

GOAL OR NOT GOAL

William Bricken

August 1985

Continuing our discussion of the *Universality of Goals* -- the degenerate case:

In the *Empty Mind* scenario, the Goal is to have no Goal. This is instantly recognizable as the paradoxical self-referencing sentence:

Goal = No Goal

Traditional programming constructs break under this specification.

The mathematics of Losp, at a most abstract level, provides tools to program inherent paradox, specifically the ATOMIC CIRCULARITY, or by another name, the IMAGINARY BOOLEAN. The cost of using this approach is to abandon Aristotelian logic, and to abandon any input-output model. That is, atomic circularity is autonomous. That is, the mathematics of No Mind is independent of impossible goal structures.

Abstractly, the two arithmetic axioms of Losp delineate the territory:

() () ==> () reduction to a goal by steps
(()) ==> reduction to non-existence by steps

The point is that one can take steps without heading toward a representable goal. Well, you might say, to seek nonexistence is a goal. As in the quantum mechanics of virtual particles, the object of meditation, the art of hiding, the cancellation of complements, and the addition of \emptyset , we adopt the *convention* of simple representation. This convention creates the illusion of direction, but the goal-like directionality is imposed by the interpretation, not by the representation. That is:

Meaning requires the imposition of a goal.

The atomic circularity, having undermined *meaning* in its paradox, is not subject to this constraint. That is, there is a formalism that computes without goals. In traditional logic, this rather subtle distinction is confounded with the concept of *consistency*, in that the semantics of logic imposes that representations evaluate to be *true*.

Whether or not all human minds are goal structured is a question of experience. My vocabulary includes the No Mind state, so I must claim, experientially, that behavior without goals makes sense.