

Systems

by Kate Jones, DSPE



Trifolia: From singularity to infinity, how differences combine and flow.
(Gamepuzzles.com, <https://www.gamepuzzles.com/edgmtch4.htm#TF>)

The more I think about it, the more I find recurring formulas appearing in every field. “Field” itself is a descriptive term for the organization of all that belongs to a certain category. Wherever I look, everything impinges on my consciousness and seeks to relate itself to everything else I have ever experienced.

The mind becomes a filing system; and after enough years of schooling and ruling are collected, comparing all that exists in one’s surroundings, a value system develops of what is right or wrong in

the choices one makes and the actions one takes. And how does one react to one’s recognition of what may be right and wrong? How does one even recognize and define the difference?

What is this complex emotional equipment that tests every nuance of every event, every word heard, and every attitude received? What are these feelings that arise as a reaction to every moment of the day, every interaction with other individuals? I have noticed, for example, how every person has a unique collection of attitudes and evaluations

of any subject. Even in agreements, there will be subtle deviations. And every sliver of difference tends to provoke a disagreement or fault-finding, which may devolve into arguments of accelerated emotions—in their extreme stage, advancing to lawsuits and physical blows.

What are the roots of such clashes? If the disputants managed to define objectively what constitutes the roots and structures of their differences, could the analysis remain in the intellectual realm, or are the emotions inevitably pulled in as permanent fetters blocking modification of attitudes? What are emotions and what makes them operate with such intensity?

My observations, setting my own emotions aside, suggest an explanation comparing emotions—the sensations driving reactions as an energy field—as provoked feelings of discomfort, anger, fear, every shade of negative vibrations that begin as psychic awareness and end with physical agitation that readily devolves into hostility and violence against a seeming adversary.

I have often pondered what formula controls a creature's reactions to assumed danger that blocks out all logical thought. When does preservation enter in a non-damaging form? Can it ever? By what process of evolution has the animal's (including a human's) built-in response taken the form of unthinking ferocity? Is there a way to modify it to develop an introspective solution based on benevolence, conscious intelligence, long-range foresight, respect for differences? How can a mind recognize that differentness need not trigger instant aversion and destructive responses rather than constructive acceptance and improved utilization?

Observing impartially, I have perceived that a form of logic has evolved through the ages that mirrors a life-form's prime directive of self-preservation. Ideas, even erroneous ones, follow that same formula and, being conditioned to retain an evolved form, unquestioningly nurture an error until its most extreme form signals that

self-preservation would indicate that change is needed.

Whether the mode of change will be for a more successful preservation may not become evident without a series of potential failures. The mind's associative functions cannot tell well-reasoned processes from poorly formed rationalizations. Its priorities may be misplaced, and the system congratulates itself for its new integration.

Comparing how systems develop with every other form of self-ordered process could lead to new insights and assist problem-solving among the millions of different rituals that humans have attempted, often in ascending stages of failure. If it were not for the proviso that self-replication through mating is a strongly addictive form of pleasure that overrides all other physical, mental, and sensory functions, human life might not have survived to its current form.

Evolution of systems at every level of operation has made learning, memory, replication, epistemology, decision-making, and value recognition the meta-system of survival. The ever-growing complexity of the interconnectedness of human decisions and actions has accumulated a continuity of conflicts that lead to a sad delay of communal coherence. Yet systems *can* collaborate, as humans have found through the structure of language, mathematics, science, encyclopedias, art, invention, and an ever-widening spread of knowledge, including recognition of what is held in common.

Now, if only the animal remnant of the instinct for violence that still dominates human motivations and relationships could be understood and exterminated, a major advance of intellectual development and human civilization could at long last be reached. For a race that is in the doorway of future space travel and seeding of intelligent life in the Universe, an end to self-destructive motivations is fervently to be wished. How many of us will it take to make a dent in that evolutionary malfunction? [Ω](#)