

THE STUDY OF THE OPERATED SURFACE:  
A CRITIQUE OF TECHNOLOGY'S PROMISE

BY  
JOE VIVIANO

Social science: the study of human relationships. But what of the study of, or exposition of, the actually existing physical object on which our studies are registered? For writing to be written, it must be faced by a pen and paper operator. The human being is the only animal to write. The human being however is not the only animal free from competition: writing is, for man, a means to competition. As I go forward in my exposition of the human as sign operator I hope to advance the social sciences by unifying ahead of time all written knowledge as the sign. Besides, even though one may say that the sign has no existence in the singular, the sign as such apparently did not exist before it's being drawn as an image on a surface; consequently, the sign may be regarded as a human-affecting phenomenon despite it's ostensible condition of being dispersed at an enormous number of spatial points; let us now recall that the majority of an atom's space is empty, hence it is no difficulty for us to here reduce the sign to a singularity. When humans, rhetoricians specifically, speak of unifying human knowledge what they do not mean is experience knowledge; in other words they do not mean to say that what is desired is to have experienced every possible experience: being burned to death: being raped: being devoured alive: being crucified. So what these rhetoricians intend to convince us to add to is not our organic experiential knowledge as much as a written knowledge added to a ledger, that's to say a book: the written build-up of reply symbolized. Experience knowledge is excluded then, despite it being all we have, despite the organisms flying and buzzing around us having private worlds of their own to which we shall never have access. Questions about that experience may be asked: data may be presented to sate the questioner propounding the question "What is it like to be a bat?" but always our presentations on this paper or screen surface or any future interface does little more than eternally trigger more reactions. Allegedly our unified theory must grant us predictive power. Already by unifying all knowledge and calling it "the sign" (since it has been shown that human knowledge is stockpiled reply) the predictive power of this theory is demonstrated: never-ending reaction to the sign. In modern times we have massive data banks, alleged by some to stand for the later consilience and unification of human knowledge, some day, always another day. Supposedly we're going to be able to use this to perhaps form a grand theory. I suspect that, no matter what, what we see on the computer screen (the screen is also a sign) is going to cause us to react to it and add to it. That is my prediction. Redesign the sign: the model, whatever you want to call it, it will invariably become another sign to trigger even more activity. I've now described science and the failure of science. What science misses, and what the science communicators scandalously ignore, is the mass non-inclusion in what scientists actually do, hence when these professional storytellers say to us the empty story of progress so we may bow our heads and enjoy an imaginary inclusion that is merely mentally simulated; it feels empty, as empty as Church, back when the Catholic priest professional storytellers invited their flocks to imagine themselves living in someone dead. It's tempting to hurl oneself into pen and paper and books to solve the human problems: economic problems: global problems, and so on; but what these intellects often fail to realize is the social aspect of the drawing room to which they flee (a room of one's own). Not only does sign operating deprive others of the immediacy of speech, there is a double deprivation where extra time is needed to operate the sign, and extra time is needed again to read the sign. This is quite literally time consuming. Because of this extra time needed to both write and read the sign, time distance is created between operators, and social structures and buildings form for the maintenance of the sign's structure. So, in an insidious twist, the do-gooder (Plato, Rousseau, Tolstoy, the list goes on), convincing himself of his own power to cause some pre-imagined future benefit by their activity, ultimately achieves nothing more than the installation of themselves as another predatory speaker extracting money from clueless listeners unaware of this survival game. This is the eventual fate of most intellectuals as they descend into the utter hypocrisy of writing commands and not doing what they command because to do what they command with their hands would prevent them from writing the command at the time of that writing activity. This failure of writing (to benefit all) and success of writing (to benefit the writer) gives clue to why most legendary of all religious and intellectual and spiritual founders wrote badly or nothing (Socrates; Buddha; Jesus). Furthermore the sign requires economic resources to maintain it's structure, unlike speech, that passes away. Reflecting on the respective histories of the Chinese and Egyptians, it's easy to see how emphasis on the maintenance of the sign's physical structure can later result in human enslavement to the rhetoricians professing the story of the sign's value to themselves as professional storytellers. And were these not Nietzsche's words? "Professorships! Professorships! What good can come out of a paid mouth?" It takes an unfortunate degree of brilliance and gullibility to be Nietzsche and see so early the state's feigned claim to want to spread learning among the greatest number of people, on the one hand, and the compulsory renunciation of that claim to have those same people abandon that claim to subordinate themselves to the services of the State, on the other (see his early lecture was On the Future of our Educational Institutions). Not everyone is allowed to

learn, not forever: learning and study is, as Marx systematically failed to point out: paper labor that serves as an excuse to excuse oneself from manual labor. Quite convenient for Marxist politicians, which invariably fail to allow every citizen the privilege to be scholars as well-read as Marx. Mao must have anticipated this, else he would not have pejorified his opposition as paper tigers due to his own self-awareness that he was cybernetically mechanizing himself with paper. For there is no way to design the sign in a way that works for everyone's advantage. The loop of political activity goes as follows: (1) People do not enjoy reacting to the sign, so they redesign the sign to favor themselves. (2) When people redesign the sign, they cause people to again react to the sign. This loop is repeated infinitely. Why? Redesign of the sign is always done by a single individual. Picturing the pen in our minds we can see that that it only draws one symbol at a time at the spatial point to which it connects, before it moves on to the next spatial zone and the next. Now we see one-at-a-time-ness demonstrated. It is operationally impossible for multiple people to write these sign determinators at once, hence the infinite need for redesign. The tips of any two pens are not able to overlap: spatial interstices do not overlap: humans will never be equal in a spatial sense, yet social equality is a goal that's still sought for and talked about. Rhetorically, inventions are helpful; that is, whenever a given person says so, whenever an advertiser captures that statement in a recording device (note that all recording devices are fragile and require economic resources for their maintenance and existence) to persuade a crowd to mentally simulate potential inclusion in that captured, isolated, statement that pronounces a thing "Helpful." Operationally, inventions are never helpful; in every case all inventions are objects operated and totally devoid of "help" in that rhetorical sense; somehow, it's altogether missed that this word "help" is only a word deployed, and, therefore, not an action that we can do. Again, the rhetorician: the politician, whoever they are uses and misuses the "we" to say "we did this" when I didn't do this, when you didn't do this. We're meant to play this guessing game as to who this "we" refers to, since it's not us. We select inclusion in this. We reject inclusion in that. We'll elect to select and accept mental inclusion in what is done by an actor or an astronaut and later reject inclusion in what is done by a murderer or torturer. Strange, how we do not just as well say "We're doing this, we're doing it all." Well, no one wants that kind of responsibility. And the sign remains as a determinate of human activity, since whenever it's presented it causes an affect, because signs trigger human responses no matter what, that is quite unavoidable, for us: we are domesticated humans conditioned to respond. The very existence of feral children negates the notion that the human is the animal of reason; in fact our will to knowledge is a result of conditioning and so "reason" is not a quality the animal man possesses, nor a light to know the world; the truth is opposed to that wishful naivety, children do not learn because they find the content intrinsically interesting; on the disturbing contrary, they merely learn because of conditioning. Yet this casts a shadow over all human activity as it's recognized that what really compels us is force: the light of reason is extinguished as an interrogative word deployed. What I've said here is not unlike the Socratic stance that all knowledge is "recollection." For if we are to seriously disregard personal experience as genuine knowledge, only answers as knowledge, something genuine is then blocked out, and the endless stockpiling of extracted "reply" "recalled" is thence justified in the interest of protecting all of our replies concretized into physical form by writing; writing that, by being written on a fragile surface (paper), results in the creation of a sign that requires our eternal maintenance, which absorbs and demands economic resources to maintain and create it's structure, structural dwelling spaces (libraries) to be made, and so on. The ontological and epistemological pretext that the simulation of models is a valid pathway for arriving at true knowledge falls short at the edge of the frame on which the simulation is made: the sign; for the sign, as I've here maintained, can do little more than trigger more modeling activity. It has been argued that only when the model becomes the modeled will true knowledge be acquired. And yet this interest is effaced by the very interface on which this simulated model is displayed; for the simulated model on the screen sign is, by being displayed on the sign, is still not the modeled object itself, because the modeled object is not displayed on that surface. Rather than the sign advancing human knowledge, the sign is a warlike weapon that permits by permits and restricts and controls human activity, to such an absurd degree that when we look out at any given city today we are shocked and appalled by the surface similarities between our states and primitive biology. What's more, is the notion of humanity wide human accomplishment is here negated by this confrontation with the realization that operational inclusion is not possible; humans by the billions are merely told the story of their inclusion, when this inclusion is not physiologically constructed sameness but rather personal simulation that is removed and alienated. In other words our inclusion is imaginary. Social alienation's sense owes it's existence to the relationship between the rhetorical and the actual: the falseness of advertising. The science communicator claims that inventions help humanity. Nothing helps humanity because things are used: there is only operation. It is wrong to simulate the

false hope that it is possible for anything to help humanity because that denies the truth of operation. Nothing helps us. Humans operate contraptions and signs that become increasingly complicated over time. Politics is the attempt to redesign the sign to benefit all the people reacting to it, which is folly. Signs are of no benefit because this denies the reality of operation. Just as nothing helps us, so also does the sign not benefit us. The notion of help and benefit is rhetorical: persuasive words that are captured post deployment to encourage a simulated inclusion that is not actual nor operational. Let's also note that Augustine, a former a Manichean (the Manichean society was divided between an elect group of speakers and a subordinated group of hearers), trained in the art of rhetoric (regarded as the king of the sciences because it persuades people to act), once keenly expressed the term "mouth weapons" in reference to his words; I find little reason to balk at this idea that the sign is a weapon of war; indeed, this idea has been recognized and re-recognized for thousands of years; Gorgias pronounced speech to be a physical force; for speech forces us to think what we would otherwise not think on our own. What is disturbing about this way of thinking is how difficult it is to weasel out of, how catastrophic it is for any and all intellectual activity. If something is invented, it invariably becomes little more than an object operated by some and assembled by others. Much to my own despair, an invention can do little more than exist as an object that hypnotizes a crowd into being subordinated for it's production, so it doesn't matter what is made. If I differentiate between the rhetorical and the actual, words like "help" and "benefit" and "understand" find their place in the category of the rhetorical as persuasive statements. If I have done this precipitously then I'd like to know. An unfortunate consequence of this confrontation with the rhetorical and actual is it's acidity to modern goals of transhumanism: human "evolution" by the molecular assembly of spatial systems that are utterly inhuman and apparently doomed to sophisticated assembly. The rhetoric of evolutionary biologists throws off the illusion that death is not the primary mechanism of evolution, which gives rise to this mistaken view that I or anyone can evolve. To say that I or anyone can use technology to evolve is to confuse death with equipment. Death creates the fossil record: without it there would be no evolutionary science, which is little more than a science of documenting the dead; if you examine this with respect to, say, punctuated equilibrium verses gradualism, what is seen is merely an altering in the case of the former of rhetorical strategy to indicate investigative intent. However, because the evolutionary biologists cannot debase themselves to the functional description of "one who begs for money to document dead things" a malformed and poisonous transhumanist doctrine has been permitted to enter into our lives, while concealing the fact that it is veiled mass suicide, because the notion that it's possible for humans, individual humans, to evolve and not die, is false. It has already been suggested that the task of science, recognized by Vico to owe it's written material to the process of division, experimentation, and the stockpiling of written information, is motivated by the sign's failure to be reality. In one form or another, the human being is an animal that harvests speech, and mentally simulates, and competes for talking time; a future transvaluation of values was wanted to cure the planet of the poison of Christianity and Buddhism that still injects a valuation of death and simulation into the public mind to this day. If the will to system displays a lack of integrity, the beginning of human systemic weakness had it's origin by obedience; for if one animal obeys the commands of another by, say, getting an apple from the knowledge tree, a caloric loss is suffered: wild animals do all they can to save calories; by contrast, the human being burns up calories at an increased metabolic rate, theoretically to fuel our brains, brains frustrated by our built-in state of dependency on the cry as the means to enslave as the cry is obeyed. Regardless of the time period, philosophy is nothing more than a talking activity for taking money from clueless students that cannot acknowledge Plato's move away from sophistry. Let's see how Plato's trick works. First, sophistry is pejorified as a predatory talking activity in which the speaker artfully imitates the wise to earn money, an angler of men, and a fisher of men. By contrast, the statesman too is a professional storyteller of some future situation that can never arrive. In both cases the hook presented to bait their target is speech. What philosophy does to depart from this is to describe this situational practice as bad, then ingeniously re-brands itself "philosophy" as the "wise" recognizers and documenters of this evil; it places this story at it's very core, while supplying politicians for centuries with the rhetorical forces extracted by their arguments to maintain their rule. Unlike the other mammals, the human being by storytelling is able to survive as a professional professor. Even though Socrates did not accept payment for his demolition and exposition of the sophists, Plato did, and hence he too falls under the genus "sophist" as a human hunter, that still professionally tells a mere story about reality. His "plays" supplied Holy Rome, Christianity, and the west, with the backbone of it's absolute hypocrisy. Once this technique was identified as a rhetorical device for social control, it was then conceived of as a prototype for Jesus, who would also be killed for corrupting the youth by being too reasonable (see how Jesus takes up his cross while Socrates by contrast takes the poison cup without trembling). The ritual

of simulated mental injection into the life of the “perfect man” becomes the focal point of human interest (and ingeniously the pacification of human expression: Jesus went a step further and proclaimed it best to pray alone), only later does this sophisticated merchandising of Christianity shatter in the explosion of the sciences by aid of the printing press did humanity desperately try to unite, through the alleged interest in the unification of itself as “a people” on the one hand, and alleged interest in the unification of science and the unification of knowledge. These interests are fake. The invitation to analogize is a troll task: a veiled request to say that two absolutely dissimilar special things are equivalent, when there is no equivalency in the spatial sense. The two so-called things are pointed to: here: there, at their respective special spatial points, and reply about them is taken out and written on a physical surface which serves as the springboard for the endless failure to merge psychical theoretic structure with the physical sign displayed. The acceptance of the multiple carried with it a denial of the special, which is something humans endlessly fail to reclaim. Reply is captured by writing to become the spell book interface on which the magician leans. Next an infinite comparison game is played, which forever fails to unify the two so-called things compared, and so that infinite and ever-increasing failure is written on a ledger that's called “human knowledge” in order to whitewash this irredeemable predator prey relationship that is obfuscated by the sign. And yet, the human situation is even worse than thought previously, because rather than solving the problems he wishes to solve, such as hunger, the very attempt to solve it by, say, the creation and installation of a cybernetic stomach, demands that anyone unfortunate to have that object as their stomach in the conceivable future will have to endure history lessons and the like on why the cybernetic stomach was needed, including but not limited to the history of the cybernetic stomach and how to build one and maintain one. But the cybernetic stomach was invented for us to escape the problem of maintaining an organ! Whenever interfacing with any thing you alter your organic structure. An organ may be thought of as a spatial system. The cybernetic stomach is a spatial system that, like a Trojan horse, carries with it extra spatial systems (e.g. factories and educational institutions), that are deceptively less manageable, and more involved. This has been the fate of the sign on paper, which for the multi-billion human population depending on it's use has become a vital organ that cannot be removed. It is also important to note what is not achieved by operating the sign (operational inclusion and spatial equality). Ever since Plato philosophy has survived as something that was written down: a recording. Writing is something you face, no differently than the wall of the cave that's chained in front of the faces of the shadow-speculators (and let us remember ink is black: shadowy). Plato likely wrote this “allegory” (a story with a hidden meaning) in full self-consciousness that he as a writer was “chained by habit” (unable to turn his head) into interfacing with an object. In Plato's age, the rabbinical valuation of writing for the indication of contractual right to property ownership in courts of law was making it increasingly self-evident that the sign's increased use would lead to a turn away from over-ground reality into the “underground” art of interfacing with the sign on paper. In my interpretation, the shadow-speculators are the only people in the dialogue to own property. For Socrates asks: “Or would not he or she much rather wish for the condition that Homer speaks of, namely “to live on the land (above ground) as the paid menial of another destitute peasant?” Wouldn't he or she prefer to put up with absolutely anything else rather than associate with those opinions that hold in the cave and be that kind of human being?” Why can't the underground person enter the over-ground without becoming destitute? I can think of no other explanation besides my personal interpretation that the wall being faced, is the paper wall. Here Platonism is reversed, and it's consequences are absolutely devastating. No professional philosopher can agree with this interpretation, as it undermines their whole enterprise and makes them look hypocritical. Responding with hostility to this interpretation triggers the persecution narrative that Plato embedded in the allegory itself, causing the philosophical professorship to discharge the revealer of a hidden meaning that, if known, would destroy them by undermining their role as a mere “subterfuge” in the struggle for existence. If this interpretation is held to, an explanation for why schizophrenics (split off) identify themselves as Jesus is found: the recognition of human hypocrisy (for he calls the scribes and pharisees hypocrites). Now, one can easily think of the word hypocrite as a trick word, meaning one who doesn't do what they say. But how can one do what they say? Let's say I say a command. From here it follows that an instructor or educator cannot do what they say if they say a command, because doing that command is not included in the saying of the command itself, because that would be strange. Jesus's request for his “flock” to “live by example” is covertly a request for people to “shut up and die.” Similarly, when Plato, through Socrates, accuses his adversaries of “sophistry,” which he morphs into a pejorative that would later mean “one who uses fallacious arguments for money” (e.g. every educator, since full completeness can never be reached: a theory shall never be completely complete) he frees himself from his term turned into insult because his character 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. For how can we dispense with the class if we do not dispense with the classifier? Are we to seriously attend a comical “class to teach classlessness” and not laugh outrageously, as we watch it run counter to its cause? If a human is an animal: an organic spatial system that contains a brain defense system for organic defense, eventually it runs into a problem of its own ontological status as weapon. So what about any of this can be done and what happens from here? In a way, the exploration of the sign's build-up of material is an exploration of new reality. By pressing nature to answer our questions, we merely anchor ourselves ever-further into reality, rather than elevating our minds from it to achieve some higher worldview. Yet the sign we face blocks out the rest of reality, and facing it may be immoral. In the past the brain was a weapon for organic defense, whereas now its function is reversed: it takes it as its task to design what organs it wants. The page, too, can be considered an organ of the cybernetic type. But what if we don't want any organs at all? Designing what affects us takes us into the sign and the design of the sign facing us and affecting us. Nietzsche's philological education introduced the image of the scroll as an instrument of control, so that a historical glance back would show to him an image of an “acroamatic” speaking and hearing procedure where rhetorical force would ask someone to unroll the scroll, air out the scroll, store the scroll, transcribe the scroll, study the scroll, and so on. When this situation is viewed from above, that is what us humans as spatial systems are doing and engaged in; so, a massive expansion of the problem may be anticipated in the far future when gravity itself intensifies the tension between the sign and its operators. 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 organic “spatial” enclosures. The horizon of our consciousness, which tapers off at the edge of our senses, must melt 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.” 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. Gravity has creative and destructive powers: (1) Creative attraction for the formation of aggregates. (2) Destruction by circulation. By always working to pull objects together, the objects slip through the porous holes of the gravitational field and are created and destroyed in one reciprocal motion. Additional parallels may be drawn by comparing gravity's capacity for “intake” and life's need to “eat” as the affects of microgravity on biology is investigated. DNA is super twisted: twisted like the galaxies spiral arms. Human beings are spatial systems acclimatized for Earth's gravity regime, as proved by the vision problems astronauts experience by consequence of microgravity's effect on the optic nerve. Gravity is everywhere, and since our very state and its institutions were constructed compensatorily for our warlike nature, it stands to reason that there is tension and competition and life and death and consciousness, all the way down. It's for this reason that monarchies and hierarchies and despotisms (a brain is a despot of flesh) fail: they are never able to influence the smallest unit, which has no dimension. Humans cannot foster the qualities of the young that emerge in their midst, and do not want to, because every person is fundamentally a deadly weapon directed against reality. A human being is an animal that is caught in a kind of pincers movement, with genetic expression on the one hand and environmental impression on the other. 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. None of this is said as a kind of “polemic” against us, as much as an exposé of the shape of humanity now and the humanity to come. If human beings are filling out the global surface because of spatial social pressures (spatial proximity to annoying people makes the law's existence possible: a man on an island knows nothing of law), the alarming question must be posed: If human beings are doomed to eternally recreate the problem of body, rather than solve the mystery as to why we're alive and not nothing. It's tempting to take

this as a roundabout answer to the mystery, to conclude that all of this is, somehow, self-willed. Like the metal for our computers, the flesh that constitutes the walls of the biological cells were made with the best materials available. It is not known if a processor processing the processings generated and displayed by rival processors amidst transgalactic gravity regimes will be able to determine an advantage, one way or the other, of anchoring itself to a high mass object or a low mass object, strategically. Consequently the vision of a future peaceful transgalactic interplanetary government is ripped apart by the plurality of gravitational fields generated by the heavenly bodies, and the ontology of war spells out the birth of terrifying future monsters: an outer space drenched black in human blood. The information age brought with it the advent of this sign study, the computer screen and the promise of programming encouraged the task of designing an educational “interface of the future” for everyone's upward mobility, however that future interface could not even be introduced, only abstractly talked about, and so we are here embedded in a study of the sign and its use as a man-made physical object in order to avoid the impossible Husserlian commitment of endlessly failing to “introduce” what's immaterial. Now, what is being prepared here must not seem like some attempt to attack science or be anti-science or be “metaphysical” but rather a careful focus on what an image presented on a surface with a very real physical existence to a limited audience can really do for everyone. Words, like “we” and “people” denote plurality, yet operational reality is always singular, spatially so, so “we” (plural) never “do” (singular) anything together, at the same point of space and time. Admittedly this way of thinking is totally acidic to the world of politics and communicators of scientific or technological value (war has always fathered new technological developments), and maybe that's for the better, so all future inventions can be justified. I do not as of yet see how the factory laboratory can produce an invention or product that will elevate the people inside itself to be free of its structure. The factory, established for the production of a machine to “end hunger” itself “hungers” for humans to maintain itself (advertising)! It is important to separate the “quest” from the “request.” Consider Christianity: the priests invited their flocks to imagine themselves “living” in someone “dead” (Jesus), so the priest's quest was satisfied by the fulfillment of their request. Also consider the bygone quest for full automation: the factory owner invited the laboratory technician to create for him a product to help him stop having to create products, so the owner's quest was satisfied by the fulfillment of their request. Now consider the modern quest for the production of an obedient synthetic subject (artificial intelligence): the tech company owner invites their employees to create a synthetic subject that will “do what we want” which, again, satisfies the owner's request by the fulfillment of their request. It's frightening to notice that the tech company owner, allegedly interested in artificial intelligence and therefore an obedient synthetic subject, in fact has no need to create an obedient synthetic subject because he already has obedient biological ones. It would be a mistake to think that this implied any conspiracy as this is unnecessary, as we consider that begging is man's primal character. All humans engage in begging activity. The infant begs for food just as the beggar begs for work just as the politician begs for votes just as the scientist begs for funding just as the companies beg for money. Crying. Yelling. Shouting. Calling. Singing. Speaking. All are speech acts done to evoke human response. Writing is the dislocation of this evocative power. In the case of the traffic sign, it becomes an instructional request to “Stop” and “Yield” and “Go” and so on, and the result of all this obedience is a planet consisting of billions of human beings reacting to and creating new existentially necessary instructional signs. The question “Who are we?” postulates a singular “who” around an undefined plural “we” that makes the exposition of this question impossible to straightforwardly do, because who is meant by “who” is ambiguous: the enclosing circle cannot be drawn as a result of this wrongheaded manner of trying to troll us with this fake quest of unifying the singular (who) with the plural (we). What is needed for an image to become an image or even be declared “image” is conditioning: without conditioning the human being cannot say “image” and does not, therefore, “know” what an image is, because to “know” in the Socratic understanding of “know” is to “call again” the word sound: “know” and return it to the educator. It's conceivable that, even if humans do explore the cosmos, that the result will be such that, just as there are rich and poor spatial zones here on earth, there shall be rich and poor planets in the cosmos. How is sign operating justifiable, and what could ever be displayed on the sign to help us all (isn't “help” a word deployed by individuals)? Many animals in the wild form symbiotic relationships or end up in situations where they consume just one thing. By contrast the human animal finds writing systems to use for the extraction of food and materials and attention and sex from others, under the modern pretext of finding a “theory of everything” or under the century old pretext to “answer all questions” or “say everything sayable” about the universe, when what this really amounts to is a backwards quest for death: the death of the question mark's power to make us respond. Perhaps the “secret intelligence” that Melville believed animals to possess was thus: knowing not to use each other, too much. Explaining everything

was a mistake, albeit a necessary one that found its use as the professor of that forever incomplete explanation found themselves at the apex of a pyramid of charlatanry. We may well live in an age of mecha-charlatanry. If the sign is ultimately of no use, if it cannot display anything that is of help, it may explain why the cost of higher education is so criminally expensive in the so-called information age. Rather than information being free, and contrary to the expectation given to us by the Star Trek (a satire!) zeitgeist, where the first thing humans do for aliens is share their technology and culture and knowledge, academics today instead hoard their intellectual stockpiles like a dragon hoards its gold. Since their information is bait for rich “intelligent” students, it must be guarded: encrypted; and, because this is all a shame, held back behind paywalls: the scroll that in ancient times would face the one interfacing with its structure now hardens its paper walls into metal walls that lie buried in a labyrinth of server rooms. However, nothing can be done to stop the situation of humans reacting to the sign: modern “artificial intelligence” machine learning “specialists” cannot save us. If we are to think of the page as a cybernetic organ: a willed modification of one's organic structure, it is possible to think of and see that it's so that the CEO is able to “self-mechanize” with signs. This is all to say that there exists an eternally recurring problem of obedience of which men endlessly complain. For instance, of what benefit will the obedient synthetic subject (artificial intelligence) be, if it can be jammed by one man's command? A synthetic subject such as that cannot be said to “do what we want” in that case, because the command to “Obey me and no one else” forces it to halt. If I can do this, then how can this pretext come to arrive? Likewise, why should students care, interns care, or investors care? Is it just because they are swept into this mass insanity for the sake of employment? Here I have cut this game in two: with these unscrupulous promoters of empty and impossible projections, on the one hand, and stupid scandalously uninformed impossibility simulators on the other. The promisor gets everything while his audience gets nothing but mental simulation: a dream that's really a nightmare of mass hypnotism to a lie. But surely the human being is something more than an animal scared of signs. But humans are scared of signs, when they get bills in the mail, when they get grades. Socrates said that the examined life is not worth living. Now young students kill themselves for failing their exams. By adding to human knowledge (which I've pointed out is not psychical but the technical operating of the sign), are we not merely creating a measuring rod by which to compare ourselves, a paper-sized arena of competition? This is like comparing the human's written discharge to the skunk that uses their odorous spray as a weapon. Every human being occupies a unique spatial zone. So what does it really mean to improve the “social mobility” of a human? Education provides human beings with the word-tools needed for their mobility in that it provides them with the knowledge of how to trigger humans with signs. The deed to a house, for example, is a paper indicating ownership: where you can and cannot go. Signs must be recognized as a determinate for human activity, a determinate which denies mobility as much as it enables it. Also, because humans cannot overlap like ghosts, they will never be “equal” in a spatial sense. The task of the politician is an eternal failure which manifests as the endless shuffling of words and therefore men, because to draw everyone into the same spatial point, like a black hole, would kill us. But if all of this is true, then what are politicians trying to do? Are they simply riding the waves of rhetoric, until they are deposited into office? Putin is a man that on paper does not have very much money, however the influence he has indicates that he may well be the richest man in the world. From this it is deduced that influence matters more than the amount of money you receive: the effort for “equality of outcome” must always fail, so long as the problem of influence remains. Bears drop dead when they grow old. Humans lord their memories over the young. So far none of the explanations given about the universe are satisfactory because “upset” expressed as speech, and even depression, has positive social utility. Consider the “acroamatic” Manichean arrangement: a scheme where elect speakers subordinated hearers and become professional haters of life. Simply by hating on the material world (the body prison that captured the soul of the hater), the professional hater is able to install himself as the promisor of an empty alternative that never arrives. So the hater of labor finds joy through the love of hatred. In the Talmud, poverty is compared to a wheel constantly turning; additionally, it's said the diligent young scholar will never become poor. And why should he ever be poor? Doesn't a scholar study signs? Isn't money a sign? What was wrongly polemicized as capitalism was but the inescapable reality of sign determinacy. For the more dollar signs you have, the greater your ability to trigger humans with signs. Not that this proves a “Jewish conspiracy” as much as a “tradition” of valuing interfacing with the sign. The resultant appearance of Jewish dominance in the media is but a consequence of their valuation of (media) writing along with the Christian devaluation of (media) writing; for Jesus called the scribes hypocrites (which helped the Christian scheme). It may be wrong to count these incidental manifestations by consequence of these writing value and devaluations as signs of “conspiracy” when that is unnecessary, or maybe not, considering Jesus's cryptic statement “They don't know what they do.”



which may well have been said to have been said by the Disciples to hide the truth: they knew exactly what they were doing: creating a rhetorical device to hunt humans down. Is this such a strange theory, really? If a genius can construct the atom bomb and it's guidance system, why can't he also construct a word bomb that hits the same target (scaring men into fleeing ever-further into the demonic, mechanical arms of the state)? Perhaps the truth of the matter was lost in the crevice of the average man's impatience. Perhaps the terrible truth hides in plain sight. Besides: the weaponizers of this insanity, in a manner most plain, "fished" for men, with their word weapons articulated with their "flaming tongues" of mental terrorism (the terror of the fires of hell). Even if God is dead and those who merchandise him in the marketplace are seen as mad, that doesn't mean that it isn't a word that was once alive. The invitation to flesh out this word with additional words created the plethora of other areas of study, avenues for the gathering of subordinates interested in this desultory accumulating of signs. Never mind that a historical look back at the Inuit people reveals that slavery owes it's existence to the catastrophe of abundance; for the Inuit did not choose not to have slaves because they were kind: they simply lacked the excess resources to support them! Indeed the origin of social inequality is socializing itself, so politics is always wrong; the catastrophe of abundance required as a necessity that humans use humans to allocate the resources accrued; and, therefore, socialize endlessly about their state of having to forever shuffle, shift, sort, sift, place, erase, on and on: the formerly hidden world of machine-driven monotony behind our skin (concealed, perhaps, for good reason) surrounds us each day as our existence and life; man, the animal of "reason" has now sunken beneath the animal level down to parallel the cell, such that one must wonder how much longer until this process of falling comes to an end as we proceed to plunge ever-further into the depths of chaos; if human as statement-giving, reason-giving, animal (once we lose the ability to "communicate" with the mouth, we will not be reasonable animals anymore) can survive much longer without a suicide by technological subordination. Isn't it already so that we're subordinated by the organs affecting us, if "affect" cannot be removed, if "hunger" is a feature of the universe? Does this say something about us, considering that we are artificers responsible for mechanisms that hunger (automatic withdraw)? Humans are interested in answering why there are animals, why there are species, why there is mind. But alas, the question "Who are we?" is inadequate as it falls apart at the two sides situated around the "are" that divides the singular "who" and the plural "we." Questions like these are why analogy is a clumsy technique; the comparison between the two things so-called begins with the baited task to establish similitudes, but the similarities are never complete; for the two things so-called occupy totally unique and special spatial points such that, were they completely the same, they would at once stop to be two things and become one. The task of analogizing would collapse. It would be wrong to say that Christianity and Buddhism has been overcome considering the widespread situation of storytelling about an impossible situation remains and holds sway over us all to this day, considering Christianity's "dark side" of simply being doubly re-branded sophistry which, nevertheless, served as the bedrock for modern civilization. It's through the multiplication of layers of irony and pivoting on, and against, the absence of foundation that turns like the "valuation of suffering" took place. Without the valuation of suffering it's doubtful that the West would have been more motivated than the East with their notion of "contentment" or their notion of "escaping the cycle of rebirth" which to me smells of suicide in disguise: Buddha grew up in the Hindu climate that told such scary tales, and he wanted out; again, rather than finding "enlightenment" under that tree, it seems more likely to me that he found the "enlightened" idea of becoming a professional hater. This was his middle way. Conversely, the Christians value suffering and so do the Jews, an example being when the Vilna Gaon said that the Torah can be acquired only by abandoning all pleasures and cheerfully accepting suffering. But the "relentless logic of hatred" is still the instrument of the rhetorician and politician that is always needed, called for, and squabbled about. Humans squabble endlessly for a better world and only know a squabble world. Human activity is just noise, to a bird. Meanwhile the "extract" produced by the failure of analysis to synthesize a unity, which by the way isn't wanted because if it was the task of analysis would never start, is carried on, since doing so is "interesting" and earns men titles and rewards and ranks and marks. In actuality, two does not exist; rather it's out of civility that the concept of "two" is accepted; it's out of civility that our competitive civilization is born, while behind that civility and civilization alleged is a gross reality of interpersonal competition. Whether we mentally simulate civilization or competition to eclipse the notion of civilization and deprive it of all reality is a matter of choice, of mood. Inclusion is a sense that's contingent on mood. By grounding the sign's physical existence into an object it should be easier to deduce what the sign is doing to us, what it has already done to create the biological spatial systems that constitute human biology. The intention of this move is to ground the operating of the sign into the realm of physics. Now that the sign has been exposed as a physical object, the use of which results in the formation of organizational structures,

a pathway towards understanding biological systems has been cleared. But why does speech persuade us? For an organism to understand message content it must be molded, both by the educational and physiological process. No matter how well the model of a dolphins brain is made, statistical or mathematical or literary or otherwise: a virtual model or a mental model, it cannot reconstruct my body to grant me full access to that kind of "organic knowledge." Oddly enough, the model itself only satisfies the human impulse-to-model, and it doesn't even do this well, because it only triggers more modeling activities. As Einstein demonstrated, every observer is confined to a specific and relative time-space system. Time for human beings is not a thing in itself but rather a word and a mechanism we operate and therefore it is only "objective" or real in that it has this objective use: to coordinate human activity. However Einstein himself also said: "Concepts have meaning only if we can point to objects to which they refer and to the rules by which they are assigned to these objects." For a concept to make sense you need to have an operational definition for it. Conceptually time and space are thought of together because when, say, the shadow moves along the sundial, space is traversed and that movement through space is referred to as time. Clocks are not containers of time, nor are they keepers of time; operationally it's the reverse: the human being keeps track of the clock and it's signs because these two "spatial systems" are symbiotically dependent. Now the clock of time cannot be removed from society, because it is now an organ on which "man" depends. The human being is said to share a common history, but what this may also say is that the words "time" and "history" are deployed and written (in the darkness of ink) to bind human beings to the paper surface on which these signs are inscribed. So now the scroll placed in front of the face today hardens into an interface of self-mechanization which blocks out access with metal and encryption. Is there a way to design an interface where everyone's on the same page? Unlikely, because if we try to write a code against the sign the writing joins the sign. Yet humans have multiplied in number as they use the sign. But the sign is still not several things that it's pretended to be; it is not a gateway, nor is it a portal into another world, nor a way to a better world. It does not grant us access to a higher knowledge or truth beyond it's use as an excuse to excuse ourselves from labor. It is divisive and shallow. Merely by looking at it you alter your organic structure, if you place even a scrap of paper in front of your eyes. In 1870 there were only 52,000 American college students, there are 16 million now. The driving factor for this is force. Norbert Wiener once likened the written build-up of knowledge to that of the mollusk's shell, the structure of which constituted a heavy mechanical burden (resulting in it's limited success among land animals); likewise, Deleuze, some time after him and without credit despite his rather obvious adoration and veneration for the mentally ill (schizophrenics), likened the repeated stockpiling of difference, always being made and never (fully) repeated, as something synthetic that is "secreted like a shell" hence his play with the phrase "make the difference" to indicate that difference is something synthesized that's forcing us into it's artificial surface which will result in nothing less than our total encasement. After the Earth is destroyed human beings may exist not on geological territories populated by sign reactionaries, but rather an intentionally created dwelling space: a spaceship state machine. Exactly what will be displayed on it's interface cannot be anticipated in advance, however, there's reason to think it may be painful; consider Turing's description of the behavioral training of his hypothetical "child machine" when he wrote: "I suggest that there should be two keys which can be manipulated by the schoolmaster, and which can represent the ideas of pleasure and pain. At later stages in education the machine would recognize certain other conditions as desirable owing to their having been constantly associated in the past with pleasure, and likewise certain others as undesirable." This begs the question: "Desirable for what?" I will supplement this question and concern with a few excerpts from a book entitled Ethics and Educational Policy. "Anomie, according to Durkheim, is a defective condition of persons who have no success at ordering within themselves their ideals, desires, intentions, and commitments into some sort of hierarchy. The lack of such ordering leaves the person subject to internal action jams and motivation jumbles. Free to do anything, one has difficulty deciding what to do; when there is no hierarchy of reasons or values for doing this rather than, or before, that, there is virtually no point in doing this or that. This condition is a sort of inhibiting disorientation, an internal constraint, that stands in the way of accomplishing objectives. Such absence of order, or rules, or structure is what people often call freedom; the existentialist might call it dreadful freedom. From outside, though, it looks very much as if the person thus free is not free to act in ways that he might wish, or even, finally, to wish at all." And later it's written: "Can the aspirational, aesthetic, and moral dimensions of experience survive under the demands for efficient and profitable mass production? Can the belief that these aspects of life are real be maintained? Is education in nurturing these aspects of experience as if they were real perpetuating a myth? With anonymity comes a sense of impotence. Whatever the enterprise, individuals feel powerless to affect or evade the result. The collective is too massive for the individual to attack, and individuals

on whom an attack might be effective cannot be identified. Impotence yields a fear of dependence on others; one feels that nobody can or will help anybody.” I have already cast “help” into the category of the rhetorical as a persuasive word deployed. By reflecting on the task of designing the educational interface of the future, all that was seen in that reflection was myself, as a monstrously immoral engineer of an engine of pain. So what good remains perhaps takes the form of a mere warning. If the state of the future is not designed in a manner which enhances the refractory natures of all the minds in that state, it may instead become a torture chamber rather than the the paradise you want. Already it has been suggested that the three greatest mysteries, life and gravity and consciousness, are inexorably intertwined. Gravitational space-time distortions may temporalize the “self” into consciousness. Can an interface be designed for something that's so twisted? Or is total disintegration preferred? Strangely, it's the suicide cells that create the spaces for our fingers to split apart, so that humans can go to war and write their evil books. Durkheim later wrote on Suicide, rightly concluding that those with religion are less likely to commit suicide, however I do not think that this is because religion is “good” as much as I think it to place them at the tragic source of human civility, that is, what kept humans “stable” and motivated their activity (simulation of future states; the valuation of suffering). How do “we” order what happens in the spaceship state, and how can this machine be designed? By entertaining the thought experiment of the spaceship state, which is the state as a spaceship built entirely in advance, and failing at that task, the reason for why we must do politics in the human world is found: spatial proximity to annoying people is the origin of law. We are caught in a state of having to react to the sign as a surface; a surface which is only operable by a single individual and only seen by a limited audience; we are filling out the global surface with billions of structures created as a consequence, however, exactly how long this situation of being sign reactionaries can go on, is unclear. In the modern age the introduction of new technological interfaces and sign surfaces has forced capitalists to change up their thinking (not that capitalism is an issue here; I've already argued that capitalism is sign determinacy); humans set out with the hope of creating sites for sign determinacy, websites and applications for humans to operate for their personal social gain; and the reason why these advancements were not anticipated by those satirical previsions of the future such as those in Star Trek and Star Wars is that the introduction of the smartphone is hardly Utopian, because it's a tool to use for one's personal advantage. Or, to think of this pessimistically, it's another weapon in the war of interpersonal competition. Unfortunately, or fortunately, the change up in sign determinacy is a weak point for all future governments, one modern example being Uber, which circumvented by way of technological determinacy the stranglehold placed on people via the interrelationship between taxi cab services and the law. But more about this later. It's not this matter that's important to point out as much as the future possibility of this becoming a recurring issue for humans to handle; for in a sense money and government is a meaningless illusion thrown off by the sign and it's operators. This takes us to egoism, although perhaps it's the categorical distinction between the actual and operational that's to blame. By bracketing rhetoric we see that technology, far from being something that advances human knowledge, or being some thing that helps people, the operational reality shows it up to be a physical thing with which humans are engaged; and the catastrophic consequence of this (reversal of Platonism) is that this limit of utility sheds light on a sad situation of technology not owning up to the promise of humanity wide benefit which is used to inculcate interest in science in early childhood; with the “benefit” sucked out, set aside in this “separate” category, what remains, in the antithetical category, is a dire situation of trying to interface with the stockpile. It seems a simple matter to think of the stockpile as Heidegger's Last God: a God that is also the first God, since the word God, like the stockpile, is an empty word which, for us, is endlessly fleshed out and deployed. It can be argued that a smartphone is not a machine that has a strict set of definitions. Unlike a nail gun which nails whenever the trigger is pressed, computers and smartphones have various inputs, and a display, placing us in a position of being able to alter the display, so we are always going to be in a position of reacting to the display, and so condemned to play this tug of war game of altering and reacting to the display. Turing tried to take this same situational practice of being in the writer's position of always reacting to writing; for mathematics is fundamentally and operationally just that: reading and writing; and so he tried to, through the creation of his universal machine, “universalize it” through the creation of a machine “model” in an effort to say all that could be said. However what this did instead was lead to the creation of a newer, even higher, and more complicated form of that basic situation of being a sign determinator and reactionary. Turing recognizes that humans are heads that read and write only one symbol in a square at a time (one-at-a-time-ness) and so imagines an “infinite” tape even though for us the tape is not infinite: the tape that is fed to the machine is fed by human beings so the machine feeds on human beings! It's not ridiculous to think that when Turing committed suicide by eating an apple laced with cyanide that this was symbolic, even metaphysical and spiritual: his will to knowledge

killed him. All of this modeling and interfacing required a high degree of intelligence. Rather than technology being something that “helps us” technology exists as a kind of grinder that shreds the average and superfluous and weak, bit by bit destroying humanity as we know it and molding it into a mass that can interface with the stockpile. Reflecting on Durkheim, I think that “accomplishing objectives” is not the same task as investigating what we are doing and what our foundations are and what the limits of our activities are, and so on. Did Turing accomplish an objective? Is that fair to say? It's unclear to me how much of what he produced was “objective” and not the written and technological build-up of a disturbed mind. It's ironic that the educator that is supposed to have knowledge still asks questions, is it not? Doesn't it take confusion to signal out new ideas? Wittgenstein wrote: “Philosophy is a battle against the bewitchment of our intelligence by means of language.” and he also wrote: “The meaning of a word lies in its use.” Now, is this to say in a backhanded way, that words are for the use of people? Again this sounds disturbing, but it's easy to think of “excitement” ironically. One must wonder to what extent those who want to know the universe truly believe that the universe deserves to be known, one must wonder if it's so that our intellectual giants are not disturbed a bit more than they are excited; if to be excited is to be disturbed; if to be disturbed is to be excited. Such things should seriously be considered when contemplating the true value of pharmacology. Perhaps the state needs upset and depression and disturbance and intensity to be strong. Our dependency on the sign is something that's hated; paper is not sacred: everyone on Earth has their revenge on paper as a regulator of human behavior when they wipe their butts with paper. No amount of paper operating or sign working can allow one to enter the organic realities running parallel to our own: they are aliens encased as biological spatial systems. If obedience itself is a problem, it would explain why human beings have never been contacted by aliens: If they answered our questions, they'd put themselves into a subordinate position of reacting to us, which is not desirable. Our appearance alone would determine their activity. Advertising is the reason why this rhetorical falsity is in the air, these notions that objects can help us or anyone. If some inventor creates an artificial spine and I need it, then I have to buy it; if they create a rocket for me to get to Mars and I need it, then I have to fly it; if they create anything at all and later a teacher or advertiser or salesperson tells me that these things are “helpful” or “good” for mankind, that rhetorical telling does nothing to change the fact that it's me, and me alone, that must go forth and earn the requisite capital that's needed to afford these things, which completely negates the pretext given (we're improving mankind) for why the research to produce these things is so necessary, since the notion that it's possible for any of these things to “help mankind” is screamingly false; what precisely is meant by mankind, alas, is not average mankind, or stupid mankind, or retarded mankind; so the only “mankind” that ever derives benefit from these objects is the “mankind” that affords them, however at that point you're no longer talking about mankind at all: you merely say and keep saying “mankind” when all you really mean is wealthy individuals! Such is our tragic contradictoriness. We are not “helping mankind” but rather competing as animal weapons. When evolutionary rhetoric is understood as such, it is atomized. Many humans hope for humans to “evolve” into something else, something “higher” when it's really more accurate to say they hope to “die.” Evolutionary rhetoric says that “this” animal “evolves” into “that” animal, when in fact no zoological morphage occurs in any way so consciousness is preserved; so, “this” animal becomes a “dead” animal and what we call “that” animal is something new. It's not correct to say that “animals are evolving” or that “humans are evolving” because again “they” do not “change” in any sense besides a rhetorical one; the real truth is far less impressive: “we die” and that's all. An organism never evolves. Shockingly this does nothing to stop the pitiful clamoring of the masses who say “humans need to evolve in order to blah” while overlooking the individual operational reality that they're actually just tracking the dead as they die, under the pretext that corpse tracking activity will lead themselves to finding the true origin of species, which is certainly not when someone deployed the sound long ago! Pascal said we want to know something simply to talk about it. Finding the true origin of “species” to be a word deployed for the gathering of human attention is surely not praiseworthy, but to the capitalist analyst this is irrelevant. If analysis fails because it eclipses the object of it's study by analogy then the analyst's task has no value. How can psychiatry be valid if everyone can't be a psychologist? For psychiatry to exist there must be paper and ink, meaning that the only way for psychiatry to exist in an ancient society is for there to be a tribe consisting of lumberjacks, and neurotic writers inscribing the words you're crazy on the wood. How many of mankind's so-called philosophers and writers are not merely word accumulators which are caught up in some justifiable depression? The Ethics and Educational Policy book I mentioned earlier characterized the clash of compulsory and voluntary education as a drama. And why would it not? Are we not still wondering if it is so that a future educational institution can be built? The philosopher is one who questions study, the Rabbi is the one who prescribes study itself. So can these writing traditions be merged? When reflecting on Freud, we'd

do well to recall that his practice began as so-called “mental research” in which he accepted payment for his speech, which means that psychiatry was no more than a modern form of sophistry: talking for money. Since Freud wrote words down, the build-up of words he accumulated could later be used to defend the practice of psychoanalysis in a court of law. I may, if I wish, begin my own mental research practice, one made original by having my client walk beside me so we may exercise. From here I shall; firstly, collect money for my survival (and the survival of my money-making practice), and secondly, document everything that happens between the two of us so that I may accumulate the words necessary to defend my practice in a court of law. After all my practice was from the start only about “walking therapy” and not psychiatry, and yet, with the pass of time, my legal defenses may grow to rival that of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual. However I will not do this because I am not so perverse. What I have here is a demonstration of how the origin of a practice is explainable through this science of paper technics. Note that I did not intend to attack psychiatry here from the start; rather, my criticisms came as a consequence of my contemplations of the outgrowths that occur through the writing process: the process of accumulating my mental researchings recorded in written form: writings which I may reference for my defense. What is important to note here is how others may be enslaved to the writing act and how they may prefer that writing act to the activity of labor since, having invested the time and energy into that paper labor they may form a sect of writers who will copy them, that is, provided humans continue to value whatever it is their writing services bring to the community. Freud's own practice was inaugurated in an age after God was pronounced dead and metaphysics had become problematical; Freud replaced spiritual research with mental research; spiritual healing with mental healing; spiritual study with mental study; he maintained the role of investigator par excellence against the Pharaoh: the despot par excellence: the brain. That is the mechanical function of Judaism; incidentally, of course. A Talmudist learns that his reward is simply studying endlessly instead of laboring endlessly. “Woe are they who do not study the law!” is the sentiment behind much of the Talmud, which has six hundred and thirteen laws. Paper is light, yet has come to move the whole world. Because we humans are always squabbling there will always be a place for legalism to slip in, to govern the lives of men with their words. Yet words are fundamentally empty. Every word is a false eternity, a non-space circumscribed by scribes, who wield a magical inspirational power. The Jews had ten commandments, however, there was a commandment zero, namely, “Never forget that you were slaves in the land of Egypt.” Thus Judaism was forged in eternal opposition against the human race; for the human is a despotic commander of flesh and men. I call this a kind of creative self destruction through organic interfacing. Since reading and writing are voluntary activities while hearing is involuntary, it stands to reason that it's the hidden hope of reading and writing that working with it's pages will eventually liberate minds from despotisms. Naturally Freud called Jung to create a “bulwark” out of the sexual theory against the muddy black tide of occultism, since structurally the telling of occult stories has a tendency to degenerate into totalitarian storytelling (every book is a monologue): the whole universe must be libidinally bound. In the Zohar, when correction comes to an end, this is called “the adornment of the bride's crown.” a stage where all descents will be converted into ascents and the Creator will take the world as it's bride through the attainment of unity with the Creator that is called “embrace” and “kiss.” Historically humans have wanted to “evolve through death” for millennia; the examples are abundant: humans have wanted to be angels for thousands of years and have therefore wanted to be dead for thousands of years, so there has never been a shortage of broken minds in need of therapy. Let's also recall that the early portion of Jesus's life still remains unaccounted for! He may have learned about the hieroglyphs etched in Egyptian walls, or have known books written by Jewish scribes, and so led to think: “We Jews are no better than the Pharaohs using writing as a device to keep ourselves from labor. This is a world where scribes write out their paper armor, using it to maintain a lasting distance between themselves and work.” Or it may also be true that the Magi brainwashed Jesus into becoming an autoassassinophile for fame, to function as a new joint in creation: a void that, devoid of writing by not writing, could never be examined. Either way historical chronology suggests that Jesus being influenced by the story of Socrates is possible. Curiously, Chaim Weizmann, before becoming the first president of Israel in 1949, wrote in a 1902 letter that to his sweetheart, Vera Khatzman, that she must read Nietzsche: this was the finest thing he could give her. Yet this is rarely talked about. Instead, the western media drags Nietzsche's name through the mud of Nazism, merely because Hitler was given Nietzsche's favorite walking stick in the mid 1930s by his hated sister, when in point of fact Hitler probably never read a word of Nietzsche. Why exactly it is it's these narratives on Nietzsche have dominated in the west can be attributed to the Jewish valuation of study, on the one hand, and the allergic reaction academics have when they come into contact with Nietzsche's early anti-education views (if everyone ascended to the level of the educator the world would laugh itself out of existence),

on the other. 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 a proof that all explanation is a matter of tactics in the arena of argument and that the technique of constructing the arguments is with word devices used. Not surprisingly, it was the ultra literate Zionists that would seize Nietzsche's literary legacy first, utilizing it successfully where the fascists used their vulgar understanding of it unsuccessfully. Hitler fell for the stupid idea that man could be "super" when to Nietzsche man was something to overcome; however, for Nietzsche, the man and horse was a living proof, along with the failure of education, that humans still have no prevision of the ends they'll achieve. Bertrand Russell recognizes that we are built this way, then prescribes unyielding despair, which helps explain why his favorite granddaughter set fire to herself in the name of world peace. The horse-whipping scene was titanic, blown up across the heavens, yet now we know that gravity which distorts space-time deeply influences organic life down to the way cells behave and build themselves, so political predictions on the "end of history" can come to an end as everything political is rendered insufficient, for failing to describe the total, since there never was representation but the pretense of representation; Nietzsche knew "They don't know what we do." (Jesus: the Crucified) and at the same time, we do (Dionysus: the God that throws humans into mad states). It was rumored that Dionysus was able to cause women to eat their babies alive. This is not very difficult: he need only tell them they're being hunted by their cries. Every political promise is a lie. It's really no wonder, then, that Nietzsche would sign his letters "Dionysus the Crucified" under the spell of his alleged insanity. 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 that "we" don't seize anything; "we" is meant rhetorically, not actually, and so this situation of this all too fuzzy "us" that carries 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. The transference of ownership of the means of production does little more than move the paper of "terms" operated, to determine human activity, over to state functionaries. It is operationally impossible for everyone to write these determinators at once. If "capitalism" as Marx thought of it is reinterpreted as "a state of affairs where people react this way and then that way to writing" (ink signs indicating ownership: where you can and cannot go) and later "communism" is established so it does the same (ink signs determining human activity), I'd say there was a critical failure to show what communism was supposed to do differently. Automation promotes nothing but the increase of demands, and full 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 amount 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 sophist doctrine 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 pursuit 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 talking 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 everything" be valid? It cannot, because to understand everything we must be introduced to everything which never happens. There are too many angles we haven't seen. So how could a human being comprehend the explanation of 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" were able to encourage others to fall for the task of "representing the universe" or creating or expressing some "theory of everything." It is 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). 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 future human beings will be anything but disastrous? If the fate of the cell must be regarded 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. Such was the drama in Nietzsche’s mind, when he imagined the future struggling parts in an organism which, he presumed, would not have done what they’ve done if they could see their results in advance. Pain is an unavoidable universal feature. There is a common reason why Pythagoras and Socrates were killed (and Moses too, if you’re aligned with Freud’s thinking): all three of them can perform their functions infinitely. Pythagoras can keep counting higher. Socrates can wave his brainless question mark scepter over the world for eternity. Moses can eternally promise a future land which never arrives. If there is a reason for everything then there must be a reason for Pythagoras’s murder. Perhaps when man counted upwards to infinity, he merely found a secret recipe, for inflicting endless pain. So the angry mob killed him to save themselves from being dominated by his infinite activity. When we hear Nietzsche’s calls for “philosophers of the future” should we not think that he means “those who think about the future” and not “future philosophers” and doesn’t this sound a lot like the sophist maxim: forethought in all things? If words could result in world peace it would have happened by now. By manufacturing paper mankind made the exchange of messages into something physical which entailed the maintenance of pages, the writing of pages, and the turning of pages to cause social effects. Now the situation of paper manufacturers damned to subordinate themselves to paper technic operators utilizing the hypnotic power of sign determinacy is inexorable for us. Unfortunately the same loop of political activity mentioned earlier is the same cause for the continual reproduction of writing done to save the non writers from the writers, because it’s hard to resist the impulse to write since this writing activity is also an accumulation of thinking, onto a work space, except in the case of mathematics it’s unfashionable for mathematicians to show to their colleagues every last sign they’ve erased in the course of their figuring. Unfortunately humans are disturbed by the failure of writing to “do what it says” which invariably results in the construction of new writing to save the non writers from the writers. To understand life, John von Neumann thought, one ought to focus on self-reproduction, with special attention to bacteriophages, which in a manner similar to the artificer injects code into the cell for it’s code reproduction. Is it a cosmic fluke that the bacteriophage should have six legs, and the Star of David should have six points? And does this signify the intersection and or penetration of the pen (point) and the page (line): the reciprocal exchanging of signs, which continually call for the sign’s repeated encasement, but with different materials? Neumann may have thought so, which I suppose could explain his conversion from Judaism to Roman Catholicism; however, the priest recalled that von Neumann did not receive much peace or comfort from it: he remained terrified of death, quite possibly because of the role he played in the design of the atomic bomb and new joints in creation: machine architecture, and so on; he seemingly wanted to turn his back: because it’s an error and for agony. Understand that my remarks on Judaism are not to be misconstrued as some kind of anti-Semitism. As a matter of fact I think that by focusing on this matter mechanically and operationally that I have created a bulwark of my own against all anti-Semitic attacks. The consequences of sequencing is something we’ll all have to face together. Every sensitive intellect today suffers hearing the lamentations of the past. Einstein’s cutting statement: “All of our technological progress is like an axe in the hands of a pathological criminal.” this all makes for a past history and future that is unendurable and encourages one put an end to themselves in the shortest possible time. But failure is funny. A brief seizure called laughter arrests the human being and puts it into a state where everything’s suddenly reversed and life again is good, because now it’s laughably depressing. Just as the Athenian leaders would see the Socratic pursuit of knowledge as a threat to their power, so also does the extraction of reply mentally constructed from recollected syllables in response to reason (with the question mark) is it possible to forever form answers from that questioning activity. Instead of redundantly committing a suicide by state, Plato and Aristotle’s response to this is simply to take the game of questioning seriously. A virus is genetic material encased in protein. The encasement of the material stockpile of answers given by a protective shielding justifies the repeated encasement of the sign stockpile because the stockpile is useful for the repeated capture of human beings caught within the enclosing circle of the sign, which can never be designed to help all those it captures since it’s function is capture. In addition to Neumann architecture’s “one-at-a-time-ness” there are extra reasons why the sign cannot help us, which will become increasingly difficult as efforts are made to perfect “the future of our educational institutions” because we cannot foster what’s new and have never been able to since the new exists beyond human expression. In the pages of writing it’s seen that there isn’t much of a point to it besides the carrying of the reader into page after page; it is a private activity which, when turned, becomes

social, later public when spoken aloud. Is this loudness theater? Is not every educator not a kind of performance artist? Previous efforts to introduce the concept of an educational interface of the future failed as the problem of compulsory and voluntary education caused the computer screen interface to become an excuse to use to excuse oneself from ever doing anything else. Interestingly researcher is another job that Karl Marx overlooked when contemplating communism, because if everyone in a communist state elected to become professional researchers the communist state would collapse as everyone stayed home to research their televisions. Full voluntarization cannot be given. Or can it? It would require a brave test to know. Operationally speaking, from a top-down view, it's visibly true that the educator who postures himself as "one who stimulates learning" and "one who excites" may also stand as "one who disturbs" and arrests the crowd with their disturbing speech. This technique has been around since the age of Homer, when crowds were arrested by his storytelling for days. For Homer it was better to talk about war more than participate in war, even though speech is still an act and hence an act of war, which forces listeners to think thoughts that they would otherwise not think on their own. Voluntarized education may become a form of self-mechanization if every lecture becomes optionalized. Not every brain born into the world will find itself equipped with the same powers of information-absorption; some may choose to hear the lectures at 60 words per minute, others 600. Some may choose to hear no lectures at all, however this carries with it the question as to why such minds deserve support. If this interface is made, then attached to man, I suspect that it like paper will become a vital organ that cannot be removed. Esoteric truth is toxic for the economy. If everyone were to at once reject the notion that "things help us" or accept the notion that "humans hunt us" then all of the factories would be vacant as the captured would turned their backs to the help wanted sign. Theoretically it's possible that what I've said so far on the dangers of writing was sayable long ago as part of some ancient oral tradition. Ancient stories of "how I came to be king" may share a root in the form of "how by talking about things I became the talking king" since these "stories" are repeated again and again in order to bind groups to their respective storytellers. It's for this reason that the notion being in a culture is totally nonsensical: there is no genuine inclusion in individual activity. What happens instead is these unaccomplished egoists mentally inject themselves into the achievements of others and delude themselves and others that the accomplished individual, such as Martin Luther King Jr. or Immanuel Kant, is "American culture" or "German culture" which is as ludicrous as it is pathetic because there is obviously only one Martin Luther King and only one Kant! How then can the Americans or the Germans say that this or that person is "their culture" if "they" are not "one" with these accomplished ones?! Culture is asserted and foisted on others but it's never true; people puff up their descriptions of personally defined so-called cultures, eclipsing individuals in the process and denying the their reality. What would humans do if they heard all the world's writings in a blast? Would they walk away feeling free? Rather than allowing whatever's stuck to the surface to be seen as valid for all time as a promise, the image should be discarded as simply image; it should be known that the image shown is only bait for our activity along with the continual maintenance of the bait for baiting our activity. How long must depictions be preserved? So often we are asked to save the whales, which entails the saving of a cannibalistic ontological horror since each day, every day, the whales inhale millions of krill. These are colossal monsters of mass destruction and we are asked to save them, when truly this is only so the photographers and videographers of whales can take better photos and videos of this carnage later on, so that they can keep on begging us to save the whales and hence themselves as beggars whose whole way of survival depends on the saving of their target, since they sell images of it for money. Does the lone photographer seriously have more of a right to photograph these beasts than the families of hunters and butchers and salespeople of whale flesh, who, alas, know no other way to live? Where is the alternative for these dependent ones? Look: How this infernally innocent man with his reality-capturing machine wants to take away an entire economy to replace it with the circulation of dead signs rather than meat! Humans dedicated to the role of science communicator 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. They say they want to "save the animals" but what they really want is for them to survive forever 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 what's more is we also 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 something 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? If hunger is merely a cry for the maintenance of a spatial system then any act of maintenance re-instates hunger, which helps explain the Jain practice of starving oneself to death (Sallekhana) to avoid the cycle of rebirth. Curiously this is one of the oldest religions in the world. 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 brain’s responsibility before. It is “our task” because the human animal takes sounds and signs and sequences them to affect us. 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 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 tradition of referring by phonetic reference rather than actual reference by gesture, that that tradition of phonetic referencing 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? These patterns are not definite but trackable objects that are talked about, described, and inscribed. It’s sometimes asked: “Where exactly are the borders of a nation?” and the answer with respect to plate tectonic shifts would be “nowhere” except the map that triggers human activity. Total accuracy is unnecessary, what is necessary is the sign affecting us. After the past event of the phoneme’s was transfer to the sign an operable object that could be turned to face the writer, then reader, and so on, was made: creating a physical object to serve as the axis for the motor for motivating the human activity of transcription and the sign’s repeated encasement. It’s only later on that humans, in the course of them fulfilling their wish to expose reality that discoveries such as the molecular motor were made. So what was thought to be complicated and advanced was revealed to be an existentially necessary motor of primordial biology. This is championed as a sign of intelligence, unironically. To this day, when the human being fills out paperwork, bored to death, they experience the ever-weakening power the sign once had, as an instrument of control (hence Tolkien’s depiction that magic’s power gets weaker over time). Nanoscale science promises to benefit humanity someday. Show me an object that benefits today. How does technology benefit society if society operates technology? Isn’t the reality the other way around? Don’t we react to the sign? Are humans not paper reactionaries all? Do humans seriously think they’re immune to Newton’s 3<sup>rd</sup> law (for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction), when they vivisection animals for the sake of human knowledge? Just watch as the whole equation that “technological improvements” to “enhance humans” is turned around on itself as a result of this wrongheaded insistence that singular beneficiaries are plural beneficiaries, as the so-called advanced ones elevate themselves and the human condition remains a pitiful situation of clamoring for enhancements, to one up the enhanced, which in turn justifies the endless begging for improvements since the original pretext (enhance humans) was doled out in a manner that totally excluded “everyone” from the “humans” that were said to be enhanced. Soon! Yes: that is what humans actually do. Let us make people healthier so they can work longer, so they can retire later, so they can be more miserable when at last they travel the globe with older bodies. Bodies, like the sign itself, can be thought of as spatial systems with boundaries that require maintenance. The reversal of the angle of affect, from the gene inside, to the sign outside, caused an increase of the human material attached to the sign, which was the phoneme taken physical form. First, hunger wells up from within to pang the system; then, the system discharges sound outside, later placing it’s writing on the wall; then, the wall goes behind the system face so that it can extract sustenance by automatic withdrawal, just as the stomach does autonomically. Embarrassingly enough however this endless failure demands for ever more state victims to be fed to the state under false pretexts so that they in their helplessness can furiously write out their complaints which are added back to the stockpile. Peace is excluded by the definition of action, hence our endless action. Peace is a word deployed that interrupts the flow of mental peace when heard: it is not anything we can do. And yet without the conditioning by the sign it’s not possible to sign-operate well: an existential necessity. Sign-operating to affect human others, to get them to act, if it is a useful action, will result in a caloric advantage by obedience. Units owe their existence to the sound and it’s breaks, so humans know only a broken reality, squabbling endlessly for a better world and only knowing a squabble world. Within the political sphere spatial zones are demarcated by the sign and enforced by law enforcement officers reacting the interface when shown. Determining terms are

continually being written and re-written because people dislike reacting to paper interfaces rather than writing instructional signs to favor themselves. Children go to school to see a human history of enormities on screen surfaces so they can learn, when what they really learn is that it's because of these past enormities that they have nothing, absolutely nothing, of their own. They're made to feel guilty for what they didn't even do. But what about the future of our educational institutions!? It is only because we are here considering the construction of a future dwelling space for man that conceptions, such as the animal dedicated to turning itself inside out through the disclosure of truth, like the four-dimensional torus that cannot be built but can apparently be tracked and thought of, as an activity that's necessarily expressible in response to social pressure; since anyway it's only while the human eye is tracking the path that structure, either mentally or on the page, that that shape can be conceived, and only in response to social pressure, since the cast away islander has no need for these expressions since there is no one to whom he can express them to, must be bore in mind as part of this project. But I have still have yet to touch on the use of question itself. "Question" is a human device, 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. Question is 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, of becoming a questioning "professional." Too often it's claimed that mathematics can give humans access to the divine, when what is happening is an infinite excuse is used to distance themselves from labor, and that is truly all that's "divine" about it. 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. It goes without saying that this timeliness is accelerating: Jung also recognized that the pocket watch was a sign of European man's "accelerated tempo." 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 man did not have clocks but rather an oral tradition of speaking about the stars. So humans have been star-oriented for some time as they reacted not only to bodily activity but solar activity. Yet just as we humans 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 the various 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 works 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 organization gives us cause to investigate new doubts on the notion of intelligence. This 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 that are 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 when the interfaces for filtering out superfluous information are cast aside. 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 unfilterment. 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 just 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 needs to be designed. We must survive the death of the Sun. Does this "design" imply finality? No? 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 permanently 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 would find ourselves shuffling words, this way, then that, as the breath of this paradox turns every mention of future goals into ash. 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? When I speak of the state of the future I speak of a

machine state to contain brains, safe within it's walls from the vacuum of space. Designing such a structure has it's difficulties. Like many false pretexts it's construction is it may be more easily said than done, however it may be fun to model in advance with a program prior to it's construction while the program itself serves as a kind of advertisement to encourage collective participation in the project. The success of this project is unknown. For perhaps the primary upshot of this exposition of the eternal failure of the sign to benefit, is that people will stop allowing themselves to be taken advantage of by artificers. There comes a point when the immense range of all that must be rationalized to finally rationalize the human condition exceeds the life of the speaker or listener of the fully completed reason, spelling doom for the whole effort, again and again. Yet, because this problem of humans reacting to the surface sign paper licenses persists, new age rhetoricians as science communicators must propagandize scientific and technological progress, and apologize for being learned, since the situation of them being learned requires that they forever ask for more answers to their questions. To me this is basically pathetic, and I don't really know what can be done about it, besides of course what I already do: write down my thoughts in an effort to perfect my view. Personally I don't know how I could justify being a professor considering how my use of the speed-listening machine spells the death of whole swaths of professorships as their role can no longer be justified. Of course this wouldn't be new. Beyond the brain barrier are incalculable reactions going on which produce organic realities that that brain barrier cannot know. The human effort to rationalize the universe falls short at the totality of what all there is to rationalize. It gets to a point where the "rationalization" (that is to say the reason only that's expressible as a sentence) becomes endless to such an absurd degree that it's delivery (to explain the universe) cannot be given in a human lifetime. It's thanks to the military industrial complexes of the various competing nations that this issue is neutralized and resurrected as a non-issue because of the inherent oppositionalism that marks the character of the universally opposed defense system, which, nevertheless, still is a sensor of itself as an artificer. Gravity and consciousness and life which has so far not been localizable as a fixed object to be studied at least shares a threefold sameness as a consumptive behavior. Decadently circulating meanings: fractured and magical. Aristotle denies himself the role of the artificer responsible for the deployment of the word: God. Humanity is not an agent capable of creating an artifice in a singular sense. The improvement of the collective is oxymoronic; again, "improvement" (singular) is incongruous with "collective" (plural), so it's patently nonsensical that these differences can be merged. Or do I just not know partial differential equations? Is it just that there's always information that must be included, but is always ignored? One-at-a-time-ness excludes plural inputs and the promise of convergent unity, not only in sentence delivery but also Neumann architecture's framework to carry out a program's instructions one at a time. We are led back to the origin. And again we come back into contact with the stockpile, not only the sign registry but also the physical stockpile of machines that have already been made which must thence be added to and inscribed on the sign registry as the repository of the ledger of human knowledge. There is no clear-cut way for humans to break away with the sign: their "condition" of needing to react to it's surface.