Practical Applications of the Dialectical Logic Symbol System

Lin, Chia Jen

University of Manchester

December 4, 2024

Abstract

Introducing two fun games of Dialectical Logic Symbol System and the safety of this System

This article is not an academic paper but rather a practical guide. For me, the applications of this dialectical logic symbol system can be divided into two types: practical applications in everyday life and academic applications. The academic applications explore how to correctly derive propositions from a continuum of thought, how to harmoniously correspond with other logical and symbolic systems, and how to support existing sound theories. These aspects require serious collaborative thinking. However, this article primarily introduces some interesting and practical everyday applications.

The application and reasoning methods of this dialectical logic symbol system are highly flexible and diverse. This flexibility is ensured by the category of reciprocity and its subsequent categories and final discussions that I have established, which are designed to safeguard the user's stability and freedom, including the ability to opt out at any time. Below, I will briefly introduce two recently discovered ways to play with the system in everyday life:

The Building Block Game

Imagine Axiom One as a building block, and the structure ¬·x∼y·¬ as another block. You can combine these two blocks with Axiom Three to create Block Three:

You have the following two blocks:

- Block One: Axiom One: ǒ
- Block Two: ¬·x∼y·¬

Now, by using Axiom Three, you can assemble them to get Block Three:

ǒ¬·x∼y·¬

At this point, you notice that Block Three has the following properties, which relate to the essence of the thing-in-itself:

ǒ¬·x~y·¬TIF

ǒ¬·y~x·¬TIF

Or you can let this “thing itself” develop further:

y¬·ǒ~x·¬ID

y·¬·x~ǒ·¬

y¬·x~⌀·¬

Now, you can start thinking about the relationship between the thing-in-itself and its actual circumstances. At this stage, you would use Block Four: “≡” (Affirmation). By combining Block Three with Block Four, you get a logical formula in the categories of actuality, which we will call Block Five:

Block Five: ≡y¬·x~ǒ·¬

At this point, you can let Block Five (in this case it is the first logical formula of CONT) develop freely, applying the operations of one of the four categories of actuality, or you can use Block Six: “ἐ” (Self) to determine the direction of this actuality.

This is the general method of playing with blocks. Since the axioms are flexible, you can use this method to construct various continuums of thought and find ways to connect them through the categories. Now, let me introduce the second way to play with the system in everyday life:

Self-Discovery Game

This approach requires you to ask yourself a profound, self-reflective question, such as “What is the essence of myself right now?” and then write down two answers. For example, you might provide the following two self-descriptions:

Description One

ἐ≡x¬·y∼ὄ·¬

This description roughly states: *I am currently an essence distinct from ὄ, and the actuality of this essence is the unity of x and y.*

Description Two

ἐ≡ὄ¬·a∼x·¬

This description roughly states: *I am currently an essence unified with the objective actuality ὄ, where this actuality itself abstracts x through negation and abstracts negation through a.*

For interpreting the above self-descriptions, users can refer to the textual interpretation of the **RECI ()** category as discussed in my paper.

Descriptions One and Two are referred to as the *initial settings*. You now need to select one description as the *starting point* and the other as the *endpoint*. Then, begin thinking about how to connect the two into a continuum of thought using various categories. You can base your reasoning on factors or considerations such as efficiency, complex actualities, and deep reflective needs to decide which category to use. Below, I will consider "efficiency":

Setting Description One as the Starting Point

By applying SID2(x, y):

SID2(x, y)
≡x¬·ŏ~y·¬   A structure derived by reverse reasoning from Description One
ἐ≡x¬·y~ŏ·¬   Description One
ἐ·≡x¬·y~⌀·¬
ἐ·x≡¬·⌀~·¬
ἐ·≡x¬·ŏ~·¬
ἐ≡x¬·ŏ~a·¬
ἐ≡ŏ¬·x~a·¬ID
≡ŏ¬·a~x·¬

Now, use TIF to swap the positions of a and x.

≡ŏ¬·x~a·¬TIF

Now, let your "self" (ἐ) appear before the actuality "≡ŏ¬·x~a·¬TIF," and you will arrive at Description Two:

≡ŏ¬·x~a·¬TIF

ἐ≡ŏ¬·a~x·¬   Description Two

The process above, starting from Description One, applying SID2(x, y), and finally using TIF, can roughly be summarized as follows: "I began from a foundation opposed to objectivity, utilized SID2(), a category that facilitates the unification of self (ἐ) and being (ŏ), which allowed me to establish the foundation of the thing-in-itself, and ultimately returned to the more harmonious Description Two."

The above calculation is based on the consideration of "efficiency." In reality, users need to evaluate and determine the most suitable approach themselves.

Inner and Outer Structure

The process described above, which links the starting point and the endpoint using SID2(x, y) and TIF, can be referred to as forming a “dialectical loop” (環). Once the loop is established, we can begin defining what constitutes “inner” and “outer.” For example, we can designate the generated logical formulas as the “outer.” If we define them as “outer,” we must then consider how to redefine ἐ≡x¬·y~ὄ·¬ and ἐ≡ὄ¬·a~x·¬ as “inner.” Let us attempt the following:

Inner Framework:

1.

ἐ≡x¬·y~ὄ·¬ Description One

ἐ≡y¬·x~ὄ·¬ID →ἐ≡y

2.

ἐ≡ὄ¬·a~x·¬ Description Two

≡ὄ¬·x~a·¬

≡x¬·ὄ~a·¬ID

Removing ≡:

x¬·∅~a·¬

x·¬·~∅·¬

x¬·~ὄ·¬

¬·x~ὄ·¬ID

Next, insert the derived ἐ≡y (from ἐ≡y¬·x~ὄ·¬ID → ἐ≡y) into the structure:

3.

¬·x~ὄ·¬ID ← ἐ≡y

ἐ≡y¬·x~ὄ·¬

ἐ≡x¬·y~ὄ·¬ID

System Security

Below, I will map certain logical formulas to the Four Jhānas and Eight Samādhis (四禪八定). I will use Chinese labels for clarity. This mapping will demonstrate to users how the system ensures security and stability:

The Category of Reciprocity

RECI (x, y)　對應初禪天界

ε̇≡x¬·ǒ~y·¬

ε̇≡ǒ¬·x~y·¬ ID

ε̇·≡ǒ¬·y~x·¬

ε̇·≡y¬·ǒ~x·¬ ID

ε̇≡y¬·x~ǒ·¬

ε̇≡x¬·y~ǒ·¬ ID

ε̇·≡x¬·ǒ~y·¬

ε̇·≡ǒ¬·x~y·¬ ID

ε̇≡ǒ¬·y~x·¬

ε̇≡y¬·ǒ~x·¬ ID

ε̇·≡y¬·x~ǒ·¬

ε̇·≡x¬·y~ǒ·¬ ID

ε̇≡x¬·ǒ~y·¬

(fi)* RECI (x, y): ε̇≡* RECI (x, y) ∧ ε̇·≡* RECI (x, y)

N(ε̇)

ε̇·≡ǒ¬·x~y·¬ →ε̇·≡ǒ

ἐ·ἐ≡ø¬·x~y·¬ →ἐ·ἐ≡ø 對應 「二禪天 或 光界」

ἐ·ἐ≡ø¬·y~x·¬TIF →ἐ·ἐ≡ø

ἐ·ἐ≡ø¬·x~y·¬TIF →ἐ·ἐ≡ø

ἐ·ἐ≡¬·ø~y·¬ ID

ἐ· ≡ἐ¬·~ø·¬

ἐ≡ἐ¬·~ő·¬ 對應「三禪天界 或 淨界」

ἐ≡ἐ·¬·ő~·¬

ἐ≡ἐ¬·ø~·¬

ἐ≡ø¬·~·¬ ID 對應「四禪天 與 無量空入處界」

ἐ¬·ő~·¬

(fi)*N (): ἐ· ≡ő* N (1) ∧ [ἐ·ἐ≡ø * N (2) ∨ ἐ·ἐ≡ø * N (3) ∨ ἐ·ἐ≡ø * N (4)]

The Identity of Self ἐ and Being ő

ID (ἐ)

ἐ¬·ő~·¬

ő¬·ἐ ~·¬ID

Transition to Categories in the Doctrine of Being and Becoming

DB(ἐ)

¬·ἐ~ő·¬

¬·ő~ἐ·¬

¬·ø~ἐ·¬

¬·~ø·¬

BC

¬·∼ǒ·¬

¬·ǒ∼·¬

¬·⌀∼·¬

¬·∼⌀·¬

¬·∼ǒ·¬

Theorem of Double Affirmations

ἐ·ἐ≡⌀

≡≡⌀

≡ǒ

⌀

NB(ἐ)

ἐ·≡ǒ¬·x∼y·¬ →ἐ·≡ǒ

ἐ·ἐ≡⌀¬·x∼y·¬ →ἐ·ἐ≡⌀

ἐ·ἐ≡⌀¬·y∼x·¬ →ἐ·ἐ≡⌀

ἐ·ἐ≡⌀¬·x∼y·¬ →ἐ·ἐ≡⌀

ἐ·ἐ≡¬·⌀∼y·¬ ID

ἐ·≡ἐ¬·∼⌀·¬

ἐ·ἐ¬·∼ǒ·¬

ἐ·¬·ἐ∼ǒ·¬ ID

ἐ¬·ǒ∼ἐ·¬

ǒ¬·ἐ∼ἐ·¬ ID

ǒ≡

⌀　對應「有身滅」

(fi)*NB (): ἐ·≡ǒ* NB (1) ∧ [ἐ·ἐ≡⌀ * NB (2) ∨ ἐ·ἐ≡⌀ * NB (3) ∨ ἐ·ἐ≡⌀ * NB (4)]

Theorem of Nothing ⌀' Absoluteness

ǒ¬·ἐ~ἐ·¬ ID

ǒ≡

⌀

But

ǒ　對應「緣有第一」

⌀≡

⌀¬·ἐ~ἐ·¬

¬·⌀~ἐ·¬ID

¬·~⌀·¬ 對應「無所有入處界」

Double Affirmation

≡≡

≡¬·¬

≡¬·~·¬ 對應「無量空入處界」

ἐ·ἐ¬·~·¬

ἐ·¬·ἐ~·¬ID

ἐ¬·~ἐ·¬

¬·ἐ~ἐ·¬ID 對應「緣 非想非非想入處」

Axiom One 「有第一」 combines “¬·ἐ~ἐ·¬ID”「非想非非想」

ǒ¬·ἐ~ἐ·¬ID

ǒ≡

∅

Establishment of a Dialectical Logic Symbol System: Inspired by Hegel’s Logic and Buddhist Philosophy: https://philpapers.org/rec/LINEOA-4