



laetus in praesens

Alternative view of segmented documents via Kairos

30 September 2024 | Draft

Pathways in Governance between Logic, Emotion, Spirituality and Action

AI-assisted clarification of contrasting modalities of persuasion

-- / --

Introduction

Potential correspondences between logical, emotional, spiritual and practical modalities

Identification of pathways between cognitive modalities

Chess and Go implications for Ukraine-Russia, Israel-Palestine, China-Taiwan, and the Koreas

Implications for dialogue in addressing international conflicts

Pathways between cognitive modalities in courtship

Dynamics of bipedalism and quadrupedalism indicative of "cognitive gait"

Connective "borrowing" between cognitive modalities

Insightful representation of pathways of 4-fold cognitive patterns

Systematic avoidance of complex modality patterns in governance

Emergent integrative perspective from a 4-fold to a 5-fold modality

Transcending the strange cognitive attractor of binary dynamics

Corresponding intelligent connectives in animals and plants?

Bridging pathways between cognitive modalities through humour

AI analysis of connectives in the UN's Pact for the Future and its Global Digital Compact

References

Introduction

Faced with the challenges of the times, there are many initiatives which could be claimed to be "logical" or "rational". Many initiatives of the past were held to be rational and appropriate, although history now calls such appreciation into question. Increasingly the use of logic is readily challenged from other perspectives -- as with the manner in which science is now deemed suspect by many. Emotion may well be a factor in determining disagreement and the failure to "like" a strategy advocated as reasonable.

Reference may be made to spiritual factors as reframing what might otherwise be deemed reasonable -- whether framed as intuition, in aesthetic terms, or as "values". That dimension may be held to be of primary significance, taking precedence over any other and determining the nature of what is rational. The subtleties of logic, emotion and spirituality may well be set aside in favour of action as a primary necessity -- however it

is "rationalized" -- irrespective of whether it is extremely disagreeable to some, possible including those undertaking it. Each of these modalities is the preoccupation of extensive commentaries and explored in a various ways, whether by academia, the arts, religions, or those focused on the concrete.

Framed in this way, it may then be asked how individuals and societies move from a logical justification to one which people "like" -- however unreasonably so -- or to justifying initiatives in terms of spiritual priorities or those of necessity. What are the convoluted pathways between these modalities, irrespective of how any one of them is held to be of primary importance -- at least for a period? Is the recognition of such pathways susceptible to rational analysis or explanation -- or is it also called into question and set aside by emotional, spiritual priorities, and those of necessity? Are the pathways better understood otherwise, through the arts, spiritual practice, or other disciplines?

Such concerns may necessarily be held to be an indulgence in times of major conflict and its anticipation -- as seemingly heralded by those of Ukraine-Russia, Israel-Palestine, Taiwan-China, and the Koreans. What role does "logic" play in exacerbating such conflict -- in contrast to other factors? How does discussion of them shift between incommensurable modes of discourse?

In this period the United Nations has just approved a *Pact for the Future* and a *Declaration for Future Generations* -- on the occasion of its *Summit of the Future*. Crafted with necessary attention to their legal credibility, these could be acclaimed as eminently "rational" and "logical" in the face of the strategic challenges of global civilization. Whilst they may indeed be held to embody an emotional dimension articulated by the world leaders in drafting and approving them -- purportedly to ensure that they are "liked" by the populations which they are held to represent -- the question as to whether they will in fact be "liked" by those populations in practice is quite another matter. For many such articulations will be read through a "spiritual" lens, as possibly understood from an aesthetic perspective. Others may set aside such modalities and see the UN initiatives as an urgent necessity determining the practical action framed by the Sustainable Development Goals and its 169 tasks.

The period is also witness to widespread concern with misinformation and disinformation -- with "fake news" (***). Acclaiming any initiative as appropriate by whatever modality is now readily called into question from that perspective. The pattern is effectively institutionalized in legislative assemblies in which opponents may use any modality to condemn and dismiss strategies advocated by others. The pattern is as evident in the relations between religions and their adherents, as it is in that between academic disciplines and government agencies.

Curiously the possibility that AI might be of considerable value in response to this global crisis is obscured by relatively ill-informed fear-mongering regarding the threat of AI to the future of human civilization. Little attempt is seemingly made to explore and demonstrate in detail how AI might be used to mitigate the challenges to the governance of a knowledge-based civilization -- emotion "trumping" logic? The outcome of the UN-organized AI for Good Summit (2023) does not seem to have contributed to more balanced understanding. Unfortunately the fear-mongering has effectively been embodied in the Global Digital Compact, as approved at the Summit of the Future. Somewhat ironically even the possibility of using AI -- to summarize, analyze and render comprehensible the documents emanating from the Summit of the Future -- has been avoided.

The UN's ambition to "turbocharge" the Sustainable Development Goals on the occasion of the 2024 Summit of the Future was previously explored through a series of interactions with AI (*Turbocharging SDGs by Activating Global Cycles in a 64-fold 3D Array*, 2024). The detection by inspection, and subsequent visualization of feedback loops in that experimental procedure with *ChatGPT* and *Claude*, proved to be encouraging to the point of envisaging an AI-enabled automated detection of indicative SDG cycles that could be essential to their viability. More generally the case was previously made for the use of AI with regard to "Yes" and "No" campaigns on controversial issues and enhancing the coherence of governance in such cases (*Use of ChatGPT to Clarify Possibility of Dialogue of Higher Quality*, 2023; *Coherence of Sustainable Development Goals through Artificial Intelligence*, 2023).

Inspired by the understanding of key cycles essential to biological life, there is then a case for challenging AI to suggest correspondences in systemic terms to cycles potentially relevant to sustainable governance -- in the spirit of [general systems research](#). As an earlier exchange has indicated, both AIs responded surprisingly proactively to this challenge (*Viability of Sustainable Development as Implied by Metabolic Cycles*, 2024).

The responses to the earlier exchange included the implication that AI might well be able to offer significant insights into the transitions between logic, emotion, spirituality, and action -- to the pathways between them -- and the manner in which each was potentially able to "trump" the other. The following is a further exploration of that possibility. A particular interest of such exercises is the question of what can be gleaned from AI "research" of its unprecedented access to vast data resources in response to evocative questions. Also of interest is the manifest engagement of AI with such challenging questions -- if only from a speculative perspective, calling for repeated iteration by which insights of practical value could potentially be derived.

The exploration enabled the Pact for the Future, the *Declaration for Future Generations*, and the *Global Digital Compact* -- as adopted by the UN's Summit of the Future -- to be analyzed by AI in terms of the connectives they failed to use, with the implications for future governance.

As in the previous experiments, the responses of ChatGPT 4o are distinctively presented below in grayed areas, in parallel with those of Claude 3.5. **Given the length of the document to which the exchange gives rise, the form of presentation has itself been treated as an experiment** -- in anticipation of the future implication of AI into research documents. Reservations and commentary on the process of interaction with AI to that end have been discussed separately (*Methodological comment on experimental use of AI*, 2024). Whilst the presentation of responses of two AIs could be readily considered excessive, it offers a "stereoscopic" perspective highlighting the strengths and limitations of each.

As in the previous experiments, the responses of ChatGPT 4o are distinctively presented below in grayed areas, in parallel with those of Claude 3.5. **Given the length of the document to which the exchange gives rise, the form of presentation has itself been treated as an experiment** -- in anticipation of the future implication of AI into research documents. Web technology now enables the whole document to be held as a single "page" with only the "questions" to AI rendered immediately visible -- a facility developed in this case with the assistance of both ChatGPT and Claude 3 (but not operational in PDF variants of the page, in contrast with the [original](#)). Reservations and commentary on the process of interaction with AI to that end have been discussed separately (*Methodological comment on experimental use of AI*, 2024). Whilst the presentation of responses of two AIs could be readily considered excessive, it offers a "stereoscopic" perspective highlighting the strengths and limitations of each.

Show All AI Responses

Potential correspondences between logical, emotional, spiritual and practical modalities

Logical connectives are fundamental to the operation of computers and AI. They are linguistic elements that connect words or phrases in a sentence to express logical relationships between propositions. The set of 16 logical connectives can be variously discussed and represented, notably in relation to the logic of opposition (*Oppositional logic and its geometry -- 16 minus 2 connectives?* 2021). In a period of global concern with misinformation, the relation of those connectives to truth tables is especially relevant.

Given increasing perception that "everything is connected to everything", the connectives are of particular importance in the light of the perceived threat of AI (*Speech acts in being spoken to by artificial intelligence*, 2023). In a period in which there is concern with disconnection from nature, and "cognitive disconnect", connectives are clearly of relevance to the manner by which the global condition is perceived and how it is modelled (*Dangerous loss of connectivity in global modelling and misinformation detection by algorithm?* 2021; *Variety of "ways of looking" -- binary or otherwise*, 2021).

Given the way in which emotion may displace logic in practice, there is necessarily a case for exploring an analogous set of emotional connectives, especially given the perceived set of emotional artificial intelligence. The argument can be generalized to include spiritual connectives, given the manner in which values and principles may take precedence. Similarly it may be asked whether there action-oriented connectives which take precedence over abstractions. In the case of global summitry, there is therefore an argument for exploring the various uses of such connectives (*Relative frequency of use of logical connectives in discourse*, 2023; *Ranking dialogues in terms of use of logical and emotional connectives*, 2023).

A major challenge is the limited awareness of the complete array of connectives, despite a degree of familiarity for their expression in drama. The most helpfully extensive presentation of the array of distinct logical connectives in comprehensible form appears to be that of Maarten van Wijk (*English language lexicalisations of all 16 connectives*, Universiteit Leiden, 2006). An adaptation is reproduced separately (*Application of insights from ChatGPT interaction to use of AI -- and to other initiatives*, 2023).

Question: Could you summarize your earlier response with regard to potential correspondences between logical connectives, emotional connectives, spiritual/intuitive connectives, and practical/action connectives

Show/Hide AI response

The following is reproduced from a question posed in the earlier exercise (*Viability of Sustainable Development as Implied by Metabolic Cycles*, 2024).

Question: Is it not possible that the articulations of "true vs false" in the 16-fold pattern of logical connectives could usefully reframe "like vs dislike", "good vs evil", and "appropriateness vs inappropriateness". It is curious that the extensive reflection on the square of opposition and oppositional logic does not seem to have been adapted to such possibilities.

Show/Hide AI response

Speculative application of logical connectives to other modalities by Claude 3.5 (in response to the question above)				
#	<i>Logical connectives</i>	<i>Emotional connectives</i> (Like vs. Dislike)	<i>Spiritual connectives</i> (Good vs. Evil)	<i>Practical connectives</i> (Appropriate vs. Inappropriate)
1	Contradiction ($p \wedge \neg p$)	Ambivalence (Like \wedge Dislike)	Moral Ambiguity (Good \wedge Evil)	Contextual Ambiguity (Appropriate \wedge Inappropriate)
2	Tautology ($p \vee \neg p$)	Emotional Engagement (Like \vee Dislike)	Ethical Relevance (Good \vee Evil)	Situational Relevance (Appropriate \vee Inappropriate)
3	Conjunction ($p \wedge q$)	Mutual Appreciation (Like \wedge Like)	Virtue (Good \wedge Good)	Social Harmony (Appropriate \wedge Appropriate)
4	Disjunction ($p \vee q$)	Diverse Preferences (Like \vee Like)	Moral Pluralism (Good \vee Good)	Diverse Norms (Appropriate \vee Appropriate)
5	Material Implication ($p \rightarrow q$)	Acquired Taste (Dislike \rightarrow Like)	Redemption (Evil \rightarrow Good)	Adaptation (Inappropriate \rightarrow Appropriate)
6	Converse Implication ($q \rightarrow p$)	Nostalgia (Like \rightarrow Dislike)	Corruption (Good \rightarrow Evil)	Social Faux Pas (Appropriate \rightarrow Inappropriate)
7	Biconditional ($p \leftrightarrow q$)	Consistent Feeling (Like \leftrightarrow Like)	Moral Consistency (Good \leftrightarrow Good)	Consistent Behavior (Appropriate \leftrightarrow Appropriate)
8	Exclusive Disjunction ($p \oplus q$)	Conflicting Opinions (Like \oplus Like)	Ethical Dilemma (Good \oplus Good)	Cultural Misunderstanding (Appropriate \oplus Appropriate)
9	Negated Conjunction ($\neg(p \wedge q)$)	Indifference (\neg (Like \wedge Like))	Amorality (\neg (Good \wedge Good))	Social Neutrality (\neg (Appropriate \wedge Appropriate))
10	Negated Disjunction ($\neg(p \vee q)$)	Polarization (\neg (Like \vee Like))	Moral Relativism (\neg (Good \vee Good))	Cultural Relativism (\neg (Appropriate \vee Appropriate))
11	Material Nonimplication ($p \wedge \neg q$)	Disappointment (Like \wedge \neg Like)	Tragic Flaw (Good \wedge \neg Good)	Social Transgression (Appropriate \wedge \neg Appropriate)
12	Converse Nonimplication ($\neg p \wedge q$)	Pleasant Surprise (\neg Like \wedge Like)	Unexpected Virtue (\neg Good \wedge Good)	Unexpected Propriety (\neg Appropriate \wedge Appropriate)

q)			
13	Nand ($\neg(p \wedge q)$)	Emotional Complexity ($\neg(\text{Like} \wedge \text{Like})$)	Moral Complexity ($\neg(\text{Good} \wedge \text{Good})$)
14	Nor ($\neg(p \vee q)$)	Apathy ($\neg(\text{Like} \vee \text{Like})$)	Nihilism ($\neg(\text{Good} \vee \text{Good})$)
15	Projection Function p	Personal Preference	Personal Ethics
16	Projection Function q	Others' Preference	Societal Ethics
			Behavioral Complexity ($\neg(\text{Appropriate} \wedge \text{Appropriate})$)
			Social Anarchy ($\neg(\text{Appropriate} \vee \text{Appropriate})$)
			Personal Standards
			Societal Standards

In the quest for pathways between essential incommensurable cognitive modalities, the insights offered by the set of familiar dramatic roles identified by Georges Polti are a potential source of clues (*The Thirty-Six Dramatic Situations*, 1895). These are discussed separately as a means of interrelating the array of narratives, plots, agendas, stories and conspiracy theories (*Thirty-six Dramatic Situations faced by Global Governance?* 2022). The question is whether that set is comparable to that of the Chinese classic illustrating a series of stratagems used in politics, war, and civil interaction (*Thirty-Six Stratagems*)

Question: My question relates to the framework by which people might be assumed to transit from logic, to emotion, to spirituality, or to action and whether the juxtaposition of those connectives suggests pathways between them. Potentially relevant in this regard are the 36 dramatic plots of Georges Polti and the 36 stratagems of China. How these might suggest pathways is far from clear, especially if the connectives are held together within a truncated tesseract as previously envisaged. Could you comment on any such transition, given its particular relevance when governance may be determined by any of the 4 sets

Show/Hide AI response

Curiously the set of 16 connectives is questionably reduced to 14 in conventional discussion of connectives (*From 16 to 14 connectives -- precluding a logical meta-perspective?* 2021). The focus on 14 is however potentially of relevance to 14-foldness in governance and aesthetics -- given the challenges to memorability and comprehension (*Pattern of 14-foldness as an Implicit Organizing Principle for Governance?* 2021; *Variety of Rhyming Patterns in Standard 14-line Sonnets*, 2021).

Question: As a parenthetical comment, I note the manner in which you give focus to "contradiction" and "tautology" in the case of the logical connectives. It is precisely these 2 of the 16 which are set aside in the logic of opposition to enable a focus on 14. My reference to dramatic conditions was evoked by recognition of the manner in which each any framing by each of the four may be "trumped" by that of another -- as drama makes only too evident, and is evident in political dynamics. In that sense none of the four can be used to "explain" the transition -- better understood through games.

Show/Hide AI response

Question: As yet to be clarified is how the contrasting dramatic plots (and potentially the stratagems) enable any of the transitions through trumping -- namely a dramatic twist. Especially challenging is how 4x8 (+4) plots might provide such pathways. It is intriguing to note that Western and Eastern swordsmanship employ 14-fold and 8-fold patterns. In the tradition of western swordsmanship, the swordsman is understood to be able to adopt essentially 14 recognizable and effective fighting postures (guards/wards/stances) overall. Of these five are major universal ones that correspond to High, Middle, Low, Hanging, and Back positions. Poetry makes significant use of 14 -- offering another "cognitive lubricant" for any such transition

Show/Hide AI response

Identification of pathways between cognitive modalities

As indicated above, it is particularly questionable whether the pattern connectives is well-recognized in a global civilization in which connectivity is widely emphasized and valued. Clearly some of the connectives are very familiar -- even excessively so given the reliance on them. A concern is therefore how people navigate between cognitive modalities characterized by corresponding connectives -- and whether limited recognition of those connectives renders them vulnerable to those with greater skill in that regard. How many

connectives are used in political or religious rhetoric?

Question: In the light of the earlier response it could be assumed that you would be willing to speculate in more detail on the convoluted pathways between the four connective modes. Of relevance is the limited recognition of the more subtle and elusive logical connectives. There might therefore be a case for focusing on the 8 most familiar in identifying such pathways. Also of relevance is the extent to which those with the art of persuasion for marketing or other purposes may make use of such pathways -- possibly as "games people play" and various forms of blackmail as a trumping device. Entertainment may well have rendered such ploys familiar, in practice without being able to name them. Given to articulation already achieved, my interest is in the seemingly limited ability to recognize and name possible pathways between the four modalities as might be suggested by particular connectives. It is my suspicion that there is great familiarity with many of them (especially the simpler 8) in drama, persuasive rhetoric, "games people play", and the like. I am less interested in the case of particular campaigns, except as offering memorable instances to identify particular pathways

Show/Hide AI response

In an earlier exchange, AIs were challenged to explore the analogy between logical connectives and chess pieces, in the light of how the "moves" of different connectives in dialogue might be distinguished (*Memorable patterns of dialogue in the light of patterns of chess*, 2023).

Question: Arguably there is a degree of recognition in the various adaptations of "games people play" to various domains. Of relevance are Georges Polti's 36 dramatic conditions and the 36 Chinese stratagems. By contrast is the detailed analysis of "moves" and strategies in chess, suggesting the somewhat naive question of how many chess strategies have been rendered familiar by naming. Can pathway exploration be taken further with respect to the four modalities in the light of your response

Show/Hide AI response

Chess and Go implications for Ukraine-Russia, Israel-Palestine, China-Taiwan, and the Koreas

Question: It would indeed be beneficial to go further -- possibly as a means of looking at current debates on Ukraine-Russia or Israel-Palestine. Before doing so, given AI expertise in the game of go, in addition to chess, how would you apply the go framing to the pathway question (as you have applied the chess framing)

Show/Hide AI response

Question: The examples of Israel-Palestine and Russia-Ukraine could have been extended to the Koreas and China-Taiwan -- thereby framing the question as to why cultures with familiarity with the 36 Stratagems and the game of go do not develop the analysis you have offered

Show/Hide AI response

Implications for dialogue in addressing international conflicts

Of particular interest in these experimental exchanges with AI is whether artificial intelligence may in future enable dialogue of greater relevance to global issues and conflicts (*Use of ChatGPT to Clarify Possibility of Dialogue of Higher Quality*, 2023; *Facilitating Global Dialogue with AI?* 2024).

Question: Claims are frequently made regarding the urgent need for dialogue between adversaries faced with prospect of violent conflict. References in the media may well be made to the engagement in such dialogue. Almost nothing is however said about the nature of that dialogue and how it may have been undertaken using negotiation strategies informed by chess or go (for example). By contrast any encounter between "grand masters" of chess or go will be widely followed with the greatest intensity -- move by named move. Given the potential importance of geopolitical dialogue in preventing conflict, could you comment on the nature of such dialogues and the possibility that their secrecy may well conceal strategies which would be considered

simplistic by comparison with those of chess or go

Show/Hide AI response

Pathways between cognitive modalities in courtship

Question: In contrast with the above considerations of the elusive pathways between logic, emotion, spirituality and action, there is a case for recognizing the proactive exploration of such pathways in the various courtship rituals of different cultures in which there may be much effort invested in a "number", a "line", and making a "move". Persuasion in other domains may borrow from such patterns -- whether as "getting to yes" or "scoring". Could you comment on how the contrasting modalities are entangled in such processes -- variously celebrated in poetry and song.

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Alleged to be one of the highest ranking non-fiction books of the 1990s, the relationship counsellor John Gray framed the argument that *Men are from Mars and Women are from Venus*. In exemplifying one of the most divisive distinctions recognized in society, to what extent might such an argument be insightfully reframed with respect to "Western" chess-based strategy in contrast with "Eastern: go-based strategy.

Show/Hide AI response

Dynamics of bipedalism and quadrupedalism indicative of "cognitive gait"

Question: That response offers insights regarding the need to "walk on two legs" in metaphorical terms -- namely the [bipedalism](#) typically associated with walking upright in hominid evolution. The concept of "walking on two legs" has been proposed as a guide to restoration scientists and practitioners in advancing the interconnected processes of indigenous-led restoration and reconciliation in indigenous territories. The argument above with respect to four complementary modalities recalls the phrase of George Orwell: *Four legs good, two legs bad*. It is upheld as a simple but powerful phrase that encapsulates the core theme of his iconic novel, *Animal Farm* (1945). Could you comment on what might remain to be learned by humanity from [quadrupedalism](#) as a cognitive metaphor with insights into "cognitive gait"

Show/Hide AI response

Connective "borrowing" between cognitive modalities

Much is made of the constraints of binary thinking. Ironically it is binary dynamics which constitute the major attractor of a wide variety of games. As a metaphor "game" may consequently be applied to relations between people, institutions and states. The dynamics of democracy and politics is readily framed as a binary game -- with problematic consequences (*Destabilizing Multipolar Society through Binary Decision-making*, 2016). Embedded in what could be caricatured as a "2-stroke democracy", there is a curious lack of interest in more complex games which 3-sided or 4-sided ball games might otherwise suggest (*Insights for democratic global governance from 4-team ball-games: 2-way football?* 2016)

Question: The useful coherence offered by recognition of the four modalities as four "cognitive legs" detracts from recognition of the manner by which they are linked -- even coordinated -- by various pathways between them. Reverting to the correspondence between the four sets of 8 connectives, it remains a challenge to distinguish their 32 articulations and to recognize how a connective in one set may disguise or "borrow" from that in another. This seems to be especially the case with the simplest. The true/false logical distinction is readily "borrowed" in emotional, spiritual or action-oriented terms -- "translated" into like/dislike, good/evil, action/nonaction. Especially problematic is the embodiment of that distinction in game dynamics as "win/lose" in the engagement with another -- further transformed into the problematic dynamics of "anti-

otherness". Could you comment on the singular investment in binary ball games (football, tennis, etc) and the avoidance of experimentation with 3-sided and 4-sided games -- as with two teams playing across another two teams -- despite some experimentation with 3-sided chess and 3-sided football.

Show/Hide AI response

Insightful representation of pathways of 4-fold cognitive patterns

Question: That response acknowledges the challenge of the problematic cognitive load associated with interpreting more complex games -- and the consequent lack of satisfaction offered by a binary outcome. Other than the games mentioned, or 4-footedness, it is therefore intriguing to consider the variety of ways in which a 4-fold pattern of interactions might be represented such as to offer an "overview". [Mandala](#)-style diagrams can trace out connectivity between four sides (especially as in [yantras](#)). A [phase diagram](#) can suggest the boundaries between different physical conditions -- framed by pressure and temperature. Intriguingly a 3-ringed set of [Borromean rings](#) (as logo of the International Mathematical Union) offers a suggestive understanding of the relationship between 3-fold, 4-fold (its loop extremes), and 5-fold (the observer's perspective). Could you comment on this challenge of representation of 4-foldness with other examples.

Show/Hide AI response

Systematic avoidance of complex modality patterns in governance

Question: That response necessarily focuses on a "gross" framing of 4-foldness, avoiding to some degree the 8-fold articulation suggested by a simpler set of logical connectives. Curiously, as noted above, their comprehension tends to be cognitively embodied in argumentation, in interpersonal relations (especially drama), and in the tactics of games. AI is clearly designed to handle the 8-fold pattern through algorithms. The question is how to render them "nameable" and comprehensible -- especially with their 32-fold implications through all 4 modalities. To what extent is global governance determined (unconsciously) by patterns whose exploration and (conscious) recognition is systematically avoided

Show/Hide AI response

Emergent integrative perspective from a 4-fold to a 5-fold modality

Question: Those responses are indicative of the curious significance of "plus one" in relation to patterns of 4-foldness, 8-foldness, or 16-foldness -- as with focus on the 5th discipline, 9-fold configurations, and the 17th Goal of the UN's SDGs. There is necessarily a perspective from which 4-foldness, 8-foldness, or 16-foldness is perceived -- imply a degree of comprehension and integration. Somewhat ironically this function is evident in the role of the "steering wheel" in a 4-wheeled vehicle. Is there a problematic confusion between 4-fold and 5-fold articulations as embodied in 5-fold strategic articulations like that of the UN and Earth4All.

Show/Hide AI response

Transcending the strange cognitive attractor of binary dynamics

Question: This exchange suggests a variety of ways of reframing the tendency to oversimplified discourse exacerbating the challenges of governance. Given the capacity of AI to make explicit use of 8 logical connectives (if not 16), the question remains as how best to apply that capacity to reframing the binary framings of ongoing conflicts (Russia-Ukraine, Israel-Palestine, China-Taiwan, the Koreas, and those of lower global visibility). The exchange has highlighted the value of naming a wider variety of connectives of relevance to problematic "anti-otherness" and misplaced concreteness -- together with that of their representation in other media (visualization, sonification). Less evident are the practical ways forward --

given the manner in which binary articulations function as a "strange attractor".

Show/Hide AI response

Corresponding intelligent connectives in animals and plants?

Question: There is considerable human focus on intelligence and its relationship to logic, irrespective of any recognition of multiple intelligences. Arguably this extends to the implications for any hypothetical encounter with extraterrestrials. There is however a distinctive preoccupation with the connection with the nature and any problematic disconnect in that regard. The question might then be asked whether animals (if not plants) show evidence of recognizing analogues to logical connectives, most notably in the case of emotional intelligence and practical intelligence. From that perspective, is there any trace of their recognition of an 8-fold set of connectives (if not a 16-fold). More intriguing, given the importance attached by many humans to spiritual intelligence (perhaps framed aesthetically or simply as values), to what extent might animals (or plants) be said to cultivate such intelligence

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Potentially, and far more speculatively, there is the sense in which forms of intelligence are inferred by traditional knowledge systems in the case of natural features -- whether trees, rocks, rivers or mountains -- occasionally accorded particular status in lore, if not in conventional legislation. This process may be entangled with traditional recognition of totem species and the curious significance attached to national symbolic animals and by some modern institutions to their mascots. As forms of connection, it is far from clear how these might relate to any articulation of connectives.

Show/Hide AI response

Bridging pathways between cognitive modalities through humour

Many appreciate the reframing of cognitive straitjackets offered by humour. The relevance to international relations is variously recognized. It can be argued that, with playfulness, it constitutes a vital integrative process in governance, religion and transdisciplinarity, if only potentially (*Humour and Play-Fullness*, 2005). It is appropriate to note the early compilation by Victor de Guinzbourg -- and the failure to update it (*The Wit and Wisdom of the United Nations: proverbs and apothegms on diplomacy*, 1961).

Question: Whilst "cognitive gait" offers one coherent insight into the use of complementary "legs", potentially far more widely appreciated is the manner in which humour may shift skillfully between different modalities. Whereas references was made above to the manner in which one mode may "trump" another -- undermining its strengths -- humour may use each to reframe another, potentially such as to offer a transcendent perspective. However the ability to "see the joke" highlights the challenge for those who fail to do so. Could you comment on the role of humour in providing transitions between otherwise incommensurable perspectives.

Show/Hide AI response

Analysis of the pattern of connectives in the UN's Pact for the Future and its Global Digital Compact

Prior to their adoption by the UN's Summit of the Future, the key texts were presented to AIs for comment, most notably the Global Digital Compact in the light of its relevance to AI (*Reframing UN's Global Digital Compact as a coherent memorable pattern*, 2024). Following their adoption, those texts were also presented to AI for analysis in terms of their use of connectives (*Summit of the Future -- Outcome Documents: Pact for the Future, Global Digital Compact, and Declaration on Future Generations*, United Nations, 2024).

The documents have already evoked critical comment, as summarized by Thalif Deen (*UN Summit*

Declaration Receives Critical Response, *Eurasia Review*, 30 September 2024). There it is noted that

What is striking is that the majority of the text is made up of rehashed and recycled wording from previously agreed upon UN documents and the language is largely vague and aspirational. There are hardly any concrete, actionable conclusions that could advance the lofty objectives of the Summit. Instead, there are more calls for reports by the Secretary General and more global meetings (Jamal Benomar, *Diplomacy Now*). .

Question: In the light of the considerations on which you have commented in this exchange, to what extent would it be feasible for you to review the texts of the UN's recently adopted Pact for the Future, the Declaration for Future Generations, and the Global Digital Compact. The analysis requested would be to identify the number of instances of use of each of the 16 logical connectives, or indication of use of analogous emotional, practical or spiritual connectives -- with due recognition of the reservations made in that regard. Spiritual connectives could be understood as references to values or principles beyond any logical framework. The Pact for the Future, as adopted, is hereby shared. Note that Global Digital Compact is Annex I in that document. The Declaration for Future Generations is Annex II

Show/Hide AI response

Question: Could further insight have been gained by taking the analysis further. Given the focus on AI (dependent on the logical connectives) in the Global Digital Compact is the absence of many of the 16 connectives especially significant

Show/Hide AI response

Question: If you can see a way to refine the analysis further this would be appreciated, especially if you could comment further on the absence of the more subtle connectives with which many are totally unfamiliar -- but which are presumably of significance to the future development of AI -- whether in terms of logic or through their correspondences with emotional, action oriented and value oriented preoccupations

Show/Hide AI response



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

For further updates on this site, [subscribe here](#)