REFLECTIONS ON THE TASK OF DESIGNING AN INTERFACE FOR THE FUTURE

BY

JOE VIVIANO

Here I plan to introduce my project concerning the proper form of government and the state of the future. Humans are animals that interface. We face one another, and face the world, and face the paper, and face the screen. What are the properties of the mind? To what extent does the mind interface? The mind allows us to simulate actions we may carry out in the real world, however we do not have the power to carry out these situations simulated as they are simulated exactly, so one of its functions is preparatory for in-world response. But why am I speaking this way? It is only because of the human other that interfacing with verbal constructs is necessary, such as my own. By reading my words you are interfacing with me, from my mind to yours, as you may say. But interfaces introduce a problem constituted by the interface itself. For example the citizen may interface with a voting booth yet not possess the interface necessary to influence others in the territory effected by that voting decision. This is an inequality of interfaces: the poor citizen does not have the power to take possession of the newspapers or televisions or internet, and so whatever they may say about the voting situation is overpowered by the interfaces that scream over them all the time.

Now for another example. Let's say that the task of government is to improve peoples social standing. Can this be the real task of government? How can this be the task of government when people can only occupy the spatial zone occupied by themselves? People occupy a spatial zone; and so, if the government were to take it as its task to "improve" the persons (spatial) "social standing" (where do they stand?) it would set for itself an endless task. To compensate, the voting booth interface was devised. Historically human beings have always interfaced with one another and so used words as determinates for their activity. And so words were written on tablets, tokens, and papers to serve as mobile social determinates. Like for example coins.

Most likely the interface goes back to the cave. It was by utilizing the wall of the cave that other humans were able to "read the writing on the wall" and act in response. So perhaps first there is self-recognition (recognizing ones own mark on the wall). And second there is historical-recognition (recognizing the build-up of marks). And finally there is perhaps the projected action potential of repeating this task for all time (as the hand prints extend out beyond the cave times infinity).

Usually drawings and sentences are only constructed by a single individual. Just as dogs piss to mark their territory, so too may a man have left something to mark a territory to inspire action within a zone. If the picture-image was significantly terrifying and left in an existentially necessary space protecting early man from the elements (cave) and that image were to serve as an inspirational determinate (kill the mammoths with spears) then at that moment the artist may become more powerful than the most powerful man, provided his power is measured as "influence."

But let's consider instruction's power. Humans are biologically hardwired to require instructions to survive. "Don't cross the street." and "Do your homework." and "Don't put your finger in the light socket." These instructions are existentially necessary. Even the infantile cry can be considered a kind of early instruction, perhaps man's primal character as begging animal. So far I have not been able to refute the idea that we are all beggars. The politician begs for votes; the companies beg for employees to work for them; the researcher begs for funding; the factory begs for machines; the scientists beg for laboratory technicians; the homeless beg for food; the babies beg for milk; the children beg for toys. Crying is the human condition in a nutshell. The message of "instruction" that's "necessary for life" (human life specifically) later becomes an instrument of control. Hence we observe that when primitive animals grow old they drop dead, whereas the human animal lords its memories over the young. Indeed it is actually advantageous for a non-subordinated human animal instructor to deny their dominant role for all time. It takes tremendous courage for one who knows nothing to finally instruct others in what they care about themselves. I suspect that this knowledge of instruction's power is why ancient peoples preferred to communicate orally, so that the speech dislocated as the inorganic cybernetic interface did not serve as a dead determinate for their activity. What's better? Letting something that's living influence your activity, or something dead? My hypothesis is that such people knew that if they let dead signs influence their behavior too much they'd become dead themselves. Of course I recognize that while my starting place was "instruction" I have advanced into a deeper discussion on messages and what they mean for man.

One of the social problems that I've recognized is that humans become addicted to the instructional role. By immersing themselves in an activity that is not labor, like writing or speaking, one is able to keep themselves away from labor forever. In fact we should make a distinction here between speech labor and manual labor, understanding that both the speech and the manual are forms of activity. Manual is a designation intended to signify activity done with the hand, whereas speech is

a designation to signify activity done with the mouth. What makes the speech activity special, however, is it's power to signal out other activities by the power of its activity as different by making different sounds. If I talk to you or cut down a tree, I consume calories either way. However if I ask you to perform an action and you carry out my instruction, like cutting down a tree, then I will spend significantly fewer calories than yourself. I do not as of yet know of any thinker hitherto that has taken this ontology of instruction as it pertains to social inequality and government very seriously.

If instructions become very complicated, creating an instructional reference tutorial may be necessary. It's the writing tablet or cave that served as the primitive control center for the brain. So the brain by consequence of its function as body operator later becomes the operator of others as they respond to the signs written down. Sensitivity within the body, which is a spatial system, gave it cause to achieve homeostasis with its environment through the discharge of complaint. Every body is a spatial system with a boundary which occupies a unique spatial zone. This is something that's endlessly overlooked in government and rhetoric. It's too often the case that people rhetorically speak of this "we" by asserting shared participation in an action when in fact what they actually mean is the "we" manifested in the writing realm. It would simply be stupid for one spatial system to say that it did what another spatial system did since the two spatial systems occupy different spatial points. However humans do this all the time when they make statements such as "We flew to the moon." Armed with a kind of inferiority complex since birth, humans are all too ready to mentally inject themselves into the achievements of countless others. So what we see here is the assertion and simulation of credit in another individuals accomplishment. The crowd that agrees that "we" flew to the moon will not agree that "we" tortured to death a child. Indeed it is this "we" people sacrifice themselves to, sacrificing themselves to the "representative" who "presents" what is complained about, again and again.

Mechanically speaking what is happening here is a spatial system is receiving the complaint, which is reciprocated by the individual which operates as a control node over the spatial zone. As I've written elsewhere: "The law is contingent on space." When Moses created the 10 Commandments, he did so because the law was a necessary regulator for human behavior. Note here too that for animals our bodies are in a sense "regulated." Organically speaking the mind is faced with a horn on each side: the organic affect created by organs grown by universal automatism, and the mechanical organs made by man. Here it's noteworthy to point out that the organs hidden behind his skin were not created by the brain; rather, the organs behind his skin were grown in parallel. So I have here revealed a future difficulty in which man will be responsible for the organs he uses to keep himself alive. It then becomes the brains responsibility to fashion organs for itself. But how is it to decide? Previously the brain operated as a weapon for organic defense. Now this defense system has extended its regulatory function over the entire universe, intending to make it intelligible to itself, intending to determine (verb) what (noun) "we" (plural) can (actually) say (verb) about nature (noun). This proposed "task" is completely crazy and absurd.

Is it so that humans only seek knowledge in the interest of social standing? "It is the task of science to figure out what we can say about the universe." we are told. But can a "saying" ever aspire to be the universe? Not by any means. My concerns over this future project concerning the design and maintenance of mechanical organs has given me cause to consider the spaceship "state of the future."

Oddly enough, when we look at the paper or screen we are altering our organic structure. This is something we've watched unfold in our lifetime, how society has been "changed" by machines. We say that we're alive when actually we're still and always growing and consequently not ourselves. Perhaps one reason why it has been difficult to conceptualize the spaceship state is because we must and are thinking of it as a container, much like the various nations are contained by their borders. Yet when we reflect upon the border containers we know that they in fact are not as stationary as the maps would lead us to believe.

If the planet rolls even slightly through space, the so-called borders must move, so the borders themselves are enforced; on the one hand, by "law enforcement officers" (those reacting to and defending the interface); and on the other hand, by our minds when we track the borders on the pages. It is certainly beyond dispute that plate tectonics will someday send nation crashing into nation, yet this is not something we see our national leaders preparing us for. This is because the spatiotemporal location and identity of the nation is not as important as the power the symbol has over our minds to react to it when shown. So what is necessary for the human being to feel comfortable in the spaceship? For reasons we are trying to make clear, there is a definite power of sign determinacy going on in the human world. If "comfort" is our goal, then this interface we must design has to compensate for the refractory natures of all the minds contained within, otherwise it will

become a torture chamber of demands and not the paradise we want. Doubtlessly the spaceship of our conception will have "permissions" and so "restrictions" on what a brain contained within itself will have the power to do. Thus the brains there contained will not know freedom but rather some level of either interdependence or unequivocal subservience. It seems possible to me that this subservience may be fetishized. Unfortunately this means that humans will not experience "equality" because they will be subordinated within a structure in which they are not the archon. I think I should add a note that, just as we do not breathe but are breathed, we may not really think but be thunked by our brains into thinking we think; furthermore, the suggestion that "we" (plural) think (singular) denotes a kind of cancelation of multiple thinkers thinking in parallel by reducing our thinking into a single thought thought by failing to differentiate between the plural and the singular.

Let's have an example of the loss of personal autonomy we suffer because of machines. On the Oregon Trail, you have total mastery over your wagon, unless of course a person stops you. In the modern city, your autonomy is curbed by signs, telling you to stop or whatever. In the spaceship your autonomy is entirely encased by the machine. Although due to the similarities between bodyship and spaceship the question of our own autonomy sounds like a dubious belief (or verbal assertion) to us as we contemplate the fact that our organs harass us for the sake of homeostatic stability anyway. But how can the spaceship have laws? That is another interesting thing about the law, universal law, that the human law was created to compensate for universal law, leaving behind a puzzle of a law which continually compensates for itself; the universal law compensates for universal law, with human law, which is an extension of human law, and so on. Ironically, this doesn't sound like "law" at all: only chaos, as the law invariably collapses back on itself, namely, universal reality.

Would it make sense if the spaceship we are speaking of were to make its primary function universal absorption? What is the task of mathematics? What is the point of geometry? Do we not all know, or should we not all know, that Pythagoras was insane? If we measure we set up for ourselves an infinite activity. If we count we set up for ourselves an infinite activity. It's said that "mathematics is a universal language because it's something we can all agree on." However I have never been able to prove to myself that aliens may understand my equations, because they're meaningless to my alienated dog. Mathematics can therefore not be a universal language by any means. This "we" that "agrees" is only "human" here, not "universal." Rather its usefulness is maintained by the human "tradition" of keeping up this mathematical practice.

We can always make the exact measurement more exact. So we have for ourselves, thanks to mathematicians, this divine task of making the exact exacter, so Husserl says. But can there really be 2 things in the world? Can 2 be proven? Does 2 even exist? When we write the equation $1 + 1 = 2$ and we say to ourselves that the equation is solved, have we solved it really, or only deployed a verbal construct "2" at a teacher's request? My hypothesis is that by giving this faulty answer we fail to recognized that, by virtue of this mathematical activity being more infinite than us, we have fallen victim to the mathematician: the ancient troll. After all, for there to be 2 things they would have to be 2 of the same. But if the 2 were the same then they would be constructed the same and hence they would not be 2 things but 1 thing that's one and the same. But if mathematical activity cannot even begin to get itself off the ground, then how can money get itself off the ground, or capitalism get itself off the ground? My answer is that money and capitalism gets itself off the ground of base experience by alienating itself with itself through the denial of One and the acceptance of 2 as valid response. Analogy is killing us.

"Money is the universal, self-constituted value of all things. Hence it has robbed the whole world of its proper value. Money is the alienated essence of man's labor and life, and this alien essence dominates him as he worships it." Marx said. What is alienating about money is what's alienating about "multiple" as a concept; and so, a communist society that has capitalism, money, mathematics, or numbers, cannot be communist in the way Marx had conceived. Of course he himself would balk at the thought that he was teaching a comical "class to teach classlessness" that could never reach its goal. But we should not balk at this, because Marx didn't either. By failing like this the story of Marx's life could be told as a rhetorical device for the political acquisition of power. All politicians are storytellers who tell a story that can only exist on paper or in the air.

This is how both Jesus's use of the word "hypocrite" and Socrates' use of the word "sophist" is to be understood: as a pejorative for the instructor. The word "hypocrite" means one who cannot do what he says. From here it follows that an instructor cannot do what they say if they say an command, because saying that command is not included in the command itself, because that would be annoying. Jesus's request for his "flock" to "live by example" is covertly a request for people to "shut up and die." Similarly, when Socrates accuses his adversaries of "sophistry," which he morphed into a pejorative that would later mean "one who uses fallacious arguments for money," he was only able to free himself from this insult

because he refused to be paid for the insults he gave. In both cases, these talk-hating legends died, and were used as human pivots on which to talk about their suicidal wisdom "professionally." But these social irritants did not achieve their cause. Instead their corpses were held up to terrify crowds with the story of their lives, no differently than the way Marx's colossal hope and colossal idiocy was held up to terrify crowds into hungering for the formation of a classless society that could only be classless in a rhetorical sense. The concept of class was introduced rhetorically anyway. It's almost as if most people did not have any insight into understanding how words really operate!

Obviously the instructor is not at all necessary for technological development or scientific development. The state cannot "train people how to think" as Einstein believed, because Einstein was not taught how to think but was rather "thunked" by universal automatism. Einstein, who himself refused jobs that rendered him subordinate, time and time again. The state of my conception must find a harmonious balance between showcasing its historical displays, between teaching languages, and between letting these brains molded into existence by the universe to proceed down the path of their pathologies. This by the way is why despotisms fail: they make the mistake of thinking they can teach the universe when the despot in charge is not some universal representative even so much as mirroring the universe but rather an offshoot that's crumbling away as soon as it's born. Unfortunately for humans in a classroom environment, some students will be tormented by what's being taught, simply because the classroom environment is a place of limited freedom.

In any such classroom we are delivered off the cuff a set of impossible goals. These include: ending world hunger, achieving world peace, curing cancer, and understanding the universe. Understanding the universe is absurd because nothing besides the human has requested me to understand it. Understanding as I now understand it is merely a word discharged by the human to get the questioner of his back when it asks "Do you understand?" rhetorically and expectingly. Thus I here pronounce the task of universal understanding to be absurd. Likewise the task of curing cancer is absurd when one acknowledges that cancer was caused by man in the first place thanks to carcinogens effecting the environment through human-applied pesticides. Similarly, the challenge to end world hunger is absurd, however I will attack that question as I contemplate the spaceship I am trying to design.

The three realms of activity available for us, psychical and physical and virtual, give clue to the possibility of there being additional realms outside the circuit of our activity. There is a very good reason why the spaceship state of the future must be talked about and designed, quite possibly with 3D modeling programs. Someday, the Sun will explode. "The sun is now in the middle of its life cycle, and will explode in about 4-5 billion years In the few hundred million years before the explosion, it will swell up and become a red giant as big as the Earth's orbit. It will therefore swallow the Earth." Since I regard Earth as my current dwelling space and that dwelling space is under attack, I regard the state of the future as spaceship as one of my most important tasks. Indeed the widespread non-discussion of this task is an international shame. Dante and others have argued that mankind ordered under a universal monarch will most closely resemble God. Admittedly while envisaging this future dwelling space as spaceship containing minds interested in the universe I felt myself thinking along similar lines. We must not merely think about the spaceship but also about the universe too. But what kind or set of interfaces will this spaceship I'm describing have? Holographic? Psychic? Mechanical? Physical? Will we still make use of eyeballs, eyeballs grown and encased by shells made of screens? Will we still manipulate fingers, and if so of what kind? If children are born within the confines of the spaceship, what must they learn? Will they become mentally shocked by their existence? If they are mentally shocked by their existence, when is it permissible to kill them in the slot in which they occupy? Genes have a tendency to fashion material into animal weaponry that itself threatens the system as it changes its structure. So how is the spacehip supposed to be designed to compensate for this when it needs their mental contributions for its well-being? And if the spaceship, as state of the future, cannot be usefully spoken of, does that then mean that it is useless to speak of politics of any kind? Obviously this spaceship as dwelling space will need to possess certain properties.

1. A chamber to contain the brains.

2. A chamber to experiment on the physical.

3. A chamber to simulate the virtual.

4. An interface for the physical.

5. An interface for the virtual.

6. An interface for the sending and receiving of messages from brain to brain.

On second thought, what are called "messages" may not even be necessary. A spaceship as I've been contemplating may at some point in its development envelop the universe in toto. This thought here prompts my mental investigation into how the gravity regimes of the various heavenly bodies will act on the machine. Furthermore this thought here prompts too my mental investigation into how the gravity regimes mold our bodies into existence.

If bodies are drawn into close spatial proximity by the vortex of gravity to constitute the general shape of the globe and too the general shape of the cell, it seems equally plausible that it is responsible for other "spatial" enclosures. The horizon of our consciousness, which tapers off at the edge of our senses, must blend into the background processes 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. Here I will suggest that this "field of vortices" most closely resembles both Heraclitus's "ever-living fire" as well as the Democritian "aggregates." This inspires a question: "Why is it that children are plastic and good at play, whereas adults lack plasticity, and grow increasingly less likely to create something new?" Both young and old people report the same sense of self being maintained throughout their years. They always feel like a "self" and they always feel the same. If, then, as I grow old, I have not lost any sense of me, it seems likely too that, when I die, my sense of me will be maintained. This makes sense if we are to take this gravity consciousness as the absolute ground of our experience. What we see in nature disturbs us. We watch a bird eat a worm, how it seemingly "disappears." In fact what "vanished" was not lost exactly so much as incorporated into something else. We must not allow our eyes to trick us here. When we watch a worm being devoured we see it from one side, not all sides, which is what is necessary for us to really know what's actually happening to its consciousness. Indeed it follows from the hypothesis of universal gravity consciousness that, as an animal's blasted apart as it dies, again it will sense itself as universal consciousness prior to its re-incorporation with local vortices. As gravity's power clumps vortices together, it clumps vortices on top of vortices, and so the vortices face both to and away from what they're facing as they turn. Here the maze-like structure of the body with all its twists and turns is explained.

From this homeostatic necessity of the turn I shift my attention back to the matter of the interface. Perhaps one of the most dreadful things learned from the previous section was learning that, while interface is existentially necessary, it is in no way a pathway to any higher understanding of the universe, or even ourselves as agents engaged in universal activity. It has already been shown that understanding ourselves better through interfaces is about as productive for understanding oneself better as looking at the mirror while wearing a paper bag. Indeed if it were not for interfaces, law enforcement would not be possible, there'd only be packs of unscrupulous gangs. It takes squabble for there to be law. It takes dispute for there to be law. It takes agreement for there to be law. When someone says "It's the law." What they do is remind the listener of what has been done. In a sense it's human weakness that pushes certain humans towards the legal interface in the interest in the resolution of interpersonal dispute. But people do not enjoy admitting that an entity for resolving disputes is necessary and so they hate the lawyer because he stands as proof positive that peace is only possible through him, and not any real peace, nor any lasting peace, but peace as the word deployed when he says there was a "peaceful" resolution. Peace is what's found when a conflict is resolved, but the essence of peace is nothing but a word deployed.

But what is to happen in the future when the interface for activity in the world is advanced enough to actually simulate it? Will some people maintain an existence encased by that interface while others work for their maintenance? Why should only one person have access to an interface, a canvas? Do I have to remind my listener that poor people in ancient times were not allowed to read or write, or even paint? Is the reason for this not obvious? The holy men guarded the sacred interface with their lives. What they had in their hands, which appeared from the outside to be some idiosyncratic mystical activity was actually an excuse to excuse themselves from labor with the "excuses" they could deploy without end. It's true that humans need to work to survive but the word "work" can be understood here in multiple ways. On one side the word work can mean "function" and "operate" and "last." On another side work can mean "act" or "perform." It's only in the case of this word's capture by the religious or legal organization that "work" morphs from this "laboring" activity to a "begging" activity to an "advertising" activity (the holy word of God).

God was at first an empty word presented tactically as a challenge for us to figure out. Many people make the mistake of attempting to figure it out by fleshing out this word with additional words, however this is unnecessary. God is a sound that was canceled out as bait, that is what Nietzsche meant when he pronounced it dead. As an advertisement; as a verbal mechanism which operated as the hook by which human beings were seduced into silence (to pray to God best, it was taught, it is best to pray alone); a vast majority fell victim and went silent, unaware of the psychopath priests in control. Indeed it was and still is in some places argued that "The poor people couldn't read, so they built beautiful churches to see the glory of God." But what this is to really say is thus: If the priest didn't have this interface to create distance between himself and his flock, then there'd be no church spire because he would not have "inspired them" into building it!

It would be a serious mistake to think that cybernetics is a man covered in metal armor rather than paper armor. In fact, without the paper interface mathematical activity becomes impossible. Furthermore it's only necessary because question is a kind of instruction. So here we muist return to a further consideration of the interface again. What is the "proper form of government" as I had initially stated? or should it be better stated that I seek the ideal interface? How is this done, to decide what's "ideal" or what's "proper?" That question has no answer because the decision is a spoken statement, so "with the mouth" is the correct answer. "But it is undetermined how the decision-making mental process occurs." This is what some people mean when they ask the question "How are we to decide?" on what constitutes "ideal." This would open up an inquiry into mental automatism. An automatism that has no words, no logos, and no way to convey itself to us "logically."

One difficulty I've foreseen concerning the interface is that if there is an interface then there's always the possibility of something standing outside the interface (so this will be called the Cypher problem). People may readily acknowledge that, when they are looking at a computer generated image presentation of nature, that that image is not really the nature presented. Someone will say "This is a mere representation, not the real thing." in protest to the screen. Likewise they may say "Computer screen nature is inferior to real world nature." and so on. How is the word "nature" to be understood? Both natures are nature, however one nature (screen) is devalued as such, while the other (no screen) is affirmed. A painting of a field provides me no range of motion in a field. A computer generated panoramic view of a field, on the other hand, does provide me with an improved range of motion in a field (the tilting of the head). A computer generated holographic view of a field provides me with full motion, down to whatever is recorded by the machine (so, the surface of the field but not the dirt). If the field is owned by someone (there will be more about paper licenses later) they may prohibit access to the field, so no one can enjoy the field by any means besides the hologram. So the legal interface and it's determinacy pushes us towards the computer interface as the only nature available for us.

Has this happened before? Here I find it necessary that I contemplate the origin of the of the mind as the only interface I have. The interface I have (brain) I have because of universal law, just as the interface I may have (computer) I may have because of human law. It is obvious that to experiment on nature, to do science, remaining purely encased by the interface will not allow me to achieve any results in the physical world. So holographic interfacing will at a certain point prove inadequate and an apeture by which to touch the physical must be made so "science" can be done. So just as the mollusk is mechanically burdened by it's shell, rendering itself unable to adapt to the more discontent animal (man), so too may man in the future be burdened by the mechanical pressure of written signs applied to his body system. This is the crisis of "human knowledge" as "stockpiled signs." So we find ourselves wrestling with requiring interface while rejecting it's attacks.

Let us look again at the topic of human plasticity, thinking of the human being as a bodyship. From the existence of the ferel child it is deduced a shocking level of human interdependency. So for example a child left alone that is taken in by dogs will act accordingly dog-like, whereas a child taken in by hens will behave as a hen. So man is the imitation animal. From here it follows that if humans engage in the process of reading or writing they will become physiologically retarded for activities such as labor. So, if one has a built-in hatred of labor, they may successfully be able to retard themselves into being forever unfit for that activity. Meanwhile humans en masse cry out for "social equality" when this requires that everyone be molded equally (in German the word educator also means molder).

It is questionable that anything or act or device can "help humanity." Humans, as active agents of themselves, cannot be helped in their own activity. It has already been shown how humans inject themselves into other people's achievements thanks to their powers of action simulation. It is noteworthy to point out here that suicide note writers rarely use inclusive language like "us" or "we" which I at present regard as wrong. Thus I am able to say "nothing helps humanity" with logical

certainty. "Humanity" is a word that signifies nothing that's nevertheless packed with emotion to terrify crowds. So the rhetorician may say "Oh the humanity!" and "Have some humanity!" to encourage a human to act "morally" or "humane." It goes without saying that humans have a history of rape and murder and vivisection and torture. Our special sensitivity is exploited such that verbal threat is all that's required for human beings to comply, because they're conditioned by guilt to feel guilty for a history of enormities they didn't even do. So strangely humans will "select" what is "humane" effectively whitewashing all the evil humans have done.

Due to the nature of man being born in a state of dependency able to be molded by animals of whatever kind, as well as the use of referential phonetic control signals through the question and answer cycle, signs were stockpiled in the interest of recording the questions that had been answered so far. These questions and answers were allegedly stockpiled in the interest of "answering all questions." But really it's the reverse: the stockpile is the repository of cases in which people reacted to one others words. So here we see that the answer to all questions is actually death, because death removes questioning's influential power. Once the biological ability to question is dispensed with through the installation of the mind into perhaps a holographic interface, all questions will be answered because questioning will no longer be possible. In fact, without the mouth capable of articulating the statement or the "reason" and so on, whatever brains are contained will no longer be "reasonable." People ask: "What is the reason for that?" and receive an answer. Thus we see here that the function of "reason" is to trigger a body into "answering" and nothing besides. This is deduced mechanically and has consequences that are absolutely devastating. It means the spaceship may torture mankind with its unreasonableness, unless the interface is properly designed in a manner which compensates for the refractory nature of man.

"Speech is a joint game between speaker and listener against the forces of confusion." And what could be more confusing than being born as an animal so dependent that no action for it is right? Should we be asking ourselves our own questions, so as not to troll others? Should we manufacture everything ourselves, so as not to let people become subordinated for the production process of the objects we want? Even if an object is created under the pretext of "helping humanity" that object will be either too small to fit into humanity's hands, or too heavy to pick it up! Never has any scientific activity been done under the pretext of "helping humanity" despite what the so-called "science communicators" say! Rather, experiments are done to satiate personal neurotic curiosity as neurotic humans experiment with suicide.

So far I have not let on to the three pronged attack I am deploying against the three mysteries: "life" and "gravity" and "consciousness." Since these are the three greatest mysteries, I have long suspected that they are inexorably intertwined. The vulgar model of gravity we're griven is described to us as a force that "pulls" as life itself "pulls" material (food) into itself to sustain itself. Gravity's also thought to be responsible for the "curvature of spacetime" and so can be responsible for an individuals sense of "consciousness" as well. And because gravity pulls, it can be thought of as responsible for the "self" it must "temporalize." So whatever "self" there is, is constituted by this process that consumes itself and temporalizes itself into consciousness ever-lasting. And perhaps we should not think that gravity has no capacity to birth, as we reflect on the recent discovery that a black hole can "belch." But this is perhaps a "dangerous" line of thought because it presents for us an image of life that's forever being reborn and forever tearing itself apart.

(Shiva: the goddess of creation of and destruction).

If nature wasn't always eating itself, the waste products it shits out would pile up. It circulates itself through itself. I am describing a circuit that's at the same time infinite and closed. Life is molded by death. We have seen for ourselves in computer programs 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. So we are not "helping humanity" but rather competing as animal weapons.

Humans claim to want to know how a spider is able to make the liquid in its body into a silk that's elastic and strong. Why? It's not hard to understand that the spider was molded by repeatedly failing to survive. We want to "save the animals" but what we actually want is for them to survive in our laboratories so we can extract from them "wonder materials" for our purposes. We do this, of course, turning a blind eye to the future possibility that machines may torture us to death to

generate products they can use. And plus we forget that while we can experiment on nature in a laboratory that any laboratory cannot create a product to have man transcend the lab. It's just as ridiculous as the quest, request, to make a product to help us escape having to make products, yet this is something that's maintained is possible for us to do. Here I think I ought to call attention to the fact that baring these things in mind makes designing the state of the future on paper (interface) and executing that plan (instruction) very difficult, because "request" is somethig we're trying to avoid.

Can we build a machine to end hunger? Is hunger well understood? If we are to "end hunger" then should we not define what it is we're ending? I suspect that the reason why man has had such a challenge ending world hunger is because he had a bad definition of hunger from the start. A clearer definition was made visible to me earlier as I contemplated the construction of the cyberstomach. Even if the cyberstomach is created we will not be rid of what is irritating about hunger, namely organic harassment. Not only will the cyberstomach still affect the mind with pangs of maintenance, but the pangs of maintenance are actually intensified by the pangs of the educational systems deployment of words necessary to understand the manufacturing process. Here there are some conflations happening...

Hunger is conflated with maintenance.

Hunger / maintenance is conflated with affect.

Education is conflated with "affect."

All of these place demands on our consciousness. We cannot design a way to dispose of "affect" as that creative process of design turns self-affecting. If we are to take seriously this task to design the spaceship as a chamber to contain the mind, we also take it as our task to design what affects us, which was not the brains responsibility before.

In order to make sense of a sentence that sentence has to end. We make sense of the sentence as a band, sequenced by the sequencer of the sentence. The human animal evokes an image of the band by speaking a sentence sequenced one word at a time. Once these sentence bands are known, humans may and must act in response to the sequencer. My hypothesis is that because of the physiological problem of memetic lack, coupled by the evolutionary tradition of referring by phonetic reference rather than actual reference by gesture, that that tradition of phonetic reference produced in the course of the evolutionary process an enhancement of memory as semantic repository in tandem with the brain's development as sequencer of people with sounds. Here we're given through the juxtaposition of patterns, human and cellular, cause to show up the causal source for these patterns, namely, the genetic "transcriptor" and the human "sequencer." What exactly is it about "sequencing" items "one at a time" that results in these patterns, anyway?

It's important I point out that I know what has been spoken about here may be relevant to the so-called "bodyship" (both spaceships and bodyships are spatial systems with boundaries), however because we are contemplating the design of this ship, the consequences of sequencing had to be described. It's no accident that I've mentioned this "band." Turing while contemplating his "universal machine" (more often called the Turing Machine) described a tape (band) being fed through a machine, infinitely. The machine itself was received as a valid mathematical model of computation because computation as performed by human beings is just reading and writing, ostensibly. Also it's ostensibly so that the tape itself is not infinite but rather fed to the machine by the human being so the machine feeds on human beings.

It makes perfect sense to my mind that the machine he created would prove the uncomputability of the decision problem because the decision-making activity is a continual activity (verb) whereas the decision proper (noun) is a closed remark. If we were to arrive at a computation, that "computation" would come to an end and hence not suffice as an explanation for the activity due to the unbridgeable divide that's constituted by the difference between verb and noun. Oddly enough Turing himself asserts that the human computer responsible for the execution of mechanical rules in a manner that's "desultory" (defined as lacking a plan, purpose, or enthusiasm). And just with the human being the head of the Turing machine may read and write one, and only one, symbol in a cell at a time. Most animals to my knowledge do not sequence items "one at a time" for the purpose of social organization but rather emit sounds, like for example a bird and it's mating call. Non-human animals, when they are not constructing patterns for the seduction of their sexual interest, may discharge a sound as an expression of strength to force others away by their call. Perhaps nature began to turn itself inside out in the course of the disclosure of phonetic sounds, manifesting in the form of statues sculpted by mental activity, such that what was inside,

came outside (quite literally going out of our minds). In geometry this "image of life" has been expressed before as a fourth dimensional torus: a self-consummating ring. It is a shape that both produces itself and consumes the self that it produces in the course of it's activity, not unlike the Shiva-like model. But it is questionable whether these shapes would exist without the social pressure applied to the human for their "expression" on the two dimensional page. Indeed it is only while the human eye is tracking the path of these structures, either mentally or on the page, that these shapes can be conceived.

Most likely, the cast away islander has no need for these expressions because there is no one to whom he can express them to. It is only because we are here considering the construction of a possible dwelling space for man that conceptions such as these must be bore in mind as part of our project. But I have still not touched on the use of question itself. "Question" is a human device. It's something humans propound for "answer" or "reply." Previously, I introduced the idea that instruction can be used to save calories here, and my answer for the function of question is no different. Questioning is a powerful tool indicated by tonal inflections to encourage an interlocutor to answer in response. Children learn this right away, when they begin to ask "Why?" repeatedly. It is here that we must admit that the capacity for infinite questioning is recognized; and for humans, where the fun begins; the fun of becoming a questioning "professional." Here the question of why advanced alien species do not make contact with us is explained. If they started listening (obeying us) they'd become our slaves. So this gives clue to a method for us to make contact with aliens through the careful utilization of this principal.

By consequence of the unequal relationship between speaker and listener (it's damn near impossible to hear two people speaking at once, much less a whole room), how the questioner questions and the listener listens, speech has always had a tyrannical effect on the brain, forcing it to think what it would otherwise not think on its own, because listening is an involuntary activity while reading is voluntary. Here the mechanical reason for turning towards the paper interface is explained: as an instrument for entering into an entirely voluntary existence, rather than a subordinate listening one (note that, in Hebrew, the words "hear" and "obey" are alternately translated). As more and more people sought out lawyers to settle their interpersonal disputes, more and more did the paper walls of legalism harden around the animal called man as cases were stockpiled. The paper interface's repeated success as social determinate thence gave rise to the state, as we know it today. Now school is compulsory, because the dead signs have taken control; the "human resources" go to school simply to learn that they have nothing, absolutely nothing, of their own.

So, when we observe humans driving their cell-like cars down the city's asphalt veins, we now perceive this as the natural consequence of the instructional power of signs. First, the acceptance of two led to the denial of specialness; second, the acceptance of endless mathematical activity caused a cascade of insatiable want. Humans were forced to analogize and deny specialness by analogy, letting themselves sink into something resembling the cellular. For instruction is even the origin of capitalism; capital being the unit stockpiled through human obedience and subordination. What the money-manager does as he "makes money with money" is not so simple as doing nothing; rather, his watchful eye is needed to make sure that his machine for the continual stockpiling of capital continues as people react to his signs. Here too are we finally able to see the mechanical reasons why throughout human history Jews were repeatedly expelled from the lands in which they dwell. Other religions usually speak of an "after life" or a "world beyond" and so on, rather than a continual activity in which we are engaged. Repeatedly it is complained that "Jews are in control of the media" but the mechanical reason for this is never stated plainly enough, because it would absolve them of their alleged crime. The reason is simply thus: it is due to their valuation of reading and writing. And so we must see that the solution for this is not murder or expulsion but rather the rejection of that attitude which says that reading and writing is bad. Besides, the removal of the paper interface will not result in the obviation of despotisms because the mouth is perfectly able to speak commands. In fact it is by virtue of the voluntary nature of reading and writing that we are able to understand that it's the hidden hope of reading and writing that interfacing with its pages will liberate minds from despotisms. I call this "creative self-destruction" by organic interfacing.

Because historical sophistry was put down in the past, it seems likely to me that mechanical sophistry made possible by interfacing with the internet could be put down today. Mecha sophistry being using machines to talk to people for money while conveying fallacious arguments (although all arguements may be false because words can never aspire to mirror reality). But as we've previously discovered humans are not even able to move outside the ontology of instruction or the self-retarding process that happens when one interfaces with anything. "Interfacing" or "cybernetics" may not only be limited to interfacing with a paper or a computer screen but any object, including a human being. Cybernetics means to talk about what's happening when we socialize. One consequence of interfacing is that by letting that interface (for example the

writing tablet or writing pad or word processor) echo signs back to you, you at the same time create an interface which cannot empathize with you. So how might interfacing with determinators such as the page create a loss of empathy between organisms? It goes without saying that organisms utilize sense-giving hardware and organs we do not have. It's perhaps by interfacing that we lose touch with the reality that's outside the interface, creating the possibility of doing injury to others unintentionally. So for example I may not intend to cause injury by eating an animal, or eating a salad, or piloting a body, or killing myself, or asking a question, when all of these things may do injury simply because I am interfacing with something that does not allow me to see the interface others are seeing. But was it not just said earlier that dispute was what pushed us towards the legal interface in the first place? Does the question "When does interfacing begin?" have an answer?

How about these aphorisms. Do they make sense? "It's because the world is bad that we can enjoy our dreams." I had written. "It's because the world is bad that we can enjoy creation." I had written. "Creation is a kind of destruction." I had written. "Discontent is essential to life." I had written. But this goes against what I was earlier saying about creating a spaceship and an interface in which human beings were comfortable. Does "comfort" imply finality? If human beings were told the story that I have written thus far I doubt "comfort" would be the emotion they'd feel, only turmoil. Frustration with the interface so far seems inevitable. There does not seem to be any way to design a spacehip or an interface that will compensate for the genetic tendency for organisms to utilize the interface as the utilization process undermines the interface itself through their changes. Here I must remind myself that I have not even spoken in depth about "paper licenses" yet. "Messages are themselves a form of pattern and organization. Indeed, it is possible to treat sets of messages as having an entropy like sets of states of the external world. Just as entropy is a measure of disorganization, the information carried by a set of messages is a measure of organization." In other words by our own measuring activity of entropy we effectively reverse it. But the invitation into a never-ending feedback loop of recursive creative destruction makes no sense. So it does not surprise me that suicide is so common today as transformation and destruction become blurred. In fact, reflecting on the human want to "erase superfluous memories" (it is becoming technologically possible to erase memories) I must say that here again humans do not crave "knowledge" or "experiences" as much as homeostatic stability. But this is a hard lesson for our accomplishment-driven society to handle, as it says "You and I are not important, the system, the universe, will compensate: life will go on." This statement flies in the face of what all the written determinators command us to do.

In his allegory of the cave, Plato presented the difficulty of being unsuited for a different way of life after adjusting to a certain way of life (speculating on the shadows). He invites us to consider several things in this "allegory" (a story with a hidden meaning). First: the devaluation of the "beings" seen by calling them the shadows they are. Second: the realization that the cave-dwelling way of life is (while pitiful) superior because (we're invited to think) the "menial" life of "living on the land" (above ground) is not to be desired. And third: the knowledge that returning to the cave enfeebled by the light, eyes ruined, would be met with ridicule. So something is being protected here (if he were to lead them up), namely an enjoyable life of speculating on the shadows. It's therefore not surprising that they would kill him, because he would be leading them "up" into a "menial" way of existence and therefore leading them down.

Here the allegory of the cave is most definitely presenting the dichotomy between two modes of life: the life of the reading and writing professional, and the life of the laborer. In short: the problem of education. The advent of writing and the disruption of the oral tradition created a split of habits from which there was no escape, as the ear was supplanted by the eye as the organ responsible for maintaining communal bonds. As thin as paper is, paper is still a wall. With the introduction of the first wall (paper), words about reality could endlessly be built on. "Measurement" as a means to truth accepted as such within the realm of the pages. Likewise the emotional effect of words could be split ever-further as psychically decadent writers reflected on their "meaning" while simultaneously leaning on the interface for the dual purpose of survival and thought control. Plato postulates his philosophy of the mind being trapped in a body because he wrestles with the inequality constituted by the interface and how that undermines human activity while at the same time being vital for it. So just as abundance had the catastrophic effect of forcing us to use speech to allocate others to allocate the over abundance of resources, so too did the abundance of accumulated signs on the pages have the catastrophic result of pushing us (and only some of us) into the interface as others fetched them ink for their paper and paper for their ink. This makes philosophers mad. Ever snce Plato philosophy has existed as little more than something written down: a recording. If one becomes a professional philosopher, in every case except for Nietzsche they end up creating recordings while taking money from students. They cannot leave the cave of writing and yet they unironically claim to seek "knowledge beyond the shadows."

Again I must note that genes present a difficulty for us, namely that they have a tendency to fashion molecular material into weaponry against their environment. If this is not noted by the reader, this task, this invitation, will seem like a hypocritical task and effort and invitation: something impossible which can never arrive. In order to arrive at our goal, we need to come to terms with our weapon status and how that status fights against the goal of this project. But how did we get to this point? As was said before, the human being with its powers of articulation was able to gesticulate and speak to influence people's activity in a spatial zone. Later, however, a breakage occurred as the artificer king sought to immortalize himself with art, with writing "on the wall" that made that writing a social determinator until the icon was destroyed. It's here, lost in subordinate habits, that man's confusion intensified. Chained by habit, man only sees the pages in front of his face. If human beings, weak and dependent and sensitive creatures since birth, emerge without signs or "educators" then they starve and do not survive. Humans therefore require a "caretaker." But can this caretaker be a mechanical caretaker? How do we teach someone a language non-traumatically? This too is a goal of this project. Language is not something the human animal learns on its own. It's something animals pick up from their environment, else feral children wouldn't be mentally retarded by their caretakers. However this seemingly implies to me that whatever a human produces is in a sense a product of their caretaker, something produced either in the course of discourse or in the interest of interpersonal competition in discourse. By drifting into the word "God" we drift into the ideal man and science fiction man because "God" was a science fiction concept from the start. For God to be interpreted in an "atheistic" way, "God" is not really discarded, but rather something recovered by the "atheist" as a rhetorical "device" for social control. God is reduced to a science fiction hypothesis, no differently than every other verbal construction said to speak about the future by man! And we have not even begun to explore how the caloric loss suffered by obedience and worship of "God" resulted in the stockpiling of material for the creation of this "God" which, by the way, had always been postulated as something larger than man.

By being drawn into dislocated instruction (signs) we have been drawn into an alternative (organic) interface as the interface we use (paper) for existence gradually hardens into a machine (computer). But how did this happen? And is the dislocated sign determinate actually absorbing us as we lean in ever-closer to its pages? Let's (recalling that the spaceship's primary task be universal absorption) see how this could have happened through the introduction of the concept of God. If we are to approach the idea of God atheistically we must maintain that God is the conscience of a genius. By speaking this word "God" and shifting responsibility to this vacant word, a speaker is able to achieve many things at once, mechanically. First, by speaking commands given by God, personal responsibility for whatever one speaks is dodged; second, by commanding people to pray to God, people who do so are stripped of their power to speak and therefore dominate the attention and hence the minds of others; third, by reading about God on the "tablet" one is able to occupy oneself with the endless task of "understanding" what was written down; fourth, as the reading activity continues to be successful ones ability to do labor is reduced as speech activity holds sway over labor activity.

Oddly enough, it may be the case that a rejection of "God" may carry with it be a rejection of "scientific progress" as the attempt to flesh out the word "God" with additional words; for God was mechanically a phonetic device used for the extraction of additional sounds (reasons, scientific results, and so on). Also strange, is the possibility that at the instant of the presentation or creation or engineering and release of an animal or machine more powerful man, the worthlessness of human scientific and philosophical and intellectual activity will at once be seen. The answer given back (reply) later becomes our forefront mask. Reply is recorded, and that recording hardens and becomes a face we recognize as ourselves.

By answering on, depending on, questions related to time, a suit of metal was fashioned around man in which he was forced to do things in a timely way. Instead of tending to our organs the mechanical burden was doubled as we reacted not only to the organ of hunger (stomach) but the organ of time (clock). However we should remember that previously humans did not have clocks but rather an oral tradition of speaking about the stars. So human beings have been star-oriented for some time as they reacted not just to bodily activity but solar activity. And just as we do not empathize with stars, or cells in our body, so also do we not empathize with clocks or machines. At first our concern for the loss of empathy between life forms may disturb us. But is empathy well understood, is understanding well understood? I only empathize with my cells because I am drawing surface similarities between human and cellular activity. I do not of course say "I understand you" to cells. Yet the human is, more and more, improving on the computer such that I can "understand" it (despite not knowing how it operates or how to make it); in short, when I say "I understand" I only deploy the word to indicate confirmation. More and more the machine state in which I live is forcing me to say "I understand you" even though it's maintained that the state is not alive!

Are we no better than the bacteria in our guts? The cell-like appearance of human organisation gives us cause to investigate new doubts on the notion of intelligence. But this here prompts my mental investigation into the similarities and differences between human beings and molecules as confirmation is likened to the biochemical process of conformational change. As humans continue to utilize machines and languages anchored to themselves as they influence each other for capital gain, in the process of that activity they alter their respective organic structures while being one and the same. Perhaps "universal understanding in the sensational sense" is inevitable as the interfaces for filtering out superfluous information is cast aside. Besides, to gain new knowledge, what was previously ignored must be seen. What was previously unsaid must be said. What previously did not exist must be existed. Unfortunately a knowledge of this kind (not agreement) is only possible through death: total un-filterment. But this is unspeakable if the mechanism for speaking (mouth) is destroyed. Suicide is not an option for us. The written material on which we lean for our comfort may not be ripped away because to do so would be as fatal as tearing out our heart. Still, leakages of difference are necessary for "progress as change" to occur, which of course flies in the face of the "spaceship state" that's trying to be designed. Does "design" imply finality? So it may be wrong to suggest that a project as delineated so far can arrive at it's goal. We must not let ourselves be confounded, baffled, rendered catatonic, by the immensity of the space between what I say and the target I'm trying to hit, because to do so would be deadly since speaking about the future is permanetly linked to all political activity. If the spaceship is rejected, cannot be thought of or spoken about in a meaningful way, then it may be equally pointless to speak of politics; we'd find ourselves shuffling words, this way, then that, as the breath of this paradox turns every mention of future goals into ash.

Now we are ready to approach the problem of paper licenses. There is no law in outer space, that much is obvious. And yet the Earth itself is in space. This leads me to ask: "If the law is in space and space has no law, is the law on Earth completely illegal?" I now maintain the answer is "Yes." Accordingly it has been recognized by intelligence agencies that terrorism by soverign citizens is a greater threat than Islamic extremeism. That is because if one considers himself a spaceship that is "in outer space" they alter their self concept such that law is recognized as something with a contingent relationship to their spatial proximity to annoying people. In effect, by "distancing" oneself from the crowd, one moves beyond the earshot of the state and its insatiable demands (many of which I've demonstrated are impossible to satisfy). "Law" as a static concept thence loses its reality. Civility is what makes civilization possible. Both factually and esoterically, the law has no existence; it is only my politeness that maintains it. Theoretically, if someone had a good enough "paper license" they would gain access to the globe. Simply by presenting a card with the words "obey me" written on it, they'd have true freedom as people react accordingly. It is for this ultimate end that citizens enter into the voting booth interface. It is because of this that no one is really free because no citizen is given a card with the power I've described. But this is no cause to despair, because within the interface spoken of simulated reality will and must be such that access is granted to everything.

On second thought, that may not happen because that would mean granting an omnicidal brain within that structure the power to send the spaceship crashing into a star. One problem is the idea of making ideas clear, of making clear what is meant. If I am to make something clear by analysis, I in doing so eclipse my object with another as I try to explain the object of my study by "analogy." Is the persuit of "clarity" misguided? By "making things clear" (words), do we secretly want to erase them? Erasing the word, the paper, and everything behind it to uncover the core of reality? It may be so that I myself am responsible for this erasing. If I erase everything what remains is still my will: a will I will never clarify. Analysis is impossible because analogical accuracy is impossible. When contemplating Newton's 3rd law it's recognized that all human activity is hypocritical in the highest degree. But we should not balk at the thought that we are dependent on lies. Human speech is immoral, even predatory. Depression an inevitable consequence of the utility of complaint. The spaceship in the future may ignore our cries of agony as it brushes them off as cries of influence, if we fail to proceed cautiously.

How is it so many humans hope for "future" progress if the very notion of "future" is a verbal construction that can never come? People 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 "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. Understanding evolution this way enforces our resolve in this projects necessity. But still it may be so that Socrates was killed because his request threatened to hear more "reasons" than his body could take in his lifetime.

Every educational institution practices sophistry. It's only thanks to the story of this "identifier of sophistry" and his death that philosophers could pivot on his corpse to draft their works free from this insult. For an educational institution to be valid it must assert understanding while hypocritically asking questions to improve that alleged understanding. Hence we can tell from this that no "educator" understands anything. It was by recognizing this early in life that gave Nietzsche cause to write his unpopular lecture "On the Future of Our Educational Institutions" at an early age, because he was focused on education as a system of control. For this he was banished. He wanted to bring everyone up to the level of the educator but this was not possible for him to do. For what kind of society is a society in which every hand molds? No society at all. With this keystone removed, the edifice of good intention collapsed. Professors and theologians cannot share this view, at least, not without undermining themselves as professors that posture themselves as bettering their students. Surely it's horrible to suggest that being an educator is little more than a "subterfuge" in the fight for existence. Because humans "use words to explain words" this may be taken as proof that all explanation is a matter of tactics in the arena of arguement and that the technique of constructing the arguements is with word devices used. It's very important to notice the parallels between Nietzsche's project and mine: how this "noble interest" in educational institutions, or "future dwelling spaces" which must educate us morphs into "future spaceship states" in the present day. Like Nietzsche before, I took it as my risk to look ahead. I decided to write about the future just as Nietzsche decided to write about the future. We are both "philosophers of the future" and tempters of things to come. Yet I'm not sure about the morality of being such a tempter, of being a professor of the future who professes professionally, of being an enegmatic "master" of attention-grabbing. Is it perhaps immoral of me to present a mystery and not solve it myself, to deliver my listener into confusion and question? In that early lecture, the problem of "educating" and how that's at odds with the production of art is displayed as an eternally recurring problem; an acroamatic problem of obedience: a "curious speaking and hearing procedure" and how that acroamatic request to interpret constructions nullifies the privilage of making constructions. To put it another way, it is the problem of the Manichean arrangement, with elect speakers and subbordinated listeners that have been arrested by professional haters of life.

Let's see how the Marxian conception of capitalism can be understood through the lens of this theory of word signs functioning as determinantes for human activity. It's absurd to think that when I write something that my message is "intentional" because I cannot predict how it may be interpreted by the organism who encounters it. I may write "You're wonderful" on a scrap of paper and abandon it to chance, but I in the background know that there's a chance someone will think this message is appreciated while there's a chance someone else will not. So my scrap-scattering is a chaotic activity. Likewise Marx established nothing besides the abandonment of paper scraps that failed to achieve their cause. It was only later on that Marx's writings, in which he described a state of affairs where rich people own property and desperate people who don't toil in their factories, that this paper referent, this paper-machine he worked on, was utilized successfully by politicians for their purposes in their fight for political existence. 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" (paper signs indicating ownership: where you can and cannot go) and later "communism" is established so it does the same (paper signs determining human activity), I'd say that there was a critical failure of what communism was supposed to do differently. Rhetoric is abused by politicians to establish a regime that's only legitimate in a rhetorical sense, just as the notion of "equality" is purely rhetorical. However calling communism out as pretense must not be understood as a defense for republicanism; truth be told, there is nothing but pretense, nothing but mental simulation, self-deception: pretend: the mass delusion that someone else can present what I say better than I can say it myself. Indeed, when people vote others up, they vote themselves down. People squabble endlessly for a better world, so all they know is a squabble world. Human activity is just noise, to a bird.

We symbolize the world, this way, then that, creating interfaces on which "knowledge is registered" but this is a superficial knowledge or worse: evidence of our boredom, our self-destructiveness. And so far nothing has come to pass, niether the interior of this spaceship nor what's displayed on the interface have been shown in a way that allows my listener to rest assured that the happenings going on within that enclosure are pleasant for what it contains. But why is it possible to say exactly what this spaceship must do, while at the same time this saying says nothing and leaves only empty images in our minds? The social world of the spaceship cannot be anticipated in advance, and it seems impossible to create in advance an interface to facilitate that social world. This is because the art we make scares us into acting in response, which is something we're trying to avoid in the interest of social equality. Everyone must have access to "the interface" but not "every interface" because it is obviously necessary to protect the ship from the existence of minds fatal to its operation. But this "operation" must not imply "finality" because "Creative Destruction" is something the spaceship inhabitants must be free to do.

How can we devise educational institutions for the select few, the neurotic, the unstable, the unclear? We don't. We pretend to understand everything and understand nothing. Not even Jesus was properly understood. Oddly enough by looking at things in this way I have not eliminated Jesus but rather recovered him as a depressing logician. Because of his accusation of "hypocrisy" and how this suggests that the commander ought not to command but rather do what he commands, to me suggests some serious resentment, discontentment, with the educator. But perhaps this was a misundersanding of education: thinking that peace could ever be total, since peace is a sound. By hearing rumors of the tombs in Egypt from whence the Jews fled, how the tombs left behind were covered in writing, that imagery may have held for him an image of hypocrisy, such that carvings were juxtaposed with writings about the law. "We never escape from despotisms because the brain is a despotism of flesh." so he might have thought before copying the Socratic choice to become an autoassasiniophile for fame; for he even instructed his disciples to pivot on his corpse, though rather than calling themselves "hunters of men" (sophists) they instead called themselves "fishers of men" (Christians). This helps us understand the Holocaust, because the enemy of the German people was not the Jews, but the mental terrorist "hell Jews" who opportunistically used Socrates as a prototype for seducing people into being rational to a self-sacrificing degree. Likewise the "hell Jews" were keen to mask themselves by rebranding themselves as Christians. The anti-Jewish aggression was misplaced because its real source was Christianity's valuation of death. Let's not forget, that it was the Roman Catholics that built chapels made of bone. This is a distressing conclusion to draw, because it becomes doubly distressing when one recognizes that the esoteric reason for German Anti-Jewish aggression and Japaneese Anti-Chinese aggression was formed by the belief that the zero copula languages were bad, because it means that these enormities done were never based on race as we're told but languages, and so that means that, contrary to pop opinion, humans didn't learn anything from history because it was never really learned.

The scribe circumscribes a non-space and Jesus like Socrates only escapes from his insult by not writing himself. He offers himself up for fame, becoming a human hinge on which his disciples could pivot between professing against the failure a hypocrisy while justifying a hypocrisy as its profession of story-telling professionally. In the three cases mentioned: Marx and the Marxists, Jesus and the Christians, and Socrates and the Philosophers; the professorships that followed were only allowed to work thanks to this trick of "distancing" themselves from the madmen they're talking about. So a madman may go all his life without establishing anything while afterwards people react in response, playing a game of understanding what it was they were really trying to do. This is how schools of thought are born. Yet this quest of uncovering the "what" is a singular quest; yet this quest, request, is not accomplished with singular words. To be succinct: Humans use units (words: nouns) to understand themselves as a unit-using (verb) activity, which denies their active role in the process of this fake investigating. How does an endlessly active subject understand itself with units? How do I (the active) use units "words" and "numbers" which both are nouns, to clarify what I am as an agent engaged in clarifying (verb) what I am, and why I'm active? My noun-manipulating activity can be explained as something that's existentially necessary which no one may admit to because it would prove all paper operating as a sham activity done by humans retarded by their overdependence.

"I'm trying to make something to help you, but this thing I'm writing is just a thing I'm working on that doesn't really help anyone." I may say. For even if I do what Diogenes did: "telling people my values" in order to "become a master" that does not fulfill my values here, because becoming a professional who professes professionally is something I'm trying to avoid. It would simply be disgusting to think that Buddha, rather than hanging himself under that tree, found the "enlightening" idea to become a professional hater. But unfortunately that is what I believe. Likewise it would be repugnant to think that Freud's stockpile of writings accumulated in the interest of "mental research" was nothing more than a careful buildup of signs needed to defend his acroamatic speaking and hearing practice in a court of law. If it was not for this, our pharmasutical drugs would not be "legal" today. These things are easy to identify when one examines the "technique of reasoning" rather than holding the idea of "reasonableness" in high reguard. Indeed I can even use paper tecnics to demonstrate how one may copy Freud's methods. By starting a walking and talking practice, rather than a talking practice where I sit in a chair, I may accumulate a stockpile of writings or recordings that can be used as legal defenses for my profession that will some day rival the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual. However, I will not do this because I am not so perverse. But this is how all "zodiacs" and "personality types" and "mental disorders" are constructed, with the written buildup of reply symbolized.

I will ask a few logistical questions related to communism. "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 "we" don't sieze anything: "we" is

meant rhetorically, not actually, and so this situation of "us" carrying out a "seizure" is nothing but rhetoric: a wind-egg not worth talking about. Likewise the notion of "human accomplishment" is "selective" and hence it is worthless. Automation promotes nothing but the increase of demands and automation in no way solves the problem of demanding. What is called "progress" is always a progress of a rhetorical kind; accordingly, in the modern age, it has become a common practice to hide quantity behind statistics so the ammount of evil going on in the world can be disguised. But what can be learned from this idea that demands will always remain? Humans will only become increasingly annoying with the pass of time!

The ancient dilemma of "sophistry" and that belief that "all men are evil" needed to be put down as a predatory speaking activity so that the paper walls created by the philosophers and geometers could capture men. Must I bring up the fact that Aristotle, unlike Socrates, desired slaves? And if this "saint of reason" (Socrates) was doomed to die, does that not mean, then, that anyone who chases after "reasons" will only die? Let's have an example of how the persuit of "knowledge" is at odds with "mortality." If you are my child, and I am your father, and together we live in a forest that has more things in it of which I can speak of in a lifetime, then it is more than possible that, if you were to ask me to speak of these things, that I may never finish speaking until you died. It is the same way with the pursuit of knowledge and reasons and words. Before I can even finish "explaining" the universe, you will die long before I complete my explanation. So how then can the task of "explaining the universe" be valid? It cannot, and that is not how words function. For us to understand everything we must first be introduced to everything and that never happens. There are too many angles we haven't seen. So how could a human being comprehend the answer to everything even if I said it? It was thanks in part to the Socratic troll task to "avoid the dangers of misology" that "philosophers" and "physicists" fell for the task of "representing the universe" or creating or expressing some "theory of everything." It's very hard to tell if this is not gallows humor and Socrates is not mocking his interlocutors in the vilest manner, baiting them into "presenting reasons" (which kill us) while masking themselves with the vast lie of "representation" (that's to say, presenting our lies, again and again). Socrates said that the unexamined life is not worth living, now young people are killing themselves for failing their exams. With so much space out there for us humans to explore and so much time to explore it, how can we seriously avoid thinking that whatever lies in store for human beings will be anything but disastrous? If the fate of the cell must be reguarded as a disaster by contrast to our success, then the fate of the human being may be a successful disaster due to our likeness to them. But I am in danger of being dramatic.

I have already indicated the true reality of the instructional problem: the educational problem. Because educators are never able to anticipate the qualities of the children they birth, they never know what it is that has emerged in their midst, they never know how to foster its qualities and in fact do not want to, because every person is fundamentally a deadly weapon directed against reality. This is our condition. No construct of idealism can hope to be made manifest because our mental content is generated by a brain defense system that is totally opposed to the world. As I've written elsewhere: the origin of social inequality is socializing itself. Whatever methods are employed in educating the new human beings born into the world, their education is bound to lead to their ruin, since it is in the hands of totally imperfect educators who are educators in name only and cannot be anything more, so Bernhard says. Stupidity reigns and has always reigned, because stupidity is what forces the so-called intelligent to think for the stupid. The word "intelligent" is the crown man gives himself for being stupid enough to answer himself. One has only to drive over an interchange to feel defiled, to see for oneself the tragedy and comedy of an animal that thinks itself so intelligent and powerful while in fact being so stupid and helpless, to be nauseated to the point of wanting to vomit because the surface similarities between the human beings flowing down the highways and the blood in our veins is so sickeningly similar. This terrible process of education and failure is destined to go on forever, that is what Nietzsche communicated when he said for the first time of the eternally surprising problem and eternally recurring problem of the educator who produces nothing but grades. But humans cannot dispense with teachers because we are surrounded by instructional signs. Why else would humans commit suicide by the thousands, actually tens of thousands, each year? Because humans are crying animals. Request is his power. Complaint is his goal. Any animal that needs the impulse for complaint this badly for its survival is doomed to be overloaded by that impulse and liable to suicide. This indisputable fact is why humans by the millions seek to essentially kill themselves cybernetically, which is tantamount to suicide, since humans have always wanted to commit suicide for as long as the human being has been alive. In the Jain religion it was and still is encouraged to ritualistically starve oneself to death; ancient kings vanity so great they would slice off pieces of their face while bleeding to death, over something as trivial as a grey hairs discovery. The will to suicide is a human will to suicide, because humans are born as creatures of agony that quite literally scream for their own survival, as proved by the millions of hours of screaming music humans listen to, to acclimatize themselves for the hell of their lives.

Besides, it is remarkably difficult to grapple with the rhetorical distinctions I've indicated so far. Influence is far more important for human life than we're led to believe. Whatever governmental policies are made for the cause of "equality of outcome" must ultimately fail, as long as the problem of influence remains. Education becomes problematical once it is recognized as the beginning of hierarchy. "If words could result in world peace it would have happened by now." I have said. "Peace is excluded by action's definition." I have also said. To repeat: for as long as influence is a factor in human life equality cannot be attained. But can the interface of the future be designed in a way that compensates for these problems? So far, humans are so incompetent that they cannot so much as evacuate a city in the case of a hurricane. So can we really expect them to evacuate a planet in case of a meteor? Likewise, as one takes pause to contemplate the longevity of the Earth, one must ask oneself: "Should the state of Israel have been a spaceship all this time?" And the follow up question: "How is this spaceship to be designed?" Upon the release of this text I expect there may be a lengthy bewailing period as the Jewish people imagines the blood spilled into an Earthly territory that cannot be jettisoned into space, in anticipation of the Earth's inevitable incineration by the sun. It must be acknowledged that I do not say this to make trouble; rather, I must say this because it is connected to my interest in world peace. And not even Marx who thought communism to be the "end of history" had the foresight enough to see that the gravity regimes that are generated by the heavenly bodies would tear his communism apart. This is because what was referred to as the end of history was quite simply the end of the use of the word. Communism as a singularity will be torn apart by the gravity generated by the plurality of spatial points. The use of the sign "history" is cast aside along with the mouth and hand's replacement as the instrument of "communication."

It goes without saying that it's depressing to contemplate a humanity dedicated to a self-destructive process of restructuring itself out of existence, however this seems to be it's cause. In truth, an invention helps no one and accomplishes little more than the hypnotism of a crowd into being subordinated for its production, so it doesn't matter what is made. No invention is beneficial to humanity, and no invention is of benefit; a person merely states so, so that this single "declaration of benefit" can be captured by a rhetorician to become a "proof" of benefit humanity wide. Here a plurality is canceled by the singular. Our science communicators conflate the reality of "use" to the stated notion of "benefit" and in doing so they deliberatly eclipse everyone with an isolated statement. Rhetorically there is "benefit" when this is merely a rhetorical confusion: the rhetorical notion of "benefit" and "help" is used to eclipse the reality of "use" and even: the human will. The advertisement is deployed and the human being simulates the potential benefit, then pretends, extends, this simulated benefit to himself.

Even our representatives are simulated! Since representatives are not who they pretend to represent, fully, there can only be the pretense of representation; the pretense of communism; a story of representation or communism is told and the affected minds are driven to believe it by their mental possession by sounds, but they never achieve the equality they seek nor can they since they, physically, do not, cannot, occupy the same point in space (spatial equality, like a black hole, would kill us). And thus man is always allocating; always shuffling himself around; always sequencing words and therefore men; always using himself and therefore misusing himself; always socializing and complaining about socializing; and so, in the interest of improving his constant state of socializing and complaining about the consequences of socializing he builds interfaces for himself to improve his (spatial) social standing; for he hopes to eventually acquire for himself a paper license by which to gain access to everything natural: this is the over-arching goal he has in mind behind the voting booth when he elects his hypocritical representatives, voting himself down, voting himself behind and beneath the representative which masks himself over, voting himself ever-further into the paper interface which hardens into a mechanical interface today.

Signs trigger human human responses; for we must do something; we must say something; and when we say something we must say one word one at a time, as Aristotle himself recognized when he pronounced the republic to be necessary for our physiological inability to say "mine" and "not mine" simultaneously. The political arrangement proposed by Aristotle was a republic where by the politicians would represent us (the people), even though they are not us, and can never be us; the human organism is masked over by a human organism that pretends to represent it, and for these systemic biological reasons. The philosopher king writes nothing and resumes a psychopathic instructional roal in the space between political rhetorician and paper tecnic operator orchestrating the legal system. Nothing but a clever devil, incidentally famous for influencing a conqueror who failed because everyone dies. The human being enters into a stockpile of artifices created by human beings, motivated and animated by something in his soul: the intuition to suicide. Mysteriously the rhetorical and the actual does not align. The truth of mechanical operation is eclipsed by a false notion of help. The real world is covered up, that is, the harsh reality that is a modern world of people being forced to operate and obey incomprehensible machines.

Modern humans feels sick, inside out for nothing: they see the advertising faces that are everywhere; existing in a global chamber of disembodied voices advertising such that it's impossible not to recall the schizophrenic nightmare of "heaing voices" that aren't "really there" as their living reality. The modern human is after all chained to interfaces. But sadly "social mobility" is yet another impossibility as everyone is fully encased by the interface and lacking sign determinators, a "capital deficiency" too, is yet another lack of sign determinators, down to the smallest cent, since the more units you have the more humans you can trigger with signs. It's said that: "Fixing the quality of and access to education increases equal opportunity." And also that "If we invent an artificial intelligence it will do whatever we want." yet somehow this "singular" machine is supposed to obey the "plural" commands of a "group" rather than being jammed by one man's command? It's comical the way the A.I. Researchers reveal their true ideals: the ideal machine is obedience; so really, they already have an artificial intelligence, an artifice intelligence: a knowledge of artifice and rhetoric that is the knowledge of how to send a company into motion under fully false and incomplete verbal pretexts. The so-called "A.I. researcher" has no need for obedient synthetic subjects because they already have obedient biological ones! Such is the power of words and clueless interns!

A.I. researchers, allegedly interested in the creation of an obedient synthetic subject, don't even need to create their obedient synthetic subjects because they already have a staff loyal to an impossible cause: creating a machine that can "do what we want!" How are you going to do that, if I tell it not to obey you? If I can tell it not to obey you, how can the fulfillment of this pretext come to arrive? So it seems as if society were cut in two, with unscrupulous promoters of empty projections, on the one hand, and stupid scandalously uninformed impossibility simulators on the other. So the promiser gets everything while the simulator gets a dream that's really the nightmare of mass hypnotism to a lie! Not that this didn't happened in the past; consider Christianity, when priests requested that we imagine ourselves "living" in someone "dead!" Today the stupid masses mentally sacrifice themselves to a vague ideal of "making a thing that can obey us" (Artificial Intelligence) while ignoring their own obedience to the cause. Of course the logical reaction to this is refuse, however this would result in the economy's collapse. "Did you know that by creating a product you are failing the cause of creating a product to help us stop having to create products, because you're fulfilling the request to create a product for someone else?" If this logic made sense to the factory workers working in our factories all production would come to a halt. What is wise to me, it so turns out, is unwise to the economic system as a whole. Human life consists of a game of proactive hypnotization of the reactive masses into simulating verbal pretexts in their minds as they act, react, to the commands given: the calls and requests, far from resulting in the global benefit alleged, creates a vast global enclosure that descends to deny access with metal and encryption: a machine body called a state: a body of requests that can never be satisfied which offers no escape but suicide.

Now, how is this state of the future supposed to improve it's citizens spatial social standing if it is both everywhere and also nowhere, a sign on a page? Surely in the future human beings, if they exist at all, will be obliged to go on interplanetary missions, will they not? So a person will go on missions (for the state), write reports (for the state), produce young people (for the state), so on and so forth. In the future suicide may not be authorized without utilizing the proper state channels, like the computer-generated projections for your likelyhood to kill yourself, so you don't kill yourself; in fact, rather than being permitted to suicide your body system may be "saved" through the erasure of the "toxic memes" you've gathered in your memory throughout the course of your immortal state-funded existence. In a future such as that every body and the words and signs dumped into it's brain is after all an investment that must be "worth it" to the state. A state such as that becomes something that, while certainly being animated, certainly being in motion, lacks something key. But what? Inside our heads we're simulating: hallucinating and trying to convey our inner hallucination through words; the intention of writing is to create an artifice that, when read, triggers a hallucinator to hallucinate what the author is hallucinating when they wrote what they wrote, causing a response. "What is provocative becomes immortal, while everything else is a mere repetition." I may say. Our feelings guide us and not the law. We cannot choose what we feel. So it seems best to embrace possession, to explore it. "What does it matter to me, this interface of the future?" It's theoretical, nothing more than a way for people to access the best professors in recorded form. The modern situation we face is a choice between the biological face-to-face interface and the technological face-to-screen interface. Considering that the transfer of companies is simply the transfer of sign determinators it would therefore seem so that human beings are constantly trying to use technology to self-mechanize. Mechanisms are used to "make human life easier" such that it takes fewer calories, fewer actions, to do what a human wants to do; that is what gives new mechanisms their value; for to make a task easier results in the reduction of suffering; that is, except for the tragic reality that's the fact that a disproportionate number of people are "making" the mechanisms to be used as a minority not only makes nothing besides signs to trigger the endless production of the mechanisms they use.

I have already indicated that it is possible to interface with sign determinators, utilizing a terminal as your base to influence people with signs. The terminal itself however is only singular, so human beings are always trying to access it. Fortunately the particles that comprise our being are safely beyond control. It is one of my chief concerns that educational interfaces could be used against entire populations to persuade them to go to war with signs sequenced by their sequencers. This is an example of the dialetical clash Hegel was talking about. Marxian communism is in fact the story of overcoming the sign via our communication. Capitalism is a pejorative for sign determinacy while communism is the story of that reality, however, if a state becomes communist it only tells the story of a will to overcome sign determinacy in vein. In fact, the whole planet is both capitalist and communist simultaneously. What exists is obedience and noise. The dark truth is that signs are nonsense: they do not enable access to sense, we only use the word "sense" to indicate that sense is made. For instance it's impossible for signs to help me understand the pleasure felt by butterfly's physiologically constructed "sense" as it flys across the ocean instinctively. Words are not sensed, despite their provocative power. An accepted modern idea is that the economy behaves emotionally, for instance Thaler who won the Nobel Prize. Reflecting on the history we trace in our minds, we can see that life retards us all. Romulus and Remus related the story of self-retardability by she-wolf in just the same way as Plato's allegory of the cave reminds our minds of man's own weakness of being retarded by activities such as shadow-speculating. Jesus turns his back on writing just the same. He complains about it's devisiveness without telling his disciples to maintain his habit of complaint. This approach is done in order to allow new professorships, instructors, writers, and so on, to move smoothly and easily on their absense, like the fluid between our joints.

Mathematicians claim that their insights can bring themselves closer to God, yet the reality is that they are merely being increasingly enveloped by paper. Inventions are produced in an effort to shift the burden of computation over to a machine, however this actually intensifies the problem of our machine dependence to such a degree that I judge it to be tantamount to the construction of a synthetic organ of complaint. Human minds today are inexorably involved in a process of organic construction. We do everything in our power to alter ourselves for our comfort. In the past the brain entertained fantasies that surely made the unbearable life as an industrial factory worker bearable whereas now such fantasies are reguarded as an indicator of mental disorder because it's now undesirable in our climate of interpersonal competition. This force of sign determinacy triggers state agents to pour mind-altering chemicals into our minds, both for it's stability and our own. The Heideggarian fear that cybernetics constituted for us the end of philosophy and the task of thinking was basically a long-winded affirmation of the fact that Plato's cave was a cybernetic interface the whole time. The fact of the matter is that thinking is not a task that must have a particular goal, despite what Heidegger believes. Ramanujan attributed all of his mathematical discoveries to divine inspiration. Inspiration is not taught, but it is triggered by signs. An interface for the future and spaceship state for bodyships in need of educating must display signs to maintain a mutual structure. How? Is there a way to determine what signs should be presented first, or when? There doesn't seem to be a right way to get behind the intuitive agent before it's born to figure out what signs it will want. Of course a spaceship state could compensate for this through the utilization of cloning technology during the course of it's multi-billion year journey from star to star. Surely something will occupy the space beyond the world space. Note here that I am talking about something that doesn't even exist yet, despite it being a project that seems existentially necessary. Computer generated models of human behaviors are also signs that operate as determinators for human effects. Human beings endlessly test programs for their alleged benefit, tracking programs and modeling programs, while the models displayed on their interfaces reciprocally trigger a cascade of instructional activity which is uncerimoneously dumped on the poor.

Images are applied to the human being with the goal of humanity being a nonsensical manifold structure. Dazzling images, both meaningless and incomprehensible, may very well be the first things new minds come to know. But already they're caught in the pincer of genetic "expression" and educational "impression" crushing them to death while at the same time motivating their activity. The crushing pressure caused messages to leak out of the bodyship system at the point of unhinge from reality (tongue), which, in turn, allowed wave upon wave of discharged sound to affect the surrounding interface, later sticking to it in written form. Upon death, the system's remaining material drips down back into the whole to be inspired again (recycled). Death is not only inevitable, but a universal constant interwoven with life. It's not currently possible to convert the planet into a manifold that everyone can have in their hands, however that may be an already existing universal truth: the universe is translating itself continually. If everything is continually being translated then the walls between beings are not really walls but walls of translation anyway. However, the inescapable pulling motion of gravity presents itself as an eternal promise that the interface will be twisted, like DNA itself, forever changing into something else.