realized on a sensing formula of some kind [e.g. the initial stimulus becomes a base line ~~and~~ for similar stimuli and modes, means, and medians as well as limits are built up around the shifting pattern of stimuli].) What we mean when we speak of natural aptitudes as related to this self-instruction.
- 3) socialization - in that early cue-givers ~~and~~ receive their place in the mind (mother as interpreter) and communicate the place and meaning of stimuli, thus accelerating tremendously the pace at which stimuli may be assigned and "understood." So important is this early pedagogy, that we speak of an infant's initial helplessness as almost ~~a~~ a passive receptor and learner.

1), 2), and 3) of course operate together and simultaneously, affecting one another and giving an early character to the organism, i.e. an initial manner of assimilating & reacting to the outer world.

Note well that the outer world is inner-described. The outer world, if it exists, is completely translated into human ~~language~~ terms. And 1), 2), and 3) see to it that all men can agree in important respects on the nature of the "outer world." This agreement is the world of fact. The ~~various~~ philosophers who from ancient times said that man is the measure

Of all things were essentially correct. Also correct, we hardly need add, are all those who have emphasized man is a social animal.

Why are certain ^{facts} said to exist & not others? Why ~~are~~ is there a grouping of agreed upon items in the sphere of inanimate objects & less in the sphere of human & animal behavior. Why will we all agree ^{xx} that a tree is a tree, but not that a man is a man?

Why will we agree ~~that~~ to the "law of gravity" but not to the "law of institutional change"?

Why will we agree that water is composed of H_2O but not that ~~it is~~ a piece of legislation is composed of the ~~several~~ ^{several} ~~interests~~ ^{interests} ~~of~~ ^{force} ~~of~~ the several interested powers engaged in ~~it~~ ^{bringing it}.

Why do we agree that nature is neither good nor bad, but that men ^{must be} good or bad?

There are many answers to these queries, and all serve to explain away much of the difference in agreement as to the validity of the respective statements. These are stated here preliminary to a more general analysis.

[

]

Generally speaking however, ^{all} men agree to statement X in proportion as the statement: 1) is close to the universal forms of ^{expression, bracketing, adding, and averaging} that, 2) is beyond the reach of hereditary differences, 3) is unrelated to socialization save for elementary communication, 4) is experienced before a welter of previous experience destroys simplicity.

Every universal fact, once stabilized, seems to lose its ~~value~~ status as value. That is to say that what is is supposed to exist for its own sake and is said to be beyond our control and hence beyond wishing. Or at least it sets a limit to our wishing. And the more facts to which we agree, the less scope for wishing, until, if all ~~the~~ events are known as facts, then the world is wholly determined and the wish, if it emerges at all, is an entirely useless occurrence.

This would be an incorrect point of view, however. For, first, a fact is merely the outcome of a struggle to achieve value. It is the trophy left behind to gather ~~just~~ while men go ~~on~~ warring in new contexts over values. ~~The~~ A fact is a mark that men have settled some score. Seeking to realize something, the infant has found a universal acceptivity. The limits of ~~the~~ behavior are never such as to deny all fact, and the most diverse of men and cultures share ^{many} universals of perception, ~~principles~~ and cognition. The great human and cultural conflicts of history have taken place in a relatively narrow margin of situations wherein men could not agree as to what is. And certain societies and philosophies (I think we should find them to be the ones that led the extremes of possible conflicts) have invented vocabularies & logics to rule out and rule in disagreements, usually turning upon a ^{logical} distinction between what is & what ought to be. It has thus come about that in such societies, fact (and the more disputed are values, the higher the regard for fact) has been enthusiastically described and raised to an exalted & independent status, so that it becomes almost impossible to think of facts as the residue of the ~~individual~~ individual-social struggle for value. Let us speak more of values in man's nature

△ ~~There~~ So-called emotive theories of values are true in the sense that they recognize the great no. of opportunities for moral blocking that complicated men & complicated societies produce and are false in their assurance that moral blockings are the base origins of morality. Man cannot strip himself to his moral fundamentals - life is too short, his ability too slight, and life's accidents too many -- and ~~not~~ heredity and other basic differences prevent agreement -- but he can (with a kind of divine irony) perceive that he almost agrees with all others, that a fundamental consensus of ^{natural} man is almost an organic finality -- and he can scarcely be called wrong in searching his nature & origins for ~~the~~ ways of creating or "restoring" a complete and definitive unity of his species.

Man's Nature & the Nature of Values

Values are part of man's nature. They are satisfactions presently experienced - projected into a future combination purporting to prolong, improve or preserve the experience. Without time, values are inconceivable. But that is not startling, for it is just as inconceivable to think of man's nature without a dimension of time. So values are an integral part of the ^{chronological} extensions of which man's mind can conceive. To the extent to which man's mind operates a temporally, it operates amorally. Also, man's values may be unconscious (hereditary or socially induced) and conscious. An unconscious value is a value beyond control - when it is controllable, it is ipso facto conscious in part. A shed is shown and one can get a grip on it.

Man's nature is complex to the point of allowing unlimited and indeterminate values. If it were considerably less complicated, we could speak of a law of nature in morality. We cannot, because, considering the wide variety of circumstances of social and natural life, and the huge variety of mental constructions possible vis a vis a situation to be evaluated, no set of tendencies may be so reduced in number and deductively clarified & specified as to establish a correct moral choice for every given moral dilemma.

These complicated values of man inhabit every action and communication. That is to say, every action has a temporal ^{and teleological} meaning to the actor, in the sense that the meaning is continuously addressed to explain it, or may be ascertained by observers to exist. All behavior is moral then, from one point of view or another.

Depriving behavior of value is only an artefact of the ^{observing} mind, useful for ^{analytic} purposes but dangerous in no extreme when postulated or defended as a reality. The impressive edifices of non-value commentary on behavior - termed factual statements & systematically put forward as

are evaluative social habits. This is the truth that lies behind allegations + counter-allegations that science is a form of religion, that religion is bad science, that anti-religions are religions by another name.)

The most simple & universal statement of the condition of human that, expression + action, hence, is to declare their position on the continuum of anarchy & habit, not poetry and science, we must, but anarchy & habit, both of which include values. Poetry refers to that expression + action unimpelled & unimpeded & uncontrolled by ~~the~~ habit and science refers to all mental & physical activities repetitive and ritually disciplined by being related to a given value.

So values are born of man's nature
facts are born of values
Facts & values are inextricably related
to a continuum of anarchy & habit.
Facts are most in evidence when a value
is agreed upon & submerged - i.e. where a
habit is introduced, where a science is
born *

Values are most in evidence when anarchy
is the rule - for the meaning of each fact
is nil without the explicit value referent.
(This is the essence of poetry & non-science)

* Science (social & natural) is a deduction from actual values.
Applied sci. differs from basic ^{original} sci. ^{only} in that the former is integral to action
i.e. action is supposed to be immediately affected. This is not an important distinction.
Another distinction note is that basic sci. deals w/ values, i.e. unagreed upon events, & since it changes "reality" is a value system. In a better sense, applied sci. is a systematic action system deduced from agreed values & is called administration.

How do values form in the person?

Perceiving the world
Adjusting to the world

What are their major patterns

What are their transmission & development channels? How do they grow?

Identification

Projection

Displacement

What is the birth of fact? How do facts split off from values? How loose does the relationship ever become and usually become?

Why are facts? Note that a fact never occurs by itself but only in the context of a value process. The scientist recognizes this by stating his hypothesis & wrapping his facts up in the value. The extreme poet like Joyce & ~~Lyons~~ pours out seemingly unrelated facts that occur only because a valuing organism is in operation without much control over the world.

The habituation of values: conscience, super-ego.

The habituation of facts: science, logic, sense-world.

Dyogenics, disassembly of values: individual character, poetry, delinquency
" " " facts: falsehoods, faults of perception, attention and cognition

Facts must be approached thro the study of values. The proliferation & systematization of facts must be approached likewise. The outstanding problems relating to the nature of (natural and social) science, both in wonderful flux today, can be grasped, formulated, and resolved for our time by the proper approach to facts thro values.

What are these problems:

1. The nature of "matter."
2. The nature of "perception."
3. The nature of "laws" and "scientific method" in science.
4. The possibility of systematization.
5. The source of systems.
6. The relations of natural and social systems.
7. The choice of problems themselves.
8. The meaning of "time," [Time exists because man says it does. He says it does because he wants it to exist. He wants it to exist because it is useful to his value system. It is useful to his value system because he learns his value hierarchy by means of a time-dimensional training. From infancy onwards. What has caused man to train his children (himself) so? ~~Be~~ Like other

animal organisms, his nervous system allows a storage of sequences, a postponement of action, a build-up of tensions -- but much more so, so that a veritable empire of sequential calculations is possible. Why is this so? Because that is so, in ~~a~~ non-teleological ~~sense~~ sense; of all other possible evolutionary mechanisms (of which we ^{can} know little), man's organism ~~is~~ is physio-psychically structured to a series of events -- a life of before & after, of get ready, get set, and go, of actions & reactions. ~~We~~ might speculate further about evolution -- we might say it is additive or cumulative, that ^{new} characteristics of the organism do not substitute ^{so} much as they heap upon pre-existing characteristics; that evolution has been conservatively progressive -- from a bare heliotropism to Michelangelo, layer upon layer, new institutions rest upon and are the old. And while a great variety of "speeds" can be calculated, and a number of changes have been of a gestalt character (i.e. so developed as to ~~allow~~ allow parallel and immediate perception), the didactic imprint of sequential order on man's nature has had in most marvellous flowering in the sense and calculating of chronology, internally and externally, giving rise to the most exquisite philosophizing and literary effort and to the breath-taking computations of mathematical astronomy.

Inconsistencies of chronology unexplainable save as above:

- a. The inadequacy of notion of infinity in astronomy, in microscopy -- the shifting of frames as one moves from one conceivable set of time symbols to another
- b. The "slowing" & "accelerating" of life's tempo in different historical epochs.
- c. Internal "slowing" & "accelerating". The mix-up of sensation, perception, cognition and values in the personality owing to the overlapping myriad chronological senses that form human experience. A present room is experienced along the paths of the past -- hence nostalgia, multiple sensation, ^{new} ~~new~~ ^{hypothesis} ~~hypothesis~~.

- ∴ values blanket that, expression, action.
- ∴ values are time-bound

Now what is satisfaction? "Present satisfactions" are all that can exist. When part of a present satisfaction comes from a time sensing - a rummaging up the keyboard of chronological sequence we speak of a value. Satisfaction itself, hence, if defined, will embrace values. Satisfaction is defined as a ~~reduction~~ reduction in tension. A tension is an excitation of nerve. It may be quite "animal" - involving simple unconscious metabolism or "cell vitalism" or quite "human" - involving an acute perception of remote consequences or, better, relationships of the organism to the environment through a stimulation of the cerebrum.

A reduction in tension hence can come as a reduction in time sensing.

Now what is the cause of tension: Life itself, on one level the essential biological drive the environmentally induced "attention" of the nerves in never-ending series from ~~tomb-to-tomb~~ tomb-to-tomb.

The transformation of tensions: Man's "rich life" is the product of the myriad levels, combinations, and transformations of tension that are possible. ① Human personality and ② the science of human behavior are based upon ~~observed~~ actual and observed frequency-patterns of the levels, comb., & transf. of tensions.

The categories of such ① & ② are important and a useful way of deriving them = The H.

Now what are habits?

I. By ~~the~~ object-goal (i.e. satisfaction sought)

II. By patterns of displacement & projection (by method)

III. By degree of persistence or frequency (habit vs. anarchy)

An adequate descrip. of I, II, III gives us the levels comb. & transf. of tensions.

The object-goal approach to tensions gives us

1. Principle of ends
2. Principle of means
3. ~~Norms~~ Clusters of behavior capable of being related or generalized (norms)
4. Environmental emphasis on undeveloped organisms (they go thru hoops of norms).

The method of adjusting personality gives us

1. Allocation of tensions to exciters (i.e. why one object excites rather another?) (i.e. with what does organism identify?)
2. ~~The distribution of~~
Why does allocation take place? [a. few fixed object-goals; b. general neutrality of tensions going back ultimately to the neutrality of sensation - hence no specific stimulants are not completely prescribed & many kinds of object-goals can use same pathway in creating or reducing tensions - here also falls the important "conversion" phenomenon of psychosomaticism which ought not to be called "conversion" since, so to speak, a late-comer has as much right to the road as an early-bird.]

Now habit is again important = we said habit was the indication of external order. Thus, then, the persistence or frequency of ^{of certain} external stimuli establish de facto a habitual (that-expects-action) pattern of the organism and if we object that de facto isn't enough, since habits, in formalized, no longer need external models, we can go into the organism & say a) the predispositions to the habits already exist for that is why the external behavior occurs and b) residual tensions of the organism

constantly renew & remind themselves of the
chronological, methodological, and goal-object characters of
their past satisfactions. Thus new action that or expression
sequential to inaction or inhibition will recapitulate the
previous modes. A man addicted to world govt in
Vermont may move to Calif., not be active politically for 2 years, and
then renew his membership in world govt movement.

Corollaries: displacement, identification are universal
normal operations.

In terms of values, ~~ident.~~ ident. + displ. assign areas of
tension satisfaction & develop into patterns (habits) of
same; values themselves are chronological extensions
of satisfactions already described acc. to such
patterns.

In sum, we conclude that values are satisfactions of
tensions presently experienced (usually in that) (as present
experience ~~that~~ includes time-sensing excitation), which are
anarchic or habitual, which are part of every experience (unplanned/conscious) ⊙

Corollary: A value = a weak form of experience

A1 strength of value depends upon the enormity
of the habit (of a prest vis-a-vis
satisfaction & a dissipate vis-a-vis satisfaction)

A2 strength of value depends upon the strength of
chronological training. (cf. relation
betw early toilet training progressing
satisfaction & saving habits of middle class.)

Now we say that poetry is the anti thesis of system, that poetry is value and poetry is anarchy, meaning by this that the essence of poetry is individuation and the introduction of values that ~~is~~ ~~hypothetical~~ uncalled for if a deductive frame is being followed. Much of what is contained in what is called poetry is not such, and conversely ~~some~~ of science is really poetry. Let us separate such elements by listing them.

First the "poetry" that we say is not poetry:

- 1. All fact statements contained in novels, poems, drama, etc., including,
- 2. All applications of fact statements in paintings, music, sculpture, etc. and including all description of values of others.
- 3.

Then the "science" we say is poetry:

All hypothesis

Then the meaning of poetry to us is:

The expression of value

- whence we find that a good scientist is often a mediocre poet bec. he must find his way from his hypothesis to facts and to the existing factual system.
- And also, a good poet is often a good scientist bec. he well employs existing fact systems to convey fully the meaning of his values.
- And a complete and absolute poet is not a good poet because he contacts no one as to his meanings.
- And a great poet can shatter our factual world with his values, enrolling us in a new "reality."

In my Elements, I classified the general methods of political science into descriptive, comp., analytic and historical (genetic). This classification was arrived at after much study but remained nebulous in its meaning. What is a method - the operations one undertakes, the procedures, or the forms of thought? I was fairly well aware that my classification tended to be of forms of thought. In fact, its weakness seemed to me to be that it could not be related easily to the multitude of operational procedures - e. g., what is IBM technique under my class., what is the interview. Yet when I analysed polls, I found it rather easy to perceive these several methods at work, even if unconscious to pollsters. Now it seems to me that a class. of general methods is more certainly a class. of forms of creative thought following the habitual, inured human mind's workings; that we do not invent new forms of thought in science; and that the problems of knowing (practical and pure) are reducible perhaps to several dimensions that we must know of knowledge: what is it; is it like what; of what is it; where did it come from and where is it going. Are these not the questions the caveman asks of any new object in his experience? Are not the great practical problems of life approached through the questions? What of religion - super/mundane? - - the question there is what does it mean - - this is unscientific? - - and it will be noted that my four categories of learning do not ask this? They ask only questions that can profitably be answered in the tradition of material (i. e. scientificable) life.

Should materials be analyzed to show these general modes of thought?

- children's conversation
- open-ended poll interviews, etc.

On analogies as e. g. nations w/ individuals, institutions w/ organisms, etc. In what does the truth of an analogy lie? We know that traditional logic holds analogy not to be truth. Yet we also know how directly and forcefully compelling an analogy can be. Does this come from the mathematical reasoning A is to B as C is to D ∴

$$\frac{A \text{ is to } B}{x} \text{ as } \frac{C \text{ is to } D}{y} \text{ when } x=y?$$

This is mathematical in the sense that math operates with empirical objects. But perhaps the empirical objects themselves are only created by the mind. I. e. this type of analogy is really idealism: it is therefore attacked as untrue on the suppositions and logic of empirical math. But qua idealism, it may have its own kind of truth. That is, it may be true to its mind in that the only way one knows the "real" objects is by giving it analogical dimensions and then mathematizing about them - all mental operations but the only way of knowing such "truths" about reality. In brief, then, we cannot ~~for~~ hold such reasoning to be illogical - since the whole operation is mental, not mental-empirical, and ∴ cannot be invalidated by the tests of empirical analogy. The resemblance is deceiving - - a distinct type of operation is accomplished, the results of which demand other tests of knowledge - - pragmatic, perhaps, or purely empathic-ideational.

In physics the laws have operational definitions that are often
1) simple or 2) based up agreed and standardized referents. Take
e. g. the time dimension in experiments: "Wait one hour, then..."
or "per second/per second," or an "iron rod" or a "metal." The
operated clauses hold very still for the definition to be understood,
transferred, viewed by the multitude. But in social science, the
clauses of the operational definition have their own troubles
independently of their relation to the subject being defined. The
vote is a choice cast in selection of a public officer. The circled
terms are not easy for everyone to comprehend, or define; "by whom is
it cast," "how cast", what are the necessary conditions for a "choice,"
or for a "public officer"? And this is a very simple case, involving
no great law of social science as the Newtonian physical laws served
basic physics.