DIALOGUES ON AXIOLOGICAL THEORY

Editorial note: The following dialogue between members of the Robert S. Hartman Institute took place between April 3 and April 20, 2021. In alphabetical order, participants were Steve Byrum, Wayne Carpenter, Darlene Clarke, KT Connor, Rem B. Edwards, Art Ellis, Charlotte Ellis, Doug Lawrence, Mark Moore, and Jay Morris. In what follows, participants and specific recipients will be identified by their first names. All participants received these e-mail communications.

Rem to Doug: During our Zoom meeting this morning, I told you that while I was teaching at the University of Tennessee, I was not exclusively or even primarily a Hartmanian axiologist. I was instead just a traditional philosophy professor who taught, researched, published, and was sincerely interested in many other aspects of philosophy besides Hartmanian axiology.

Axiology was just one of my philosophical interests along with many others. I became most deeply involved with it after I retired; more about that later. I did teach a graduate course in axiology every three or four years or so before I retired. I tried integrating axiology into an undergraduate course once, but only once, while teaching at UT. The many other things that I taught and published about were traditional (non-Hartmanian) ethical and axiological theory, process philosophy and theology, philosophy of religion, American philosophy, the history of philosophy, medical ethics, mental health care ethics, ethics and animals, and others. Most of my actual teaching, research, and publishing during the last 15 years or so before I retired were in standard medical ethics and mental health care ethics. I never figured out how to bring axiology into medical ethics, etc., and I probably could not do so even today. Also, medical ethics changes so rapidly with advances in medicine and its dominance by insurance companies and government that everything I knew about it when I retired in 1997-98 is probably obsolete today.

You may or may not know that I was definitely not a loyal "follower" of Hartman while he was teaching here with us. Instead, I was probably his most severe critic in the UT Philosophy Department. I did audit several of his graduate courses because I had enough good sense at the time to realize that I might learn a great deal from him, which I did. But one aspect of his position turned me off completely, and I assumed (mistakenly, as it turned out) that this one thing brought down his whole project. This one thing was his "doctrine" of "the infinite value of man," his abysmal philosophical arguments for it, and his linking of axiology with transfinite math. I argued with him in person about all of this, and I was convinced back then, as I am now, that his "proof of the infinite value of man" was one of the worst philosophical arguments that I have ever seen. I have published my explanations of and objections to all of this in much detail in my *The Essentials of Axiology,* and in several other articles in our *Journal of Formal Axiology,* so I will not repeat any of that here.

I was so completely turned off by Hartman's excursions into infinity that I had very little to do with the Hartman Institute during the first ten years or so of its existence. I was a Charter Member of the Institute, largely out of respect for John Davis, but not for Hartman's philosophy. During that period, when the Institute met annually for two or three days at UT in Knoxville, I attended a session or two when what interested me did not conflict with my own teaching schedule. But I had little enthusiasm for it. I did continue to think about Hartman, to teach Hartman at the graduate level, and to read his works during all of this time.

Finally, about 15 years following his death and 10 years after the founding of the Institute, it hit me! You could just lop off all of this nonsense about infinities, and what you have left would still be the most remarkable, defensible, insightful and usable general theory of value available

anywhere. Only at that point did I become seriously involved with the Institute—somewhere around 1987. After that, I did everything that I could to sustain, develop, and promote the Institute and its objectives—and I wrote, edited, and published all that I could to insure that Hartmanian axiology got a fair hearing with others—especially with academics. The trouble there is, almost no one in the academic world has ever read anything that I have published, written, or edited on Hartman. I have no cure to offer today for why axiology has never "caught on," so to speak. I tried my best.

I think I know why most professional philosophers today and back then reject Hartmanian axiology. It is all of those infinities! Once a professional philosopher today learns that Hartman promoted the idea of the infinite value of man, and especially when his "proof" of such is explained to them, at least 99 percent of them will just leave the room immediately, and they will never come back. There are other factors perhaps, but I do believe infinity is the main culprit. After all, it took me at least 20 years (Hartman's presence at UT included) to get over it. Given his infatuation with infinity, Hartman almost defeated himself. Consultants who use the HVP know little or nothing about it and never use transfinite math.

My deepest involvement with Hartmanian axiology as a workable, insightful, and defensible theory (once infinities are dropped) came after I retired from teaching at UT, 1997-98. I think there are several reasons for that. For one thing, I was then not involved with teaching anything else, or very much involved with other professional philosophers, thus less distracted by other things. But the main thing, I suppose, was that I just had a lot more time to think about it, to work on it, and to figure out how to make sense of it and use it. I think that at this point in my life I have done about all that I can do, or have the energy to do, with Hartmanian axiology, but I am glad that its future is in your hands and the hands of others like you, Suzie, Cliff, and so many others. We had a good talk this morning, which I very much enjoyed. Best to you and your family!

Steve to All: Thanks for allowing me to be part of this conversation. I doubt that anyone related today to the Institute and to the work of Hartman has spent as much time in "instructional settings" as I did with Rem Edwards. Of all of the graduate teachers that I had across two Master's Degrees and the PhD, none had as much impact on me as Dr. Edwards did—and in many respects continues to be of great value. He directed both my Thesis and my Dissertation. I spent countless hours of discussion with him in his office, attended his classes and lectures, read—and continue to read and reread every piece of material he has written, and only regret that my damnable introversion has kept me from having more of a personal relationship; I envy the kind of personal relationship that my cousin, David, and Vera had with him. Everything that I have done since UTK has been touched by Rem Edwards and the great opportunity I had to be influenced by his intelligence and his academic and professional demeanor, his writing style, and his engagement with other people that has always been filled with a spirit of care. With this all in mind, and claiming some degree of "authority" because of it, I would agree that Rem is a "traditional philosophy professor."

To me, this means that he was curious about all things philosophical, theological, and axiological that crossed his desk. To me, this means that he gained deep insight, integrated with what he had appropriated up until that time, and had a gift for interpreting in ways that even undergraduates could understand. Pardon the analogy—and you can tell what I have been doing this morning—Rem was like a huge dust rag that had been wiped across ages of philosophy and theology, picked up and collected from every source, and then shook the dust of his interpretations and knowledge on all that came near. I feel tremendously grateful to have breathed in so much of Rem Edwards' "dust." To me, to be a "traditional philosophy professor" is a high calling of high

calling. His classroom and writing room were his pulpit, and we are his congregation. Had he stayed in the church, there is no telling what kinds of pulpits he would have commanded. We are all so very lucky that when Rem came along that men of his brilliance did not have to be culturally assigned to a pulpit as the only place they could serve their "calling" and conduct their "ministry."

Now, to the matter of Hartman. Of course, I was taken with Hartman as many people were, but Rem always helped me "keep my head on" about his work. I quickly had problems with his transfinite math. It seemed an unnecessary adjunct to me. I understood that Hartman was a man of his times, and that, in the 1950s especially, mathematics was becoming so overwhelmingly important that to gain credibility with a wider world, the relatedness to the latest mathematics could easily have been perceived as essential in some way. I first discounted it all as not as important, then—after years—I made my peace with it. To me—and I have become very insistent about this and having written about it for a long while now— the transfinite math is a metaphor, a model and paradigm that Hartman believed would advance his positions. I never had him admit this to me, but I never had him deny it either. As his friend, Maslow, was apt to say, it was a "useful tool."

I am so glad that the recent writings advanced by the Institute are not burdened down with the transfinite math like *The Structure of Value* is. So, Rem is so very correct about his struggles with the transfinite math, and he is equally right that pushing this to the side does not need to be throwing out the baby with the bath water. He is also correct that new Hartman initiates or consultants using the assessment as their primary contact know very little about the math; nor do they need to. They may also know very little about Hartman's work beyond the assessment, and that is an inadequacy that I would hope new initiates would see as a "lack" that needs to be filled.

What I keep saying as a central part of my work is that Hartman saw language—words—explanations as extrinsic and systemic realities. I totally agree that there is a point at which words give out on us, and we actually live beyond words. This, to me, is the Intrinsic as a dimension of existence that we can experience, but when we put the Intrinsic into words, instead of, as the Beatles said, "let it be," we really get into trouble. The Intrinsic was meant to be experienced, not explained. Yet, we have an obsession about putting reality into words in order for it to gain "meaning."

So, what are words ultimately good for? I really believe this is where Hartman is decisive, and what he says about language at this point is as important as anything I have ever read from any philosopher-of-language expert. Hartman said that when you move toward the Intrinsic, the unique, dare we even say realities of a non-denumerable infinity of possibility, the best language can do is "point beyond." The best language can do is "talk about." At this point, interpretation, hermeneutics, conversation, and dialogue—both internally and with others—becomes infinitely (there's the word again) more valuable (axiology) than any definition and explanation.

This is what I learned at the very first: the "theologic" is not an attempt to prove God, but simply a way of "pointing toward" or "talking about" God in ways that will never "trap" God within systemic constructs or extrinsic ecclesiology, religious practice, or dogma. You cannot "prove" the Intrinsic. So, it is possible to gain tremendously from the "Hierarchy of Value" as a kind of "map" of different dimensions or perspectives WITHOUT having to walk the literal ground of transfinite mathematics or take "infinities" too literally. Hartman was "pointing" and "talking about."

I recall one day, struggling with these issues during the Thesis, and Dr. Edwards saying in an almost off-hand manner that still is part of my basic frame of reference toward people and life: "You have been accustomed to talking about the "natural" and the "super-natural." Have you ever

thought about bringing in the "*Supra*-natural"? I felt a door open to incredible sense that day, and whether Dr. Edwards would say it or not in the same way that I did, Hartman's hierarchy of Systemic, Extrinsic, and Intrinsic found a parallel—a way of "pointing" or "talking about"—in Natural, Super-Natural (extrinsic events or experiences for which there is not as yet a readily available explanation), and Supra-Natural (intrinsic events or experiences for which there will never be a reduction to explanation and words, and which we should not want or desire). Name the Number 1 item of insight I have taken from Dr. Edwards, and this is it. Accept it, without worrying about "infinities" in any kind of mathematically defined manner (and realizing that math is simply a different kind of language), and life can have a different kind of "fullness" and "richness" (favorite words of Hartman) that reaches toward the "goodness" of possibility that we all have.

The person I am married with (Spanish language says "with" not "to") and I have been together now for 74 years. There is a "beauty" (Intrinsic) in our relationship that sometimes I must admit causes the thought of a "non-denumerable infinity" to cross my mind. On a lesser level of consideration (the ancient middle-eastern word *sider* means "wisdom" much like the Hebrew *hokman* and the Greek *sophia*), there is a new bird showing up this spring outside my study window, where I have worked daily for over thirty years—a "non-denumerable infinity" of possibility, fullness, and richness in the woods beside my yard. There is actually not so much transfinite math here as a metaphor, a way of "pointing," a way of "talking about" that does not capture and reduce.

Where does all of this meandering lead? My strong suggestion would be for the Institute to create a book that includes—at the beginning—a kind of "memoir" of Dr. Edwards' personal experiences with Hartman, designed to help those who did not know Hartman to have insights and to know him better. Then, a broad, middle section, could include a collection of all of the papers that Dr. Edwards has written about axiology and Hartman. I know a lot of this is already contained in his books, and it might be very interesting if he might even consider adding to this collection maybe something like 10-20 critical pages from each book that he believes centralizes the book's most important meaning. My guess is that there is plenty that has not made it into books. A final section might include the evolution of his feelings about Hartman and Hartman's work over time. Such a book would be absolutely invaluable to Hartman scholarship in the future. Thanks for giving me a chance on this Easter morning to talk a bit about Rem Edwards. He is and has been an amazing gift to all that we do, and to those of us lucky enough to study and learn directly from him, an amazing gift that keeps on giving in our lives. Best to you all.

Rem to Steve and All: I greatly appreciate the kind things Steve says about me above, and his suggestion that a book be published containing some of my axiological articles. I hope some of the nice things Steve said about me are true, but I do not think that such a book would be necessary. All of my articles on axiology, and most on everything else, are readily available now for anyone to read online at:
https://rembedwards.academia.edu/, https://philpeople.org/profiles/rem-b-edwards,
and https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Rem-Edwards.

Some of this stuff is actually being read!

I would like to comment on a few of the philosophical/axiological points that Steve made. I agree with all that he said, but maybe I can elaborate briefly on a few of his very good points. Yes, "infinite" can be used quite legitimately as a metaphor, though I think that Hartman himself meant

it literally. Telling people that "you have infinite worth," and "you have infinite possibilities" can be very inspiring things to say metaphorically, though I have two reservations about it. First, it is not a truthful thing to say, taken literally. The danger is that someone will take this literally—a danger with using all myths and metaphors. Second, some people may just not tune in to mathematical metaphors. We all know, however, that we do not always communicate successfully, no matter how hard we try or what idiom we use.

Hartman did have one important thing to say about metaphorical language that is relevant here. He said that it is the language of intrinsic evaluation. This means, I think, that we can use metaphors to express and communicate our profound intrinsic evaluation of and personal identification with and love for someone else (or with any intrinsic, extrinsic, or systemic good being valued intrinsically. Remember that every dimension of value can be valued in terms of some other dimension of value). Also, I don't think that metaphors are *always* used to express intrinsic evaluation, though Harman was not careful to make that qualification. Sometimes metaphors can be used to express devaluation— "You dirty rat!"

I also agree completely with Steve's point that "there is a point at which words give out on us, and we actually live beyond words." Yes, this is most conspicuously true in the intrinsic dimension. Words are always inadequate when we are trying to express what needs to be said about intrinsic value objects, whether they be other people we love, or our dogs and cats, or God. Metaphors are often the only words that work for us, or at least those that work best, in such situations. Something in Hartman's hierarchy of value is relevant here. Steve says, correctly, that "the best language can do is 'point beyond'." In a sense, that is true of all language in every dimension. Systemic values (language, words, or thoughts) always have less value than the desirable realities toward which they point. Pointing is all that referential words ever do in any value dimension.

Our words for "good car" obviously have less value than the desirable reality toward which they point, as do our words for "good philosophical system," or "morally good person," or "good lover." These reality are always better than, have more good-making properties than, our words for them. As for metaphors, we should not allow our need for them and our unavoidable reliance on them at times to prevent us from trying to think deeper and to strive for clearer and even more illuminating thoughts. There is a legitimate place for demythologizing! (Especially in religion and theology!) We don't need transfinite math to tell us that the desirable realities symbolized by our words for them have more good-making properties than these systemic symbols themselves. Good philosophy itself is quite adequate here. Again we must agree with Steve, "So, it's possible to gain tremendously from the "Hierarchy of Value" as a kind of "map" of different dimension or perspectives WITHOUT having to walk the literal ground of transfinite mathematics or take "infinities" too literally. Finally, to borrow a phrase from Steve, each of my former students and each of my colleagues in the Hartman Institute has been "an amazing gift" to me! Love to all of you!

Steve to All: I cannot think of a more thoughtful and accurate response to what I had to say. And, Rem probably did this while working in his garden, keeping pace with grandchildren, and who knows what else. Great responses!!

Mark to Rem and All: Rem, I must say, as per usual, I do agree with you regarding Hartman's use of infinite. Bob truly wanted to be a value scientist and to calculate value. For Bob, he truly believed that persons were of non-denumerable infinite worth. This was not a metaphor, but a

mathematical reality. Perhaps our dear friend, Steve, is being rather philosophical in his assigning intent to Bob. That is as it should be. So, Rem, you are exactly correct to criticize Bob for his use of infinities. They are a mess and do not take the science of axiology where he wanted it to go.

I have found that the use of different mathematical formulas will do the same for Bob in separating out different value dimensions without the use of the "damned infinities," which obscure and cause more harm than enlighten. The difference in intrinsic value and extrinsic (and systemic) value can be mathematically explained as differently expressed mathematical dimensions. Moreover, no higher dimension can be reduced to some configuration of a lower dimension. One can project a higher dimension into or onto a lower dimension, but not without distortion and loss of information. I would suggest all read one of the most wonderful books ever written called *Flatlands: A Romance in Many Dimensions* by Edwin A. Abbott. It is of the greatest interest, and I still recall reading it as a teenager and loved it mightily. You will also, I think. I truly appreciate this brief discussion. Lively, lovely, friendly, and caring. My love to all of you wonderful persons.

Steve to Mark and All: Thank you, Mark. What you say about *Flatlands* is a wonderful cue to those who have not experienced it. Takes me back as well. I was reading yesterday in Sam Keen, whose work I have followed across the years—*Apology for Wonder*, *To a Dancing God*, etc. In his *In the Absence of God*, he writes: "The technique of playing with metaphors helps us avoid the naïve literalism that turns both God and the great pathfinders—great Teachers—into supernatural beings." He then quotes Wittgenstein: "A new word is like a fresh seed sown on the ground of the discussion." This is why seeing Hartman's problematic mathematical technicalities as metaphors has been so important to me, especially given—as Rem points out—the importance of metaphors to him as a way of talking-but-not-talking about the Intrinsic. I believe I would be a naïve literalist if I went too far down the path of the math as purely math, although Mark is probably very correct in saying that Hartman may have been a bit stubborn about how he saw the math. I would also add that "playing" is a commanding word in Keen's sentence, and I am reminded of that profound dissertation (my own), *Intrinsic Value and Play,* which has been checked out of the McClung Library at least twice in nearly 50 years. And, it then is like Hartman's entire axiology simply throws a fresh seed on the ground of discussion, and that is all—all—that this "great chain of being" is in most respects, a discussion, where the greatest Teachers of all are simply being seed scatterers. (It is interesting that the first public discourse of Jesus, when He is describing who He is, is "The Parable of the Sower." It is interesting that Paul describes his entire work in terms of the reward and joy of the sower, and not the obsession that our world has with "reaping" and what we will gain from it that is of extrinsic economic value and extrinsic power value.) At our best, we have grasped this distinction and we talk with each other; at our worst, we become tribal and violently demand that there is only one discussion, one "Truth," and it is ours.

Steve to All: It is me again, and you thought I would stop. It's too busy today to stay with this conversation, so blame Rem—he started it, and then Mark has moved it along with keen insight. In this conversation, I think we are getting a bit not only to the base of what Hartman had to say, but also who he was. Jay Morris, whose insights are always significant, and I had a conversation this morning which was intended to be on other matters, but we got off onto Hartman, Rem, Mark—the entire conversation. This following thought occurred to me during the conversation with Jay, and especially when he asked me to talk about my own personal experiences with Dr. Hartman. As they used to say when pipes were part of the image: "put this in your pipe and smoke

it." I even go back so far that there was actually tobacco in the pipes people most often made reference to.

1. On a systemic level, people are at times able to "*get* a joke." In other words, the joke resonates on some level of understanding and rationality. 2. On an extrinsic level, people think something—something extrinsically specific—is funny. I might think that the gyrations of Steve Martin as "King Tut" are funny—a specific reality. I might think that my neighbor is funny in the way that, right after he has raked all of his leaves, if a leaf falls on his clear lawn he is apt to run out and get it. Or, the extrinsic is exhibited when we laugh because everyone else in the room is laughing. In fact, we may not know exactly what they are laughing about, but it seems to be the "right thing to do." A lot of the extrinsic dimensions of our living and our behavior falls under "the right thing to do." 3. On an intrinsic level, someone may have a "sense of humor." The word "sense" here is critical to observing that we have now moved into the Intrinsic, and we are talking about an entire perspective (although I like to say "pre-spective"), or "lens," or "framework" that is part of our unique portal to the world. To me, all that we are talking about relating to metaphors and play somehow moves in this particular territory of experience.

So, what does this have to do with Hartman? A great deal, I am convinced. I thought he had a wonderful "sense of humor," and that was part of the way he moved into and about his world. He could pick up on dynamics of a situations with his "sense of humor" that made the situation "richer" and more valuable. I think one reason he liked me—and "like" certainly has an intrinsic dimension—was my strong East Tennessee "hill" accent—something that I do not think showed up a lot with "philosophers." I also think he "liked" the way we talked about religion and sports in the South, which he found fascinating (another intrinsic word), and which he said that I could move along the entire spectrum of these topics from sublime dimensions to ridiculous dimensions—and there were plenty of ridiculous examples that he always listened to closely. All of this being said, I can't help but wonder if his "sense of humor" might have been a factor of mitigation in relating to the questions we are capable of raising about "infinities." Certainly, he took the discussions seriously, and he had put a lot of coin in the bank of transfinite math early on. By the end, I sensed him "smiling" about some of those discussions—that slight half-grin that diminished, to me, any sense of absolutism about the issue. My argument here is not very "philosophical," but it makes me smile just thinking about those days and those conversations. Have a good week—back to work here.

Mark to Steve and All: Thanks to Steve for trying to exit this conversation, but I cannot without one final comment. In nature there are "phase changes," such as water to ice and to steam, electrons flow without resistance (near absolute zero), plasma states, etc. All these phenomena are "seen" and recognized, but I do not believe that anyone has actually explained how or why they occur. The phase change form extrinsic to intrinsic value is a similar phase change. We may know when we see it, and we may equally experience it, but we do not have description of how and why it occurs. Just my way of saying that we should not be too hard on ourselves when explanations desert us, and we are left like Robert Frost's window flower, we lean aside and think of "naught to say". These riddles are being wonderfully explored by the physicist Stephan Wolfram in his profound new book, *A Project to Find the Fundamental Theory of Physics*. He has discovered that a new process, when repeated over and over in its simplicity, creates complex relations and dimensions. It is a wonder of simplicity and the growth of complexity out of simplicity. Have some fun, and please take a look. You will be rewarded.

KT to All: How true what Mark and Bob are saying. Rem must now think we have all gone off the rails. He does call us "Hartmaniacs." I believe Rem is right. You are "Hartmaniacs." What better rating? And what a wonderful way to celebrate Easter, trying to catch up with all that you are writing. Thanks for the thinking, and sharing the thoughts. (They match the many colored Easter eggs among the flowers! ☺That's a metaphor! You sure woke me up this Monday! Thanks again. I wait for more.

Darlene to All: "I've learned that people will forget what you said, people will forget what you did, but people will never forget how you made them feel." Maya Angelou.

Agree with KT! I have really enjoyed reading these e-mails. I truly miss sitting in a room and LISTENING to your discussions!! Thank you, Rem, for sharing your initial email and creating this delightful stream on dialogue! Thank you, Steve, for introducing me to the RSHI. I had no idea, after that first meeting in the UT Library, that I would be blessed in so many ways! Hugs from Texas.

Steve to All: If I had anything to do with Darlene Clark's becoming part of RSHI, that is likely the best thing I ever did for the Institute. Darlene is a "light" out from under a basket and sitting on a candlestick for me. When I have a question, I call Darlene. I am more of a sit-in-the-back-of-the-room-and-talk-to-Lynn Clark kind of a person, and Darlene is absolutely a leader. Time to fold the tents and put this day to bed. Best to all of you, and thanks to Rem for getting this all started.

Wayne to All: I believe these discussions are an excellent opportunity to begin an examination of the nature of the "Science of Axiology." I spent time in an independent study with Dr. Hartman that focused on the roots of his concept of "science" in Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason.* The insight I gained became the basis of the decision model I built for the Army. I believe that an examination of Hartman's understanding of axiology as a science is a worthy project for the Wisdom Council and would be a great contribution to the Institute.

By the way, I have a copy of a paper on a topological analysis of the value dimensions. David Mefford gave me the paper years ago. My copy is packed away. Vera may know where David's copy is located.

It has been a long time since I have been called a Hartmanic. I was given that title in a discussion in the late 70s after an Institute Meeting.

Editorial Note: After Wayne was first called a "Hartmaniac," the faculty and other graduate students in the University of Tennessee Philosophy Department began to call all who were seriously interested in Hartman and his work "Hartmaniacs." This continued for many years after Wayne left UT.

Art to All: What an enlightening and rich discussion! We are constantly reminded that formal axiology is unfinished business, but we are so fortunate to have what we do have. I believe that Dr. Hartman really did want it to be a science. I think (and hope) he would have been open to the newer mathematical approaches. I encountered the same kind of reticence from him when I timidly suggested that psychologists would have difficulty accepting the HVP because it is not empirically derived, (empiricism being the psychologists' "religion"). His response was something like, "Oh,

they will when they understand the logic." I think he sometimes had a great deal more faith in humanity to embrace logic and rationality than I do. Although I understand the problems with transfinite math and the infinity of humans, I have always enjoyed the elegance of the metaphor in relation to the intrinsic (I hope without falling prey to the traps which have been discussed!). Ignoring the math problems and other issues, for the "ordinary person" there is a kind of insightful "face value" in describing the dimensions in terms of finite/infinite: the systemic as a limited/finite dimension; the extrinsic as denumerably infinite—someone along the way, maybe. Frank Forrest, called this "practical infinity."

My conversational example of this is: If we froze time at a certain moment and asked, "How many grains of sand are on the earth at this moment?"—we know in this closed environment at a single point in time, the answer is "X," but we cannot humanly arrive at the exact value of "X." (Looking out the window right now as I write this, I could ask "How many leaves are on the trees on this 75 acres—another incalculable "X," but when I blow off the roadway in the fall, I know it is billions!)—and the intrinsic, a dimension beyond, which has such value that we can't measure it in numbers, and it is hard to express in words. Seems like we always get back to where we live every day—the extrinsic. We can conceptualize perfect systems, but (with the exception of math and logic?) they play out in our lives as imperfect circles, approximate airline schedules, etc. When we want to talk about intrinsic values, we must use words (extrinsic expressions following systemic rules), which, as has been pointed out, are inadequate for the depth and richness we really want to express. So we need poetry, and music, and metaphors to help us. And if we are lucky, sometimes we can "tap in" to the intrinsic richness.

Thanks to all of you for this conversation.

Rem to All: I had no idea that I would unleash such a pent-up flood of delightful Hartmania when I first wrote to Doug about being a typical philosophy professor. What wonderful reflections on Hartman as a person and as a thinker, and what wonderful intrinsic respect for one another has been expressed! Thanks to everyone. Please note that I include myself as a Hartmaniac, always writing "Fellow Hartmaniacs."

I am tempted to comment on everything that everyone has written during this wonderful dialogue, but I will resist that temptation. I would like to say a few things in response to Art. Many thanks to Art, Mark, and some of the rest of you who knew Hartman for your recollections of conversations with him, especially those in which he expressed an openness to other systems of math into which systemic, extrinsic, and intrinsic objects of value could be plugged. I also greatly appreciate your recollections of Hartman's humor and his wonderful ability to respond with humor, kindness, respect, and competence to the thoughts of all of his students and fellow faculty members. I just wish Hartman had lived long enough to explore seriously other options besides transfinite math.

I agree with Art that Hartman "had a great deal more faith in humanity to embrace logic and rationality than I do." For one of many things, the current state of political dialogue in this country well illustrates this. What is happening to religion in this country also illustrates the same. All of us know that the so called "mainline" churches in America have significantly declined in membership, attendance, and support since around 1990. We seem to be moving rapidly toward a dominantly non-theistic social order like the one that has prevailed in Europe for some time now. I recently heard a commentator say that non-theistic thinkers have long-since hoped for the decline of theistic religion in the US, and they predicted that with the passing of religion, people would

then become much more rational, scientific, and sane. How mistaken they were about that, so the commentator indicated!

I would like for us to understand how Frank Forrest treated extrinsic values. He actually rejected Hartman's treatment of them as denumerably infinite in good-making properties. Instead of $\aleph_0$, Forrest actually invented a new axiological number for extrinsic goods, the number "k" which he defined as an "elastic finite set," (in his *Valuemetrics* book, p. 5), which meant "finite but indefinitely large or practically uncountable," *but definitely finite* and not a "practical infinity," unless this just means "practically uncountable." The leaves on acres of trees, grains of sand on beaches, and so many other realities, are far richer in number of properties than we could ever practically count. The extrinsic and intrinsic realities we talk about in any dimension of value are always richer in good- or bad- making properties in themselves than they ever could be in our systemic thoughts about them. This is one reason why we must often resort in practice to poetry, metaphors, music, and mysteries—and appropriately so. Words will never be enough to capture or express the full realities of the persons and things we love!

I remember one wonderful conversation with Hartman that may be relevant here. I think that some graduate student came into class one day and remarked that his wife had asked him, "Why do you love me?" and he did not know how to answer her. Hartman's immediate response was something like, "That's a trap! Don't ever try to answer such a question! Words will never be enough!" He was right! That's probably a good place to stop.

Steve to All: There is so much to respond to in what Art and Rem recently add to our conversation.

1. I remember once trying to present Hartman's concept of what constituted "science." He said something like it was the combination of the intension and extension of an axiom. I got a lot of blank stares, although I have come to find his use of the word "intension" as opposed to the more normative "intention" has powerful implications; I see "intension" as "in-tension" and a prime indicator of an intrinsic experience. Then, on another occasions, Hartman sees "science" as simply an attempt to talk about reality in an orderly manner. People tend to resonate more with this end of his science-explanation spectrum than the first mentioned above. I'm not sure that anyone could adequately explain the combination of the intension and extension of an axiom in a coherent and consistent manner.

2. We clearly are at war about "science." Trump's "science" and Fauci's "science" are very different. Even Fauci in his brilliant experience never pushes science into the area of the absolute, which is an expectation that I believe many people—like Art's psychologists and the general discipline of psychology—tend to believe they have discovered. Everything, to me, is in process, and being in process means any "truth" is only a "penultimate truth." Nietzsche is totally correct in saying that everything is interpretation, and that there are no absolute truths. I have forever argued that the only way some "truth" could be absolute is if we have every single, solitary variable relating to a particular reality, and how would be ever know this? Would the very last variable come with a sign on it: "This is the last variable you need to consider on this issue?" So, "orderly talking about" makes a lot of sense. Some psychologists, those we have to deal with in our work, advance issues of "validity" as if they have a field of research and tools that are "valid" are ridiculous. How "scientific psychologists" determine when inductive reasoning can be called deductive reasoning is amazing to me. Have you read the book—best one I've read this year—entitled *Nobody is Normal,* by Roy Grinker? It is a total eye-opener about what constitutes

"science" and how psychology's claims about being "scientific" in some sort of more absolute way are at best presumptuous and at worse just insane.

"Science" should admit that it's "best, educated guesses" credibly aim at more precision of insight and articulation. What we have experienced as "science" is actually a hermeneutics of interpretation related to whatever focal point that a particular "science" is enamored of. Such hermeneutics is wonderful, but we should always be honest about what it is and what it is not, and we must always be very suspicious and cynical when scientists, senators, "seniors," or sermons project the capturing of absolutes. Everything is penultimate absolute, and usually more penultimate than absolute. And, that is fine.

In a sense, our Rem-stimulated conversation is a "pointing," a "talking about" that is so vitally important and the "best" we can do. We are, and I know Rem will appreciate this, able to see "science," "psychology," "axiology"—and on and on—as a progressive evolution of greater insight, only foiled when we become convinced that any stage of that evolution is the ultimate or the end.

3. I love Art's "grain of sand" and "leaves" approach. This is the kind of conveying of insight that people will relate to. There is no quibbling about what Art is saying, but some of our discussions across the years at the edge of "infinities" may have sounded like the old quandary of how many angels can fit on the head of a pin, or that eternal question of whether God can create a rock that He cannot lift. What Art says about music, art, and poetry is totally affirmed in my experience. He begins to sound like William Blake in his "Auguries of Innocence"—and sounding like William Blake is a compliment of the highest order. Hartman forever referenced the poem "Room," and it is as much a portal to the intrinsic as most philosophical regurgitations.

Any time we remember Frank Forest, we remember someone who added to our conversations in immensely important ways, in addition to simply being a really great guy just to be around. However, the happiest I ever saw Frank Forest was not about Hartman—we did not even talk about Hartman on the day I'm describing—but rather when on a vacation trip to Daytona Beach I delivered to him three old parts off of an old airplane motor that my brother (who worked with Delores Scates' husband) was sending to a mutual friend of my brother and Frank at Embry-Riddle.

4. Certainly, Rem is correct about the movements of a non-theistic Europe, always a forbearer of what is likely to take place in America. The number one use of churches in the United Kingdom today is "conversions to houses"—along with "barn conversions." People say about the conversions: "This was once a pig sty." Or, "this was once a church." Of course, a lot of "church" has been ruined by modern evangelicalism of the Trump/Franklin Graham/Falwell style, but "loss of church" surely does demonstrate a loss of situations in which the intrinsic might invade upon us. My wife says that she stopped listening to sermons in churches a long time ago, but the beautiful music and light through the stained-glass windows is still worth the trip. The number 2 use of churches—tourist destinations—to see the architecture—is almost like cities that built pilgrimage churches during the crusades to bring COMMERCE to their towns, tourists to view the churches and their relics.

One of my reports built off the profile assessment has to do with a person's propensity for "spiritual experiences" or engagement in "spiritual disciplines." After creating and following that report since about 1995, I now see that the scoring patterns have become weaker and weaker; we are losing our propensity for the intrinsic. I'm not sure I want to bring back God in the way that a lot of the dominant churches today talk about God, but I am sure that I do not want to lose the Intrinsic as a possible arena of experience in my life.

5. I am finally reminded of the old story I've told a million times about a young newly-wed man who comes in at the end of the day to find his new wife crying on the couch. He is overwhelmed at why she is crying. Her response was, "Why do you love me?"

When I taught logic, I used this as an example of a "complex question." The man—not much more than a boy—goes through an unsuccessful litany of answers: "You cook better than I would have ever imagined, almost as good as my mother; you can drive better than any woman I know; you are very clean. Obviously, none of these answers were working. He was, of course, making the situation worse. In his own desperation, he asked, "What did you want me to say?" Her response: "You have told me that you love me for WHAT I am. I want you to love me THAT I am."

The distinction between "what-ness" and "that-ness"—to me—is at the core of everything we are circulating around in our conversation. I have never even told this story without people grasping the differences in Systemic, Extrinsic, and Intrinsic, along with the ultimate limitations of all language and the foolish attempts that we seem to continue to make to take "that-ness" and reduce it to "what-ness" in order for it to be "scientific" and "meaningful."

Charlotte to All: Steve, I am in total agreement with your wife about "church"—and would add to her music and light through stained glass the lovely floral arrangements the altar guild creates and, most importantly, the friendships of some of the folks we encounter there who are so dear to us. I do sometimes listen to the sermons, or parts of them, running them through my own "translator" to make them meaningful to my own life. I'm really enjoying these conversations! Thanks to all of you.

Jay to All: I feel like Elihu in Job Chapter 32 as he listens to Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar as they try to comfort Job. I say this out of respect and envy as I listen to your experiences with Dr. Hartman. These conversations have encouraged me to think about Dr. Hartman, who I never met, but I feel that I am getting to know him more intimately. I believe that Dr. Hartman has brought me closer to understanding death in order to help me understand life. He was surrounded by the atrocities of World War I and World War II. In Hartman's *Freedom to Live* and *On God's Side* I got a closer glimpse of how death brought him new insights.

I bring this up because as an inner city kid I was exposed to the deaths of my friends, beginning at the age of five. Hartman lived to serve. Just last week, one of my colleague's mother suddenly died, and she was very distraught as she talked about her mother, Mary. I asked her to tell me about her mother. By the time she had finished, I commented that I *like* her mother and truly wished that I could have met her, and that she was very blessed to have had such a wonderful soul in her life. In fact, after she described her mother, I told her that she and her mother *are* so much alike. Kathleen called me this week and told me that she is looking forward to going to Florida with her sister from England to meet her mother's friends, who have planned a celebration. Kathleen told a few of her colleagues in the past few days about this wonderful woman, named Mary. Is she sad? Yes. But she has discovered that her mother is very much alive in her heart, and she has a deeper appreciation of true love. The power for me has been to find the intrinsic value in relationships, even after so-called death has occurred.

Dr. Hartman's smile and desire to give of himself are gifts, and we are still talking about him even after his physical departure. I believe that death brings us closer to life and ultimately to love, if we allow it to evolve and do not confine it to what we think it should be. I continue to learn about Dr. Hartman as I become more involved with the application of his work into the lives of

those around me. Steve and Wayne have enabled me to make this work live in the lives of the people whom I encounter. In a few cases, I have seen transformation in people who were hopeless. Now they have been revived. It is almost as if they have been resuscitated. The work is real. How far does it extend? Only God knows. This world is in crises. It needs hope. Thank you all!! Take care.

Doug to All: What a great conversation! (Rem, see what you started!) In particular, transfinite math and various infinites are hot topics and for many good reasons! I believe that its exposed weaknesses and controversies are evident to many. Maybe we could move forward??!!

A number of years ago, as those know who have talked to me, (specifically Rem Edwards and Mark Moore), the problems associated with transfinite math arguments became forgone conclusions to me. By now, Rem, among others, can only be described as frustrated by this topic. Mark simply moved on. I believe I have hit upon the solution to the problem using set theory. This two-step solution begins with what I call "Emergent Set Theory" and then moves to Hartman's dilemma. I cannot, nor would I try, to explain this in an email. However, it is not that complex, and the basic concepts can be covered easily. I propose giving this solution to the group in a Zoom meeting, and then having a preliminary discussion. Best to all,

Rem to Doug and All: I will indeed be present for your Zoom meeting to listen to your presentation. I am not much of a mathematician, so I may not understand what you are trying to explain. Also, I regret to say that I will bring my usual skepticism with me as I listen. No improved version of transfinite math or set theory will be of any use to axiology unless you have a sound argument (valid, with true premises) for the "infinite value of man" to go with it. Hartman's preposterous "proof" of human infinity was the absolute presupposition of his use of transfinite math and assigning an infinite transfinite number to human beings. His use of transfinite math to construct an axiological calculus was built entirely upon this absurd foundation. Unless you have a "proof" that individual human beings contain within themselves an infinite number of good-making properties, and unless you give that first, I will not believe that anything you have to say about an improved transfinite math will have any relevance for axiology.

When I was first exposed to Hartman's axiology by Hartman himself in the late1960s, I was convinced this his "proof" was one of the worst philosophical arguments I had ever seen. I *am still convinced*. Sorry to be very hardheaded about this, but this is what turned me away from Hartman many decades ago and prevented me from taking almost everything else about his axiology seriously until around 1987, as I explained earlier. Of my many publications on this issue, the most recent was, "Axiological Reflections on Human and Divine Infinity," *Journal of Formal Axiology: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 12, 2019, 10-37. There, I review my main arguments against a Hartmanian "proof" of human infinity. I go on to offer a very indirect religious argument for "the infinite value of human beings." My religious argument was actually based on a Hartmanian strategy, namely that value compositions can have new "organic whole" total values that one, or more, or all, of their components do not have.

Specifically, as included within the composition, "God loves us," we do have infinite worth, (I personally believe), but only because God loves us. This religious argument does not require that we have an infinite number of good-making properties within ourselves, and it does not warrant the application of transfinite math to human beings as such. God and God alone brings infinity into this value composition. I said to Frank Forrest many years ago that perhaps he had created a transfinite calculus for dealing with God and theology, but not one that applies directly

to human beings as such, considered apart from God. As I pointed out, my religious argument has severe limitations. It cannot function as the general "secular proof" of human infinity that Hartman's own axiology really needs to ground the application of "infinity" to human beings as such. Also, it will be persuasive and relevant only to theists. So I hope that at our Zoom meeting you will explain your own sound "proof" of human infinity before you go on to explain the improved math or set theory! (I apologize for being such a severe skeptic!)

From Mark to Rem: Bravo, Rem. Hartman may need non-denumerable infinities for Hartman's own axiology, but other apologies where humans have finite value do not need this. For humans to be finite is not such a bad thing. Infinity is a "pretty" thing, but that alone does not make it true.

From Rem to Mark and All: Mark, I greatly appreciate your support with respect to the finite inherent or self-contained value of human beings. I recall that you and I had good conversations about this even back during your graduate school days. I also sincerely hope that Doug Lawrence will not be greatly offended personally by my email comments. Doug, please don't take this personally! My quarrel is with infinity, not with you as a person! I love you, I value you as a person intensely and intrinsically (and all the other Hartmaniacs receiving this), and I do not wish to offend you or lose or diminish your friendship or our mutual deep respect for one another. This is purely a systemic issue!

I have a few additional thoughts about using "the infinite value of man" as an inspiring metaphor, even if it is not literally true. I'm against it!

Yes, we do need to use metaphorical language at times, but we need to be very careful about the metaphors we use. I have already mentioned several reasons for this. For one thing, it is very hard at times to tell whether someone else is speaking metaphorically, or whether they really mean what they say and intend to be taken seriously. Also, sticking persistently with metaphorical language can be just an excuse for sloppy thinking, an excuse for not thinking more deeply and clearly. This can "block the path of inquiry," to borrow a phrase from C. S. Pierce (who did not apply this to our present issue).

I would now like to add the caution that some metaphorical language can be very dangerous psychologically, socially, ethically, politically, and perhaps in many other ways. Hitler, racists, and many politicians today use just such metaphorical language at times. (Metaphors aren't just effective ways to communicate intrinsic evaluations, as Hartman assumed.) Yes, it can at times be very inspiring to tell a friend, a patient, a student, a consultant, etc., that their possibilities are infinite. Though this can be an inspiring thing to say, it is never a truthful thing to say. Yes, it is very important at times to give people hope for the future, but it is always very harmful to give them false or misleading hopes. For example, telling a young person about to graduate from high school that they should go on to college and "make something great of themselves because their possibilities are infinite" might inspire them to try, even if they are clearly not qualified to do college level work. Even worse, they might think, "If my possibilities are truly infinite, there is no need for me to go to college at all because it is POSSIBLE that some unknown relative or mysterious donor will die tomorrow and leave me ten million dollars, and I will never have to hit a lick of work! This, too, is covered by "your possibilities are infinite." As you say, Mark, "Infinity is a "pretty" thing, but that alone does not make it true."

One religious reason why I am opposed to using "we humans are infinite" metaphors is that this borders on religious blasphemy. (I'm actually serious about this!) That is, it comes very close

to turning people into gods. I agree with most traditional theologians through the ages that one of the most important and meaningful ways to differentiate between us and God is that we are finite, and only God is infinite. Centuries of traditional theologians are with me on this. (I explain this plus a lot more in my 2019 article on "Axiological Reflections on Human and Divine Infinity.")

Of course, I may be completely misinterpreting the math or set theory project that Doug proposes to explain to us when we Zoom. He may have a new finitistic math that differentiates between the three value dimensions without involving infinities at all. Mark, I know that you have developed, explained, and published just such a math in your "A Quantum Wave Model of Value Theory" in *Formal Axiology and Its Critics,* 171-21,. Marcus Gojman also published a finitistic math alternative for axiology in his "Axiologics: A New Calculus of Value," *Journal of Formal Axiology: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 5, 2012, 17-129. I have always strongly encouraged such approaches. I hope that Doug has something like that in mind.

One of Hartman's primary requirements for anything to be called "scientific" is that the relevant data must be joined with a suitable mathematics that allows for predictions and calculations. Since no one seems to be doing anything with what Mark and Marcus have accomplished, we should perhaps assume that at present formal axiology is not yet a science since it lacks a workable calculus. (But Mark and Marcus may insist that we do have such a calculus in the above presentations.)

Hartman argued that axiology was not an empirical science at all. It was a purely formal science like math and logic. I can go that far with calling it a science, at least with respect to the otherwise empty "form of the good" as "concept fulfillment." But once we start adding content to that empty form, e.g., the three basic kinds or dimensions of value or goodness, it seems to me that we are back doing philosophy again. So I have very serious reservations about axiology as a "science." It may be only an insightful, meaningful, defendable, and practically useful philosophy. I discuss this issue in some detail in my *The Essentials of Formal Axiology* book, 82-85. There you will find some very illuminating quotes from Hartman himself on the nature of real science. I am sure you, Mark, recall that Leon Pomeroy did not regard axiology in Hartman's form as a science at all. He equated "science" itself with empirical science and refused to apply the term to purely formal sciences. I recall that you and Leon had some very lively debates about this at times! Leon himself thought that he should be awarded a Nobel Prize for turning axiology into an empirical science in his *The New Science of Axiological Psychology*. (Did he think too highly of himself?) That is probably a good place to end this discussion, at least for the moment! Best to everyone!

From Steve to All: I do not disagree with whoever expressed the sentiment earlier that "enough is enough!!" Maybe it is like our brains are under COVID withdrawal, but there are elements of this discussion that seem important, or that I am trouble getting out of my system—excuse my East Tennessee comparison, but the discussion is like a too-big piece of tough roast beef; the more you chew it, the bigger it gets and it becomes impossible to swallow, but yet it would not seem exactly right to spit it out. (I apologize for the comparison, but if you have not had that experience, your life had been too protected and insulated, and I can't help but wonder who is cutting your roast beef for you at the old-folk's home. I can take a different "path" than Rem at times, although the divergence is usually minor, and more semantical than substantive. So, for example, I push back slightly on a couple of points in his last communication.)

1. To talk about—again, Hartman's "talking about"—metaphors does not in any way necessarily imply that metaphors have any kind of higher, sacrosanct, or "better than" intellectual status, especially compared to what we sometimes traditionally think about when we say "science,"

"fact," or "evidence"—all of which stand on their owns shaky ground at times. Metaphorical language is simply another way of "talking about," but a legitimate acknowledgement that language is always limited, even if we have not understood those limitations as yet. Any time I am consciously using metaphors, analogies, similes, etc., I will warn audiences that we always need to be careful in what we are saying, as these forms of language are likely to almost always find some kind of "break down" point. Yet, for want of better words, metaphorical language is intrinsic language, and may be one of the best ways we have of trafficking in the intrinsic. For me, the very best way to engage in the intrinsic is silence, but that is a story for another day.

2. To me, Rem is creating a kind of polar opposition between Charles Sanders Peirce's statement about how metaphor can "block the path of inquiry" and his own never-wrong-but-seldom-ever-uncertain language about "sticking persistently with metaphors is a cover for sloppy thinking." First, I do not disagree with Peirce or Rem to a large extent. Yet, did Peirce recognize that in his very statement he is relying on total metaphor—"blocking a pathway" is purely metaphorical? Then, aren't words like "cover" and "sloppy" capable of being too pervasive in their application? At some point, doesn't "thinking" have a "break down point" just like metaphors do; isn't all "thinking" capable of being "sloppy"? I'm simply not sure that I see a need for a polar opposition, an "either/or"; I am always and forever suggesting that "both/and" is a healthier response to almost any reality under consideration. We should try very hard not to be "sloppy." At the end of most days—back when we wore ties—my wife did not have to ask me what I had had to eat that day—the tie spoke for itself. However, that did not mean that I should resist eating or that I did not need nourishment, just because I was apt to be a bit "sloppy."

3. I like Rem's student example, but I am not totally convinced of one implication. If the student's being "infinite" means that he/she does not then need to go to school because this "infinitity of possibility" will bail him/her out at some point with a lottery ticket that wins millions or a rich uncle/aunt that leaves millions. That doesn't exactly add up to me—so, my friend's comments notwithstanding, I can move back from the altar a bit. It seems to me that "infinity" has some kind of correlation with the word "eternity," and if that is the case in any way, then—given eternity and the finitude of the student's life—the possibility of the win/gift occurring in the life of the student could become very, very slim. "Eternity" can discount a great deal of likelihood. On the other hand, an education might actually have a greater chance of making a positive contribution in the short run of eternity. I resist "infinite possibility," which is beginning to sound like Calvinistic predestination or some kind of necessary destiny. Both Wesley and Arminius would likely believe in the "infinite value" of a human being, but neither of them would go in the direction of a reality that ultimately has predetermined or destined outcomes. Both would talk about the work of human beings in developing selves that achieved higher ranges of potential, and Wesley especially would likely see infinity alongside of perfection, something to be moved toward but something that would never be achieved in its perfected entirety. [I know we can fall back on a next-life option, which is the cop-out solution for many problems, but then non-denumerable infinity really takes over, and that is again—for another day.]

4. Finally, moving yet one more step away from the altar, the discussion of humans being finite and God being infinite has always left me short in any quest to understand God. Isn't God as "infinite" a systemic concept/construct? Isn't that all it is? How much does saying "God is infinite" help, except in traditional apologetic confessions of faith, which we can systemically agree with or disagree with The systemic is one level of evaluative consideration, to be sure, but it is kind of a yes or no, thumbs up or thumbs down, confessional posture that can be meaningful to some and not to others. A very bad analogy would suggest that some people love asparagus and others do

not—but that neither position or agreement about either option has much to do with the asparagus. Actually, all that is being said here is that the traditional theological position on God across the ages, the position held as vitally important by many believers, is that God is infinite. Yet, if you take the concept of eternity as seriously as many traditional theological positions have, then human beings can easily be seen as being infinite as well—all we have to do is interject the idea of eternity again, plenty of time to smooth out a lot of rough edges.

5. I fully and totally agree with Rem on the importance of Leon Pomeroy's book. If his book is studied on even a minor level, the aggressive antipathies—or fears—of so many psychologists about axiology as an equally important pathway toward human understanding could be quieted, and another "both/and" pathway opened. Again, read Grinker's book on "normal," especially his last chapter, and you will easily see a movement beyond psychology to axiology. Now, I am ready to say "enough is enough," and we need no show of hands to recognize all of those in agreement. Best to all.

From Rem to Steve and All: I am ignorant, wrong, and uncertain about many things, but I do have strong convictions about the issue of human finitude and the irrelevance of transfinite logic. No one has ever given me a good reason for thinking that I am mistaken about them. If and when talk about "the infinite value of man" and the soundness of Hartman's "proof" of the infinite value of man ever becomes prevalent again among Hartmaniacs, that will be the day when I forsake axiology and will never come back. But I agree with you that enough has been said, and it is time for us to move on to something else. Thanks for all of your insightful comments!

From Doug to All: All, Thanks for your responses! You will be getting a Zoom invite from me. Note to Rem: You know my fondness for you and how I highly value any and all skepticism that you bring to the table; I would not have it any other way. As you know, I have a lot of math in my background, but no worries here. This meeting will be recorded so we can distribute it as we see fit. The meeting will begin with "Emergent Property Set Theory". It will then move on to solve Hartman's Dilemma. I'm excited for the opportunity to speak to you. Should be lots of fun!

From Mark to Doug: (After the Zoom meeting). I apologize for missing your fine presentation. After listening to the presentation, and thank you for sending it, I am very, very impressed. I fully encourage you to continue your research. Bob was wrong in that you need infinities to express different values. I would encourage you to look at modern developments in "complexity theory". Specifically, complexity deal with emergence as a process. This study has recently taken a very large leap forward in the work of Wolfram. Wolfram has developed an algorithm for demonstrating emergence as a natural process of life and science. He takes his approach back to the birth and development of the universe itself. His approach is directly related to what you are doing. I suggest him to you as you may find his approach to have some advantages over set theory, which is rather crude in comparison to Wolfram. I think I need to do a paper for the institute on Wolfram's work and it relevance. Thanks Doug. Great work, please keep it up.

From Doug to Mark and All: Thanks for your comments, Mark, and the Wolfram lead! The reality of the situation is that Set Theory is not (was not) my first weapon of choice. Once key concepts were identified, I decided to backflush into set theory (for a variety of reasons). Standard set theory notations/concepts do not really support us. You have to go to a highly specialized branch to get at what we are talking about. It does, in fact, exist. Two big names: Bartholomay and

Nicolas Rashevsky. (I like Nicolas). Attached is a paper by Bartholomay (Molecular Set Theory specialist) which has valuable references. Also, in my library: *A Class of Models with the Potential to Represent Fundamental Physics*, Stephen Wolfram. A class of models intended to be as minimal and structure-less as possible is introduced. Even in cases with simple rules, rich and complex behavior is found to emerge, and striking correspondences to some important core of known features of fundamental physics are seen, suggesting the possibility that the models may provide a new approach to finding a fundamental theory of physics. I will move him up the ladder based on your comments! I believe this line of thinking will win the day, and hope you can help by pushing it into the *Journal*! Sky is the limit.