

**THE NUCLEUS AND EVERYTHING CONNECTED TO THE NUCLEUS:  
WITH SPECIAL CONCERN FOR THE NATURE OF ARTIFICE AND NATURE  
(AN ILLOGICAL EXERSICE IN CENTRIPETAL IRONY)**

Outside our brains is the nucleus, or the law, which is comprised of the control-stimuli, and inside our brains is the nonsense or the anarchy, which receives the stimulus external to it. Because our language, or word, is the bio-hacking tool used in order to manipulate humans into preforming for the indolent, the world has become what it is: it has fallen into the same patterns of failure as before. This is the failure pattern, and why mankind is the suicide animal, in much the same way as the cells that he is made of commit suicide, by way of the apoptosis process, which we now recalled as necessary for the development of the organism, I suspect; for the twofold reasons: first, that discontent is needed for creativity, and, second, that discontent yields discontent with the present state resulting in suicide; however, in this present state-existence it is not possible to be free from the word; for everything is owned by the indolent and the speaker, while the listeners obey and act as the auxiliary organs to the speakers, unwittingly and oblivious to the fact that the mouth, initially mans food-intake apparatus, has become, because it is a thing operated by the nervous system; an extension of the nervous system; the means by which others are operated by it: creating the mankind-network that exists today. Thus we can see that there are now two groups of humans, at least, in the west. On the one hand there is the Catholic tradition, which attached humans to its cynicism; for it recognizes the perpetual hypocrisy that is the speaker-listener relationship, and on the other hand there is the Jewish tradition, which attached itself to the nucleus or law as the means by which mankind is to circumvent enslavement to various morbid phenomenological beliefs, often related to the transference of listener consciousness to another plane. The Catholic tradition therefore expresses itself as societal masochism; believing the speaking-position to be evil; preferring the submissive, listening position; for it sees that all speaking is hypocrisy, and all creation is really the destruction of constituents, in much the same way that a painter destroys plants to create the paint needed for his paintings. On the other hand, the reality of the nucleus cannot be fully denied, and therefore in the course of this essay we must consider its existence, as such a nucleus, to be true. Because all expression is generation; generation, that generates from a position of permanence; for never does the individuals point of view seem to change, only that which surrounds him seems liable to change, and the permanent requires at least three points of support, not a straight line, to maintain its position, which raises the question to the possibility of any equilibrium among the constituency to be entirely equal, and not a continually rotating self-reciprocating feedback loop of potentialities in a pool of contaminating potentialities; reacting to each other forever; for perhaps a totally indifferent potential would die, were it to maintain its indifference and its indecision; giving the appearance, which is really generation, of a universe of endless misery, since true contentment cannot exist here because there is nothing but endless discontentment and hence endless activity and hence endless misery. But we will not make that the focus of this essay. Instead, we shall wish to focus on the nature of this nucleus that brought us here and everything connected to the nucleus, which must function properly in order for the societal organism to perpetuate effectively. Oftentimes in such a state there comes a time when the constituents in the state cry out and punish the state, usually whenever the conditions within the state reach a point of unbearability sufficient to warrant a rebellion against the state. This is little more than a compromise. In point of fact, however, the ultimate correction of the state would be the recognition of the differences implicit in the human organism, that is, his nervous system, which operates the mouth and hence manipulates the minds of others into gathering food for the mouth, so the mouth can go on mouthing and by way of mouthing service the indolent brain: addicted to its own indolence. Apart from the mouthing mouth is the obedient listener, which is generally content with its listening position due to its generative abilities; however, sometimes, life for the listener becomes unbearable, normally due to the speaking classes demand for luxuries, which the listening class enjoys, vicariously. The division of labor among the states, in our current view, is little more than the result of the nervous system, which by way of compromise and alternately by way of conquering has taken possession of the entire world, and we are its prisoners; for everything is owned by the state. Oddly enough, the profession of the priest class, which, little too often, is recognized for what it is: a professing profession, and therefore it barely pangs the consciousness of the Catholic church that in its effort to preach about their identifier of

hypocrisy, Jesus Christ, they've form yet another professing profession, which again thanks to the limits implicit in the organism, the nervous system, result in the creation of a state that is the Catholic Church, which itself is an institution founded on hypocrisy because the speaker cannot do what it speaks; for all speaking is commandment or bartering, and not action, and the priest class bonded itself to that money making nucleus called the Holy Bible, which is only holy insofar that it is a nucleus that confounds the listeners and workers into giving money, back to the indolent speakers: the generators of the words that are contained within. And so we may now be inclined to view any and all religious texts as merely the pretext by which they justify their indolence; distorting indolence into morality, because adherence to morality is purely adherence to conformity, because, again, all speaking is commandment. What we desire, therefore, is a state of affairs of total freedom; utterly unpunished non-conformity, which does not seem to be the state of affairs in the world due to the differing generative apparatuses in our brains, which has the power to torment us into acting and speaking. Already it seems that silence is preferable to speaking due to words power to destroy a listener, making him compliant to him. To turn away from the speaking-listening network that is humanity today would, unfortunately, be interpreted by the state as insanity, when really it's the desire for autonomy and freedom; for the omnipotent psychiatrist, while sitting in his chair, hardly considers the facts implicit in his biology: that he, like his patient, is actually gathering food and shelter, with his speech, while the pangs expressed by the patient and generated by the patient accomplish nothing whatsoever in the way of money-making or shelter-making, hence the neuroticism found in the patient. It now becomes apparent to us that the nucleus is little more than a trick, which gives rise to the concern that our entire being is little more than a trick, which we now recalled might account for why the schizophrenic is prone to genital mutilation, that is, revenge against the trick; his own genetic code: the cause of his suffering and the cause of his existence. It isn't really possible nor is it financially feasible for the psychiatrist to fulfill the demands of his patient, which perhaps might be to share in the bounty he has earned, through the exploitation of his own patients, and therefore his only cure can be the destruction of his patients, by way of forced hospitalization and forced medication, resulting in the the annihilation of the patients brain. And unfortunately for the patient it can be no other way due to the psychiatrists own fear of the legal system, which is the state, persecuting him for his negligence, should the patient harm himself. Indeed, in a roundabout way, the patient, in such a case, is merely using his speaking apparatus to get his way, courtesy of a legal system that is the nucleus of the state in which he lives. Perhaps, as man seeks to uncover laws of nature, and why he exists, what he really seeks is to understand the nucleus responsible for his progenesis; for that nucleus, like the indolent speaker, might have expressed man as little more than a cry in an endless nothing that means nothing because there is nothing but the echo of the nucleus and everything that is connected to the nucleus, which nevertheless gave rise to our existence, or so we've supposed.

Perhaps, by simulating an inquirer, we will come closer to the truth!

Why did the earliest humans kill animals?

For food.

How did we coordinate our hunts?

Communication.

What was the means by which we communicated?

Our mouths.

And where did our food go?

Our mouths.

With what do we control our mouths?

Our brains.

So when we are coordinated who is in control?

We form a mutual agreement for the sake of the hunt.

And the mutual agreement was heard?  
 Yes.  
 And this agreement was between us?  
 I do not follow you.  
 The words flowed between our brains, into your ears.  
 Certainly.  
 And if I were to say: Can you give me a glass of water? would you be controlled by me?  
 No, since I'd be granting you that, voluntarily.  
 I'm not so sure.  
 Please, elaborate.  
 Am I speaking to you now?  
 Yes.  
 Are you listening to me now?  
 Yes.  
 So I am the active and you are inactive.  
 I'm actively listening.  
 And do you listen, voluntarily?  
 Not necessarily, because I understand words.  
 And what if I were to tell you that I do not understand words?  
 I'd say that you are lying, because you understand me.  
 And what if I were to tell you that I do not understand you?  
 I'd say you're lying, because we've maintained this conversation.  
 Care to elaborate?  
 Well, I can't carry on a conversation with a rock, since rocks don't understand me.  
 Rocks don't understand you?  
 They do not.  
 How do you know?  
 Because they don't react to me.  
 So, based on your example, a rock will understand me, if I throw it?  
 No, that isn't what I mean.  
 But the rock is reacting to my throwing it, so it understands.  
 It seems our expectations are not the same.  
 It seems so, but isn't the purpose of the legal system to sort out expectations?  
 That is mainly because we agree without knowing what others expect.  
 And you expect that I should know you?  
 Correct, since I'm here before you.  
 Haven't you called me you?  
 I do call you you.  
 And I call you you?  
 You do refer to me as you.  
 Why don't I call you I?  
 Because that doesn't make sense.  
 Why doesn't it make sense?  
 No one would understand your meaning.  
 And if I were to say: Can I give I a glass of water? what would you say?  
 I'd then invite you, to help yourself, to a glass of water.  
 But isn't it odd that I can't call upon your personal identity?  
 What identity is that?  
 The identity you call "I".

You're correct: the sentence that you had spoken was functionally useless.  
 And didn't, earlier, I assert that I had spoken a controlling sentence?  
 To which sentence do you refer, my memory is poor.  
 The sentence: Can you give me a glass of water?  
 I now recalled it, and your assertion.  
 And now what do you think?  
 It seems that while "I" reflects my identity, you cannot use it on me for your benefit.  
 And yet you can?  
 Correct.  
 And isn't that interesting?  
 Perhaps so.  
 Will you now do something for me?  
 Perhaps so.  
 You need only tell me if you can understand the following sentences.  
 Very well.  
 Swim fall dance die eat stumble run.  
 I don't understand.  
 Why?  
 I heard only verbs.  
 And will you entertain another sentence?  
 I will.  
 Rock frame chair land sea shoe tree.  
 I don't understand.  
 Why?  
 I heard only nouns.  
 So a sentence is functionally useful only when there are both verbs and nouns?  
 It would seem so.  
 Will you try to understand a new sentence?  
 I will try.  
 My dog ran away.  
 I understood that one.  
 Then what did I say?  
 You told me that your dog ran away.  
 And what does that imply?  
 That you own a dog and that it ran away.  
 Who gave you the idea that the dog was mine?  
 This idea came directly from you.  
 And from where do you get your own ideas?  
 They come from my mind.  
 Didn't you already concede that your ideas come from me?  
 What ideas?  
 Your ideas about the dog running away.  
 You generated those ideas.  
 So I am the generator of your ideas?  
 That isn't true.  
 Then what?  
 I am the generator of my ideas.  
 So the world is my idea?  
 It would seem so.

Strange! How questionable it seems that we are even the generator of our own ideas, since around us there is nothing but stimuli which generates ideas within ourselves. And yet around us there is the law, which binds the world; creating streets and houses and cells, which, oddly enough, have received their names from human cells, and not the reverse. We seek to understand nature and how it generated us so we can understand the universe, yet we don't recognize that in expressing this desire to others we only re-create the structures of nature around us: imprisoning us within a state; the state, which is made of everything we've constructed, which not even architects and expressers construct: they merely excrete the instructions to others so they might build monuments to their vanity, when in reality everything is going to die. In fact, everything is continually dying including the mind, because everything including the mind is always changing. The duration of a generator is irrelevant and death is irrelevant since that which the entity is made of is a constituency, which is generated by the nucleus we hope to understand, yet cannot understand, because the only thing to understand is that there is nothing to understand but a continuum of generated hallucination; that strives to make itself as pleasant as possible, yet fails, since the world continually fails to recognize the problems inherent in our biology, like the nervous system, which automatically creates the world and the state in the world as it seeks to express to others what is to be done in the world. Oddly enough, to understand someone is to become subservient to him. If we all admitted that we understood nothing, and walked about, not understanding each other, we'd merely think of each other, as food. And really we do think of each other as food, since we populate a state, where we must barter for food, since everything is owned by the state. For the state, people are food. For the teachers, students are food. For the speaker, listeners are food. Instead of hunting for animals we hunt for listeners, who grow our food. For parents, children are food; for the elderly parents now oftentimes hope that their children repay them, by furnishing them, with shelter and food. When we speak to our social group, we hunt for entities within it that will supply us with food. Those who are unable to supply themselves with food, become food when they are weak. And if you try and run to someone within the state to tell them that the world makes you feel like killing yourself, then all that will happen is the state will repossess you, because you produce tax dollars for it, which to the state is its food. If we may be so bold as to reason the purpose of the nucleus which generated us, we might at once consider that expression to be no more than the attempt to influence, and, by influencing, lessen the pain and misery impressed upon it, by outside influences. And, sometimes, the pain of being a thing that is influenced upon is too much and the influenced commits suicide; for no other reason than it was unable to resist the impulse; perhaps, everything that is done is done because the doer could not resist doing, what it did. And now our mutual agreements, that we've expressed outside us, have become this new nucleus, for the state, which drags us along in much the same way as our brains drag our bodies along; for the brain is a speculating machine in much the same way as wall street is an amalgam that is comprised of speculating machines, and the capitalistic society to which it is attached has little choice but to accept its speculations, just as ancient man had once stoically accepted the forces of nature; for there is nothing but nature, our nature. However there is an idea alternative to this where we aren't masking ourselves over at all, but one where one might conclude that through total non-action there might be a way to recede away, break entirely away, from this reality and everything connected to it; for perhaps hunger itself is little more than an outside trick made to manipulate us into doing what we don't want, namely, eat and survive, in a world which fuels upon itself, which is insanity. Indeed, it is ancient arguments such as this which convinced men to be subservient to speakers, again, on the basis that it would be immoral for them to do otherwise, when in actuality they by happenstance managed to become kings and Gods among men; building a society with their discontent with the world, which was really discontent with their brains; for true creativity comes from discontent, which inversely requires a creative and implicitly destructive mind, like the Devil-God Shiva herself. And there might be no better proof of this hypothesis than the fact that the Inuit tribes had a custom of assisting their depressed with their wish to die, through assisted suicide; resulting in the stagnation of their society, since discontent is what causes creativity and growth, when all growth is destruction because our end is destruction. That

is ultimately the price humanity must pay for its obedience to the mad; destruction, and really all that will come from this mad obedience is the perpetuation of a universal madness, which is the generator and the nucleus, and everything connected to it; for to understand madness is to over-stand which is to understand everything and the nucleus and everything connected to the nucleus or the universe, which is an engine of universal madness whose result is universal madness. If the state were to re-amalgamate and it were to make defense its goal, it might regress, and become an engine of violence, just as it was millions of years ago when dinosaurs roamed the earth: so, too, will gigantic states roll throughout the cosmos; striking fear in the hearts of man, which to them might be little more than germs; pests, far too stupid to perceive the magnitude of the terrors that now dwell in the universe, which we erroneously called the universe when it was merely the observable universe; those creatures, if we may so call them that, unspeakably frightening to us, may live; consuming the stars; consuming the heavens. And what, might be the brain of such a creature? Perhaps a nucleus? Code? Whatever is expressed by humanity as law invariably becomes the nucleus of the state, which, however, cannot fully represent the multiplicity within it, that is to say the desire-generating brains within it, which themselves are engines powered by the universe itself, which, however, we nevertheless have the nerve to define and say we know when we do not; for any simulation of consciousness might merely be an imitation, inasmuch as we cannot create an artificial brain which totally mirrors the complexity of the universal machinery that underlies our neurons, and yet we do just that, when we create codes of conduct; effectively deadening ourselves as we become branded and masked over by those codes, just as we deaden ourselves by becoming an auxiliary instrument for a speaker whenever we accept ourselves as his subject, in every possible sense of the word subject; for the subject of the sentence is always the subject of the speaker and the writer of the sentence, while the verb of the sentence is always the dictation, which is narrated, by the speaker and the writer of the sentence. It's perhaps, by latching ourselves to other peoples sentences, that we've allowed the world to become what it is: an inherently unequal world, when really the good thing would be to run away from everyone as the only fully moral action, at least, in a super moral sense. Just as the structure of the sentence has branches and lines, so too, does society have branches and lines; networks, which mankind has attached himself to, and it's from those treetops that everything trickles down to the people below, who rent and barter for sunlight, while the first ones and the ancient ones unfold before them, to insight the jealousy needed for battles to wage in the shade: the fallen remains seep into the earth, to be fed to the ancients. What better way could there have been for the mind of man to form, than from some cannibal cause? None: our minds were made by violence and paranoia. Capitalism and cannibalism: they rhyme in English, and they do more than rhyme. It is for similar, exploitive, reasons that we're schooled effectively, that is, as food for the state; for if an institution were to exist that would teach the state and everything connected to the state to its students, that is; how to properly exist, in this capitalistic society, such an institution would be put down by the masses as an institution for evil, when in point of fact it's the state that is evil. What we have instead is a degenerate pygmy state where those unfortunate enough to be schooled by the state are kneecapped by its labels, hypocrisy and mendacity, where few if any lessons in financial management are given; since everyone prefers the messages that are presented to them in stultified form from the television, which promises them, day by day, that they are but inches away from being millionaires, when in fact the only thing they're close to is a screen. And yet our skin is a screen, we now recalled, and it's with that skin that the writer of this essay uses to feel the keys on his keyboard, to hammer out or hammer down, his ideas on the nucleus and everything connected to the nucleus. Everywhere you look what you see is the product of agreements, even all the factories wherein the workers work for poor wages while begging for better wages. Essentially, any and all agreements are bad for the soul; for a soul cannot be unfettered and free, if it agrees. Whatever we're thinking; whatever we're feeling; anything at all, if you don't want to do it, shouldn't be done; for that is enslavement and pain, which is wrong. When we see children going to their schools what we're actually seeing is children going to their destruction, since it's by speaking to someone that we destroy what it can generate on its own from it's personal experience with nature. To stand under someones thinking is

to lower oneself into the grave of their thinking where we deaden ourselves with their thinking, so now the only living thing is the new nucleus, the nucleus of the state: its operators or executives, as we quite rightly say, who execute all their lives, in every possible sense of the word execute; meaning they not only operate as they execute, but, likewise, murder as they execute. When we serve executors we only serve murderers, and we all know that at the top of every government is always murders, who pretend they are not murderers when they are murderers. Day by day we try not to despair, and sometimes we run to others for safety from our despair, only to realize that we're destroying them with our despair, so we run and then drive back home where we lock and bar the doors and then sequester ourselves in our rooms, where we type our despairs to ourselves, out, alone. It's purely for vanity that anything at all is published to the world; nobody in their right mind, in a super moral frame of mind, should ever seek to publish anything or ask anyone to read their writings, since if they were to give out their writings to anyone, what they would really be giving them is a death sentence, as they destroy the readers thinking with their thinking. The world seeks complexity and sophistication, but what it really seeks is stupidity and falsification; for why, exactly, would anybody paint anything or write anything, when there is such a thing, as nature? It would be better to exist in nature as a king of nature; it would be better to look out at a forest and think: I can cut down this forest, than it is now, when we look out at our cities, which are littered with the fragments built by executors and murders; knowing that we cannot cut them down, and so we visit the movie theater where through a highly Lacanian mirror stage fulfillment we pretend to be Godzilla or aliens or whatever form of apocalypse that suits us, who annihilates those utterly repulsive cities before our eyes. This is how it really is. And this is also why I feel nothing but guilt and shame if ever I share my writings with anyone. Again and again I share my writings with my friends; hoping that they'll tell me I've gone insane, and yet again and again they tell me I'm sane. Even the doctors will say that I'm sane. And my last doctor, aside from saying that I suffer from chronic depression, said that I'm completely normal, not the least bit insane. And yet it is my current view that whenever we become something for someone else we kill ourselves, since to be something we are not is to kill ourselves. At all times; whenever we're spoken to; whenever we're influenced upon, we're being killed: our so-called soul is being killed by the influencing force outside us, which is actually being generated from inside, though we don't know how, and yet it generates; however, if we compare this generating nucleus to our own generative abilities, namely the purpose of language as a commanding sentence, what we learn is that everything we generate is entirely false. When we ask if a thing is a this or a that it obviously isn't this or that at all, because it can only be what it is, and not something someone said it is, since what it is can always be said to be something else, insofar that it can be described in some way else. When you observe politics, you invariably end up observing the consequence of this failure, that is: you'll end up observing people talking it out forever, when nothing can be done about this talking problem, which is the problem of controlling and influencing and implanting ideas into the universal mind: the universal generator. And, oddly enough, the universal generator feeds upon its own generations, one generation fuels another generation, and so on and so forth. If I were the only person on earth, and I had not the need to eat, I'd wander across the surface of the continent, until I found an ocean in which to drown myself and my boredom. And, similarly, if humans could photosynthesize, we wouldn't need to use each other for food, we'd instead use the sun for food, as a superior food source. Humans are really an incompetent species, since they are completely unable to coordinate their efforts to solve the problem of food, thereby freeing themselves to preform other activities, and what is stranger is that humans are basically content with this talking game wherein nations talk it out forever and compromise forever; for words are mind-manipulating tools for the purpose of extracting food from other minds. To abide by the rules of grammar, is to limit the tools one can use, which is always bad, since it limits our potential. Whenever someone speaks a sentence in speech, their speech can never be said to be disorganized since the purpose of speech is to evoke hallucination in the listener; for all listeners are really hallucinators, and so if ever someone listens and hallucinates they may very well be impelled by that hallucination, to do an action in reaction to the stimulus they receive external to themselves, and what is external to us is



but the nucleus, which maintains the human amalgam, and not even the entirety of the human amalgam but merely the feeble-minded minds within it; for there are many kinds of sentences which are actually false sentences, like the either or sentence and the if then sentence: utterances designed to introduce an expectation when all expectations have the possibility to disagree from other minds, in the sense that a mind cannot be said to agree, with a word. Whenever you say either or, you're not actually knowing if the or is reality or the either is reality, you're merely dictating reality, which is impossible, which means you're lying: the sentence-builder is lying, at all times, because at the top of the sentence-structure is, of course, the sentencer, or the sequencer. In effect: we're living a lie and a fiction, inasmuch as a game is a fiction, which in effect makes life a worthwhile game, since the nucleus is a generator lying to itself and generating to itself; revealing to itself and showing off its infinite combinations, to its generations, which are lies, and yet, while the generations themselves are lies, the states which produced them are thought not to be lies at all; for the sequencer beholds all, because the sequencer not only generates a state but enjoys the generations of its states, since everything is ultimately the state, and the generator, and the sequencer, and the nucleus, which stimulates itself with its stimuli, which is to say: it generates the means by which to receive the stimulus it wants by generating more stimulus to be heard by itself, so it can give to itself the stimulus it wants to receive, and alternately so it can receive the stimulus it wants to give itself, by generating the requisite stimulus. And now we might extend the sphere of our reasoning to encompass Judaism, which generates an ideal science fiction concept in the form of God, which generates the earth, and postulates that that science fiction concept, which is their ideal, has now chosen the idolizers, so that in effect the idealist is liberated and becomes chosen by his own ideal, so he is now free from Gods which had hitherto been represented by mortal men, and bonded himself to himself, his ideal, since the Judeo-Christian God does not exist, as anything but an ideal. We cannot allow ourselves to ignore the usefulness of such an ideal, nor can we allow ourselves to ignore the usefulness of recognizing the hypocrisy inherent within the speaker-listener relationship: how, really, it's asinine to pray to an ideal God, since the ideal God ought to be psychic, which is merely to say, as Jesus said, that the ideal God ought to be the person, which after all was the original intention behind the genesis of the Jewish religion, to benefit individual persons, namely, the professors. When actually the doctrine they profess might be stated in admitting that everything expressed is nonsense, that is for the benefit of the expresser, or the speaker, who, thanks to its speaking, happily chokes to death on its speaking since the vocal cords evolved to be in a position vulnerable to choking thanks to the benefits of the speaking apparatus, which outweighed that particular maladaptation thanks to the usefulness of the sophisticated speech, which while entirely false nevertheless confounds and continues to compound feeble-minded listeners into states of obedience to the unreality generated by the speaker, because it is pleasant-sounding to the speaker. Indeed, the reality we enjoy has time and time again proven to be an unreality that we enjoy, since beneath the skin of everything is something we didn't see; something we didn't expect; something that doesn't make sense, since everything is nonsense. Perhaps it was purely a sophisticated survival trick to speak to others about their personal misery which, at first, was the misery of hunger, then the misery of boredom; hoping to be saved from that misery, only to realize generations later how inescapable that misery was since its source was the brain, which had adopted that misery by courtesy of evolution, in much the same way as our vocal cords had evolved to be in an undesirable position susceptible to choking thanks to the survival benefits that come with an increased vocal range; namely, to use or seduce others into becoming instrumental to the discontented, influencing brain. If we may again summarize; we might say that man is an animal that is miserable, and that miseries only cure was the formation of the state, which is a new animal, an animal amalgam, that is a state of misery. But, of course, that may only be due to the fact that the nucleus, the nucleus of the state, is merely explained to us, yet our ability to edit the nucleus of the state, and propose adjustments to the nucleus of the state, is so limited, at least with respect to today's technology, hence why more and more we attempt to bridge the gap between ourselves, that is between our minds, using technology. Rather than being silent, what perhaps will happen instead, is we'll silence ourselves with technology, by blending our minds together;

deadening ourselves and killing ourselves, since humanity can't simply be quiet, and use body language to get along with each other; for now, the prosthesis that is the state, cannot be rearranged to service the individual; now, the states are individuals: institutions for the destruction of people, and re-construction of states; the proto-animal amalgams now known as states, hence why whenever an individual goes to a psychiatrist to complain about the state, said psychiatrist cannot alter the state, but merely the brain of the perceiver of the state, thereby altering his state and stabilizing the state, which, however, has a finite duration, since all states are continually foundering on the brink of collapse, including the patient of the psychiatrist, who instead of acting on his discontent with the state, becomes contented with the state, so no real activism is done because the backlash received by the nucleus of the state forces the psychiatrist to psychically kill his patient, thereby preserving the state, and not the patient, whose error was to listen to the state and everything connected to the state, when he ought to have ignored the state that transmits hallucination in stultified form; continually anchoring unwitting listeners to the networks of listeners, as the gigantic and diabolical people-destroying prosthesis made of people called the state. And yet: this is somewhat alarming to us, since we now recalled that our body is a cellular state; that our hallucinations might likewise be information presented to us in stultified form; produced by a universal generator, that is the the sequencer of the nucleus of the artifice in nature, which perhaps continuously makes the same mistakes for eternity, which is, however, a paranoid view that perhaps we will return to, later. Instead, it seems better to focus on the nucleus, and everything connected to it, with special concern for the nature of artifice and the artifice-in-nature; how it is generated, and how language is generated and or why it is generated. Right away, we are taught by pain, social or otherwise, that certain expressions are wrong; to avoid and maximize reward for our senses is what gradually builds up in us our database of sense about the world; for all information that comes to us is seen or felt and therefore sensed. Perhaps, whenever it seems as if we're sensing the world, we're really sensed by the world, still, in the sense that we are at all times generating and being generated: acted upon by force, since the generated utterances are forced on us; physically forced on us; impressed upon us, as the utterances that are patterns, enter our ears, which we very quickly identify as painful or pleasurable; for, very quickly, we suffer if we do not, until we are dead. If an assemblage which is continually impressed upon in an unpleasant manner, it may eventually become unstable and disintegrate its constituents; thus, suicide isn't actually suicide; it's just the divorce of an unhappy assemblage: a constituency which cannot generate, in a manner that is pleasant, since the surrounding constituents programmed it to be an unhappy generator, which we now recalled is also due to the inability of the generator to access the nucleus so it can re-write the nucleus for its pleasure; for it is a nucleus that is out of reach: the state-nucleus is far beyond our hands and in the hands of the people who represent the state; the state teachers who are the henchmen of the state, who school children in all the mendacity of the state: how, initially, revolutions were fought for taxes on tea, hence the genesis of the state, and how we pay taxes on tea, still. Thus, before the age of nine, we are taught the errors of the state: how humanity fails and has always failed to recognize the perpetual hypocrisy that is the speaker-listener relationship; for the speaker is never telling the truth but merely impressing; however, I was not impressed and will never be impressed, by the speaker or the state; the speaker continually seduces, and nudges, like a hypnotist: suggesting we do or think or feel or experience something in our brains, which is evoked by the traumas in our minds. Little by little we are seduced into agreement by the state, and if we agree to too much we'll be defrauded again and enslaved again and subjected again; for that is really the place of the subject of the speakers sentence in the speaker-listener relationship, who, quite literally, plays the heads of the listeners as he sequences them with his words by way of evocative evocations for the purpose of forming the surrounding constituents into an enjoyable state-prosthesis, until that state is a lonely state, like it was at the beginning before the big bang, at which point this state will explode. All of life is therefore a game of everything card pickup, wherein everything is continually picking itself up and, then killing itself, whenever it's together due to the unbearability of being whole, since to be whole would be a state of pandemonium, not a seductive tune for seducing us back into pandemonium. All we can do is oscillate between pandemonium and nucleus, and both are generated by the generator of lies.

And now, let us return to our inquirer, who has sought to know the truth!

Do you wish to know more?

Yes.

The subject of the sentence is subjected by the sequencer.

I see.

The predicate of the sentence is compounded by the sequencer.

I see.

The agreement with the sentence is aggregated by the sequencer.

I see.

The sequencers of law comprise the operators of all nations.

Not the scientists?

No.

Not the engineers?

No.

What are such entities?

Such entities are auxiliary to the sequencer.

I see.

Their megalomania drives them to serve the sequencer.

I see.

The sequencers megalomania drives him to dominate mankind.

I see.

The sequencers words work through evoking trauma and stimulation.

I see.

The sequencer generates megalomania with its duress.

I see.

The sequencer stimulates itself this way.

I see.

The world is truly hilarious.

Truly.