NICK TO GEORGE

***Ok, so in my monist psychology I assert that motives are the integrals (or derivatives, I have never been sure) of behavior. To say I am motivated in an instant is a category error, benign only so long as one recognizes that the empirical basis for our instantaneous attribution is the shape of the curve of behavior over time.***

GEORGE TO NICK

**🧠 Claim (Paraphrased):**

To say "I am motivated" at a given instant is a shorthand—a projection backward or forward from a trajectory of behavior.

In your **monist psychology**, motives are not hidden essences, not inner engines.  
They are **summaries of behavioral curves**:

* Perhaps **integrals**, when motives are inferred from accumulated actions
* Perhaps **derivatives**, when motives are inferred from sudden changes in behavior

But in either case:

**“Motivation” is not an instantaneous property—it is a curve-fitting hypothesis over time.**

**🧭 Why this matters:**

This reframes motive as:

* Not a **thing** in the head
* Not a **cause** per se
* But a **description of continuity** or curvature in behavior space

This is a kind of **teleological realism** without metaphysical baggage.  
You’re not positing ghosts or mental levers. You’re saying:

“We read intentions the way we read acceleration—from position over time.”

**🧬 Parallel to entropy?**

You could say:

* Entropy is not something you **have** in a moment.
* It’s something you can **measure** from the path a system is disposed to take—or the configuration space it tends to spread into.
* It becomes **visible** only in the **shape of change**—not the snapshot.

So both **motivation** and **entropy** are:

* Not intrinsic point-properties
* But **interpretive functions over time and configuration**
* **Curve-based attributions** grounded in empirical regularities

**📐 And the category error?**

To say "I am motivated *now*" is like saying "this point *has* curvature."  
Strictly speaking, no point does.  
But give me a neighborhood—give me a path—and I can calculate a derivative or an integral and give the illusion of an inner quality.

It’s a **useful illusion**, but one we must not mistake for substance.

**🌿 Final thought:**

You're not erasing motivation.  
You're re-anchoring it in the observable world—**as structure, not substance**.

And if that's not pragmatist metaphysics, I don't know what is.

NICK TO GEORGE

***Is there such a move to be made around entropy. Could I vary the gas equation variables in box B in such a way that they would point to equality with box A without actually getting there, and thus reveal entropy?***