

Logical Being

by Sven Nilsen, 2025

In this paper, I argue that Logical Being is not biased toward Pure Being, which is a common misconception. Instead, I see Logical Being as being permutation-invariant over Pure, Process, Wild, Hyper and Ultra Being as used by Kent Palmer to summarize the work done by six philosophers in the previous centuries. I demonstrate this by using contradiction of multiple propositions to construct a 5-dimensional vector model, using the 5 aspects of Being as bases, and equip the model with a semantical suppression mechanism. Each dimension is defined in terms of self-reflection on the model and I show that this is permutation-invariant. Therefore, Logical Being which constitutes the permutation-invariance in this model, is not strictly biased toward any aspect.

The most common critique of Analytic Philosophy is that Logic is biased toward Pure Being. From a path semantical perspective there is no solution to the synthesis between Logic and Language. This is why Path Semantics is needed as a field, so people can explain the differences between Logic and Language and tradeoffs in design, to fill in the gap between reality and philosophy.

However, the research on Path Semantics has concluded that it is possible to treat the fundamental language biases in Joker Calculus, Seshatism and Platonism, as symmetric in some theories. This is now understood as an “internal difference” in philosophy, where the difference is only knowledgable for some speaker of some language and not when seen externally from the outside.

There is a saying that illustrates this phenomena:

*“In theory, there is no difference between practice and theory,
but in practice, there is a difference between theory and practice.”*

This means that it is difficult to make a solid argument from the perspective of Analytic Philosophy to counter-argue the critique of Analytic Philosophy. The very fact when you can not tell the difference between two things, can be used as argument that Logic is biased toward Pure Being.

Now, is this really true, that Logic is based toward Pure Being?
Or, is Logic in fact biased toward a permutation-invariant ontology of Being?

This is not about whether Analytic Philosophy is biased or not. We all know that Analytic Philosophy is biased in some sense. What matters, is precisely in what sense it is biased.

Here, most philosophers simply assumed that Logic is biased toward Pure Being, without actually doing any work to prove it. They use Logic as an example to explain what Pure Being is. If you ask “What is Pure Being?”, a philosopher might answer “Things like science or logic.” So, people assume that philosophers know what they are talking about, but they are not shown any real philosophical argument why this is the case.

In reality, I will argue that the situation is much worse. We do not even know that science has something in common with Logic or Pure Being. As far as I know, nobody have ever proved a such thing. This position comes from over-confidence in feeling knowledgeable about this topic.

It is true that the common use of Logic is biased toward Pure Being. Hence, this is the reason why people accept the argument that Logic is an example of Pure Being. It is intuitively true from usage.

Still, just because something seems intuitively true from usage, does not imply that there are none philosophical positions that are valid to hold that say otherwise. We frequently underestimate how influential use of symbols is in culture. A Path Semanticist, who studies how people use symbols, has to clarify the positions that exist out there, even though they are not commonly held by people.

When people from the field of Analytic Philosophy started attacking Continental Philosophy a century ago, they made a large blunder: They did not do any work on contradiction prior to debate.

It is kind of self-evident that you have to account for contradictions from an analytic perspective, in order to claim to have a better philosophical position from a perspective of Analytic Philosophy. As a consequence, as long this work has not been done, it does not really matter what people said during the debate or what happened, because it is more or less a huge mistake by acting in over-confidence.

Only recently, in the paper “Existential Contradiction Logic” (Sven Nilsen, 2024), contradictions between two propositions were brought up and examined the differences between constructive and classical logic. This was surprising, because nobody even thought that there could be a difference between those logical languages, despite knowing the differences from other perspectives, e.g. the axiom of the Excluded Middle.

With other words, we have to work out contradictions in philosophy by restarting the whole process. Later, when there is a basis to argue from, one might revisit the debate that happened a century ago and try understand what was going on. Until then, such simple questions like “Who is right in this debate?” are not even meaningful.

Very recently, by discussing this with Kent Palmer, I became aware that there are things like contradictions in what Palmer calls “Aspects of Being”. This seems a natural starting point to perform some closer investigation. I was thinking at the time that examining contradictions by multiple propositions, instead of a single proposition, would shine some light on Palmer’s system. However, I now think this is also relevant for talking about Logical Being, to help framing the debate of what Logic has to do with Being. I believe Logical Being is different from Pure Being, so I call it “Logical Being”. By separating the two, we do not risk confusing these two ideas.

Kent Palmer organized Being used by six different philosophers as 5 different aspects (Hegel, Heidegger, Deleuze, Derrida, Badiou, Zizek, plus other philosophers):

- **Pure Being:** Identity. The assertion of identity or self-sameness.
- **Process Being:** Change. The capacity for temporal change and transformation.
- **Wild Being:** Imbalance. The locus of imbalance, tension, and asymmetry.
- **Hyper Being:** Contradiction. The generator and measure of contradiction.
- **Ultra Being:** Residue / beyond. That which is beyond or outside the system.

For example, in Heidegger’s philosophy, “Pure Being” is Present-at-Hand and “Process Being” is Ready-at-Hand. Heidegger thought that Present-at-Hand was when you study something, e.g. a tool that is broken. When you use the tool, it becomes part of your own Being and you are not consciously aware of it. Intuitively, Heidegger saw these two ideas as very different things.

From the perspective of contradictions of multiple propositions, Pure Being is different from Process Being because they contradict with each other. They can not be used in the same context, so people are forced to choose one aspect and stick to it for some time until the work is done.

For Hegel, contradiction was in the thesis, which he called “immanent contradiction”.

Hegel does not believe that contradiction necessarily lead to absurdity. This means, Hegel might have thought about contradiction from the perspective of multiple propositions.

Contradictions of two propositions have just one proposition in classical logic:

$$!(a \& b) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad !a \mid !b \quad \text{in classical logic}$$

In constructive logic, these two sides are not logically equivalent.
You can prove $!(a \& b)$ from $!a \mid !b$, but not vice versa.

Many people believe Hegel came up with thesis-antithesis-synthesis. However, this idea originated with Fichte. Fichte was in turn reacting to Kant, which in turn tried to unify Empiricism and Rationalism. In Fichte's philosophy (Using Joker Dialectics), Rationalism (0) as a self-imposing "I" meets its negation $!0$ before turning into a synthesis $0 \mid 1$ (Rational Empiricism):

$$0 \rightarrow !0 \rightarrow 0 \mid 1$$

This is what people later recognize as the dialectical process:

$$\text{thesis} \rightarrow \text{antithesis} \rightarrow \text{synthesis}$$

Which is NOT how Hegel's philosophy works.

Hegel looked at Schelling's early philosophy $0 == 1$ that unifies reason with nature. Hegel realized that another way to express this was $0 != 0$, so no external nature was needed as a starting point. He puts this in Fichte's thesis instead of 0 :

$$0 != 0 \rightarrow !0 \rightarrow 0 \mid 1$$

Hegel does this to distinguish himself from both Fichte and Schelling, to be recognized on his own.

However, Hegel does not stop there. He think about this dialectical process as a kind of recursion, which he calls "Spirit". This leads to Absolute Knowing $?0 \mid 1$, a state where masked Rationalism sees Empiricism, before turning into Schellings unified reason with nature $0 == 1$:

$$(0 != 0 \rightarrow !0 \rightarrow 0 \mid 1)^n \rightarrow ?0 \mid 1 \rightarrow 0 == 1$$

This system of thought made Hegel one of the most influential philosophers in Western philosophy.

When we interpret Hegel as thinking about contradiction in terms of multiple propositions, it is through the contradictions in the aspects of Being that Palmer uses in his system. People use e.g. Pure Being in one context, instead of Process Being, because they recognize contradictions between these two aspects. This is why they choose to use one aspect.

The choise of aspect of Being can lead to different dialectical processes.

With this in mind, there are 5 aspects of Being: Pure, Process, Wild, Hyper and Ultra.

Yet, when Hegel arrives at $0 == 1$, he claims this is Logic becoming unified with Being. How?

Intuitively, if Logic is biased toward Pure Being, then how can it be unified with the other Beings?

The simple answer could be that Logic is not biased toward Pure Being.

To unify Logic with the 5 aspects of Being, aspects of Being have to be permutation-invariant.

Now, let us first assume that aspects of Being are permutation-invariant. This explains:

1. Why Hegel thinks Logic is unified with Being
2. Why people think Logic is biased toward Pure Being

People think Logic is biased toward Pure Being, simply because they associate invariance with abstraction, which is Pure Being by aligned dimensions of Seshatism vs Platonism language bias.

If I can show that aspects of Being are permutation-invariant, then these two puzzles are solved.

The problem is: Permutation-invariance means that one aspect of Being can be swapped with any other, without the overall system changing. This might seem very strange at first.

Obviously, Pure Being is not like Process Being and vice versa. What is strange with swapping them, is that we tend to think about such operations as some notion of equivalence. Does the swapping mean that Pure Being can be substituted with Process Being and vice versa?

No, I am not claiming that Pure Being is substitutional equivalent to Process Being. At least, I am not claiming that they are, when your perspective of aspects of Being is fixed. What I need to do here, is to give some semantics to aspects of Being that helps understanding how they work.

The trick I use is this: What makes people choose Pure Being vs Process Being, is due to contradictions between them. This means, what makes Pure Being “Pure” from the perspective of using symbols, is that this aspect is semantically suppressed in Process Being. This works the other way too: Process Being suppresses this aspect in Pure Being. The same goes for all aspects: Pure, Process, Wild, Hyper and Ultra. They all suppress their own aspect in the others. What makes one aspect stand out on its own, is the total suppression it receives from all the other aspects.

Formally, each aspect of Being is given a 5-dimensional vector:

- Pure: [1, 0, 0, 0, 0]
- Process: [0, 1, 0, 0, 0]
- Wild: [0, 0, 1, 0, 0]
- Hyper: [0, 0, 0, 1, 0]
- Ultra: [0, 0, 0, 0, 1]

The sum of these vectors have the following property:

$$\sum_{i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}} v_i = [1, 1, 1, 1, 1]$$

Each basis vector correspond to one aspect of Being.

By conserving the sum, each aspect is also preserved as some basis vector. However, under this restriction there is no requirement that the system remains static. It can change over time and be interpreted differently from another perspective. Two people can view the whole system differently.

For example, Alice’s Pure Being `[1, 0, 0, 0, 0]` can be Bob’s `[0.9, 0.1, 0, 0, 0]`.

Both Alice and Bob generally agree upon how to interpret Pure vs Process Being, but Bob thinks about Pure Being in a slightly more dynamic way than Alice does.

Now, Pure Being can be thought of as a particular state of any aspect of Being. When we measure this state accurately, one can think about it as maximizing out Pure Being. The statement about this measuring of aspects of Being can be thought of as $[1, 0, 0, 0, 0]$. This is a self-descriptive system.

Intuitively, Pure Being can be used to measure any aspect of Being. So, in this sense, Pure Being can flow into other aspects of Being and vice versa. Do you see where this is going?

The change in perspective between two people can be thought of as Process Being. When maximizing out Process Being, $[0, 1, 0, 0, 0]$, any permutation can instantly swap to any other permutation. This includes, swapping one aspect of Being with another.

In Process Being, we have the same statement of permutation-invariance as in Pure Being, but from a completely different perspective. Now, we do the same for Wild, Hyper and Ultra Being.

Wild Being is about imbalance. Here, it is a tension and asymmetry between aspects of Being. Since the sum is conserved, there is always tension and asymmetry between various aspects. How much tension and asymmetry? The answer is the same permutation-invariance as before.

Here, Wild Being is yet another completely different perspective than both Pure and Process Being. Still, when applied on this system in isolation, it states the same permutation-invariance. So, we are using this system as a self-description of itself as a system. Logically, we have not changed the description of the overall system. We are just thinking about what it means from different perspectives. They all have the same description.

It is through using this intuition that Logical Being can mean Pure, Process or Wild Being.

Continuing to Hyper Being, which is a generator and measure of contradiction: By suppressing contradiction in the other aspects of Being in $[0, 0, 0, 1, 0]$, there is no contradiction elsewhere in themselves. So, every aspect can mean their full meaning and suppress the other aspects. Still, this suppression that gives meaning to each aspect, is also the contradiction that is Hyper Being.

Like before, with Hyper Being one can see this property from every aspect of Being, so this means that it is permutation-invariant. Now, e.g. $[0.1, 0, 0, 0.9, 0]$ sees Hyper Being as mixed with Pure Being, so the highest Pure Being is at most 0.9 . There is still a lot of contradiction, but less than before. Also, we have less Purity of Pure Being. You can do the same with Process or Wild Being. By reducing contradiction, you can reduce the change between two perspectives (Process). Or, you can reduce the remaining imbalance between aspects of Being (Wild).

You see, these four aspects of Being: Pure, Process, Wild and Hyper seems very different at first, but when studied in this system, they harmonize very well with each other.

The last aspect of Being is Ultra Being. This is about what is beyond or outside the system. Since this aspect is suppressed in the other Beings at $[0, 0, 0, 0, 1]$, there is nothing "beyond" this description. So, Pure, Process, Wild and Hyper Being can fully be what they are on their own. Now, we can take any aspect and see it through the lens of Hyper Being. Not matter which aspect we choose, we get the same permutation-invariance.

That was all! Now I have shown that Logical Being is not biased toward any particular aspect of Being. Logical Being is neither Pure, Process, Wild, Hyper or Ultra. Equivalently: It is all and each.