

Some Theoretical Points for Consideration

VERBAL MEDIA	<p>Strong claim: Language (in its ordinary, prosaic use) is inherently unsuited to describe and express certain ideas having to do with time-base and the in-forming component in events. This may be because the verbal medium is time-activating.</p> <p>Weaker claim: Language has been unable to express and describe certain ideas to do with time-base and the in-forming component in events because it has lacked the relevant concepts. It can be enriched with these concepts once they have been successfully introduced, e.g. through non-verbal media, use of examples, etc.</p>
THE ROLE OF SPACE IN THE T-TRADITION	<p>Strong claim: Spatial concepts have no place in the T-tradition</p> <p>Weaker claim: The concept of space/spatial location is needed to distinguish an event from a duration. Thus the T-tradition, which uses the concept of event, also uses the concept of space. The T-tradition, unlike the S-tradition, attaches special importance to the classifying of events according to time-base, from which it takes the structural principles of the universe to be apparent. Classifying the universe according to the size and location of the objects in it would not reveal the structural principles.</p>
TIME-BASE AND VALUE/ACTION	<p>Strong claim: An understanding of T-base will resolve conflicts by displaying an understanding of 'good/bad', 'right/wrong' from which the best course of action can be seen (perhaps given further information of a practical sort).</p> <p>Weaker claim: An understanding of T-base will not necessarily resolve all internal (intra-personal) conflicts and conflicts between people/groups. When people come to understand T-base they will be likely to change their values and this will be likely to be in the direction of greater harmony. Of course this could be said of many religious and political systems, but the advantage of T-base is that it is more comprehensive, displaying how other systems can be understood within the T-base framework.</p> <p>Strong claim: Understanding of T-base allows one to make some definite value judgements and underpins an assignment of authority to T-based informed practitioners.</p> <p>Weaker claim: Understanding of T-base is likely to make one more appreciative of T-based informed practitioners.</p>
THE ROLE OF THE ATEMPORAL	<p>Strong claim: The concept of the atemporal features in the T-but not the S-tradition.</p> <p>Weaker claim: The concept of the atemporal features in both traditions, but it is event-scores, not object-scores, which reveal the in-forming/motivational structure of the universe.</p>
THE ROLE OF HABITS A AND B	<p>Strong claim: They show how the concepts of space and time can be derived from the more fundamental concepts of extendedness and number.</p> <p>Weaker claim: The concepts of space and time are primitive and are used in constructing the concepts of A and B.</p>
QUESTIONS	<p>Is State O a particular (there's only one) or a type (there are many instances of it)?</p> <p>Does the square canvas of the T-base roller represent the atemporal or the complete history of the universe?</p>

Some Practical Points

Scientists and philosophers advancing a theory have an awareness of what would lead them to reject a formulation because it is conceptually incoherent (confused) or because it doesn't fit the empirical evidence. They have a long experience of having rejected formulations (some of which may have been very fondly held, or seemed like very good ideas) for these reasons, and have a technique for rejecting and reformulating which they can apply alone or after receiving feedback from others who have pointed out evidence or conceptual relations that they haven't noticed. To fully assess a theory one must try all ways of defending it by adjusting it (and reformulating it), sometimes weakening the claims it makes to accommodate the problems arising, whilst maintaining a firm grasp of what constitute problems for the theory.

In seeking to communicate a theory, i.e., get others to understand and accept it, a monologue is useful primarily at the initial state of presentation. After that it's necessary to find out how others are interpreting the formulation and what they see as difficulties.

When you change your formulations it never seems to be because of some articulated conceptual confusion, or conflict with the evidence. Rather it is more like the way an artist refines a work. Your natural way of engaging in discussion (the monologue) leaves no prospect for discovering how others are interpreting you and what they see as difficulties. Your (re)formulations never embody problems for your position (thought up yourself or taken from others) forcibly expressed, together with your response to the problem (as do philosophical and many scientific treatises).