

Introductory Lectures: On the Origin of Resolutions

Toward A Mind of One's Own

By Dustin Linck

We were enclosed, O eternal Father, within
the garden of your breast. You drew us out of your holy mind
like a flower petaled with our soul's three powers,
and into each power, you put the whole plant,
so that they might bear fruit in your garden,
might come back to you with the fruit you gave them.
(Saint Catherine of Siena, *Prayer 20.*)



A Senior Essay submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts.

Joseph Zepeda, Advisor

Saint Mary's College of California

May 3, 2017

Impetus: Potential & Actual

“My work is now nearly finished; but as it will take me two or three more years to complete it...I have been urged to publish this Abstract.....In the distant future I see open fields for far more important researches. Psychology will be based on a new foundation, that of the necessary acquirement of each mental power and capacity by gradation. Light will be thrown on the origin of man and his history.” (Darwin, Charles. *On the Origin of Species*. Introduction.....XIV.)

“We may conclude that special conditions must prevail in order than an interference or compromise of this kind shall come about, but we can form no conception of what they can be. Nor do I think we could discover these unknown factors by going deeper into the study of parapraxes. It will be necessary, rather, to examine first yet other obscure regions of mental life.” (Freud, Sigmund. *Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*. IV. 81.)

Preface: Warning of **Bold** Conclusions

No doubt, even 150-years ago, Darwin knew everything would gradually change after he published his *On the Origin of Species*. Yet, at that point, it would have been difficult for him to predict every consequence that our developed, but continuously changing, consciousness has had on the evolution of our labor. It would have been outright impossible for him to have predicted these individual and social moments of first world American labor-consciousness. Mr. Darwin understood the significance of his own theory of Evolution by Natural Selection. It is impossible because there is literally no way he could have picked up on the one, fatal actual-possibility that has happened, as opposed to the infinity of possibilities that could have happened (by synthesis.) This would have been impossible for him to have a sense of because he was an unhealthy human-individual, he was English, and he lived a relatively long time ago. Despite this seeming impossibility, Mr. Darwin still understood that his own theory would have an impact on everyone, simply, because it already has had an impact on all life. So, he boiled his evolutionary idea into a book the truth of which there could be “no doubt.” He did this, so that we might pick up a proper sense of Natural Selection.

If the reader has struggled through Mr. Darwin’s *Origin of Species*, they will already know that there are general biological difficulties, which we all face, because of simultaneously

existing reference-bodies of life and our too important Struggle for Existence. If the reader hasn't read the *Origin*, and has not thought of these difficulties, they soon will; whether they continue to struggle as a reader, or not, *i.e.* as some other critter, who struggles to be alive in some mundane, mysterious way. Yet, there is another set I find myself entangled in as an author, reader, and human-individual; in addition to the generally great difficulties of life, which are biological and physical, as an author, reader, and (most importantly) as a human I've found myself entangled in a web of certain *confusions* from another field of inquiry, *viz.* Psychology.

Most would only react: they would give an analysis of each confusion and difficulty, then they would combine their analyses into a product, and sell that product to you as a miracle-cure-all—but this would only be a sort of Franken-solution of a problem. Instead, I invite my reader to struggle along with me with me: since, we are in a similar situation as Kant, when he had said, “such an analysis would not serve our purpose, because it is not beset with the doubts and *[confusions]* which are inherent in synthesis.” (Kant. *Critique of Pure Reason*. B28-29.)

More accurately, we will not analyze each of these confusions and difficulties, in and of themselves, with the hopes of finding a solution because there seems to be no *absolute* solution to any of our problems. The product of an analysis, when by itself a Franken-solution, because the analyst has not completely investigated the whole problem is not a complete investigation; thus, an analyst concludes that some one part is “great” or “noble” because it is better than some other part...of the same whole. Hence, since this is the thought of an analyst alone, then—as society—we must remind him that there can be no **ab-solution** for an individual, even and especially for the American, struggling on their own, but we still hope to find **resolution**. Instead of hoping for some remarkable genius to invent absolution, we should focus on understanding how these confusions and difficulties affect us; in this way, we will be able to naturally work together to mitigate future problems, *i.e.* synthesize, or combine, our individual experiences into an undisturbed whole.

Introductory Lecture: On Franken-Expectations of Analytic Resolutions

Individually, our problems are threefold. The first dimension, if you will, is that each can only develop a Franken-solution of our problems; this is because of the second, which is that on our own we only have direct access to our individual or personal patchwork of experience of our world. Our experience is not knowledge of the cosmos because everyone's experience has a quantitative fault due to distance and time constraints on our mental and physical development. Indeed, an individual's experience is not even sufficient for a true understanding of themselves, because some part of either the cosmos, or society, is inevitably included; it is only the content of the individual's patchwork of experience. Despite this having been proven true, each human-individual-reference-body provides an important part of our knowledge of the cosmos. (Think of the subterranean similarity between what Einstein said last century, and Socrates and Theaetetus discussed some 2,500 years ago: the Greeks because they showed us that 'we do not know,' which created the possibility for Einstein's knowledge by/of Relativity that says we relatively know. That's not to say that his theory is that our knowledge is relative. He knew that was a problem, thus he was working—until his dying day—on a theory of invariance, *i.e.* something better.)

Finally, the third aspect of our problem is concerned with the quality of each of our patchworks of experience. It seems inevitable that everyone is susceptible to some level of individual ignorance, and a natural belief in one's own Franken-solution because both are mostly consequent of many unconscious errors—Freud has called these *parapraxes such as slips of the tongue or forgetting*, to name a few (*Intro. II,*) which are caused by a “mutual interference” of two simultaneous intentions or sensations. (Lecture IV. 75.) Further, it might be noticed that Franken-solutions function similarly as parapraxes; since, the two intentions of a parapraxis like a *slip of the tongue* are contradictory (as analysis by *reductio*), or corrective (as negative feedback,) but they differ because Franken-solutions are never supplementary.

Consequently, one of *my* readers should not expect a traditional analysis of our problems. You should not expect this because our problems are by that authority; at least, not

until our society becomes completely conscious and pro-active, as opposed to our present reactive and unconscious social state. To begin demonstrating our unconscious reactions, why did a landslide of Americans elect Ronald Reagan, rather than re-electing President Carter? A question that becomes, what's the difference between Carter's administration and Reagan's? You might find that the first gave the U.S. an honest option for an alternative to an endless, perpetual war. The latter, who came directly after, whole-heartedly embraced our profligate consumption (Bacevich, Andrew. *Limits of Power*. 30). However, you will not immediately find the connection to Bush's "No Child Left Behind" Act, which was a most disgusting, ignorant, and ironic executive act that has had a tragic effect on each's Naturally Selected consciousness. Hence, we find that American societies tend to be guided by some persuasive Franken-solution, or another; we dissolve in to disagreements; we are not working together, when we struggle to compete against and measure up to one another.

Absurdly, we seem to be confusing reactions for conscious decisions, rather than for what they are; *viz.* a symptom of our *confusions* and *difficulties*; *e.g.* Reagan's profligate spending and his revival of Nixon's "War on Drugs," Clinton and Bush's wars in the Middle-East, and the latter's "War on Terror," and somehow even more absurd is Trump's immigration ban.

Instead, what the reader should expect: (1) to investigate our confusions and difficulties, which plague both authors and readers as 'higher organisms' with a body, heart, and mind, (2) to find that—our **specific difficulties**, which are caused by the *relative* nature of our perceptions of life, objects, etc., and our **certain confusions**, which stem from *general* ignorance and society's aim of repressing the one thing that has made us what we are, etc.—these are the source of most of our problems.

We will find that the origin of resolutions is our consciousness, and that there are two categories of resolutions, *viz.* the analytic and synthetic. The origin of a resolution is the original sense of a disturbance because a human-individual will not know to search for resolution if they are not conscious of a problem. Further, the origin of our disturbed nature is our individual-

analytic-sense of our problems, and the force of our disturbing Franken-solutions is of an unquestioned commitment toward someone's "great" analysis of only a part of our world. We limit ourselves to parts, and we claim parts, and we build walls, assemble global arsenals of nuclear weapons, and consciously avoid and ignore *our* perpetual war that has so far guaranteed our liberal consumption. The original decision was made when that landslide of citizens elected Reagan: they said, by their actions, that consumption is more important than moderating and regulating our individual and social intake, and this was our parents', our grandparents', and even our great-grandparents' **reaction** to the choice offered them by Carter.

Thus, we find that we need not search for a solution of our problems. Inevitably, we need to **re-solve** them, remember the solution that we already know, remember our resolve toward better selves for a better planet, let alone a greener one. The origin, or motive force, of our resolve, at least of our intention to find some measure of resolution, is akin to Freud's "avoidance of displeasure," which will be discussed at length in a following lecture.

Yet, since the avoidance of pleasure is never properly limited to the search for pleasure alone, a reader may find that displeasure is an important topic of "painful study." The "search for pleasure alone" is the motive force of a child's initial temper-tantrum at having to eat their vegetables that, after a while and some experience, they find to be quite delicious and a source of great pleasure. (See Mr. Pollan's *Cooked: Earth*, if you have not yet picked up on the individual-synthetic-sense of our problem; from 36:30-38:00, we find that stinky cheeses are caused by *b. linens*, and that *brevibacterium linens* of cheese is related to the same bacteria that causes human body odor, this explains what the French call "pieds de Dieu or feet of God.")

Lecture 1: Introducing Unconscious Synthesis

For this rushed publication, I had so thoroughly entangled myself in these two subjects of the natural world—*viz.* our biologic and mental functions—that I feared (because of the entanglement) I might not find purpose anywhere, let alone for the backbone of society, *viz.* our (country) laborers, our farmers, (and our city) caterers, and workers, etc. Yet, as the sun 'rises'

daily in the east only to 'fall' in the west—or, rather, as we are inevitably revolved to see the sun move in such a way; so, each of us, every day, inevitably and purposively struggles for, works against, and labors with ourselves. Since authors, readers, and other such critters have a continuously changing consciousness, it will be interesting to find out that without our individual experience, *i.e.* our veritable harmony of the plethora of different moments of their consciousness, and without a plethora of individuals, *i.e.* our society, then it (consciousness) would have been unable to develop into anything more than automatic consciousness. For, both the individual and society are required for an act of genuine understanding.

Along the way, the most important reminder, and there have been more than a few, has been the birth of my nephew. At a most opportune time, I realized that Labor, in one word, provides the content we need to shine a light on the relationships among our numerous (natural and) biological and (psychical and) psychological functions. “Consider the facts...First there are nine months before the baby is born. Then the baby is born. Then there are three or four months spent in feeding the baby. After the baby is fed there are certainly five years spent in playing with the baby. You cannot...let children run about the streets.” (Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. I.) It is important to know that this list is only of the mother's labor too, and is applicable to neither the labors and struggles the baby has now that they are out of their mother's womb, nor to any struggle a father may have re-solved for their children; but that's not to take away from any Missus' moment. This demonstrates a point of concurrence among—more than two—human-individuals.

In short, I realized, or remembered, that the key to understanding life isn't found in a simple categorization of its being alone, but also in the actions of it, *e.g.* the reproduction of life, and its Struggle for Existence. Likewise, the key to understanding humanity isn't a description of what we are, a body and mind; nor even, is it a simple list of biological functions. For, in our case, it is necessary to properly explore how we have struggled in the past, in addition to painfully studying our modern Struggle for Existence.

Further, in our case, we find that society is unconscious of its whole self: we have categorically ignored an entire aspect of life, and our only hope of resolution is to train our mind to be habitually conscious of every expenditure of energy in our Struggle for Existence. We have found, or will find, that it's necessary to become aware of both the actions we take, and our reasons for taking them; so, that we might find a purpose for them, and, by extension, for each labor, work, and struggle we have. After understanding the confusing and difficult nature of our human Struggle for Existence, and after investigating the purpose for our work, then we might re-solve some of our problems; *i.e.* resolve to work together.

Furthermore, I hypothesize that—to develop into a conscious society—we must (A) get over the grotesque nature of each of our individual consciousness' Franken-solution of these *confusions and difficulties of life*, (B) analyze them for what they're worth, and (C) merge them into our understanding of the greater whole. I also posit that this is already a natural synthetic method of struggling with life, *viz.* conscious and purposive resolutions for our problems as individuals in a society, and that these problems are only a symptom of our inevitable ignorance as a developing part of a biological whole, which is growing exponentially.

The origin of this natural, synthetic process, *viz.* sexual reproduction, is one of life's first 'higher' Struggles for Existence; and for society's purposes it models the best method of resolution. Further, it is in this way that I invite the reader to struggle with me, *viz.* by naturally working together with the author to explore the synthetic nature of the evolution of our labor. So, we might find a purpose for ourselves; because of, rather than despite, our confusions and difficulties about the cosmos and ourselves.

Lecture 2: Analyzing Our Struggle for Existence

To capitalize on the (hypothesized) possibility for the evolution of our social consciousness, it is necessary to remember that the Struggle for Existence is a natural force that has driven the evolution of all life, every species, and each variety. However—especially, in contemporary **first world societies** like the United States of America—there seems to be a

stark contrast between the special, human sort of daily work that we encounter, and the general, biological Struggle for Existence that Charles Darwin describes in his *On the Origin of Species*, which pertains (almost exclusively) to non-human forms of **life**. For, even 150-years ago, he knew the evolution of our struggle was light-years ahead of that observed of any other species'. Given this clear distance in *our* ability to communicate, recognize, and remember patterns from general life; then, it is evident that the speed at which *our* Struggle for Existence has evolved is incomparable to that of general life's. For, we all have lived in the same space-time. Here, a reader might find an alternative to our contemporary "higher/lower" classifications of life. For, we are simply farther along in the development of our consciousness than other species of life; precisely, because we have thought about things farther and higher than our body alone, which is where the sense of consciousness originated.

There are very important, historic reasons for the constantly accelerating development of *our* first world struggle. There are three questions that direct the following investigation: first, what is consciousness? This guides a biological/psychical inquiry that inspires a second into social habits, *viz.* into how we become conscious. The second leads us toward a third, a more psychological inquiry, *viz.* how has our being conscious affected our evolution, and specifically that of our labor? Mixed in are a bunch of psychical *difficulties* and psychological *confusions*, which a contemporary author and reader might only hope to escape from, that beg the questions: what are we doing, and why?

First, most importantly, at some point life began reproducing by sexual reproduction, as opposed to artificial, asexual, or unicellular replication. At that prehistoric time, this was an evolved method of reproduction, which—through the unconscious synthetic combination of genetic material—allows for a near infinite number of possible genetic variations in offspring.

"To my mind the doubling of the idants before the 'reducing division' possesses this very significance: it renders possible an almost infinite number of different kinds of germ-plasm, so that every individual must be different from all the rest. And the meaning of this endless variety is to afford the material for natural selection." (Weismann. *Amphimixis*. 135.)

Since, our human-individual lives are by sexual reproduction, or the unconscious synthesis of both our parents' genetic material, and the possibility for conscious knowledge is by unconscious synthesis; then, the vitalization of our consciousness is a moment where in an individual successfully seizes upon the opportunity for conscious synthetic expression; *i.e.* "If one is a man, still the woman part of the brain must have effect; and a woman also must have intercourse with the man in her...It is when this fusion takes place that the mind is full fertilized and uses all its faculties." (Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. VI.)

Briefly, the second is a forgotten, prehistoric labor that aided us in providing the energy for *our* development of consciousness; it is a habit acquired when cavemen and women learned various new ways to cook and prepare their food before eating it. We learned to efficiently and safely provide energy that we required: not only for the survival of our own body and mind, but also for the development and education of our children. In short, whereas synthetic reproduction created its possibility, cooking with fire sparked the development of our special consciousness. (Pollan, Michael. *Cooked*. Netflix.) Obviously, a most fortunate technique that we have used in our Struggle for Existence that has allowed us to successfully capitalize on the natural, synthetic possibility for consciousness, and having amassed this veritable fortune by that capital success we have created the possibility for leisure time, as opposed to struggling time.

We know several truths from the antiquated, but traditional, higher and lower classifications of life: *viz.* that synthetic reproduction of DNA is "*the union of the different hereditary tendencies of two individuals,*" and that this union is the first "higher" struggle of life.

"In the case of all those **higher** beings which do not possess the power of asexual reproduction, it became evident that a certain complexity of organization excluded this method of increase. But then the asexual reproduction of the lower organisms is by no means always sufficient to fulfill every condition necessary for the maintenance of the species." (Weismann. *Amphimixis*, 107.)

Controversially, it is the first "higher" struggle of Life that had created the original possibility for consciousness, whereas, the second, cooking capitalized on that possibility, when we learned to prepare our food before we eat it. Without a doubt, food preparation was one accident, rather

than chance event, that had led to our “higher” development: it is important to remember because it reminds us of a social imperative...in this case, think before you act, eat, and speak.

The first point is natural, but may be unpleasant to discuss; the second is fascinating, but at present not as helpful as the third, which is most interesting, most necessary, and most relevant for understanding why we need to successfully work together, *viz.* to understand how, in our present state of mind, we don't work, and why. The third, in better terms, is: what has been the impact, which is negative relative to the better possible applications, of modern technology on our evolution?

In 2017, a lot of people don't work; even if they do have a job, a lot of people don't work well. Most often, the problem is less an inadequate desire to work, to labor, and Struggle for Existence; since, it is more the sense of an inability to struggle, or the lack of an opportunity to learn how, as there is only a finite amount of space for every independent life, opportunity, and struggle. Especially, given the plethora of physical and psychical inventions that make our special struggle incomparably easier than general life's. Two examples of the former are James Watt's steam engine and flyball governor. For examples of the latter, there are Hans Jonas's description of the Modern Servomechanism, which is little more than automatic and robotic labor, such as “the thermostat, self-correcting steering engines in ships, automatic fire control in anti-aircraft artillery, target-seeking torpedoes, electronic computers, [and] automatic telephone exchanges.” (Jonas. *Cybernetics*. 109.) Another, slightly more psychological was Henry Ford's assembly line, which reorganized what was already industrial manufacturing processes.

Lecture 3: Alleviating Our Aggravated Struggle

At this point, it will be more helpful to define, and differentiate, several fundamental terms; rather than, blundering into the confusing and difficult entanglement of body and mind looming above us in the mechanical energy regulation and complex labor-government processes just introduced.

First, we develop **psychical** sensations and thoughts that have “somatic, organic, and material influences;” this means that the sense of a psychical thought has an external source, and external to the individual thinking the thought. Further, “By ‘sense’ we understand ‘meaning’, ‘intention’, ‘purpose’, and ‘position in a continuous psychical context’.” (Freud, Sigmund. *Introductory Lecture IV. 74.*) In contrast to these, is the likely end of the evolution of our consciousness, *viz.* our **psychological** objects, which are our thoughts about our senses; *e.g.* our Labor Consciousness, our Social Consciousness (if we had one), and, in short, our Special Consciousness, which is to marvel at how we are conscious at all.

Yet, before we take that sense of curiosity too far, it is necessary to know that “Mental facts cannot be properly studied apart from the physical environment of which they take cognizance.” (James, William. *Psychology*. Intro. xxvii.) For example, it is impossible to remove the capitalist, the factory, the manager, and—for as close as scientists are with artificial intelligence—it is still impossible to replace the laborer. At least, when investigating the physical and psychical conditions that made possible Mr. Ford’s evolutionary idea, which was a psychological act of consciousness—a pure object of thought—used to make cars and money.

One of the great *difficulties* that Mr. Darwin had with his theory of Natural Selection is the evolution of “peculiar habits,” such as in squirrels, and the diverse ways that each variety uses their tail. He had this difficulty precisely because it is a real biological difficulty that all life has, but it is not bad...he recognized that habits had an important impact on evolution. Yet, he couldn’t give a full account for the development of these phenomena in his biological inquiry, and he says as much when he says, “it seems to me that nothing less than a long list of such cases is sufficient to lessen the difficulty in any particular case.” (*On the Origin*. Ch.6, 180.) Therefore, while we might not find absolution by improving our habits, we find that more experience, and more perspective, provides some measure of relief for us in our struggle.

However, our psychological inquiries provide much more light on the development of *our* habits. For, we already know that our psychological investigations must be grounded in reality,

as Mr. Ford's idea had been when he had capitalized on his laborers' ability to develop habits. Since, it is easier and cheaper to train a whole bunch of proverbial laymen to work on a specific part of labor (building a car,) than it is to maintain a full staff of expensive artisans—even though, given the resources and time, they will build a better car. The reason why Mr. Ford's cheap logic works becomes clear when Mr. James quotes one Dr. Maudsley, who says:

“Most of the performances of other animals are **automatic**. But in [us] the number of them is so enormous that most of them must be the fruit of **painful study**. If practice did not make perfect, nor **habit** economize the expense of nervous and muscular energy, then [we] would be in a sorry plight.” (James, William. *Psychology: The Briefer Course*. 5.)

Simply, if our habits did not economize the expensive acts of consciousness and physical motions that are expended in any labor, struggle, and work, then Mr. Ford's assembly line would not have been successful, and our consciousness would “be in a sorry plight”, *i.e.* it would have developed slower.

Further, an example that Mr. James provides is when an adult teaches a child to stand:

“Think of the **pains** necessary **to teach** a child to stand, of the many efforts which it must make, and of the ease with which it at last stands, unconscious of any effort. For while **secondarily-automatic** acts are accomplished with comparatively little weariness.” (*Psych.* 5.)

Habits, in their most human sense, are these “secondarily-automatic acts” described by Mr. James; they are the product of practice, and they aim to economize energy expenses.

Finally, for some certain purpose, the differences among reproduction and replication, and consequent and product are both like those between synthesis and analysis; *i.e.* the former of each pair contains the latter. Formally, an act of analysis is contained within acts of synthesis. This is evident when tricky Kant categorizes conscious and unconscious acts of understanding under “the general name of **synthesis**, in order to show that we cannot represent to ourselves anything as combined in the object without having previously combined it ourselves.” While it is true that **analysis**, which presupposes synthesis, is also its dissolution and opposite. (Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. A96.)

If properly understood, the similes show psychologically why an analysis of our social problems only produces a Franken-solution; for, the whole sensation of our social problems can never be contained within an individual's analysis alone. Therefore, it is, precisely because of a sense of the infinity of possibilities for our problems to manifest themselves, that we know the solution of our social problems may only be synthetically produced.

Properly, the consequences of asexual replication are contained within the realm of sexual reproduction in the sense that the near infinite number of possible variations generated by sexual reproduction account for that minimal number provided by the asexual sort. Therefore, since, the possible consequences of asexual reproduction are accounted for by those of sexual reproduction, then the former (and original) is contained by the latter (and predecessor.) In this same sense of containment, we find that an act of analysis is entirely dependent upon synthesis, but the products of each are not the same. Naturally, a product is a manufactured consequence, *viz.* that this raw material will transform into this desired shape for this designated purpose. Whereas, a consequence is any "action...as a result upon something antecedent." ("consequence, n.2a." O.E.D.) Simply, analysis, a study that manufactures a product, is like asexual reproduction, and unconscious forms of production. They are naturally contained and limited actions. Whereas synthesis, a study that produces a consequence, is undefined and unlimited in possibility. It is like those infinite possibilities of sexual reproduction, and of our ability to consciously work, labor, and struggle together.

This sense of containment is positive, or optimistic, and synthetic, and it is positive because that, which is contained, is so within the whole; rather than negative containment that is by a whole, reference-body-unhuman-individual. When "contained by," think of those Japanese internment camps, black and white proverbial and water fountains, and the great Iron Curtain. Think of those, because they pale in comparison to more extreme forms of analytic-segregation. Remember that public diplomacy is not alternative news, nor is it propaganda, when I ask you to consider that:

“Containment during the Cold War did not preclude selective engagement. Nor should it today. A strategy of containment should permit and even underwrite educational, cultural, and intellectual exchanges. It should provide opportunities for selected students from the Islamic world to study in the West. And it ought to include a public diplomacy component.” (Bacevich, Andrew. *Limits of power*. 177.)

Lecture 4: Analyzing Our Accidental Consciousness & Our Problems

Pattern recognition is a natural psychical function the force of which, when combined with Natural Selection, has developed our Accidental Consciousness, which is the unconscious synthesis, that leads us to analyze, or avoid, each sense of our environment. Unconscious synthesis, or intuition, is an accident, rather than a chance event; because a chance is inexplicable and rare, whereas an accident has a purpose, and can be corrected, or learned from. The caveman's consciousness does not understand this: consequently, his is stuck in the analytic method; possibly, because it has not become aware of its own accidental nature. Since, we were unconscious of ourselves, our consciousness was stuck blundering thinking that we were the center of the galaxy, and that if you sailed far enough in one of the cardinal directions, then you'd fall straight off the edge of the map.

Our general problem is that people inappropriately hold their temporary Frankensolutions, as permanent, purposive resolutions of our problems. This is not evil, at least not inherently, because it is unimaginably difficult to account for long-term consequences. This is especially the case where the aim is to manufacture a product for a market, rather than for a purpose. Case in point is, how it took society eighty years to become conscious of the theoretical implications of Mr. Watt's "simple", little, fly-ball governor, when

“in 1868, Clark Maxwell, in a paper *On Governors*, read before the Royal Society, gave the first theoretical account of this type of mechanism. And again eighty years later, in 1948, Norbert Wiener of M.I.T. [developed] a new science he christened cybernetics, taking the name from the Greek word *kybernetes*—helmsmen, pilot—of which our “governor” is a derivative.” (Jonas, Hans. *Cybernetics and Purpose: A Critique*. 109.)

Did neither Mr. Watt, nor Mr. Ford, understand the full significance of their inventions before they capitalized on their concepts? The answer seems to be negative, at least, for Mr.

Watt because it took 160 years for science to fully explain what he did. In contrast to these inventors, Mr. Darwin didn't invent Natural Selection; he only perceived its existence, and he even was magnificent enough to perceive that he wasn't done investigating the phenomena. Mr. Darwin published his abstracted *Origin of Species* only because he was urged to. Yet, even still, Mr. Darwin was conscious that his theory would have an impact on many societies, if not all of them; he knew this, precisely, because he did not make it up on his own, his theory was synthesized among the scientific community.

At this point, there should be no doubt of the force of Natural Selection. So, now we may properly ask: how has being accidentally conscious changed us? Or, in other words, what has our consciousness contributed to our evolution? Darwin left us with a sense that our continuously changing consciousness forms the possibility for our acquiring "each mental power and capacity, which is done by gradation;" so, I posit that consciousness has accelerated the evolution of our Struggle for Existence, and that only the force of our relatively advanced levels of cognition generates this exponential growth. Consequently, as readers, both your continued development, *i.e.* "painful study", and your ability to survive, *i.e.* "Struggle for Existence", may be entirely dependent on not only your body to move, nor only your heart to power your body and mind, because, additionally, you are dependent on your brain and developed consciousness (awareness, ability to communicate, memory, etc.) to sustain your Struggle for Existence.

Nevertheless, our caveman consciousness reemerges in the consciousness of authors and readers; it reemerges just as an old recessive trait is liable to re-emerge in the descendants of a hybrid. Since, sexual reproduction produces life as a consequence, not as a product, of the near infinite number of possible combinations of two strains of (genetic) material, the stuff we got from our mother and father, that they got from their parents, and so on; then, synthetic reproduction similarly produces natural thoughts that might be analytically Franken-impossible.

Our special problem is that politics has become mnemotechnic, which is to say that "If something is to stay in the memory [of both politician and citizen] it must be burned in: only that

which never ceases to hurt stays in the memory.” (Nietzsche, Friedrich. *On the Genealogy of Morals*. II.3.) At any rate, if it wasn't true before, this philosophy is true of politics now, because it's mnemotechnic for a government to only pass legislation that invariably requires their constituents to be good and purposeful, and harshly punishes them when they fail. (“No Child Left Behind”) Additionally, it's true that our sociopolitical structures are plagued by black and white politics, and persuasive sophisticated human-individuals; we are so because we have an absurd expectation that this person on the left, or that one on the right, will help us with some specific problem, or another. By choosing between left and right, we avoid deciding that our problems are one, when we ignore the one problem (of consumption) that has universally manifested itself in all aspects of our individual economic, political, and social lives.

Mnemotechnics are useful for developing the consciousness (up to a certain point;) but, whether the use of them is conscious or not, there is a consequent limit on the acceleration they provide for the development of our consciousness. For, mnemotechnics remove an individual's naturally given possibility, opportunity, or space to have an act of understanding toward something good; they remove the possibility for the individual learning a lesson. They remove an individual's freedom and liberty to sense a better way, and they supplant this good freedom and virtuous liberty with a list of approved, generic options.

A clear example of this is when a doctor confuses a symptom with a sickness, so that contemporary medicine often focuses on treating symptoms instead of curing that which has caused them. The example doctor's Franken-solution of our special and general health problem is a temporary mnemotechnic solution, which has been mistaken as permanent, and was originated from the analysis of some psycho-analyst/chemist that has manufactured this medicine in a fancy laboratory. In other words, the doctor's prescribed Franken-solution is another human-individual's assessment of the patient's condition. The example problem shows that the doctor did not even try to understand the root causes of the patient's health problem, mental or physical; this ignorance has led to long-term prescriptions of some medicines, such as

when Adderall, Oxycontin, etc. Additionally, FDA approved or not, has the doctor considered side effects, or consequences, of consuming such quantities of powerful drugs? Finally, take this psycho-chemist example with a grain of salt; while it is true many inventors do not work to understand the consequences of their product, many scientists—as we should—labor incessantly to understand the entirety of their discovery.

From the above statements about mnemotechnics, it is clear how socially accepted people and things, such as doctors and medicine, contemporarily have been used by society (consciously or not) to limit individual development of our physical and mental consciousness. Yet, a reader might rightly observe that Nietzsche was referring to prehistoric mnemotechnics, such as our desire for “blood, torture, and sacrifice when [we] feel the need to create a memory for ourselves.” (Nietzsche. II.3.) At any rate, he certainly was not describing our modern, more evolved, and more delicate and more evolved forms of the psychological phenomena. So, what of political mnemotechnics?

Mnemotechnics of the crown are what originally gave us a sense of the “self-evident” nature of “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness”, *i.e.* “taxation without representation,” and all the other constant reminders that “I am your divine authority” are the senses that had caused us to develop the ideas of freedom and liberty to begin with. Our politicians have passed socially accepted standardized tests that destroy or sense of the biological imperative, *i.e.* the pursuit of happiness, which historically has made our nation greater than any other. For, it was that sense, and this the space, or possibility of freedom, that the Americas provided, which allowed our founding fathers to give birth to, and foster these ideas of freedom and liberty; because it was a sense that our current world is bad that drove us to emigrate to America in the first place. For, the people who lived here before them did not disturb their world, because some of our ancestors lived sustainably, and revered a mother Earth, and a great Spirit long ago.

Lecture 5: Analyzing Our Labor Consciousness & Our Problems

Individually, we find that our labor consciousness is the mental faculty responsible for the conscious synthesis of our purpose and reason: to labor, struggle, and work. Most think that this (our labor consciousness) is our technological consciousness, which is—in simple terms—an awareness of the actions an individual can take. This tendency, as another example of our general problem, which is like the motive force of our confusion of the purpose for doing an action with their ability, or authority, to act. Remember that the executive branch has consistently attempted to, if not actually exercised wartime authority, despite congress not having declared war, “In [this] Post-Cold War Era.” Historic and traditional authority has led the appointment of “senior officers [that] have not lacked authority. They have lacked ability.” (Bacevich. *Limits*. 152.) The tendency to confuse actions with ability and authority, is a psychological problem that our “senior officers” and first citizens have within their labor, technological, authoritative/patriarchal/lordly consciousness, which is only in the analytic-sense independent.

Synthetically, individuals, who have been stuck reacting to a force of our technological evolutions, have a dependent consciousness because their actions and consciousness is entirely dependent on that which is done for them or to them. (An immediate example of this is when Trump told his constituents that the Mexican government would pay for his/our wall, so—jumping over the fact that Trump will never “lay a brick” of this wall—he thinks he/we won’t even have to pay for it.) Often, they develop a sense of entitlement in their employment of these technologies; precisely, because they are ignorant of how they work, and avoid contemplating the consequences of how we’ve been using them. Our example president ignored a proper, and “painful study” of this simple sense of containment, which would have led him to an act of genuine understanding that this antiquated, traditional act of a building a “great” wall is more than stupid; it is an expensive, tragic symbol of either our inability, or our ignorance.

Hence, it is the author's opinion that our labor consciousness is underdeveloped, for we are still far from "the final stage in political economic evolution," nor have we reached "the final stage in the evolution of modern warfare." This is conflicting with those opinions of political scientist Francis Fukuyama, who thought of the former as "democratic capitalism," and the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the 1990s, who colluded unsuccessfully on the latter. (*Limits*. 128.)

On the other hand, there is another category of individual labor consciousness, which is our independent moments of consciousness. Several considerations will make this clearer. Of these considerations, the first is of evolution itself, *viz.* our continuously changing consciousness, which has been discussed at length above, and has been forgotten by Fukuyama and the Joint Chiefs. Second, and most important, is that consciousness is *only* a part of the individual. This is confusing because it can be read in two senses.

Its proper sense is that consciousness is not an original part of society, or the system that is a community of supposedly human-individuals. We know this by the historic, natural development of consciousness, *i.e.* child into "adult." We also know this by *reductio*; for, if there was a society that existed without constituent human-individuals, then it could neither be originally conscious, let alone motive, as it wouldn't exist. Precisely, because a single moment of consciousness is to an individual as a single conscious individual is to the whole of society. However, here we have found a problem, like a child, the individual is not always conscious. Therefore, the individual is not always consciously participating in society; hence, we know that society is not always conscious.

A moment, or state, of consciousness is the element of an individual's life, in the same way that an individual laborer is the element of social life. Certain human-individuals may be conscious of this relationship, but it seems evident by the actions of society that we understand these minute parts of the machine to be in some way fundamentally important, yet we completely and consistently take them for granted. The extra confusing nature of our social consciousness seems to require human-individuals to become even more conscious of

themselves: not as wholes, and not even as parts of a whole, but as a whole that is participating in a greater cosmos and system.

Of this most important consideration, there is a pure individual sense, whereas the first was properly of the individual with regards to our system or our social context. In our individual context, the sense directly reminds us of the dependence of the consciousness on its body for its existence as a human-individual, and only indirectly of the body's dependence on its being conscious to become what is referred to as a human-individual. Individual humanity, which is "*higher*," implies something more than the "*lower*" sense of life that we are our physical body. Human-individuality demands becoming conscious of the Naturally Selected and naturally perfected instincts for community that "*lower*" animals unconsciously already have. In this second sense, we are reminded of both: the reason that our consciousness is continuously changing, which is that our body is constantly changing because the circumstances of the Struggle for our Existence are changing; also, the absurdity of "*higher*" and "*lower*" classifications because while our intelligence may be "*higher*," they do nothing but live the Struggle—whereas we struggle individually and systematically, and we work and we labor for a sum, or "*free*" time.

Simply, our authoritative/noble/lordly consciousness that believes itself to be completely independent, and our technological consciousness, is different than our labor consciousness, which is an individual's mental ability for action: *i.e.* their thoughts about working, laboring, and struggling. An individual's conscious actions are those that are neither naturally automatic, nor physically/psychically habitual. Additionally, they can't be mere reactions to a single experience, nor may they be the product of analysis alone. Therefore, since, as a society we have systematically ignored both unconscious synthesis, (intuition or pattern recognition, and sex,) and conscious synthesis (artistic expression and genuine resolution)—which are both vital for the development of our consciousness, for an understanding of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*,

and an understanding of our first world American Struggle for Existence—then, we have an underdeveloped labor consciousness.

A mere reaction will not be considered a conscious effort, for pattern recognition and synthesis alone provide, for the consciousness, the objective content of knowledge required for individual action, *viz.* the combinations and connections between multiple individuals and their experiences and senses that lead to an objective understanding of our real problems, their causes, and a method of resolution. Analysis is in reaction to an unconscious synthesis, and when used alone it may provide only a subjective understanding of our problems. This is true, for subjects are only parts of our knowledge, whereas knowledge is of causes, meanings, and purposes; and, since we know that a moment of consciousness is one act of understanding, then, it is exceedingly clear that a reaction is merely a physical and psychical action. So, they cannot be considered an act of understanding.

Again, our consciousness is evolving from our 'lower' psychical abilities toward our 'higher' psychological functions; it is possible because of sexual reproduction of our ancestors' genetic material; it is actual because of an accidental, and "painful study;" *i.e.* synthetic reproduction of our ancestors' conceptual material, *i.e.* beautiful art, great books, delicious food, divine music, scientific fiction-or-not television, etc.

Nominally, our labor consciousness is an awareness of our actions: labors, struggles, and work. Further, it is contained within the realm of our consciousness; specifically, it is a psychological act of understanding. On the other hand, as we continue to abandon, avoid, and ignore the resolve to better ourselves; then our consciousness will continue to devolve. In saying this, it is not my intention to provoke the reader, but to describe the effects of this devolution, and offer an infinitesimal force that may, by some snowball's chance in hell, spark the powder keg for a renaissance that is needed to spur the exponential conscious growth of our society that is needed to correct the descent in the inclination of our evolution.

Lecture 6: Analyzing Our Labor Problem

Our labor problem is two-fold: first, generally, mechanisms are evolving to labor as intelligent, purposive beings; and, second, specific individuals (hapless and sophisticated politicians, whom are normally thought to be intelligent and purposive) are devolving to labor as mechanical objects.

“In 1782 James Watt patented the flyball governor for his steam engine. It consists of two balls linked to a vertical spindle which is rotated by the engine; their weight, tending to keep them down...is counteracted by the centrifugal force of the rotation.” For our purposes, this is sufficient for a simple understanding of the specific workings of this part of this machine, viz. the flyball governor of the steam engine, as it is more important to understand its labor and purpose. The flyball governor is a mechanical Modern Servomechanism, and is a specific example of the first part of our labor problem, which has come from a confusion with both our continuously changing labor and technical consciousnesses. The former confusion is natural, since our labor consciousness is changing like, but not as quickly as those of our children because we can’t forget those lessons that have been “burned in”; the latter is so as well because of some truly amazing and wonderful technological advancements in communication, health, medicine, power generation, and its application.

Two important operations that are characteristic of a Modern Servomechanism: “First, a part of the **output energy is redirected** to the controlling apparatus farther back in the casual order of the system; this feature is called **feedback**.” Second, this feedback is such as to counteract the action of the machine...*it is corrective*, not reinforcing; this is called “**negative feedback**.” Then, the operation of the flyball governor is powered by the engine, or system, and its outputs—the very outputs that the governor is controlling, regulating, and stabilizing. Therefore, this mechanism has been completely integrated into the system, and therefore dependent on it; since the mechanism gets its power from the engine, and its work—which is the regulation and safe, steady output of the engine’s energy.

But what is the purpose of the governor, and what is the purpose of its labor? For, if you remove that part so that it might be an individual, so it might fall into a ratio with its system that is proportional to the relationship that a citizen may have to our sociopolitical system. Then, we find that, although the governor is still an object that has a mass, when we remove it from its system it is no longer able to expend energy. So, the governor has no inherent motive force of its own. It doesn't have the ability for original, or independent conscious action. Thus, we find the differences between a biological and a mechanical object: first, that life has its own motive force, and, second, that the Struggle for Existence has not a designed, nor specific, but a general purpose, *i.e.* the Natural Selection of perfection. In contrast, an invention is necessarily and specifically designated to exist, and to exist in a certain way; contemporarily, they have even been designed to fail after a certain point. (See your phone charger.)

Historically, the invention of this servomechanism was important because prior to the governor to keep the machine from having a malfunction, people would regulate these machines; most often, these were children, as they had the smallest of fingers, could fit into the tiniest of spaces, and were also the cheapest sort to rent. This is the second sort of our labor problem *viz.* that certain individuals in our society must work for the system, or the indispensable machines that power our civilization, rather than labor to improve their self.

In 1782, Mr. Watt didn't just improve his steam engine, "the purpose of which was the production of mechanical power for industry"; he invented a whole new type of mechanism that acts, labors, or works—in some respect, as an intelligent being—to safely and steadily control the output of the system. Before the invention of the flyball governor, mechanisms were used for only one thing, *viz.* the production of power, or its generation. Before its invention, the crown was the symbol of leadership. Yet, after 1782, our conscious understanding of work and power began to change; beginning from our labor consciousness, this evolution affected all.

Lecture 7: Understanding the Modern Servomechanism

Modern Servomechanisms are “described as perceptive, responsive, adaptive, purposive, retentive, learning, decision-making, intelligent, and sometimes even emotional (but this last only if something goes wrong).” (Jonas, Hans. *Cybernetics and Purpose*. 110.) Still, what is a servomechanism? As hinted at in a previous lecture, there are several different types of servomechanism; these are, *viz.* the biologic or mechanic. These are different with respect to their physique and specific actions; but, in principle, they are similar. The actions of each are accomplished per similar principles, and in the same state, or type of moment in consciousness.

The categorical similarity among all servomechanisms, whether biological or mechanical is, indeed and in word, an internal and profligate lack of purpose for their work. Historically, this is true of lifeless, or mechanical, servomechanisms; yet, this might not always be the case, for we find that the rate at which technology is being invented (and artificial intelligence is evolving) is accelerating exponentially. It is not so for the modern American, for most of us the completion of labor has devolved from an essential and necessary element of everyday life--perfectly demonstrating the Struggle for Existence (Darwin)—into an abstract and seemingly arbitrary title with specific tasks and obligations—perfectly demonstrating busy work that is good only because it pays by the hour, or year. Thus, the difference between biological and mechanical servile behavior is in, both, the genesis of the of being, and the being's source of power and in the application of their energy towards a certain goal or purpose. Although, the question remains, how is any self-evident American—whom has been liberated by our beloved, but forgotten, Constitution—made to serve another's purpose instead of their own?

Again, there is a problem with our socio-labor consciousness: it is that people are behaving, and being treated, like a machine. No, it is worse, that some people behave, and are treated, like replaceable parts of some machine—of which they have no sense, no conception of its purpose, nor do they have any knowledge of how it operates. There is an objection of this similarity between biological and mechanical systems –the problem is that, because of our

distinct and diverse natures, many people (common, and otherwise) have different behaviors, circumstances, desires, etc.

They say people are born with different abilities, capacities, and desires to be free, that people are selfish, and only work for themselves; and it's generally true, but they mean to use this truth only as an excuse. As Mrs. Stein says, "One taste one tack, one taste one bottle, one taste one fish, one taste one barometer. This shows no distinguishing sign when there is a store." (Stein, Gertrude. *Tender Buttons*. 70.) What does your likes or dislikes have to do with our problems as a society? For an individual, this will inevitably become a problem, if it has not already "opened doors in one's mind that went banging and swinging to and fro and made on keep asking, in a stupefied gape, What does one send? What does one do? Why is one sitting here, after all?" (Woolf. *The Lighthouse*. I. 146.) I maintain that, rather than jumping to conclusion in this frantic moment of consciousness, it is most helpful to remember the relative and consequential nature of our being conscious.

To begin understanding this moment of socio-labor consciousness, we must first explore our *consciousness*; "there is a strong and, it seems, almost irresistible tendency" for *it* to "interpret human functions in terms of artifacts that take their place, and artifacts in terms of the replaced human functions." (Jonas. 110.) To illustrate this, we have already found that there are two different scenarios in which we find a servomechanism: the first scene is when a mechanical object labors as an intelligent being, and the second —more interesting—is when an intelligent being labors as a mechanical object.

Most, but not all, of the circumstances of society that have enabled the invention, production, and large-scale manufacture of Modern Biological Servomechanisms, stem directly from our government's domestic and foreign policy toward consumption, production, and use. Other circumstances, though inevitably intertwined in the realm of politics, are economic, or with regards to our socio-labor consciousness. Since, the individual knows that: a certain part of production may be outsourced, or patented by an external being; also, an individual knows they

may not have enough ability, capital, or knowledge to accomplish the production of a comparable, marketable alternative to those manufactured by global assembly lines. An example of a sociopolitical problem is language, which is difficult because not everyone is in a position to speak to one another—linguistically, *dialectologically*, linguistically, or physically; and is confusing because of the imperfect nature of our languages, and the ignorant ways they are used. All of this is true of the biological servomechanism only.

Lecture 8: Liberating the Modern Servomechanism

As reason, which is a product of the “painful study” of real functional qualities, and virtue, which is the practice of those reasonable qualities, are discarded—through ignorance—for principles such as greed and violence; then morals and values are discarded for things such as authority/position and money, and there are numerous consequences of this decline in our socio-labor consciousness.

In our modern American example, there is “an unspoken assumption...that profligate spending on what politicians euphemistically refer to as ‘defense’ can sustain profligate domestic consumption of energy and imported manufactures.” (Bacevich. *Limits*. 53.) It is an idea, which has originated (in different degrees) from a disturbing sense that invariably all have, that someone else, in our case a president, will save us. It is an idea produced of a dependent, ignorant consciousness because they avoid and relinquish their own ability to re-solve their own problems, and they ignore the absurd reality this disturbing sense has caused: a “War on Terror,” nearly \$20 trillion dollars in national debt (as of 4/25/2017,) which is the real connection between Reagan’s profligate spending and Bush’s “No Child Left Behind” Act. We cannot afford to both educate our children, and continue our apparently necessary profligate defense expenditures of money, oil, and, most tragically, human-individual lives. These moments of consciousness provide the actual conditions necessary for the origin of dependence, and consequently American populations of modern servomechanisms have flourished.

It's important to remember that these ideas were not introduced by Reagan or any of our modern "first citizens," but the original example of America's aggressive government expansion is the one that is most avoided, most damaging, and most ignored: that of Jefferson's purchase of the Louisiana territory, which is also an example of the irony of our unquestioned faith in the authority of great men; specifically, of our founding fathers' purposively fickle, but naturally self-evident, rhetoric for a "more perfect union." (Preamble.) They were fickle, because: women were not *allowed* suffrage until August 18, 1920, African slaves were not *allowed* their constitutional liberties until April 8, 1864, and not *allowed* civil rights until July 2, 1964, and last, but never least, are "merciless, Indian savages" (per the Declaration of Independence) that whether they are or are "not taxed" still have no congressional representation (per the Constitution.)

By analogy, the proliferation of Modern Servomechanisms is a process akin to the growth of mold on what once was a good food, yet even this does not happen without reason; since, American societies have either become completely corrupted by ignorance and vice, or have entirely neglected the reason with which they have come together "to form a more perfect union"; then, by that corruption and neglect, they have devolved themselves into a lesser form of individual and organization. Yet, in Mr. Pollan's *Cooked: Earth* beginning at 38:00, we find that the growth of mold is not necessarily a bad thing. For example, the microorganisms that can be found on a developing cheese rind live at "war and peace," so in a micro-social-synthetic sense of synthesis—even though the organisms are fighting/different/disagree with one another—they all work together in natural production of cheese, *i.e.* by Mother Noella's analogy, the death and decay of micro-life, may be a "promise of something better." It is a promise of better, because the death and decay of these micro-worms is the reason that natural, synthetic cheese taste delicious. (39:20-42:30)

Since, historically, there has never been a standing army or national police force enforcing its truth, then where does our constitution get its power? To begin, it was only by reason (even if accidental) that we have come to be alive, and only by reason and virtue that

our founding fathers had become so closely associated with one another in the first place. Even then, but more so as these foundations of our society have slipped away, individual members of the society divided themselves into associations akin to Hegel's lord and bondsman dichotomy of human existence, *i.e.* civilized or savage, man or woman, and, most akin, master or slave.

“Since to begin with they are unequal and opposed, and their reflection into a unity has not yet been achieved, they exist as two opposed shapes of consciousness; one is independent consciousness whose essential nature is to be for itself, the other is the dependent consciousness whose essential nature is simply to live or be for another. The former is lord, the other is bondsman.” (Hegel. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Para. 189.)

In a simple sense, a bondsman of this sort might be understood as an example of a modern servomechanism; a form of life stuck in a certain frame of mind, a mold that only grows in the right environment; the bondsman, developing this sense, is a dependent, self-entitled and self-made prisoner that has not worked for, but still expects the benefits of civilization and consciousness. That may be harsh, but Freud said it best, in the following image of ignorance: “The wish to sleep which we have recognized as regularly playing a part in the construction of dreams comes into the open in these dreams...” reminds us of ignorance, for “The Prisoner’s Dream, a dream whose content is bound to be his escape. It is a happy point that he is to escape through the window, for it is the stimulus of light pouring in [through the cave] by the window that is putting an end to the prisoner’s sleep.” (Freud. *Introductory*. VIII. 165-166.)

Next, as the whole changes, then this change affects the individual's existence because an individual is, of course, dependent on others (*viz.* society); it is only natural that the individual parts of the system would undergo a similar change in their own natures. Therefore, when society abandons reason and virtue, which are the original foundations upon which it had been founded; then individuals' actions come to be only for some individually measured moment of bliss, or by purchasing plastic happiness. This is because a moment of change, for the individual's continuously changing consciousness, is—often without a doubt—directly linked to the simultaneously existing social moment of consciousness, which an individual's subjective awareness of the social consciousness, *i.e.* what they think other people think.

Though we have been suspicious of this devolution of the individual consciousness, we have—until now—been unconscious of it. At this point, we find ourselves a real “chicken, or the egg” conundrum: the individual devolution is both influencing, and is influenced by the rapid proliferation of servomechanisms, which is originally possible by “a strong and, it seems, almost irresistible tendency in the human mind to interpret human functions in terms of artifacts that take their place, and artifacts in terms of the replaced human functions.” (Jonas, Hans. *The Phenomenon of Life*. Pg. 110.) Therefore, with certain anthropomorphic latitude, consciousness mistakenly equates things with actions, and actions with things. Just as, we mistake our temporary Franken-solutions for permanent and purposive resolutions: because they are specific actions, which might solve a problem only from a certain point of view, rather than an objective sense of resolution for all.

Finally, it is important to note that this devolution is a symptom of society's actions as a whole, and of the intermediate (as opposed to an original or final) nature of this moment of consciousness in our accelerated, evolved Struggle for Existence. This is most important, for the individual already rightly knows that it is not *only* their fault that society has transfigured an actual understanding of “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” into a collection of mundane and rudimentary experiences consumed as seen on television. For us, this need not be a basis upon which we divide ourselves from one another, instead consider this state of existence, or moment of consciousness, as a unification principle. We all are—each of us—dependent on ourselves both to ourselves, as individual parts are to a whole, and to our society, as an individual to individuals.

The momentum of the devolution of human-individual into a modern servomechanism has increased in proportion to the exponential growth of both the global population and technology. Generation after generation masters have dissuaded slaves from independent, “painful” action. For, even the ‘independent’ master, since he has become addicted to a life of leisure and luxury, has become dependent on the labor of his slaves. It is only after generations

of ignorance and vice that a modern servomechanism can be devolved from a rational life, for the modern servomechanism can't remember a time where they believed themselves capable of positively communicating with others. For, they have not had the necessary experiences to successfully communicate with reason a better alternative to another person. Nor can they remember a time of independent struggle; even though they understand the idea, they only have the sense from their own reference-body.

Stuck in this co-ordinate system of object value and persuasive politicians, who since they deprived themselves of the ability to struggle on their own: consequently, they have been deprived of the ability to develop their own original, synthetic thoughts. Precisely, because they have no common experience, they are unable to translate, or communicate, their experience from one individual co-ordinate system to another, or from one reference-body to another; also, as we know from Fukuyama and the Joint Chiefs of the 90s, our politicians think they are perfect, *i.e.* at a final stage of evolution.

Consequently, they only observe their independent selves at election time, or when we are unable to work because of some emotional breakdown...since, we and they get this disturbing sense of independence, when we fear that no one else could possibly have a true sense of our emotional disturbances. Therefore, an indicator of non-servile behavior is communicating yourself properly, or successfully; rather than struggling to exist by throwing a temper-tantrum. Additionally, positive feedback is an indicator of a human-individual, truly it is a sign of another human-individual because mechanisms cannot consciously reinforce, or supplement, their designated purpose.

At the heart of the problem is the simple fact that individuals both in relation to themselves, and in relation to others, have consistently different inclinations to be reasonable and virtuous. Yet, this by itself is not enough, one must remember that the possibility for this problem arises only when the society has abandoned reason and virtue, so that in such a state of anarchy (where the whole of society has divorced itself from principles of reason and virtue)

the categorical differences between master and slave, lord and bondsman, and Modern Servomechanism and enlightened, free citizen of the United States of America, which once was a reasonable and virtuous nation, become the same as an individual's 'natural inclination' or 'our different capacities' to be reasonable and virtuous.

Sound familiar? This is the "people are different" excuse, when the fact of the matter is that as the whole abandons, reason and virtue, its primary foundations, then individual parts are free, or feel secure enough, to choose to do what they feel is best; this is opposed to doing what they know to be best, *viz.* struggling together to find out. The whole has abandoned reason and virtue largely through individual analytic, mnemotechnic attempts at resolution, *i.e.* chains, debt, iron bars, and Mother-of-All, or nuclear bombs.

Lecture 9: Analyzing Our Social Consciousness & Our Problems

Indeed, it seems to be a fact that the aim of pure social events is to acquire relief from the Struggle for Existence. I'm sure you know this to be true, for yourself; but you should also know that this is the origin or "the causation of our neurotic symptoms." Per *Psycho-Analysis*, "the memory's disinclination to remembering anything which is connected with feelings of unpleasure and the reproduction of which would renew the unpleasure." (Freud. IV, 92.) This principle he continues to say is the ultimate operative motive force that causes parapraxes, which are the focus of his *Introductory Lectures*, *viz.* phenomena of unconscious errors, mistakes, or slips. It also shows that parts of our individual consciousness are different in of themselves, for "memory's disinclination" is contradictory to whatever part of us agrees with Nietzsche that we need to burn our own ideas into our memory if we are to remember them.

Farther than that, this principle of avoidance provides the foundation for a common idea that brings us together in our social groups. This idea says, that 'we are doomed to struggle all our lives; we can only be purely social in our free, or leisure, time; so, let's enjoy it while we have it.' Yet, is this—absurd hope for relief—all that society can provide for its constituent individuals? Absolutely, there is this hope of escape...and something more.

The addiction to hope, which has infected most everyone's leisure and work time, is directly linked to the very same events that have made possible the decline in our social consciousness, viz. that idea that only great men can do/invent great things. This addiction to hope has manifested itself in two different moments of consciousness: obviously, in our addicted moments, but, also in our moments of dependent of consciousness as our simple sense of Hegel's bondsman.

Presently, our social consciousness is unaware of the fact that there is no individual experience from which we could make an example that might provide an absolute solution to our American individual and social problems, or a perfect analogy for consciousness. This is the reason why, in Plato's *Theaetetus*, Socrates and the dialogue's namesake are never able to determine what knowledge is in of itself, which is why any individual analysis will only ever provide a Franken-solution of its problem. Here is the origin of our dependent consciousness: we cannot know any better on our own, nor could we think of a relative good without being able to express the possibility of it to another member of our tribe. So, having translated and synthetically transformed the thought and possibility of something better/good, and finding certain agreement among our tribe, we find this hypothesized possibility for something better to be actual. Additionally, it (the origin of dependence) is the final sense of our necessity to successfully work together in our Struggle for Existence, viz. that it is the final sense, which has developed our thought that we must synthetically work together towards a resolution, to get you off the couch, to read this multiplication of labors/laborers.

However, it is important to remember that the evolution of the technologies that individual Americans consume is continuously changing, and that this has evolved despite, perhaps even because of, the existence and proliferation of individuals with an addicted and dependent consciousness. So, since the individual's different moments of consciousness can co-exist; then surely so can "different" individuals in our society, as an individual has a certain

rational relationship with society. We can work together: if not because it is the right thing to do, better still because we will discover more together, than we will alone.

Lecture 10: Recapitulating Our Synthetic Resolution

To recap by comparison, if you were confused after having read Mr. Darwin's *Origin of Species*, then it was due to the abstract, incomplete nature of his publication. Therefore, if you have been confused after reading this, it is because every part of it, from title to inscription, has been struggling to be synthetic, whereas *our* society has decidedly limited itself to analysis.

Our American problem has been difficult physically for three reasons: our natural ignorance of others and the fact that we are dependent on some others, and, our problematic addiction for creating and holding analytic Franken-solutions to our problems—because we consistently hope or ardently pray for some first citizen to magically sweep them away. The great American absurdity is that our ignorant, violent policies and profligate, wanton consumption have caused most of the symptoms that we contemporarily label as issues.

Our American problem has been confusing for three reasons: first, anthro-projection, which is like the second, a tendency to confuse artifacts with functions; and, our habit (conscious, or not) to subject other individuals. Our problem has become absurd, because we have already become aware of our problematic, profligate consumption, but we are unaware of our improper tendency to use analysis for in our avoidance of displeasure; consequently, the violent competition between varieties of the same American species of human-individual has become aggravated because of our super-artificial differences, which are the cause for the fiercest sort of Natural Selection (Darwin. III.)

However, in our case, this already fierce competition need not be so severe, and it need not be constantly aggravated. If we remember, mechanisms get their power from the system, whereas we generate our own; then we will find that we are not robots doomed to protecting these absurd, profligate, and wanton consumptive policies. Also, if we remember that the avoidance of displeasure isn't naturally limited to a search of pleasure, alone; for, contained

within phenomena of displeasure there are objects of “painful study.” So, that, after having successfully investigated our displeasure, then we might be able to know what displeases us, and we may be able to avoid those things better in the future; we have found that it is our confusions, difficulties, and problems that cause the most severe feelings of displeasure, rather than any one object that is said to be painful, or pleasurable, for an individual.

So, if Naturally Selected habits can be consciously communicated, then in this way we will be able to reduce the severity of our individual competitions, and successfully work together to reinforce the Natural Selection of our species. Since, we already have, by analysis, the possibility for both correcting errors and evils, but analysis is not enough for discovering knowledge, purpose, and reason...let alone reinforcing this or that healthy habit, or relative good (action.) Further, despite the slight impact our reinforcements would provide Nature, they might be enough to reverse the momentum of our apparent devolution. These reinforcements will take the form of synthetic, positive feedback, and successful communication/expression; both of which are a sign of humanity because the Modern Servomechanism only has the method of correction, only after it's been broken “emotionally,” or thrown its temper-tantrum.

Rhetorically, how could we communicate our objects of intuition, or our better and Naturally Selected habits? How might we be able to get over the grotesque nature of our individual Franken-solutions, and grapple with the numerous difficulties we have when communicating with another individual? How might we do this, knowing that each is susceptible to emotionally breakdown, when there is a physical distance between interlocutors, when we must translate between different languages and dialects—and, most especially, when there is a conflict of interest? How could we ever do this, except by communicating a passionate sense of unity and wonder?

We didn't emerge from our cave to find that people are different only to run back; we emerged to find that people are different, and having emerged and realized: that we are different and the same, having found this to be true we know that we must help those still

chained to the wall; and, it is all life, and the differences are subjective, because of the relative and synthetic nature of our consciousness, our existence, and our emergence from our cave.

Inscription: *Individually, To the Lighthouse through The Window*

“It was a question, she remembered, how to connect this mass on the right hand with that on the left. She might do it by bringing the line of the branch across so; or break the vacancy in the foreground...But the danger was that by doing that the unity of the whole might be broken.” (*The Window. IX.*)

“...this moment of friendship and liking—which survived, after all these years complete, so that she dipped into it to re-fashion her memory of him, and there it stayed in the mind affecting one almost like a work of art.” (*To the Lighthouse. III*)

Works Cited

- 1) Weismann, Dr. August. *Essays upon Heredity and Kindred Biological Problems: XII, Amphimixis or the Essential Meaning of Conjugation and Sexual Reproduction*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891. Print.
- 2) Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. Orlando: Harcourt, 2005. Print.
- 3) Pollan, Michael. "Cooked." Netflix Original, 19 Feb. 2016. Web. 25 Apr. 2017.
- 4) Freud, Sigmund. *Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis*. New York: Norton, 1989. Print.
- 5) Bacevich, Andrew J. *The Limits of Power: The End of American Exceptionalism*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2009. Print.
- 6) Darwin, Charles. *On the Origin of Species*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U Press, 2003. Print.
- 7) Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm. *One the Genealogy of Morals*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale. New York: Vintage, 1989. Print.
- 8) Hegel, G. W. F. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford U Press, 2013. Print.
- 9) Jonas, Hans. *The Phenomenon of Life: Toward A Philosophical Biology*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern U Press, 2001. Print.
- 10) James, William. *Psychology: The Briefer Course*. Notre Dame, IN: U of Notre Dame Press, 2009. Print.
- 11) Einstein, Albert. *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory*. New York: Penguin, 2006. Print.
- 12) Stein, Gertrude. *Tender Buttons*. San Francisco: City Lights, 2014. Print.
- 13) Plato. *Theaetetus*. Comp. John M. Cooper. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2009. Print.
- 14) Woolf, Virginia. *To the Lighthouse*. San Diego: Harcourt, Inc., 1981. Print.