Chaos Out of Order
How Anti-natural Human Rules Make a Mess of Life

By Alan Rayner

'Entropic' (pen and ink on paper, circa 1990). *The imposition of hierarchical order on natural flow geometry creates distress and turbulence*

I have long wanted to see mathematics and science being applied properly to Nature and human problems, with a comprehensive understanding of what can and cannot be quantified, and how and why and in what circumstances. Plus a comprehensive understanding of what numerical quantities actually signify.

I have therefore been dismayed by the way I have actually experienced mathematics and science being taught and practised, in effect as a form of post-hoc rationalization. This divides in order to rule over natural continuity, only then to consider how to 'reconnect' it into a pale shadow of the original that in no way comes close to 'explaining' it, while claiming fraudulently to do just that.

This fraudulence has become absorbed into systems of governance that inherently make a mess of life by imposing rules that contradict the reality of natural pattern, process and relationship. It becomes apparent (at least it did to me) as soon as you ask a simple basic question like 'what makes any body visible?' Whereupon, with just a little contemplation, it becomes clear that 'every body is a dynamic inclusion of space in form and form in space'. Whereby 'space' is omnipresent, frictionless and hence receptive stillness and matter, from subatomic scale outwards, is dynamically informed by energetic response around receptive (gravitational) centres of space.

Hence, if it is truly to be 'natural' - and not anti-natural ('abstract') - any numerical figure MUST be a dynamic inclusion of its spatial and energetic neighbourhood ('ground'/ 'habitat' /'situation'), NOT

an independent entity. It must be dynamically distinct, not statically (or statistically) discrete. No 'one' is 'alone' ('all one' or 'all there is').

So, if you ask me how to quantify 'receptive stillness' and 'energetic response', my first thought is that neither can be quantified in isolation from the other (as per abstract binary/digital/Boolean logic). BUT THEIR RELATIONSHIP CAN, because every naturally OCCURRING body is itself an expression of this relationship, but never as a COMPLETE entity ('whole' or 'independent singleness') in itself (cf Gödel's Theorem).

I am reminded here of Mandelbrot's approach to quantifying 'degree of irregularity' in terms of 'fractal dimension' as the relationship between radius of spatial field, and structural amount measured within it at different scales of view. And also the relationship between radius and circumference of a circle (not a 'rational' number).

But I also come back to the true and original nature of calculus and the infinitesimal interval as a more than zero, less than finite ('whole' or 'part-whole'/'fraction') dynamic locality in which an 'instantaneous rate of change' can be quantified. The latter in effect combines receptive stillness and energetic response in terms of the numerical relationship between them. But it should not be defined as a linear length that can be summed (integrated) with others into curvature, without implicitly incorporating space. Linear structure is a derivation from curved structure, formed dynamically as an energetic response to receptive spatial influence, not vice versa.

https://occurrity.com
http://www.spanglefish.com/exploringnaturalinclusion