On the Curious Immorality of Mechanical Cryptography and Writing

BY
Jo Viviano

On the Curious Immorality of Mechanical Cryptography and WritingWhat are the drawbacks of writing? Will a theory of everything ever be written out? Does it need to be displayed on a piece of paper (surface) or a computer screen (surface) display? What barriers are there between human beings and universal knowledge? What of the long term development of life? Do we still believe beings that call themselves "human" will travel to other solar systems, galaxies and stars? When science communicators convey aesthetic ideals glorifying technology and science, are they being fairly sensitive when they say what they say? "A merger with technology. A technological singularity. A theory of everything. A unified science of cognition. A fundamental theory. A logical foundation." Here I shall expose the war-like applications of writing to describe the limits of what it can do, so I may penetrate beyond the human into the deepest reaches of the universe: our cellular progenitors and the smaller particles and phenomena that brought us here. We may begin by noticing that writing is an anti-social activity. When the operator of a stone tablet or scribe writes one sign at a time, they must break away socially to perform the act, they must agree to themselves or others the meaning of the words; additionally, time is needed to perform this writing act, space is needed to write it out, and physical resources are consumed in the writing process.

Furthermore because the writing surface display is of limited size and symbols are small generally, the writing itself is exclusionary due to spatial limits: only a narrow number of human heads can see the writing before it becomes annoying, whereas it's far easier to verbally address a whole crowd. Extra time for the message to register is therefore increased. I may put scare quotes around "extra time" as an operational limit of human agency, just as humans cannot read multiple words simultaneously. In western culture, the historical impact of two pivotal characters (Socrates and Jesus) who opted to write nothing summons the imagination to ascertain the reason for this preference, and yet the exposition of the meaning of this preference for these characters has not been done straightforwardly. It is among my goals expose why this is so; also it is among my aims to submit a psychology of genius for the improved education of future generations. Because these legendary characters who do not write create an absence that can never be directly examined (including Moses, Buddha, Socrates, Aristotle, and Jesus), telling a story about their existence generates endless interest, so the character itself for the ancients may well have facilitated the practice of statecraft as a rhetorical device for social control. I shall expand on this later. The advent of writing was was a history-constituting event by producing a physical object which begs for historical explanation; however, the dark side of writing is overlooked, even by modern philosophers of privilege: the privilege of paper operationalism is not equally disseminated because spatial and temporal limits prevent unified reading and writing. There are a number of historical examples of great minds being fascinated by this, which I shall touch on in the course of this historical exposition, to unify them all.

Alan Turing may have desired to produce a mechanical model of this when he created his universal machine, where symbols were read on squares on an infinite tape "one at a time" thereby producing a mechanical model which, in itself, is a thing which is capable of "Saying everything sayable." which was an aesthetic philosophical ideal in vogue in his time. It goes without saying however that the "infinite" tape proposed in this model is not infinite, really, but rather something with a very finite physical structure that requires economic resources for it's creation, maintenance, and existence. Likewise, the spokesperson or salesperson for such a device must successfully generate interest in the mechanism, as futurist and science communicators successfully do, despite the fact that operational

inclusion is not possible: the achievements of astronauts are invariably displayed as theater vicariously enjoyed. When the writer wants a would-be reader to read what they write, extra time is needed to read that which is written compared to the time that might be saved were the writer to utter their expressions aloud.

Note that although we are engaged in a science of human ethology, we must already concern ourselves with matters of space and time. Space and time are limits which stop the flow of knowledge: a classroom cannot fit an infinite amount of human beings in it's space, and a teacher must allocate the time they have and decide who is worth speaking to, for example. Man's interest in learning has no efficacy. Rather than conceptualizing a sentence as something that is read, it may be better to think of it as something that must be deciphered, decoded, or solved. With this in mind, it's clearly impossible for anything that is not human to decode human expressions properly. It seems to be a little known fact that Kurt Gödel was friends with Albert Einstein, or that Gödel believed there to be a hostile conspiracy to suppress some part of the works of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. As it stands, the war-like applications of reading and writing are manifold, so it should not surprise us that a portion of Leibniz writings be suppressed were it to express itself in a manner so straightforwardly diabolical: the Leibniz wheel's use in the combinatorial art of coding and decoding messages, encryption and decryption. Wherever there is encryption there is a barrier which blocks knowledge, blocks out understanding in the experiential sense; in the case of animals and plants (which fascinated Alan Turing greatly), the two kingdoms of consciousness are utterly incapable of understanding each other despite being evolved from the same fundamental something (a common ancestor). This begs two important questions: What caused this divergence? Is a technological divergence of linguistic and, as it were, emphatic breakdown possible for human beings? I maintain an empathic breakdown is something that ought to be avoided at all costs, lest future generations form unacceptably vast power disparities comparable to our relationship to that of mice in our laboratories and paper in our books.

Such a technological divergence is quite antithetical the Kurzweilian promise of "technological singularity" (a merger with technology) and yet it is not possible to prove this negative. When a spokesperson says "we" will merge with technology, they wield a pronoun "we" which refers to no one, because they look past their role as salesperson: a seducer who attracts human beings into participating in the project, buying the product, working for the company. In other words, being subservient to the cause: a subservience which runs contrary to rhetorical notions of unity. And so, these goals (human enhancement, a merge with technology, etc) are incoherent, if not mecha-charlatanry. In times of rapid change where empirical research outruns theory and the rapid development of technological development eludes the ability to explain it to the general public, charlatanry holds sway, because of the gap between those in the know and the rest of the population is especially wide. A divergence of technical expertise creates new aggregates of informed and ill-informed individuals. But why might a technological divergence be considered immoral? To his mother, Turing wrote the following:

"You have often asked me about possible applications of various branches of mathematics. I have just discovered a possible application of the kind of thing I am working on at present. It answers the question 'What is the most general kind of code or cipher possible', and at the same time (rather naturally) enables me to construct a lot of particular and interesting codes. One of them is pretty well

impossible to decode without the key, and very quick to encode. I expect I could sell them to H.M. Government for quite a substantial sum, but am rather doubtful about the morality of such things. What do you think?"

Noting this, Gödel's fascination with Leibniz and, as it were, Einstein's praise of and friendship with Gödel makes sense: the incompleteness theorem Gödel's exemplifies his concern (full completeness shall never be reached; a theory shall never be completely complete) well follows in the course of this interpretation that all expressions are codes or ciphers to be decoded or deciphered by readers, who merely declare them as read. Consequently this would mean that whatever theorems are created serve only to increase the quantity of linguistic encryption barriers, barriers which cannot be unified, far less translated to anything living outside the human-to-human reaction ring. Hence we have an endless tower of theories. Those who seek to express a theory of everything do not express it in a manner that is readable to plants, because plants have not been trained to decipher human sentences for their survival. This is because learning is not something humans do because they find the content intrinsically interesting but, more insidiously, because they are forced to by a human instructor because they cannot transcend interpersonal competition. And tragically, even if a theory of everything is expressed, the general situation of humans reacting to signs displayed on surfaces requiring economic resources for their creation and maintenance remains, so we are led again and again to perpetual despair over the general situation of sentences causing effects that are merely short range. Indeed, quantum computers do not even have a humanitarian benefit; the reality runs contrary to any such claim as these machines fall into military hands for the purpose of coding and decoding enemy messages for tactical advantage and national security in the service of cryptanalysis (quite necessarily the quantum computer is used for quantum cryptography).

Where else in the universe does the use of physical objects play a role in the socialization and anti-socialization of organic aggregates, what social results have emerged, and how does this analysis of human and inhuman aggregate inform our understanding of consciousness and life? The introduction of physical objects external to the body for social advantage and disadvantage is, ironically, the very thing that keeps professional promisers in the business of suggesting technological advancements are good. So just as the quantum computer has no benefit to man (in toto) so can no physical invention help man transcend the lab: full automation is not possible, because there is no mechanical independence; the "infinite tape" that is fed into Turing's machine is fed by human beings so the machine feeds on human beings, unfortunately. Stories like these must be told, if we are to come close to envisaging the shape of humanity and consciousness to come. My hunch is this concern deeply disturbed and inspired Turing to formulate his theory of reaction diffusion systems in an attempt to assure himself that his inventions were not immoral fundamentally. Seemingly this concern should arise as one takes into account the situation of humans reacting to the surface displaying writing; if, in time, the individuals reacting will diffuse across the cosmos and, by way of mechanical encryption, become unable to communicate with itself after generations. Plants require food and possess a certain knowledge, moving to and away from light, yet also they have a built-in sensory blindness to what may be more nutritional sources of food. If we have a common ancestor, then we must question where, why, and how this most general kind of divergence of sense occurred.

Here's where Alan Turing's fascination with plants comes into play. It is a curious fact that human

beings cannot converse with plants and bugs effectively. Ostensibly, there is a lot of space in the galaxy, and with so much space in outer space, there is that much the greater space for us to make mistakes. Disturbingly it would seem Turing's moral doubts may stem from the moral concern of supplying man with the technological means to block the flow of knowledge by mechanical means. What Turing sought in his metaphysics was an attempt to elucidate for himself why a breakdown in sense occurred; as a child Turing read a book "Natural Wonders Every Child Should Know" containing lengthy passages that call the reader to imagine what it's like to be a plant or a bug or a worm. The takeaway being a desire to know these divergent worlds; however, by trying to satisfy his appetite for knowledge, Turing ran the risk of adding new barriers and joints to creation in the process of modeling his thoughts mechanically, hence his decision to kill himself with an apple laced with cyanide (the knowledge of good and evil), to indicate he learned something he'd rather not know.

Turing's interest in a code or cipher of the most general kind is his way of unlocking the hidden world of experience animals and plants must know. A genius, he hopes to perceive all things: a universe with all code translated, transparent and clear. Nietzsche says it well: "What, indeed, does man know of himself! Can he even once perceive himself completely, laid out as if in an illuminated glass case?" Today, the primary barrier to knowledge is encryption, and yet, if Gödels theorem of incompleteness rings true, encryption itself is knowledge. This is because knowledge expressed in speech or writing is necessarily in code that must be unpacked by a trained human subject. Consequently, the cost of higher education is, paradoxically, more expensive now in the so-called information age; when a student naive to the true purpose of the computer would expect the opposite due to the touted promise of it's ability to use computers to disseminate educational material. Unfortunately, the salespeople professing the benefits of computers throw off the illusion that it's techno-evolutionary ancestor (writing) did not originally have anti-social rather than humanitarian applications, anti-social applications including but not limited to: thought control, distraction, encryption, deception, time distancing, and the consumption of physical resources. Were it otherwise students could enjoy a life of study without end, without having to renounce societies claim to have a vested interest in the spread of learning.

Nietzsche's early unpopular lecture On the Future of Our Educational Institutions was on exactly this; there he takes note of this curious fact of our tragic contradictoriness of society's claim to want learning while perceptually renunciating that claim. Likewise despite Karl Marx's habit of consuming volumes of alcohol and writing in his studies, he did not seem to account for the existence of paper labor. A class to teach classlessness runs counter to it's cause, hence the perpetual failure of communism. The labor of research and writing is something Marx looked right past: the educator informs the audience of class by classifying. Consequently, class cannot be abolished because a new classifier can always reclassify. But if professional researcher was a job all citizens were permitted to have, then a communist society would collapse as everyone stayed home to research their televisions. Research, Study, Learning, and the pretense to be interested in knowledge, are fake interests which function as social barriers. Study, at last, only becomes it's own reward once that studying activity had retarded the organs of the animal into failing at all other, more laborious activities. Academic life, alas is only that: a way of life; humans do not really care about knowing or knowledge, intelligence or information. And so, rather than being a genius which supports itself and adds to encryption, Nietzsche's thinking begins in full consciousnesses that our interest in the even spread of knowledge is feigned. For Nietzsche, knowledge is suspicious; other animals stand as a living proof that the pretense to knowledge is another subterfuge in the

struggle for existence.

For what might the next step be, if everyone knew everything? Would society be blown out by the information, because no person would obey a superior? If Nietzsche and Tolkien's philological education informed them of a world where writing is merely an instrument of social control, then it should not surprise us that Nietzsche sought a reversal of Platonism, or that Tolkien should write of the eventual destruction of the ring (the universal ring of reason). Our word "school" is derived directly from the Greek word for leisure. In my interpretation of Plato's cave, the shadow-speculators are the only people in the dialogue to own property. For Socrates asks: "Or would not he or she much rather wish for the condition that Homer speaks of, namely "to live on the land (above ground) as the paid menial of another destitute peasant?" Wouldn't he or she prefer to put up with absolutely anything else rather than associate with those opinions that hold in the cave and be that kind of human being?" For one to be unable to enter the over-ground without becoming destitute, the wall being faced must be the paper wall: a right to contractual property ownership. It is simply a historical fact that in ancient times slaves were not permitted the privilege to read or write or paint because doing so would grant them power to create determinators for triggering human activity, physical determinators which consume physical resources, and, thereby, enslave. Over the course of human generations the human being's utilization of writing created systemic barriers between whatever people did not use writing for social distancing (writing consumes more time than speaking). Writing creates new organs. It's for this reason that Heidegger thought cybernetics to be the end of philosophy, because cybernetics was it's beginning via the maneuver of Plato. Any object you engage with alters your organic structure, be it a hammer or a cave of a screen or a paper in front of your eyes.