

Etymologically, 'Diabolic' Stands in Contrast to 'Symbolic'

"The opposite of symbolic is the Greek word diabolic (diabólicos) διαβολικός. In turn, diabolic comes from the Greek διάβολος (diábolos). Diábolos, διάβολος is formed from διά (dia = through) and βάλλειν (ballein = to throw, to cast). It literally means the one who throws something through or among others, hence the one who separates or divides."

<http://etimologiaspalomar.blogspot.com/2016/11/simbolico-y-diabolico.html>

This is the basis for Luhmann's use of the pair of concepts.

His application of the meanings of the diabolical and the symbolic is challenged by Christianity's indications of evil.

When Luhmann discusses the primary forms of observation associated with the respective functions of modern society, function systems, he explicitly talks about the cohering symbolism applicable there.

When he juxtaposes the diabolical to this, he uses the term in its very original and precise meaning, as the antithesis of the symbolic, i.e., in meanings where Christianity's adoption of the term has not yet reserved it for the meaning of evil, the devil, what Christians need as the defining opposition to the good, God, within the Christian cosmology, which is hopelessly entangled in the two extreme values of morality.

The diabolical, in Luhmann's systems theory, indicates forms of observation that do not obey but cross and divide a thematized manifest form of symbolism/cohesion, i.e., as observations that

divide and distinguish the content that a thematized symbolism/cohesion consists of.

Cohesions, semantic, structural, are invalidated through the diabolical perspective, put into epoché, when systems theory thematizes a symbolism.

Science observes based on its own distinctions, in order to qualify descriptions and observations based on scientific criteria for truth. It acts through the cohesion it embodies, constitutes, is.

Distinctions and indications live by each other, and they evolve through each other in a process crucial for what can be described scientifically.

Artificial intelligence is now the new kid on the block to create the conditions for these cohesions.

In other words, it's about semantics, and about semantics as the creation of criteria for what makes sense in scientific language use, i.e., about the development of science.

A scientific method, focused on qualifying descriptions as true on the terms of science, must therefore be diabolical towards forms of symbolism that are only the theme for scientific description.

What unfolds within the symbolism of economic rationality, what can be indicated via the communication medium of money, can be described through an external frame of meaning, a frame that is diabolical to economic rationality.

The meaning of science is qualified on foreign terms in relation to economic symbolism. Science, including the science of the economic system and economic man, analyzes and orients itself diabolically in relation to the symbolism of the economy, the symbolism of money.

The social sciences must thematize the forms of symbolism that bind function systems and communities together, and science bears them semantically indicated by virtue of science's own symbolism, which performatively unfolds

diabolically in relation to these thematized forms of scientific attention.

The scientific semantics is centered around the criteria for qualifying one of two fundamental values, namely truth at the expense of falsehood or vice versa. For this purpose serve the methods and theories of science, i.e., the long tradition that has preceded the development hereof.

In system theory, every semantics lives in the form of meaning, and there is no significance, meaning, without the symbolism, coherence, that unfolds semantically as the foundation of meaning. It can be observed, but not necessarily on the premises of the observed coherences.

Social communities and functions cannot necessarily be delimited physically or geographically, but it is still possible to talk about domestication, domains, and identity.

A trained social observer cannot, regarding one's own or others' personal social identity, be blind to the generalizations, traditions, that facilitate the inscription of oneself and others in daily relations.

Social identity is a necessity for modern society, just as it was in more historical contexts of humanity.

What is special, when science's diabolical perspective has truly manifested in the observer, is that the social coherences and the expectation structures that manifest more or less trivially within the social, lose their self-evidence.

Therefore, identity suddenly appears as what it is, namely a construction, carried in its context, thus conditioned.

Coherences are reflected upon and appear as conditioned, losing the natural character of familiarity of everyday life, losing valence, and are seen in the light of other possibilities.

The observer of observations necessarily positions themselves on their own semantic premises, forms of observation, which do not need to utilize the observed observer's form of observation, but rather their own. Thus, science must

necessarily position itself on the premises of science when describing its theme of attention. It can also thematize itself and must, in order to qualify its descriptions of itself as science, be ready to reflect on its own premises, forms of observation, in the light of alternatives within the domain of science.

Dogmatic faithlessness thus constitutes the premise of science, meaning the paradox that only the faithful devotion to faithlessness can qualify a manifest content of a historically constructed and qualified corpus of theoretical and methodological approach to knowledge in a scientific sense.

However, there are differences within the science's faithlessness in relation to theory and method, what distinguishes it from what it describes. The history of science deals with the tradition of viewing methods and theory in contexts. The prerequisite for being able to scientifically indicate valid alternatives to practice is the knowledge of the practice in its conditioned context, i.e., the inscription of the possibilities in their context of conditions. The committed scientific description must be founded on the ability to account for its validity, i.e., the conditions on which the validity is founded.

In principle, everything can be made an object of reflection, i.e., thematized in its conditioned character, but concretely, science will always be tied up in its current constitution, i.e., the practice, performative activity, and historical grounding within which it unfolds.

Thus, it is only in principle and in the long run that everything can be doubted, but not concretely, as there must be a starting point of "non-doubt" behind every doubt.

René Descartes had arrived at the same conclusion, but his certainty, i.e., the assurance behind and in cognition, he let substantiate, in that the thinking self should be able to recognize itself as that to which all doubt owes its existence. Thus, an absolute starting point that cannot be otherwise.

The faithlessness of existentialism applies to cosmology, a specific faithlessness towards the Christian worldview, as seen in the works of Albert Camus, where the dark tones from a universe emptied of meaning result from the Christian cosmology having lost its validity.

When it comes to society, the external world of the psyche, which is based on and differentiates itself on the background of autopoietic system formations within communication and consciousness, its own semantic premises, science will inscribe itself under the domain of the diabolical in relation to the subject of its theme. If, by definition and in an ontological sense, it was of the evil, the conditions for science would be in a dire state!

The ability to reflect on the universes of meaning that unfold in modern society is about constantly being able to enter and exit the meanings that apply conditionally within the different universes, i.e., to navigate the multiverse of universes. It is about the diabolical, i.e., the ability to describe a symbolism on foreign conditions.

It involves an approach to and practice within semantics, consciousness, and communication that must be ontologically neutral or at least on par with the most qualified approaches of the natural sciences to what exists, thus the study of "that which is" as well as "to be," which is "the whole."

The best-qualified forms of diabolical practice are characterized by being explicit about their own unfinished nature, the fundamentally Sisyphean aspect of the affair.

It cannot help but appear overly ambitious, while it must also be self-erasingly humble.