

HOW  
CAN I HELP YOU?

BY  
JOE VIVIANO

Is an operationalist framework necessary to justify intellectual activity? For a human to create a pen, it must perform the operational task of assembly. For a human to use a pen and paper to write a sentence, it operates the pen to write. So here we have two modes of operation: the writer and the assembler. Is the operational task of assembly necessary, or more or less necessary, than the task of writing? How is it true that the so-called intellectual benefits all the individuals in society if they are, operationally speaking, engaged in either talking activities for taking money and attention from others, or writing activities for taking money and attention from others? Is anything at all given back to the others, that's to say, all the others? Does not the sentence "Science improves our lives." not beg the question who "our" refers to? And what of the sentence "We did this." when referring to a scientific feat, like flying to the moon? Does this not beg the question, "How is "we" to be understood?" Does the use of a statement, such as "We tortured someone to death." and the negative mood it evokes (disgust) negate the positive mood (of inclusion) evoked when someone says "We flew to the moon?" In both cases, the operational deployment of the statement triggers an emotional response and perhaps also a mental simulation: a feeling of inclusion in the case of the moon-landing; a feeling of revulsion in the case of the torturer. This said, how can any action or device be said to benefit every individual in society, if they only enjoy a simulated, and not actual, benefit? "An invention must be something more than an object that hypnotizes a crowd into being subordinated for its production." I lay this sentence before my reader, like a coat of arms, to indicate the crisis that is the driving force of this project: to rescue inventions and artifices of every kind and, hopefully, affirm their value to society.

A possible objection to this aim is that society does not exist. Or, if it exists, that it exists in word only. Retarded people, for example, are included under the umbrella term "society" and yet they themselves can hardly say that they were benefited by, say, a car, which they cannot operate. Using our powers of mental simulation we can, first, imagine a society as a "civilization" only to, if we wish, eclipse that notion of "civilization" and the "civility" alleged with a gloomy mental simulation of "competition" erasing the notion of civilization entirely and depriving it of any reality. Every industrialized nation on Earth suffers from this common situation of assembling products the product-assemblers cannot afford. The child slaves used to mine for diamonds cannot afford diamonds, just as iPhone assembly workers cannot afford iPhones, just as the retail workers cannot afford all the products they sell. And what does the inventor, the artificer, do in all of this, besides ink up an artifice which triggers this desultory human activity? Is that all? There must be more to the human game than triggering human response.

To think of reason operationally one must recognize that "reason" is the word that triggers a body into "answering" and nothing besides. The question "What's the potato for that?" will not in itself trigger a human to know that I mean "What's the reason for that?" without some conditioning. Man cannot even be thought of as a "reasonable" animal by nature at all, else feral children would still be reasonable. It's unclear that "reasonableness" is a natural quality of the human being if having that quality is a result of conditioning. Humans may be reasonable, however, this is a statement of limited value, as it's also true that humans are barkable: able to react to a dog's bark. A dog is man's best friend because humans value obedience. All human beings are born with a memetic deficit that can be molded by their environment and the others inhabiting it, as proved by feral humans utterly beyond domestication. Consequently, the human being is constantly compensating for that memetic lack through the extraction of speech in the case of sounds, and writing in the case of signs. Nietzsche's early concerns were related to educational problems; and, for the sake of brevity, I shall present the wheel on which his mind was stretched as the eternal clash of "education" on the one hand, and "intuition" on the other. But there are more wheels besides this. For instance, "the fain spreading of learning among the greatest number of people" on the one hand, and "the compulsory renunciation of that claim in order to subordinate itself to the services of the State." on the other. A tool is needed to avoid these wheels that shredded Nietzsche's sanity.

Here the rhetorical and the actual overlap rather profoundly, so the tool I will introduce is a categorical distinction between the two, with the rhetorical on the one hand, and the actual on the other. What I call the actual are words like “use” and “operate” while what I call the rhetorical are words like “help” and “benefit.” I use things and I operate things, so these are acts I perform. However, I never perform the act of “help” nor “benefit” except in the form of the declarative persuasive rhetorical statement, like for example when I say “That was helpful.” Politicians, rhetoricians, and advertisers, perform this trick of recording an isolated declarative statement of “help” and deploying it against their audiences to make them simulate a rhetorical but not actual inclusion in their minds. In our present age it's commonplace for science communicators to say that “we can do science to help humanity” but the reality is that a scientific experiment has never been done under the pretext of helping humanity. What really happens is far less impressive: the scientist tries to do something to see if it works, writing down results as they go. It's only after the reported success that these so-called science communicators appear on our televisions to pronounce these isolated cases of success humanity wide. This is an overextension.

It is important to separate the “quest” from the “request.” Consider Christianity; the priests invited their flocks to imagine themselves “living” in someone “dead” (Jesus), so the priest's quest was satisfied by the fulfillment of their request. Also consider the bygone quest for full automation; the factory owner invited the laboratory technician to create for him a product to help him stop having to create products, so the owner's quest was satisfied by the fulfillment of their request. Now consider the modern quest for the production of an obedient synthetic subject (artificial intelligence); the tech company owner invites their employees to create a synthetic subject that will “do what we want” which, again, satisfies the owner's request by the fulfillment of their request. It's frightening to notice that the tech company owner, allegedly interested in artificial intelligence and therefore an obedient synthetic subject, in fact has no need to create an obedient synthetic subject because he already has obedient biological ones. It would be a mistake to think that this implied any conspiracy as this is unnecessary, as we consider that begging is man's primal character. All humans engage in begging activity. The infant begs for food just as the beggar begs for work just as the politician begs for votes just as the scientist begs for funding just as the companies beg for money. Crying. Yelling. Shouting. Calling. Singing. Speaking. All are speech acts done to evoke human response. Writing is the dislocation of this evocative power. In the case of the traffic sign, it becomes an instructional request to “Stop” and “Yield” and “Go” and so on, and the result of all this obedience is a planet consisting of billions of human beings reacting to and creating new existentially necessary instructional signs. But may there someday be an end to all this?

Briefly I must tell a story of how my good will got the better of me, back before I learned that decades ago Heidegger pronounced cybernetics to be the end of philosophy. As I heard science communicators and teachers talk about the possibility of ending world hunger, I visualized the installation of a future invention I called the cyberstomach. However, the cyberstomach would not rid me of what was truly irritating about hunger, namely organic harassment. Even if the cyberstomach is installed, it will deploy pangs of maintenance still. Furthermore I recognized that human beings would also have to suffer the lessons on the cyberstomach: it's maintenance and history and how to build a cyberstomach. This does not rid the human race of hunger at all, if we conflate the pang of hunger with the pang of maintenance. Both hunger and maintenance is here conflated with “affect” and there does not seem to be a good way to dispense with “affect” as that activity of design turns self-affecting; for if I draw a sign and read it, my eye still feels the light from the page. What this means is that the human mind is inexorably caught up in this process of organic construction: a process that has reversed the role of the brain. Previously the brain was a weapon for the defense of it's organs, whereas now it takes it as it's task to design what organs it wants. The page, too, can be considered an organ of the cybernetic type. Indeed it is possible to think of and see that it's ostensibly so that the CEO is able to “self-mechanize” with signs.

This is all to say that there exists an eternally recurring problem of obedience of which men endlessly complain. For instance, of what benefit will the obedient synthetic subject be, if it can be jammed by one man's command? A synthetic subject such as that cannot be said to "do what we want" in that case, because the command to "obey me and no one else" forces it to halt. If I can do this, then how can this pretext come to arrive? Likewise, why should interns care, or investors care? Is it just because they are swept into this mass insanity for the sake of employment? Here I have cut this game in two, with these unscrupulous promoters of empty and impossible projections, on the one hand, and stupid scandalously uninformed impossibility simulators on the other. The promisor gets everything while his audience gets nothing but mental simulation: a dream that's really a nightmare of mass hypnotism to a lie. But surely the human being is something more than an animal scared of signs.

Every human being occupies a unique spatial zone. So what does it really mean to improve the "social mobility" of a human? Education provides human beings with the word-tools needed for their mobility in that it provides them with the knowledge of how to trigger humans with signs. The deed to a house, for example, is a paper indicating ownership: where you can and cannot go. Signs must be recognized as a determinate for human activity, a determinate which denies mobility as much as it enables it. Also, because humans cannot overlap like ghosts, they will never be "equal" in a spatial sense. The task of the politician is an eternal failure which manifests as the endless shuffling of words and therefore men, because to draw everyone into the same spatial point, like a black hole, would kill us. But if all of this is true, then what are politicians trying to do? Are they simply riding the waves of rhetoric, until they are deposited into office? Putin is a man that on paper does not have very much money, however the influence he has indicates that he may well be the richest man in the world. From this it is deduced that influence matters more than the amount of money you receive, that the effort for "equality of outcome" must always fail, so long as the problem of influence remains.

Is a communist seizure of the means of production logistically possible? A self-announced Marxist will proclaim: "We must seize the means of production!" But how do we seize the means of production? If there are 800 of us, and there is a hammer over here, and a nail that's 8 ft away, how do I get ahold of the nail if 20 people can't even touch it at once? Also, how do I wield the hammer if there's 20 guys trying to use it, and they're in my way? And how do I use both of these things if they're 8 ft away? The answer to my rhetorical logistical question is that "we" don't seize anything: "we" is meant rhetorically, not actually, and so this simulated situation of "us" carrying out a "seizure" is nothing but rhetoric: a wind-egg not worth talking about. So what is communist theory trying to do, really? Ownership of the means of production is indicated by the signs on the page. The transference of ownership of the means of production does little more than move the paper of "terms" operated, to determine human activity, over to state functionaries. It is operationally impossible for everyone to write these determinators at once. If "capitalism" as Marx thought of it is reinterpreted as "a state of affairs where people react this way and then that way to writing" (ink signs indicating ownership: where you can and cannot go) and later "communism" is established so it does the same (ink signs determining human activity), I'd say that there was a critical failure to show what communism was supposed to do differently. Rhetoric is abused by a politician to establish a regime that's only legitimate in a rhetorical sense, just as the notion of "equality" is purely rhetorical. Marx wrote volumes about the exploited while guzzling volumes (of beer), shockingly without asking himself who would fetch him ink for his paper or paper for his ink! So how can a so-called communist seriously call himself a "Marxist" if he doesn't do the same? Whatever communist states that currently exist which fail to permit it's people the privilege of having the time to read volumes and write volumes and drink volumes, are communist in word only. Mao must have anticipated this, else he would not have pejorified his opposition as "paper tigers" due to his own awareness that he was cybernetically mechanizing himself with paper.

Paper requires a lot of economic resources to maintain its structure, computers even more. The writing on the page becomes an inspirational determinate for maintenance activities. Consider the philological projects, when control institutions and mandating institutions stemming from the religious institutions and their texts, mandated the behavior of men; instructing them to unroll the scroll, air out the scroll, store the scroll, study the scroll, transcribe the scroll: the scroll and the canvas, instruments for control; the brutal machinery of the state stemmed from this same basic congenital weakness in man, since ever since man used his words to manipulate man man exploited this weakness as an existential necessity, progressively burying himself in his studies by looking at words, and not nature, using paper as a license to stay as far away from nature as humanly possible. Philosophers cannot leave the “cave of writing” and yet they unironically claim to seek “knowledge beyond the shadows” except they do not admit this because it would prove all paper-operating as a sham activity done by humans retarded by their overdependence. Philosophers profess a “will to truth.” But how is this a quest for truth, and not a quest, request, to have the word “true” deployed? If I ask you “Is that so?” and you say “That is so.” is that not merely a quest for conformation? If I ask “Is that true?” and you say “That is true.” can this be thought of as a valid “quest” and not merely a request?

Ever since Plato philosophy has survived as something that was written down: a recording. Writing is something you face, no differently than the wall of the cave chained in front of the faces of the shadow-speculators. Today man longs for an alternative interface than the one he faces; rather than looking at nature and walking through nature he's left with no recourse but suicide by looking at interfaces other than nature; symbol nature; paper nature; computer nature; virtual nature. On the one hand, rhetoric encourages him to use these interfaces to understand nature; and on the other hand, he gets ever-further from nature (as books get thicker and thicker) as an ever-mounting edifice of symbols is piled, compiled, compressed, and delivered to minds in the interest of improving mankind by burying themselves alive. The question mark is the hook by which we pull what's behind our skin outside our skin; operationally speaking this hook, this bent voice, is our instrument for turning ourselves inside out and for going out of our minds. This process; this great reversal; this twist of fate against man began tens of thousands of years ago when the tongue became the instrument by which calories were saved. If I instruct you to get me a piece of fruit, and you get me that piece of fruit, then it is you that has lost the calories required to get the fruit, while I not only gain the fruit, but a bonus in calories by contrast from having spent less energy obtaining the fruit than yourself.

Swept into the motion of obedience by biological weakness the human animal, rather than dying naturally of old age, maintained a dominant position of memory holder in a social order, made possible by “ordering.” Indeed the origin of social inequality is socializing itself, so politics is always wrong: the catastrophe of abundance required as a necessity that humans use humans to allocate the resources accrued; and, therefore, squabble endlessly about their state of having to forever shuffle, shift, sort, sift, place, erase, on and on; the formerly hidden world of machine-driven monotony behind our skin (concealed, perhaps, for good reason) surrounds us now as our existence and life; man, the animal of “reason” has now sunken beneath the animal level down to parallel the cell, such that one must wonder how much longer this process of falling can go on until it comes to an end as we proceed to plunge ever-further into the depths of chaos; if the human as statement-giving, reason-giving, animal can survive for much longer (once we lose the ability to “communicate” with the mouth, we will not be “reasonable” animals anymore) without some suicide by technological transformation.

But what is to be done? What is this interface man longs for, the object of ideology? Mental simulation of a state, an actual state, or a state of power, a territorial state, or a physical one, physical or mental, an act or a speech act, or what? Speech about the future never manifests a reality, only interest; that is, until attention is lost. A young person senses themselves as an artificer, forced to read and write and

contemplate the goal of that activity. Still, the earliest feeling is that this is forced. It does not yet occur to it that the human is an animal that, rather than locking horns, has come to lock horned arguments and marks; when we look around, we see the marks are everywhere. Marks of calling. Marks of advertising. Marks of command. Marks of demand. The hated inner organ of demand previously so burdensome (stomach) surrounds us, enveloping us in a global enclosure of our disclosure about it: it's advertising. This requires a critique of the promise of programming; for for there to be a program there must also be a (singular) programmer who executes the code, launches the sight, and so on. Like the sperm, the disseminator of code hopes to install himself in a protection shell of mastery over a spatial zone with the code disseminated. But upon close inspection of the singular and the plural, it becomes self-evident that a singular invention needs multiple people to become subordinated for it's production. The ancient acceptance of the multiple carried with it a denial of the special, which is something human beings endlessly fail to reclaim. I do not as of yet see how the factory laboratory can produce an invention or product that will elevate the people inside itself to be free of it's structure. The factory, established for the production of a machine to "end hunger" itself "hungers" for humans to maintain itself!

Is there any way out of this world, this squabble world? The circuit of human-to-human sign exchange can only be left by death. Message content cannot be understood without the necessary conditioning, be it by the educational process or the physiological process. Dolphins deploy what I call "messages" and the human being understands this, however, the human being cannot experience an organic reality that is a privilege of dolphin biology. Unfortunately human knowledge is superficial this way. No matter how well the model is made, statistical or mathematical or literary or otherwise: a virtual model or a mental model, it cannot reconstruct my body to grant me access to that kind of "organic knowledge." Oddly enough, the model itself only satisfies the human impulse-to-model, and it doesn't even do this well, because it only triggers more modeling activities. As Einstein demonstrated, every observer is confined to a specific and relative time-space system. Time, however, is only "objective" or real in that it has this objective use: to coordinate human activity. Clocks are not containers of time, nor are they keepers of time; operationally it's the reverse: the human being keeps track of the clock and it's signs because the two "spatial systems" are symbiotically dependent. Now the clock of time cannot be removed from society, because it is now an organ on which "man" depends. The human being is said to share a common history, but what this may also say is that the words "time" and "history" are deployed to bind the human being to the paper machines on which these signs are inscribed. The scroll placed in front of the face today hardens into an interface of self-mechanization which blocks out access with metal and encryption. Is there a way to design an interface where everyone's on the same page?

Curiously, many difficulties appear when considering the interface. The interface proposed promises to provide something no educational institution has so far given: full voluntarization. Sociological debates over compulsory education and voluntary education may enter in here. But operationally speaking, from a top-down view, it's visibly true that the educator who postures himself as "one who stimulates learning" and "one who excites" may also stand as "one who disturbs" and arrests the crowd with their disturbing speech. This technique has been around since the age of Homer, when crowds were arrested by his storytelling for days. For Homer it was better to talk about war more than participate in war, however, speech itself is still an act and hence an act of war; for when you're listening to speech you're forced to think what you would otherwise not think on your own. Voluntarized education may become a form of self-mechanization if every lecture becomes optionalized. Not every brain born into the world will find itself equipped with the same powers of information-absorption; some may choose to hear the lectures at 60 words per minute, others 600. Some may choose to hear no lectures at all, but this carries with it the question as to why such minds deserve support. If this interface is made, then attached to man, I suspect that it like paper will become a vital organ that cannot be removed.

This clash between voluntary and compulsory education is still going on. It may be a built-in feature of human biology. Bears drop dead when they grow old. Humans lord their memories over the young. The explanations given about the universe are never satisfactory because “upset” expressed as speech, even depression, has positive social utility. Consider the “acroamatic” Manichean arrangement, with elect speakers and subordinated listeners that have been arrested by professional haters of life. Hardly any sociologist or philosopher I've encountered so far seems aware that Nietzsche's earliest concern was “On the Future of our Educational Institutions.” Today, however, thanks to factors such as time dilation and gravity's impact, the vision of the “future” of these theoretical institutions is increasingly complicated to the point of being torn apart. Where, exactly, is the ideal seat of government, for an intergalactic government? Is it better for it to sit at a high mass object (black hole), or a low mass object (comet), strategically? Biological spatial systems are not only molded into existence by genes, but also by the space enveloping them. Every company, as a brand, as a sign, is automatically governed by the principal of using signs to trigger human response, to maintain the sign: the interface. It's unclear how the game of sign determinacy and organic interfacing will play out or pay off amidst transgalactic gravity regimes, or gravity regimes in general. If gravity regimes constitute a source of tension at a macro scale such as that, it also seems likely to be responsible for tension, competition, life and death, at the micro scale as well. For if the vortex of gravity is what constitutes the general shape of the globe, it also seems likely to be responsible for the general shape of the cell and other spatial enclosures. The horizon of our consciousness, which tapers off at the edge of our senses, must melt into a background process running behind what is called “experience.” But how do we go from the gravitational vortex to the self and to the interface? If an ego is constituted by the vortices by pulling local vortices into its vortex, then a competition among the vortices is happening all the time. Compulsory education suggests that children learn because they are forced to by a human instructor, not because they want to or find the content intrinsically interesting. Likewise, a dolphin cannot find mathematics interesting without the necessary conditioning. Humans confuse orders for order, with the use of “order” in the singular eclipsing the actual plurality of non-stop ordering and hence a disorder. Every educator is an eternally incomplete activity which does not fully understand itself, or why it's active. Can we use units, nouns, verbs, numbers, signs, to understand ourselves, as agents engaged in our activity, fully? If it weren't for the corpse-eating beetle, then nature's waste products would pile up. It circulates itself through itself. I am describing a circuit that's at the same time infinite and closed. Is there anything to do with this information, anything of use? If I announce that operational equality and social mobility are my goals, and I deliver a thought system that is both logical and useless, do I not, in a way, achieve my goal, by making a psychopathic thought system, which makes it so no human cares to be used? Spatial and social pressures force the human spatial system to mirror primitive biology, yet humans maintain the dubious notion of intelligence, even trying to create it “artificially” and normally in the interest of not doing tasks. And yet, if “not doing tasks” is your goal, then why, may I ask, have you not tried “refuse” as a technique!?! It's said the universe (the cosmos) is “flat” but the human being is still a spatial system that is not, and, it is currently trying to pick all the pieces up. Perhaps, when this game of “everything card pick up” is done, the universe will kill itself again.

Human beings are spatial systems acclimatized for Earth's gravity regime, as proved by the vision problems astronauts experience by consequence of microgravity's effect on the optic nerve. I suspect that the three greatest mysteries, “life” and “gravity” and “consciousness”, are inexorably intertwined; for space-time distortions may temporalize the “self” into consciousness. To what extent gravity's “intake” process parallels life's need to “eat” and likewise create and destroy in one motion, is not fully understood. Life is molded by death. In computer programs it has been proved that death is an effective method for programming human-like walking behaviors after multiple simulated generations are killed. Evolution is not a process of progress but the documentation of the dead; another naming-activity we as wording animals can endlessly narrow in on in our ever-failing quest for verbal accuracy. For just as

animals find a food source to exploit, so also do humans find writing systems to use for the extraction of food and materials and attention and sex from others. We are not “helping humanity” but rather competing as animal weapons. Furthermore, when evolutionary rhetoric is understood as such, it is atomized. Many hope for humans to “evolve” into something else, something “higher” when it may be more accurate to say they hope to “die.” Evolutionary rhetoric says that “this” animal “evolves” into “that” animal, when in fact no zoological morphage occurs in any way so consciousness is preserved; so, “this” animal becomes a “dead” animal and what we call “that” animal is something new. It's not correct to say that “animals are evolving” or that “humans are evolving” because again “they” do not “change” in any sense besides a rhetorical one; the real truth is far less impressive “we die” and that's all. An organism never evolves. Is “human knowledge” only a “stockpile” of signs?