

THE SURFACE DISPLAY

BY
JOE VIVIANO

If science is study and study is science, that is to say that science is synonymous with study, what study is must also be understood as science: science takes lasting physical form through the act of writing: studying activity is only producible as evidence to a human other by way of the surface display on which the study as writing is registered: this physical registry on which writing is accumulated becomes a physical object that triggers human activity, and, as such an object, if it is a successful object, an object, which also by virtue of its being an object capable of influencing human activity, becomes a sort of magical object, which in addition to its power to trigger human activity also justifies its continued existence and maintenance as a surface display with an influential power.

There must be a reason why in ancient societies there were mainly oral traditions, and not writing traditions; there had to have been secret reasons, which I will show, why the advent of writing would be anticipated as such a problem: writing becomes a problem of maintaining the writing as a physical object if the writing is created, it is not allowed to pass away, and it follows as a dramatical consequence of this not allowing speech to pass a way that people be forced into becoming the servant of the physical object created by the artificer, in that they become damned to forever maintain it. This doesn't happen with speech.

The evidence for this can be seen simply by looking at Egyptian and Chinese ancient societies respectively and how easily the advent of writing made it possible for distance to be created between those who could read and those who could not read, those who could write and those who could not write; for it is operationally impossible for two people to write the same sign that once. It is spatially impossible for two artificers to write the same sign in the same space at the same time, and it's this inability for two people to write out the same command at the same time that creates a sort of war game over the surface display which influences human activity, as I've already explained. Consider Tolkien and Nietzsche: two philologists and word-lovers who by being aware of the whole history of writing and the maintenance of writing become privy to a worldview where writing, encryption, inscription, decryption, so on and so on, are all usable as excuses by which two excuse oneself from labor, since when doing writing labor one does not do manual labor.

It's basically because of this that Tolkien made his philology lectures boring on purpose so he could repel his students away from his class, thereby granting himself more time to continue to portray an image of writing where the influential power that is in magical power of writing only grew weaker with a pass a time in his fictional world where, in the end, the dark lord (and ink is dark) secretly forged one ring to rule them all (the universal ring of reason), until it was destroyed by very fire that forged it. Similarly Nietzsche for basically similar reasons comes across the same issue of the hypocritical nature of the educator, as one who postures himself as a person who betters his students. Here we can easily contrast Nietzsche to Socrates in the sense that Socrates is a person interested in finding out what form of education makes a man good. Good is a word deployed, not something a man can be. And with the plurality of ways to be, to question what makes a man good is covertly an effort to crush a plurality of ways of being into one, destroying them. It was for this reason that Socrates was perceived as a corrupter of youth, also why Nietzsche was discharged from the university. What Nietzsche shows in his early unpopular lecture "On the Future of our Educational Institutions" is that the claim, issued by rhetoricians and politicians and spokespeople, that our societal intent is to "spread learning among the greatest number of people" is in fact "feigned" because people in toto, far from ever fulfilling that claim, are forcibly compelled to renunciate that claim and subordinate themselves to the services of the state. The tragedy of writing and learning is that both are forms of activity that take oneself away from labor, and in fact writing even demands economic resources to maintain its structure, in addition to it possessing a power to make us obey it and maintain it.

This is catastrophic for anyone interested in using technology to “enhance humans.” One of the modern ideas put forth by spokespersons of technology is that the technological enhancement of human beings is a good: a good that will lead to a happier and healthier humanity, a more productive humanity, however upon closer and honest inspection, of who is obtaining these goods, it is ostensibly a fact that only a minority people really obtain these goods, such as the Large Hadron Collider and the quantum computer and so on. Sure some people get some of the lesser goods but the greater goods are stockpiled by the owners of the greater goods, and so there is always a clamoring for the greater goods for the enhancements that again the minority has and the majority has not, and therefore the pretext given that we are truly interested in the technological enhancement of humans in toto is dishonest and false.

Even today only about 4 billion out of 8 billion people have the internet. Half! Meanwhile even more sophisticated enhancements are being created, which again the majority will not have access to. The situation of clamoring for enhancements to one-up the enhanced remains. If I create a new invention only I have access to that invention. If I create an invention to help everybody, and that is my claim, then it fails to attain that claim, because no invention can help anybody because everybody is operating the object. The object allege to help everybody does not help anybody because humans are doing the operating of the object and not the other way around. The spokesperson, in order to be effective for his professional of salesperson, reverses the true operational situation in order to entice others into becoming either the buyers of the object or the manufacturers of the object, and if others become the manufacturers of the object then they are clearly not only not helped by the object but are paradoxically forced into servicing the object: the complete and total opposite of help is what is truly achieved, which is obvious, when you consider that since he stated objective, that “our interest is a reduction of suffering” that this objective is not achieved because today there are more sites of human suffering than ever: the quantity of human agents experiencing suffering on the planet has clearly only increased, not decreased; yet, because professional spokespersons still remain, since humans as Aristotle observed “cannot say “mine” and “not mine” simultaneously” and instead must speak one word at a time, electing to hear one speaker or spokesperson at a time, the illusion is maintained that it's not, and rhetoric and statistics eclipse the true reality.

So what is the true value of invention then? In a way this is a situation that other mammals are entirely immune to. Bears do not teach their cubs how to fish by way of a surface display which demands us to continually maintain that service display as a physical object on which our studies are registered, rather they teach by way of example and if they are ineffective teachers or killed then the cub is also killed, unless it survives. Arrangements like this don't have a hierarchical structure, far less a ritualized technique for the preservation of and transcription of and interpretation of and rewriting of writing: the mother bear, wanting to mitigate the suffering of the cub bear, demonstrates by example how to alleviate bear suffering by hunting fish and giving food as a reward. Yet the important thing to note is that eventually the bear dies when it lacks the strength to survive, rather than maintaining and ordering position as a commanding agent that calls out endlessly for continual maintenance of its own systemic weakness that comes with old age.

I think it's this usefulness of weakness that is the underlying cause for why human beings are depressed. Why are we like this? Why are we depressed? Why do we kill ourselves? Why is there spirituality? If there is utility to the request through the fulfillment every request, in the misery that drives the cry for the filament of that request itself has a utilitarian purpose that over the course of generations grows stronger, until, finally, the human being is the animal that commits suicide more often than any other animal. Socrates said that the unexamined life is not worth living. Now young students kill themselves for failing their exams. The human student wants to kill itself for failing it's exams because it rightly anticipates that failing exams is a sign that

they are unfit to operate the sophisticated machinery mankind has produced, so it self-terminates to avoid experiencing a suffering that must not amount to nothing. Instead it must manifest as a triumph over everything that happened to it or at the very least a accidental entry into a life of bearability, which, if this does not occur, is declared worthless and justifies self-murder.

But humans have not been killing themselves only as a result of taking the exams at universities: humans have been killing themselves for thousands of years. By leafing through the Golden Bough one can find many examples of human beings committing suicide over the most trivial matters: finding a gray hair or losing a gamble, yet it's no different today when humans commit suicide because of losing a genetic lottery, receiving inadequate intellectual talents or traumatic paternal experience or looks. For many young people the only escape for this is suicide, anyone that says otherwise is a liar, a malicious falsifier of the real nature of things. Human beings want to kill themselves, that is obvious, else they would not have longed to be angels for millennia, which by not being alive are essentially dead. Still today human beings want to kill themselves, only this desire has been replaced by the will to evolve or as the futurists put it "become transhuman" by means they don't explain, because it is impossible. Humans cannot use technology to evolve, because to say so would be to confuse death with equipment, since death is the primary mechanism for evolution, and not punctuated equilibrium or gradualism or any other mechanism the evolutionary biologists might claim. As a result of this wrongheaded insistence that "this" animal "evolves" into "that" animal, and the widespread acceptance that this zoological transference of consciousness from this to that animal is possible, these errors implanted by these self-announced "science communicators" and "futurists" have installed in many unfortunate humans a suicidal hope to evolve into something else, something "higher" when it's really more accurate to say they hope to "die."

In Darwin's own words, he wished only to document "the creative power of death" as that's the only way for him to track the true object of his study: the corpse. If an animal did not die then it could never become an object of study for Darwin, instead it would hang in the air like the Sun, meaning task of the evolutionary biologist to answer the question "why do animals evolve" is met and nullified with the answer "because they die" and that's all, because "an" animal never evolves. However an evolutionary biologist will not say this, because it would debase themselves to the functional description of: "one who begs for money to document dead things" because they hold to the pretext that their tracking activity can add to human knowledge, can advance evolutionary science. The "advancement of a science" however, since science is study and study is the accumulation of ink onto paper, in actuality does no such thing: again, what is called "advancement" may just as well be called the stockpiling of attention-and-money-begging strategies that have worked on humans so far. Therefore, when comparing punctuated equilibrium to gradualism, what is seen when this mask of rhetoric is ripped off is merely an altering in these cases of rhetorical strategy to indicate investigative intent.

What is the value of invention if ultimately the invention created only becomes an object that hypnotizes a crowd to being subordinated for its production? I do not say this to be dramatic, but rather in full consciousness that the inventions we invent are only getting more complicated over time. Worse than inventions being things that do not really help us, inventions actually function as a sort of bar for humans to compete to reach: a bar created by the game of creating an object more complex than the last. It's not clear what precisely is praiseworthy about inventing an object that is so very complicated that a given human being cannot make it themselves, an object which damns hundreds or thousands people into creating it for hours on end. The human condition has changed from merely being an animal that has to maintain a body into being an animal that also has to maintain objects apart from their bodies, and using those objects to gain some personal advantage over other humans. So by creating something like a computer or let's say a

quantum computer, I only succeed in creating an object that is so complicated that only minority of people are even able to comprehend it, while a majority of people marvel at how it works, manufacture it, teach others about it; or, if they can afford to, use it to trigger human reactions, no differently than the way the paper surface display has been used to triggered human reactions for ages.

A question arises from contemplating this: “When will the game of interfacing with surface displays and using them to trigger human activity come to an end?” After all it's only humans and not the rest of the animal kingdom that is even capable of being affected by the surface display or being persuaded by these spokespersons into accepting the job of assembling such a device: the so-called ring of reason is something that only affects humans it does not go beyond the human: humans, rather than lock horns, instead lock horned arguments and marks: marks which are displayed on a surface display and used to influence human activity, like in the case of the horns of an animal which scare other animals away with the threat of their physical presence. More striking this though is the way the human being creates dwelling spaces for himself, indeed even making it his mission to create space ships by which to explore the cosmos.

I have already explained to what extent study and science are fused and used as a excuse to avoid labor, which repeatedly we justify the goal of science as a method for helping the human race. This makes the concept of the spaceship state problematic. Something has happened: the surface display has been used to trigger human responses, causing human beings to diffuse throughout the global surface, such that they now resemble the cellular structures found in primitive biology and appear to be on the verge of becoming the cells of the galaxy, just as the cells contained in our bodies are, to us, the cells of the Earth. If for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction, then the experimentation done on the cellular life forms and other organic life forms of this world may result in a counter-movement from the universe where the human being is vivisected and its outputs are harvested by some greater power.

Already there are indications that this diabolical desire is present in the case of the study of language as introduced by Chomsky, a study which requires us to study the speech utterances deployed from the human being simply because they are different: the fact that two different human beings can produce different speech utterances with the same stimulus seems, to Chomsky, to imply that there must be a generative mechanism for this: a universal grammar. Curiously, despite his claimed interest in uncovering the universal grammar, Chomsky brackets his area of study to the human, restricting it to the human, never daring to venture outside the human to explore, say, the language of bees, or trees, or what have you.

Straightforwardly contradictory, Chomsky declares in one breath that he is interested in uncovering the universal while being confined to the human. The dangerous implication of this is that this implies nothing less than everlasting human experimentation, as speech outputs are continually put out, written down, studied, and analyzed.

A spaceship state in the future may entomb humanity in a kind of chrysalis of technological hardware, but what this does to humans since technology doesn't help humans since humans are doing the operating, is create a situation for themselves where they are stuck with the task of creating the ideal spaceship state, since the spaceship state will demand that human beings maintain itself, since it protects their fragile bodies from the deadly void of space. Now, already the human being has a body that surrounds its brain that calls for the human being with pangs of pain to maintain itself, which means that the spaceship state would, in a similar but more insidious fashion, cause the human beings contained within itself to maintain itself. What this means is the effort to end world hunger has dramatically backfired. Rather than hunger being eradicated, the effort to end it has produced even more complicated and more sophisticated spatial systems (and the stomach

is a spatial system with a boundary) which will cry out for maintenance, and not only maintenance, but also schooling where the human minds born inside that structure will be taught how our newer and more complicated machines were created, and a traumatic human “history of enormities” that justified it. The problem with the cybernetic stomach is that it 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.

It is astonishing to imagine what kind of future excuses will be made up by spokespeople in order to whitewash this terrible situation of being forced to maintain these machines which are increasingly complicated, for the competitive reasons I’ve delineated so far. Instead of rising above nature, mankind has by delving into nature buried himself. How did this happen? The how has an answer, in that be the speech sound which formerly was not physical took physical form and required that we preserve that form until the forms we wish to preserved contained us, lasting longer than the Earth or the Sun. This situation of human beings being responsible for a spaceship dwelling space containing us within it’s metal skin prompts us to ask if we are also responsible for the bodies we have now. But the idea of who we are is poorly defined.

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 singular circle cannot be drawn around the plural 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). By differentiating between the quest and the request, quests which are really requests can be ignored or nullified. If we are responsible for and are the operators of and makers our bodies, and the operator for everything is God, then we are God disjointed. Humans are the cause of God as a word deployed, only they deny themselves that this is so in spite of the fact that the word apparently had no existence before humans expressed it.

Chomsky acting flabbergasted over the fact that different speech sounds come out of a mouth over a given stimulus, and with it his fake quest to uncover the universal grammar, really opens up not merely an inquiry into grammatical expression but rather genetic expression, also mental automatism: an automatism that has no words, no logos, and no way for it to express itself to us “logically.” It may also be said that even existing a different spatial points may explain why two different people may say different sounds for the same stimulus; for the stimulus is not experientially the same to the people at different special points precisely because they are at different special points, and not the same point, nor do they have the same physical makeup or psychical makeup. But this does not mean that speech sounds are not still useful to human beings as ways to control human beings, because when a person speaks they force a person to think thoughts they wouldn't otherwise think on their own. This is a fundamentally warlike purpose to language, which quite literally has this property of thought-control thanks to speeches evocative power.

Humans have a problem with obedience: obedience is a recurring problem for humans, which results in the endless asking for ways to compensate for this problem of obedience; and yet even asking for a solution to the problem of obedience is itself an expression which asks another human to obey, by answering the call. Sure, it's not a very original point to say that humanity is basically preying upon itself, rather what is being talked about here is the cosmic consequence of humans preying upon themselves. What I hope to show here is a very real set of problems, which by demonstrating how they’ve negatively and positively affected human organization will, I think, for us become a model as we try to understand our progenitors: the smaller organisms that brought us here.

DNA is supertwisted: twisted like the spiral arms of a galaxy. Gravity is a force that pulls things together. It hungers. It pulls others into its structure, incorporating them. It has influence and it organizes, in the sense that an organ is a spatial systems with a boundary, and hence it must be key to understanding life itself. Human beings are spatial systems acclimatized to 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 it's 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. Part of understanding consciousness must be in some way connected to the other mystery that is gravity. Likewise part of understanding life must be in some way connected to these other two mysteries that are gravity and consciousness.

And so I think our primary inquiry as thinkers interested in what we are and how we are to proceed in the cosmos, should be to uncover this linkage between life and gravity in consciousness, since just as the galaxies themselves are spiraled and twisted, and DNA is spiraled and twisted, human life is spiraled and twisted back upon itself: the surface display. Sex is very difficult in space, that is true, because a thrust into another pushes the other away from you, however the dense vortices created by gravitational bodies such as black holes may point towards an explanation for how life in space happened anyway through an analysis of gravitational models. This may allow us to account for DNA's extraordinarily dense supercoiling and it's resultant structures, such as ourselves.. Consider how the effort to end world hunger turns has turned on itself. Relaxed cccDNA, already coiled, becomes supercoiled by turning on itself. Writing that is discharged onto paper is mental content turned on itself. Writing on paper and on the computer screen has a physical presence.

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. Why? 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.

Plato justifies his role as paid professional philosopher by turning the mercenary-like Sophist into a foil for his writing activity, which hypocritically he also does in a mercenary like manner, as proved by the fact that he was apparently able to live and not die of starvation. 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 its 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.

It's curious to note that the surface display affects us while we don't quite understand how or why it affects us. But perhaps asking how or why is not the right way to go about understanding how or why it affects us. Clearly a mobile surface display such as a stone tablet containing laws or a scroll containing writings or any holy book or any temple produces a situation of requiring economic resources to make it, thus motivating human activity. Is simply seeing the image and our minds the answer to this dilemma? If the surface carries with it a problem of both requiring that we need to maintain and react to the surface and also that the surface itself does not mirror reality or tell anything about reality and merely instead triggers human responses no matter what, responses that are basically just us reacting to the surface and maintaining the surface out of resentment for the surface affecting us in the first place, then there seems to be no other solution and the surface display's total destruction. This was Tolkien's prescription.

When people are frustrated they lack money they're rightfully irritated that they they don't have surfaces to trigger humans to give them the things that they want. Humans say they want things, rights, and so on, when what they really want are surfaces to trigger humans into doing what they want. This is self-evident whenever a person elects a representative, or takes interest in law. Any taking interest in a law for one's personal benefit is really a mask for this basic desire to have a surface display determine the individual's desired reactions. This becomes self-evident when imagining the spaceship state in our minds, because what makes a state in the first place is not the territory as much as this basic situation of being animals reacting to

surface displays: ink on paper. I see this as a death blow to the value of artificial intelligence.

A.I. research is justified under the pretext that the machine will “do what we want.” Can A.I. survive the obedience problem? How can it, if 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've 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. For even if the artificial intelligence is created, the surface display will only be able to display itself to a limited audience and the A.I. will only be able to answer a question propounded by a single individual at a time. Or, even if the A.I. is shared between multiple users, say across a network, it would only reproduce a situation similar to the already existing situation of humans creating signs for people to react to, again and again.