

# Get Rid of Our Final Taboo!

– The Human Ability to Create is Thinkable

*Condensed Presentation of*  
***Hyperdialog*** BETA 01  
*Part 1: The Fundamentals*  
*Ola Alexander Frisk*

## *Get Rid of Our Final Taboo!*

*– The Human Ability to Create is Thinkable*

Condensed Presentation of  
Hyperdialog, Beta 01,  
Part 1: The Fundamentals

Ola Alexander Frisk

ISBN 91-975929-2-7  
Hyperdialog Förlag, Ekerö, Sweden 2005

hyperdialog@gmail.com  
<http://hyperdialog.blogspot.com>

Copyright © 1995–2005 Ola Alexander Frisk  
All rights reserved  
Hyperdialog is a registered trademark

### *Publication history*

The main content of this text are from:  
Hyperdialog, Beta 01,  
Del 1: Grunden  
Hyperdialog Förlag 2005  
ISBN 91-975929-0-0

# Content

About.....	4
Abstract.....	5
Alert.....	6
Our Dynamic Opportunity.....	7
Today Innovation Must be Expected – Previously, Obedience was Demanded.....	7
Don't Get Stuck in Final Decisions and Rules.....	8
Capture Our Hidden Knowledge .....	9
The Process of Dialog.....	9
The Superior Distinction of how to Reach Understanding.....	9
Static Logic.....	11
Dynamic Process of Dialog.....	11
Hypersociation – A Contradiction is a Relation.....	12
The Process of Dialog – Analyse and Generation.....	13
Systems – Heaven or Hell.....	13
Useful Emotions.....	14
Grasp Dynamic Processes.....	14
Get Rid of Confusion and Discover Possibilities.....	16
The Static Tradition Itself.....	16
The Active Hinder.....	17
The Passive Hinder.....	17
About the Dominant Tradition to Explain our Ability to Create .....	18
Vicious Circle.....	18
Conclusion.....	18
Final Conclusion – What It Is All About.....	19
Hyperdialog and Hermeneutics.....	20
Acknowledgements.....	21
Selected Bibliography.....	21

# *About*

This is the first book in a series of three; and present the foundations necessary to understand dynamics and use the dialog as a concrete and practical tool. The second book will be about the function and process of the dialog. The third book will present some fragments of the history of dynamics and how knowledge of dynamics has been forgotten. As the subtitle, Beta 01, indicates this is a work in progress. Consequently I, the author, hope to inspire dialogs about the art, nature and reason of dialogs.

*Contact me via  
<http://hyperdialog.blogspot.com>  
or [hyperdialog@gmail.com](mailto:hyperdialog@gmail.com)*

## *Abstract*

Hyperdialog concerns the human ability to use and understand dynamic thinking and acknowledging the tools for this purpose: the process of dialog, together with logic, as faculties of reason. This perspective might sound strange but this concept is based on ideas that Aristotle acknowledged. Nevertheless, the dominant tradition today is to believe that reason consists solely of static logic, and subsequently we are forced into an inability to understand how we resolve contradictions. Thus our ability to resolve contradictions, by use of dialog, is not considered to be within our culture and as a consequence the process of dialog is considered impossible, paradoxical or even assumes mystical dimensions. One benefit of acknowledge the process of dialog as one of the faculties of reason is that many fields of knowledge can be re-understood and new possibilities arise to find systemic relationships. With today's dominant tradition of reason being seen as adhering exclusively to the faculty of logic, we fail to describe many basic human areas in as an intelligible fashion as would be the case were we as well incorporate dialog as a faculty of reason. Today, the dominant tradition of reason excludes the non-logical ability to resolve contradictions used in learning, communication of complex ideas, play or innovation, as well as in spoken dialogs.

# *Alert*

This presentation is directed to experience and to reason – not to what we believe we can talk about. The idea is to bridge the gap between our experience and what we believe we can put into words. Hyperdialog is about possibilities or an invitation to a useful perspective of the world. But please observe that Hyperdialog, like a screwdriver, can be useful indeed, although trying to apply one to every problem is a bad joke. This presentation is limited to the fundamental relations that make it possible to understand the process of dialog as a practical tool in the same fashion as we acknowledge logic as a tool. In order to limit the scope of this presentation, I save arguments, historic perspectives, a systematic presentation of the elements of the process of dialog, and practical examples for another text. Although my core message has been said before in many forms and fashions, this message bears renewal in a new form. Our current epoch dooms ourselves to disrespect the most fundamental functions of human abilities and this prevents us not only from understanding ourselves but also into disregarding both ourselves and our potential.

## *Our Dynamic Opportunity*

We need dynamics. While we have an intuitive understanding of dynamics in practice when we are in motion, our traditions of knowledge and description generally assume static descriptions. Thus, we do not fully grasp dynamics in spite of our potential, since our words and descriptions primarily conceptualise static relationships. Words and traditions lock us into the static tradition, regardless of what we want. Our opportunity is to re-understand our potential for describing our world from a dynamic perspective.

### *Today Innovation Must be Expected — Previously, Obedience was Demanded*

The competence we need today is in many ways different from what was needed only some years ago. Today we need to be innovative, flexible and dynamic. Previously, the established order of how things should be was regarded as the final answer. Today, there are few situations where there is an established order to obey. Today we have to invent our next steps daily. Some ingredients of this difference include constant worldwide competition, handheld computers and the Internet. In short we have overseen a transition from a focus on material production to one of intellectual production. Since we are living in a process of change, there is a gap between our current needs and the traditions of yesterday that still dominate our possibilities. One of many examples of this gap is that we currently dislike "Command-and-control" organisation of work simply because it is inefficient, but at the same time find it hard to define alternatives. We often work nowadays in specific projects or task-oriented work groups where the objective is to create new ideas. Yet we still have little or no understanding of processes that can help us to understand what we can do to reach our goals or grasp our possibilities.

Today work consists mostly of dialogs in its many forms and fashions: for example the dialogs we are engaged in meetings and negotiations, or our internal dialogs when no one is able to help us master a new digital gadget. The complexity of the tasks means that we must start dialogs in order to understand the nature of the situation we find ourselves in. Also, constant change itself creates a need of reaching an understanding, since the information we had moments ago may later on be obsolete. More and more people must therefore rely on their ability to perform dialogs – not only to make the company successful but even to be ensure they keep their jobs. Earlier, most work consisted of obeying commands originating in a small circle of management. The tool the elite has always used to reach their decisions has been dialog. Today ever

more persons must possess this competence. This is not to say that integrating order and command with dialog (or innovation) is impossible. To believe so reveals an incomplete understanding of dialog's potential, nature or character. In other words: We live in a world we are not prepared for. Many ideas with which we are educated and trained to follow simply are not valid for our daily life. We live in a time where the earlier traditions of how to work, communicate and live still are active even though our lives frequently demand other solutions. We are trained to follow static frames and explanations but live in a dynamic world. Yet because we are smart we get by simply by continuing to work – and occasionally create new solutions on the fly. But as soon as we begin to become aware of what we do or how we think we fall silent, since our static concepts and vocabulary limit ourselves to the pursuit of static ideals. If we try to catch our fluid processes with our static frame of mind, our ideas and actions become stiff and meaningless. Today, we need to grasp dynamic processes in the same fashion as we earlier learned to understand nature from a static perspective with the aid of logic. In short: we are now expected to be innovative, yet our established traditions of reasoning have trained and constrained us to following static ideals and commands.

To grasp that there are real and unquestionable possibilities using a dynamic perspective, we must grasp that it is sensible and possible to possess a dynamic perspective. One way to begin is to recognise that we all use a dynamic process of dialog in speech. We are aware while speaking that understanding unfolds. We adopt new observations and arguments and form new understandings. It may be hard to grasp that such a mundane, humble and ordinary thing can be the key to hidden knowledge.

### *Don't Get Stuck in Final Decisions and Rules*

The understanding of dialog and dynamic processes conveys the unanticipated side benefit that we are even able to re-assess static relations. This means we can then better understand and separate static from dynamic situations – and as a consequence not remain stuck in static ideas and decisions in a dynamic world.

When we cannot understand dynamic processes, we are forced to consider the world as only consisting of static objects, rules and relations. Consequently, we poorly understand basic human dynamic abilities like creation, learning and communication.

# Capture Our Hidden Knowledge

## *The Process of Dialog*

The Process of Dialog can be said to be the tool where we form the new and not yet understood, creating understanding and thereby giving us meaning. This process is traditionally described as a *thesis* being combined with an *antithesis* to produce a *synthesis*. This simple structure or process is one of the foundations of dialog and can be applied to many situations and areas, of which spoken dialog is but one application. That we currently often believe that dialog is limited to the spoken application of the process is perhaps the first hinder to developing a broader understanding of dialog. What we do in a dialog is to solve the difference or the contradiction between the new information and our already established understanding, or between the thesis and the antithesis. The solution usually takes the form of an answer or narrative of ideas that fit the situation and this answer or new information is the synthesis. We are able to do so because we possess this ability, as well as possessing the ability to follow logic and to follow up on what we already know.

## *The Superior Distinction of how to Reach Understanding*

The ancient Greeks said that there are two possible ways of understanding. By observing, or by questions and arguments: the process of dialog. Observation later in history became the tradition of how one studies nature, or to be even more precise: logic. Dialog, in the meanwhile, was forgotten, especially as a mass-market tool to approaching understanding. Today we want to believe that logic is the only possible faculty of mind – and we find ourselves falling silent in situations where it fails to assist our fundamental human abilities like learning, communication and how to create ideas.

Aristotle (384–322 BCE) noted in his book "Topics" that it is much easier to learn how to be logical, than to master dialog. The complex dialog was however a needed competency that the elite had to master in order to develop or lead society – others should only obey that which was created by the elite. It can be said that this tradition has continued to our present day. Not necessarily with an intention of keeping knowledge of dialog secret, since confusion about the proper use of the dialog has made most of the descriptions useless anyway.

Therefore, it is no surprise that dialog has simply been forgotten once the study of nature became a successful generator of prosperity. One must also remember that needs in society were once rather simple and uncomplicated compared to today. Our civilisation could prosper using far less complicated abilities than the process of dialog, especially in the earlier stages of the technological and commercial revolution. Most people worked using their body as simple machines that only needed to follow traditional commands and rules of what had already been established. Now, as our culture begins to depend on more complex structures, where fast worldwide communication on an individual level has become commonplace and when intellectual capabilities are increasingly important, the process of dialog becomes a needed and treasured skill for everyone when the value is realised.

According to Aristotle in *Topics*, as I currently grasp it, there is distinction between what we can observe and what we can discuss. Consequently, there are two separate categories of how to reach understanding that I call: *The Superior Distinction of how to Reach Understanding*, which separates

1. Static relations: That which we can understand through observation or demonstration, which later in history became recognised as logic, from
2. Dynamic relations: That which we are able to understand assisted by a process of asking questions and building arguments with our ability to think – that is the process of dialog.

This Greek system was a perfect harmony. One faculty for contradictions and one faculty for relations that are not contradictory. Accordingly, using this perspective, logic cannot, per definition, be the only faculty of our ability to think, although that is commonly believed today. A more complete model of reason is one that also incorporates the process of dialog, allowing and legitimating information to be collected both from logic and dialog. When we grasp that there are at least two faculties that complement each other and not just one, we understand logic alone as limited and that the *relationship*, or to be more precise, the *dialog* between these two components function to provide greater understanding and meaning. It is equally fruitless is to get stuck in the opposite extreme, to be counter-reactionary and to reject logic and claim dialog as the solitary path to understanding. Which approach is best is situational and requires appraisal of the possibilities or problems at stake. But it is more than an either/or choice. Knowledge of the processes of dialog enriches our understanding of what is even meant by logic. We see the formerly static understanding now as an option instead of as before, the only possibility, or the "truth". In short, logic and the process of dialog might be said to have this relation: that which becomes logic is what we define as logic via the process of dialog.

## Static Logic

There are numerous definitions of what logic is. Since I assume that it is impossible to present a precise yet comprehensive description of logic, I will here stick to only one, but a very important component of the definition of logic, one that may safely be said to be included in great many definitions of logic. I believe that most other details of a definition of logic can be related to this central definition. This core of the idea of logic is often called "*The Law of Noncontradiction*" formulated by Aristotle in "*Metaphysics*". He writes: "*It is impossible for the same thing at the same time to belong and not belong to the same thing at the same time and in the same respect.*" With logic it is possible to grasp non-contradictory relations and is the base for static comparisons such as measurements. Since logic can be used to examine relationships, means that logic is a sufficient faculty for most simple assignments, such as following rules and obeying commands, which is basically nothing more than accomplishing what has already been defined.

When we are able to grasp the dominant static tradition of today, then we also are able to recognise the limits to what we can understand but are not able to put into words. This is our hidden knowledge of how to solve contradictions, an ability we are untrained to use or develop in the present static tradition. Not only do we not realise that the static tradition is but one approach to understanding, we have as well come to misrepresent Aristotle himself by limiting his contribution. Today Aristotle is called "the father of logic". Yet, in reality, he must also be recognised as a "father of the process of dialog". At least in the sense that he probably was the first to make an extensive systematic description of dialog – as well as logic. The significance of this cannot, of course, be recognised when observed strictly from within the static tradition. From Aristotle's point of view logic and the dialog were each other's complement. That Aristotle wrote about the dialog in his book *Topics* is almost forgotten today, since it does not fit the dominant idea of reason or our "picture" of Aristotle.

## Dynamic Process of Dialog

In the same fashion that logic can only handle what is not contradictory, dialog is the tool for solving what is contradictory. Contradictions are the fundamentals for dialogs, since that is what we resolve in our dialogs. That our epoch dislikes contradictions is understandable, since it is common to believe that logic is our only faculty of thought. For example, in my computer's thesaurus "Contradiction" is explained with: "A refusal to grant the truth of a statement or charge," and lists the synonyms: "denial", "rejection", "negation" and "disclaimer". To accept the nature of contradictions is to accept dialog as well as our human abilities to form dialogs. When our thinking is based on logic, we make our lives more difficult, simply because we are forced to understand con-

traditions as threats to the existing order, since we have no or limited abilities to understand processes that are not describable as logical. But when thinking is based on solving contradictions, our mode of thinking can incorporate both the existing and the becoming, as well as what lies between. When thinking is limited to the already existing, there is little possibility of understanding the future, since the idea of process cannot be understood. The only conceivable possibility seems to be to preserve the existing. In this sense every change is evil and must not take place. Therefore there is a common fear of "conflicts". I think it is proper to use the word *conflict* when there is no understanding of the process of dialog. The word "conflict" has its own meaning and generally refers to something bad. From the perspective of dialog, in which contradictions are accepted, the many different forms contradictions take become useful, such as for learning where contradictions illuminate what we already know from what we do not yet grasp. Furthermore, this way of looking at contradictions can even be useful in understanding communication and our ability to create new ideas that resolve contradictions.

### *Hypersociation — A Contradiction is a Relation*

That an analogy or an association describes a relation can be easily understood. At least we have been told so since our childhood. But that a contradiction also is a relation, a contradictory relation, is harder to grasp in the same sense as described above. Our understanding that processes are built of complex relations becomes much more useful once we recognise that these relations can also take the form of contradictions. When we deny ourselves the insight that contradictions are also relations, when we only accept ethical condemnation, we deny ourselves the possibility of converting the negations into positive relations. Were we able to handle contradictions as easy as we currently use associations to understand, form and develop relationships we would make great strides in understanding processes and dialog itself. Both associations and contradictions have a function in describing relationships that we use. Consequently, if both associations and contradictions have a category or common name it would become easier to understand the function of relationship, or indicators, of both associations and contradictions. For this reason I call them both *Hypersociations*. *Hypersociations* is also a mirror of a definition of reason that incorporates both the processes of dialog as well as logic.

## *The Process of Dialog — Analyse and Generation*

Today, when dialog is mentioned, it is often understood as a tool for analysis. One of the reasons for this is the tradition of the fragmentary understanding of the nature of dialog. We think for example of Socrates (469–399 BCE) and his dialogs, which in the hands of Plato (427–347 BCE) was to analyse ideas or points of view. We have forgotten that using dialog for analysis requires us to generate new ideas that aid the process of reaching an outcome. Thus, the process of dialog can be used for both analysing and for generating ideas. That the later function is forgotten is of course a consequence of our more recent tradition of relying so heavily on static logic and our apparent belief that we cannot understand our ability to create.

## *Systems — Heaven or Hell*

Systems play an important role in many situations. When systems or specified relations are considered in a perspective of static logic, the presented relationships have a different value than when a system is viewed in the perspective of the dynamic process of dialog. The process of dialog itself can be described in a systematical manner, with specified functions and elements. However this short presentation is only an introduction to such a systemic description. From a static perspective a system is a kind of rule or set of rules that must be followed. From a dynamic point of view a system is something that can be built, redesigned, changed or totally remade in combination with other systems. Systems are wonderful things. Think only about your personal system of using your kitchen. Is it not great to not have to search for a knife every time you need one? How about the system you are using right now – the alphabet? A system can be anything that we decide is a system. However, the idea is that a system has defined components and relationships among these components.

Awareness that a system is a system allows you to observe and understand consequences of changes made to the system. Therefore, a system is a very useful tool when you want to understand relationships. In other words, we are able to decide whether an observation is consistent with the existing system or not. If it is, we can say that the observation is according to logic. One instance is the system you have in your kitchen to sort tableware. You possess an almost instantaneous overview of where the various components are located, and you are able to act immediately on that knowledge virtually without thinking. Regarding my intention with a systematic description of the elements of the dialog, I do not, of course, wish to make dialogs automatic or machine like, but it is absurd to waste time merely to locate the proper tool. The goal is larger, using the efficiency of a system in a personal way that fits a further need. To continue the analogy, an well-ordered kitchen is not necessarily a goal in itself since the final aim can be to make it easy to create magnificent dinners together with your friends.

In the tradition of logic we have only been trained to follow systems and not to create systems. We like to hate the messenger instead of the source, since it is easier. Therefore not many of us like dealing with systems, because systems – from the perspective of logic – can only be obeyed and cannot be understood as a foundation for creation. There are lots of systems that help us to create, such as the alphabet. Thanks to that, there is an agreement of what the letters symbolise, so we are able to read and write. It is the same with musical notation or our mathematical symbols. We are able to carry out the same process with any other system. Consequently, there is much to gain by learning the systematic elements of dialog in the same manner as we use the elements of the systematical alphabet.

### *Useful Emotions*

The process of dialog helps us to understand relations between emotions and facts. In a static perspective we are taught to avoid emotions, an ideal even our personal experience reveals as not always very helpful. This avoidance can, for some, result in the opposite reaction: that everything becomes defined in terms of the emotional, another dysfunctional strategy. However if we look upon emotions as expressions of awareness of contradictions toward that we already defined and understood – emotions are invitations to dialogs for the purpose of understanding and definition. In short emotions are, from this perspective, impulses to better meet the future.

### *Grasp Dynamic Processes*

Since we currently mostly believe that logic is our only paradigm, we are forced to choose between what seems logical and what seems totally mystical. Yet, since dynamic processes can be understood using dialog – processes like learning, communication – our ability to create can also be described or understood as better following the rules of dialog than logic. A common illusion arising because of our static-logic orientation is that we humans lack ability to understand processes as such. From the perspective of dialog, understanding processes is not an illusion but a reasonable possibility. To explain this ability it might be useful to present arguments from a dialogic perspective based in the tradition of static logic. These arguments are as follows.

1. When we believe that we (personally) only are able to understand what we (globally) already know, then we are only able to refer or talk about what we (as humans) already know.
2. This means that we cannot transgress the boundaries of what we already know. This situation can be said to be a static closed system.
3. In such a closed system it is possible to associate all known ideas to each other. Therefore, every idea can be said to have a logical relation to each other. This is a world that is based on logic and consists of logic.
4. Anything outside of this closed, logical world is, by definition, impossible to talk about.\*
5. This logical world can be compared with a world which acknowledges the process of dialog, one that is able to resolve contradictions.
6. This means that, in this dialogical world, there are actually no boundaries for what can be understood, since it is possible to resolve the contradictions between what is known and what is not yet understood.
7. This dialogical world can therefore be described as a dynamic or open system.
8. Since the process in the closed system is restricted to what is already known, such a process can metaphorically be said to be the equivalent to following an existing map.
9. A process in an open system can in the same fashion be said to knowing how to make or draw a new map.
10. In a world where processes consist of resolving contradictions, but when only logic is applied, the experience of resolving contradictions cannot be explained, and therefore it is believed that processes that do not follow what already is known cannot be understood or explained.
11. Our world is an open system, but it is mostly believed to be a closed system, and therefore the illusion arises that we cannot grasp dynamic processes that transgress what is already known.

\* This relation is the same as the famous argument of Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889–1951) in his *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* where he claimed: "*Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent!*". He needed this argument to define the order of facts (the order of what is already known) or what we call science. Yet, this is not the sum of the world. It must also be remembered that he later spend many years trying to get rid of this relation.

## Get Rid of Confusion and Discover Possibilities

We now turn to the kind of restrictions the static tradition places on our possibilities of understanding, and what reason, logic and the process of dialog and their traditions mean. When we have some perspective of processes and dialog as a very useful tool of understanding processes, we are able to rediscover our world, relationships and possibilities. Today, we cannot understand our ability to create, and it is the same with our ability to learn and to communicate. The same situation also concerns the process of dialog – and above all few today believe we can fully understand processes. To all these enigmas or paradoxes there is one answer, and that is the ancient Greeks idea that the *process* of dialog is the key to understand dynamic processes, such as our ability to create, learn and communicate. Yet, this simple message is still almost impossible for us to absorb for the reasons listed below. *Nota Bene*: The following explanation is not the only possible explanation of why we do not currently understand the process of dialog.

### *The Static Tradition Itself*

The excuse that we cannot understand rather simple activities serves to obscure the issue. Accordingly, the excuses become the explanation. Not only do we label our ability to create as somewhat "mystical", but also we come to claim that it must be mystical in nature and cannot be fully understood. In the same fashion, and for the same reasons, there is a powerful illusion of a mystical dialog. Nevertheless, this tradition of belief is strong, and reasonable argument is avoided due to the pure force of referring to the dominant tradition as "it has always been so". The static tradition of describing the world consists of an *active hinder* and a *passive hinder*, preventing our ability to comprehend the process of dialog as a reasonable endeavour.

### *The Active Hinder*

The Greeks that founded Western culture said that the process of dialog was the antithesis to what we today call logic. This makes sense in practice, since we must have a tool to be able to create logic – because logic itself has no such capability. But today we live in an epoch where we consider our reason to be synonymous with logic, which by definition cannot contain something that is contrary to logic. Consequently, we have little possibility of describing our ability to create when only logic is considered. This relationship is the active hinder that makes it impossible to recognise what I earlier called the superior distinction of how to reach understanding.

### *The Passive Hinder*

In a world that only accepts logic, dynamic processes must, per definition, be defined by something other than the process of dialog. Therefore, from the perspective of logic, dynamic processes are doomed to be regarded as mystical. In such a world this serves to explain our human abilities with resort to mysticism. The bizarre consequence is that such a world must rely on mysticism to be able to form and protect logic. Therefore truly mystical explanations become valid foundations in a "logical" world when processes must be "explained". A good example of this confusion is the myth of creativity, which is nothing more, and nothing less, than an industrialisation and adaptation of the Christian tradition of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost is also called "Spirit of Understanding" as well as "Spirit of Creation". This mystification not only takes the place of reasonable descriptions, it is also activates many forms or layers of taboos. The first layer is religious; to create can be dangerous since it is to replace the godhead. The second layer consists of taboos against religious questions in a world dominated by logic. The interesting consequence of this relation is that the religious taboos are strengthened and work with full power – perhaps even more powerfully today than when religion openly was the dominant power in our society. This passive protection includes conceptualising the process of dialog as a part of religious tradition. When the only formalised use of dialog for generations (separating by more than two thousands years the ancient Greeks and ourselves) has been for religious purposes. Therefore, it is not strange that when we nowadays attempt to talk about dialog we use concepts and ideas that reminds us of religion. Recognising these religious conceptualisations today also triggers feeling of taboo due to the unease many feel for religion. Having said this, it must be made clear that the questions of religion have in themselves nothing to do with the processes of dialog as a reasonable and practical tool. Similarly, a church is built using ordinary building materials and is ordinary – until it is consecrated, declared sacred by a solemn ceremony and becomes, in a religious perspective, more than an ordinary building.

### *About the Dominant Tradition to Explain our Ability to Create*

"Creativity" is a new phenomenon. Ideas about "creativity" started to explode around 1920 when the industrial economy needed new products. "Creativity," from the perspective of dialog, can be seen as a temporary entry into the process of dialog in a world where individuals usually are confined to static logic. When contradictions are not allowed and when the intellectual process of dialog cannot be used openly, there was a need for a mystical representation of the human ability to create, and religious symbols were transferred and mixed with human experiences and needs. Here, the "Spirit of Creativity" is more important than intellectual understanding of the processes. The literature about "creativity" is mostly about a hidden dialog. For example, we commonly hear about handy tricks to enhance "creativity," which are indeed something of methods to create and resolve contradictions – what else can it be? However, since contradictions or dialog per se are rarely identified as essentials for creation of new ideas, our ability to create is bound to be misunderstood in a blend of ideas based on logic and outright mysticism. To describe our ability to create by incorporating the process of dialog might be the final taboo of our epoch.

### *Vicious Circle*

If the above described aspects are not taken in account, any effort to try to understand the process of dialog may very well end in a vicious circle, because the elements mentioned here have become a interlocking closed system.

### *Conclusion*

Dialog does not evade explanation, nor is it mystical. Unfortunately, the present and dominant perspective or frame of mind that I call the *Epoch of Mystical Logic* works to deny the human ability to resolve contradictions and reach reasonable or even logical explanations.

## Final Conclusion:

# What It Is All About

Logic is universal and important, but it is not the most powerful way of utilising our ability to think systematically and reasonably. The most powerful process we have is reason – which determines logic. Accordingly, if we understand things using only logic, then we are not able to understand reason. If we live in a culture that, for the time being, cherishes logic and believes logic supreme – reason cannot be understood.

With reason we can discover, plan and create our future – that is, what we can do in the next step. If we limit ourselves to logic we can only understand, think and talk about what already has been done; the established.

We may enjoy ideas that can be said to be illogical. Even if such joys can flourish, it is easy to get the taste that it is a poor substitute for, and inferior to, logic. Furthermore, we might fear not complying with the ideal of logic; to limit ourselves to only talking and thinking about the established. If we have such feelings we are not only influenced by *The Epoch of Mystical Logic* – we become a part of it. To be a part of this era is to deny ourselves our possibilities, of using reason to build our future.

*The Epoch of Mystical Logic* was, or perhaps is, an era where it was forgotten and denied that reason has TWO main tools: logic AND the process of dialog. It is our ability to use the process of dialog that gives us the capacity to go beyond the limits of the already established.

If only be able to survive, we must master the art of becoming, to reach the next step in thoughts, actions and in every spoken dialog. We must, accordingly, use the process of dialog.

## *Hyperdialog and Hermeneutics*

Today the dialog is often associated with a special tradition called *Hermeneutics*. However the idea of the dialog is much older, than *Hermeneutics*, and has inspired many different traditions. Since the aim with *Hyperdialog* is to present the dialog as an concrete and practical tool – I imagine that this perspective is far to "systemic" or "practical" to be a part of the "reflective" *Hermeneutic* tradition. When this is said it must also be said that reflection need a space were there is no need of practice and concrete results. It must also be said that the tradition of *Hermeneutics* has defended and developed the traditions of the dialog in times when the dialog has been neglected. Consequently I firmly believe there is a need and a gain to regard *Hyperdialog* and *Hermeneutic* as two separate domains or traditions. I will get back to this issue in part three.

## Acknowledgements

Hyperdialog is the result of several years of study and practical work to understand dialog in work processes. Some of his work has been funded by an Initiative of the European Union's Social Fund called *Adaptation to Industrial Change* via *The European Social Fund* and from two Swedish foundations, The Foundation Culture of the Future (*Stiftelsen framtidens kultur*) and The Foundation for Knowledge and Competence (*KK Stiftelsen*). The objectives has been to grasp what is going on when people work in innovative projects, from the perspective of dialog, and to construct tools that can be used for guidance and help in such work processes. Please observe that the mentioned organisations does not necessarily endorse the views expressed in this book.

## Selected Bibliography

Aristotle;

Metaphysics,

[www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?lookup=Aristot.+Met.+1.980a](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?lookup=Aristot.+Met.+1.980a),  
accessed 5 October 2005.

Topics, <http://etext.library.adelaide.edu.au/a/aristotle/a8t/>,  
accessed 5 October 2005.

Ludwig Wittgenstein;

The Blue and the Brown Books, Blackwell, 1997.

Philosophical Investigations, Blackwell, 2000.

Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus, Routledge, 1996. And at

<http://www.gutenberg.org/dirs/etext04/tloph10.txt>,  
accessed 5 October 2005.