

I find this piece very valuable as showing how the presentation I have made strikes another person who has spent a lot of time on it.

The order in which I rate the content of the event-based concept is not the same, of course, and I need to put down the difference between what I want to say (to have said) and what emerges from a straight read through of your essay.

Elemental intentions in the account which do not seem evident in text.

1. The first objective in using this resolution of structure to the terms T-B x I is that it brings mental events into the same framework as objects and situations of any kind. The phrase 'Any structure as..' means that our totality is in these terms, (and
- 2.) but that we cannot say it is anything because the medium is one that uses the similarity rather than the absolute 1:1 relation between medium and referent, the latter being implied by the word is.
3. The dimensionality of event subsumes the 3-dimensionality of space and 1 of time, by adopting the relatedness between three components of the dimensionality of event, viz: (as in TBDI) Passing time effect; time-base; and omnipresent. My referee for this dimensionality is Park who spells out very distinctly how physics uses a form of time-base (Fourier transformations) and atemporal continuum which is the same as my Plane Z omnipresence. Other referees appear in the physics dept., eg D Bohm, and the Gregory O-Structure. All of these say quite specifically that we are not structurally interpretable in terms of either space or time in the sensory Newtonian picture.
4. As the physicists affirm, this framework of dimensions is incongruent with the language and incongruous to the sensory perception. As Park says, we find no equivalent for passing time in the brain. So something about event structure is true which applies to the brain (as processing information across the whole T-B spectrum (AZ)) and the processes we regard as psychological.
- 4.1 We can think of the idea Insistance as closely related to the idea Intention.
5. The newly proposed framework is representable visually and therefore converting the time-frame into a space-frame with the Insistance/intention or in-forming component visible in the way the form is informed.
6. The need for an understanding is forced to the scrutiny of the Least Event point-of-origin. Without such a point of origin in the shared language all interpretations will be 'hunting' for the precision afforded by it and we will be faced with provisional and often mutually incompatible verbalisations. (Hence the disaster in the Wittgenstein example of a good intuition spoiled by its medium.
7. You end with positive apprehension of the use in social contexts (and their political and economic associations). How much more Pax we can derive from the comprehensive picture inclusive of the LE, the contra argument to which you subscribe I in turn do not follow. If statistically the quantum of action can be either a traversing or a quasi-stationary event that = the indeterminacy space, then this argues for the LE being essentially in either an A or a B form.