

Creatures Made of Clay — Notes

I. General

A. ...

II. Include

- A. No objects (ontology) at the get go
- B. Point-to-point relationality ('correspondence' is the wrong word) of physical laws (regularities)
- C. Non-effective relationality (e.g., bouncing on a post horse) clearly advantageous
- D. Need for state; can't simply react depending on proximal "stimulus" (laminar connection)
- E. The "state" is useful because it allows the creature to have an effective means of responding to situations and states of affairs that are *themselves* unable to be effective.
 - 1. Includes the past
 - 2. Includes non-projectable properties (look up!)
- F. The future (and prediction)
 - 1. Deduction, reasoning, etc. \Leftarrow will need development,

III. Issues

- A. Complexity, "emergence," etc.
 - 1. Seems relevant to categorization, which are regularities of a sort
 - 2. But why? Maybe because of gradualism...needs thinking about
 - 3. Maybe also because of the continuity required for evolution. That is: it may be a requirement on the kinds of categories and capacities that we have that they had to be able to evolve continuously, with micro adjustment (DNA-level?).
 - a. Once you get a categorical system going, you can maybe evolve through incremental adjustments in the combinatorics (so that a micro-adjustment can "throw" the result from point α to point β).
 - b. Maybe related to bifurcations (which in a sense are exactly this)
 - c. Also of course related to digitality (which should be explained)
 - 4. Can I imagine a creature with categories and capacities that were powerful (maybe even more powerful than us) but that could not have evolved continuously—and therefore, in some sense (which should be explained) could not have *evolved*?
 - 5.
-