Introduction to Language Bias

by Sven Nilsen, 2025

Language bias is a concept that helps bridging language gaps in design and philosophy. It solves some of the issues of using gender in too many contexts, that is resulting from an erroneous anthropomorphized observer effect upon the material perspective of the human body. Language bias also helps relaxing the tension between duality and non-duality. It allows ideas to flow more effortlessly between domains and can also assist in clarification efforts by using formal languages.

Humans attribute erroneously emotions to biological organizations, and the confusion of not being able to separate different language biases from each other leads to many unnecessary conflicts and suffering for many people. One such example is the use of gender[1] as a concept applied to many contexts which differ greatly in nature. Gender is an example of humans using language in a way that stretches beyond practical use into too many categories, that makes any effort to define it meaningless. People do not agree on specific definitions and lack signifiers in language to separate different contexts and use of gender in language from each other. So, gender is a term that has been over-used, not because people find it useless, but because they lack a better term of language bias.

Language bias can be used to talk about subsets[2]. For example, if there is a language with 3 symbols, then one can pick out 2 of the symbols and design a new language. This does not imply that the language with 2 symbols is less powerful or less general in every context. In computer science, a binary computer can be efficient, although a ternary computer[3] can be more efficient than binary for some applications. The theoretical optimum is a combination of 2 and 3, but mostly 3 symbols, depending on context[4].

When one person speaks about language bias in the context of computer science and the construction of hardware, people listening can figure out from the context that the person might be talking about using 2 versus 3 symbols. Logically, there is no specific benefit of using 2 over 3 or vice versa, as the use in every context is logically equivalent. However, in practice, people care whether an executing program requires a lot of memory or time to complete. So, logic itself has a language bias and likewise, execution of programs has the corresponding dual language bias.

In aesthetics[5], language bias plays a major role. Language bias is the particular set of attributes or constraints in design that give rise to some aesthetics. Architects and designers develop philosophies to achieve high quality, judged often subjectively and in ways that are not easy to verify. This results in vague definitions and applying names to historical and new inspirations. So, both the design and the judgement in aesthetics has language bias intrinsic built-in as part of the process. Using language bias in aesthetics does not burden people by pointing out a particular direction or inspiration, while carrying a precise meaning that allows listeners to figure out what is being said.

Like gender, language bias allows people to figure out a specific definition applied in a particular context by careful reasoning, but unlike gender, language bias does not carry the emotional baggage that has resulted from a long history of oppression and abuse. This is why using language bias can be helpful when gender would be too provocative. Language bias holds a neutral and open ended position, which invites people to contribute their views instead of holding them at distance.

Joker Calculus[6] is a formal language that has two modes of evaluation, the Open and Closed variants. This allows expressions to take on meaning relative to holding or grasping when referring to the human hand, which is Present-At-Hand or Ready-At-Hand in Heidegger's[7] philosophy and

Pure Being or Process Being in Hegel's[8] philosophy. The fundamental bases in Joker Calculus are Platonism and Seshatism, that credits knowledge by abstraction and causality, respectively.

The use of Joker Calculus allows people to apply language bias to many domains that can clarify their perspective, insight or philosophical position. Since the bases are Platonism and Seshatism, the language bias also carries over to the traditional use of gender, since Plato is male and Seshat is female. It also carries over to the traditional use of theology and mythology, since Plato is mortal and Seshat is divine. Platonism is encoded with `0` and Seshatism is encoded with `1`, which makes it easy to interpret Joker Calculus as a formal language that extends the binary system `0, 1`. Therefore, Joker Calculus can be applicable to something as fundamental as Information Theory, but also transition over to highly complex philosophical topics. This flexibility is both powerful and precise: People who learn to use Joker Calculus can quickly navigate the complex landscape of philosophy without relying on particular terminology developed by various philosophers. For example, when applying Joker Calculus to Heidegger's philosophy, it is implicitly understood that one is working with the language bias of that context. When people apply Joker Calculus to other philosophers, e.g. Hegel's or Deleuze's[9] philosophy, they can make the transition without confusing readers or listeners, that this use of language bias holds in a particular context but also connects ideas across different domains of philosophy through the same formal language.

Philosophy of the past century (20th) was heavily influenced from the outside, of scientific developments in the century before (19th), that took off from Darwin's approach to Naturalism by applying qualitative observations in combination with testing hypotheses about the general state of the world. Terminology such as gender, species, families and evolution are common in philosophers' vocabulary today. Not many philosophers are consciously aware of this, but take it for granted since all people around them practice philosophy in a similar way. However, Darwin influenced language of philosophy significantly that changed philosophy from being an umbrella of mastering various scientific and humanistic disciplines, to splitting up in specialized domains that use similar terminology but applied to different contexts. This has made entry into philosophy much harder and separated amateur philosophers from professional philosophers, creating a split between those that approach philosophy through curiosity and those that make a career out of it. As a result, a confusion has appeared where many people think that the way they use terminology applies to more contexts than it does in real life. It might be a result from applying Darwin's new ideas at the time, to various domains without the supporting scientific evidence, that caused a lot of suffering. In many ways, a similar pattern to the one about over-extending gender, has happened before recent times. So, when looking back at the modern history of philosophy, it seems useful to apply language bias to the development of new ideas that changed the way philosophy was practiced.

It is easy to look back at the history of philosophy and be judgmental, due to the immense suffering that resulted from bad ideas which were inspired by philosophical developments. However, to make progress, people should put more weight on precise terminology and make some effort to spread the use of precise terminology in their community. Otherwise, one might risk that people get obsessed with the past and caught up in it like a net. While history can teach us valuable lessons, it can also make it difficult for people to move on by focusing too much on what has happened before. It is tempting to use terminology established by famous philosophers as an argument from authority. However, it is important to invite people to dialogue in a such way that they feel their voice is heard and they have something valuable to contribute to in discussions. Here, using language bias as terminology can make it easier for people to participate and make philosophy a social activity, perhaps to reduce some of the isolationist tendencies in modern times.

Overall, precise use of terminology does not mean lack of knowledge transfer from one domain to another. A better design is by using proper terminology that is not explicitly tied up with some specific area or interest. Use of over-extended terminology can have severe consequences later on.

Another domain where it is useful to understand language bias better, is the contrast of emphasis on either duality or non-duality. This use can itself be very dualistic and cause made-up problems in debates. While Joker Calculus might be perceived as dualistic due to its two fundamental bases, it can also clarify the unbiased status or putting the two bases besides each other on equal footing.

This means that people do not have to make a choice between duality or non-duality. They can perceive both positions as authentic on their own and view the harmony in combined use. Overall, it is important to admit that wrong use of philosophy can result in great suffering and people should do some effort to use terminology that does not put more baggage into the historical development of philosophical ideas. People need to move on from naive stances toward duality or non-duality.

At the same time as people move on, one also has to admit the suffering that happened historically. Essentially, the great misunderstanding of Seshatism vs Platonism, by increasingly favor Platonism, hence crediting knowledge by abstraction, over Seshatism that credits knowledge by causality.

People should move on from the past, yet also accept what happened historically, as a part of our past. The past does not go away just because people move on. Seshatism vs Platonism is part of our intellectual tradition, even though people did not think that much through that lens that knowledge is generated in multiple forms. The lack of foresight and understanding of these two language biases from around Plato's period and forward, is partially the cause of the great suffering that followed in the following two millennia. By enabling the use of this terminology, it can both help people to move on, but also ground philosophical ideas better in the historical development.

There is a Platonic perspective of ideas that enables moving on without being burden down, using abstraction. There is a Seshatic perspective of ideas that reflects upon the historical development, by causation. The combined use allows people to balance out biases toward the nihilistic opposites of either root bias, which favors less thinking and doctrinal oppression. Acknowledging and accepting the past is important psychologically, both to ground and to move on, at the same time.

The future is very likely not going to be a utopia, but hopefully, it possible to avoid a dystopia. The future, regardless of what it is going to be like, is going to be real. This is important to keep in mind when moving forward, that people carry responsibility with them. The ability to change the future is always in the moment, no matter what happened in the past or what plans or dreams people have for the future.

Language bias is not about dreaming up an unrealistic utopia, neither is it designed to seduce people into a downward spiral. Language bias is a tool, but it is also a tool designed to help balance out things mentally such that one can focus better on what matters: The real.

This is needed because the future is going to be real and likely neither an unachievable dream, nor bottom-less suffering. However, without a tool to help us balance, one risks a lot of suffering, similar to the suffering that happened from bad ideas in the past. This is a real risk of the future. Looking back at the past, confirms that people who had unrealistic expectations for the future were disappointment, but also many doom sayers ended up wrong, sometimes due to new ideas that appeared unexpected. It is possible to be causally optimistic within the context of applying language bias, because it is something not tried before, where philosophers mostly tried to establish terminology that had root in their intellectual property and not as a shared public good. Language should not be owned by anyone.

This introduction puts emphasis on the motivational aspects of using language bias. This is because language bias is a highly technical and difficult philosophical topic. Only with sufficient motivation one can justify the investment into the exploration of the landscape around the concept of language

bias. Furthermore, as this research aims to become a shared public good, there are not many economic incentives by individuals to pursue it. Yet, this work has to be done in order to make progress.

Language bias deals with the real, it is also complex in ways that many people find off-putting. The real is always complex. It is not possible to hide the complexity behind simplified ideology. Simplified ideologies usually results in more suffering than less. Exploring language bias is a mental burden that is taken up by carrying responsibility and to live a life with purpose.

Currently, it is difficult to get any leverage from the professional philosophical community regarding research on language bias, so the pioneers of applying language bias must expect to sacrifice their effort in hope to achieve a better world. The call for joining this effort, is not a call for huge investments, but to inform people honestly about what to expect if they were to enter. A little bit honesty pays off in the longer run.

References:

[1]   "Gender"
          Wikipedia
          https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gender

[2]   "Subset"
          Wikipedia
          https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Subset

[3]   "Ternary computer"
          Wikipedia
          https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ternary_computer

[4]   "Radix-Less Symbolic Efficiency"
          Sven Nilsen, 2024
          https://github.com/advancedresearch/path_semantics/blob/master/papers-wip2/radix-less-symbolic-efficiency.pdf

[5]   "Aesthetics"
          Wikipedia
          https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aesthetics

[6]   "Joker Calculus"
          AdvancedResearch
          https://github.com/advancedresearch/joker_calculus

[7]   "Martin Heidegger"
          Wikipedia
          https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Martin_Heidegger

[8]   "Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel"
          Wikipedia
          https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Georg_Wilhelm_Friedrich_Hegel

[9]   "Gillez Deleuze"
          Wikipedia
          https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gilles_Deleuze