



Jon Hellevig:

ALL IS ART

**On Social Practices and Interpretation
of Feelings**

Contacts:

Jon Hellevig

competition@hku.ru

www.hellevig.net

Book sales:

www.ruslania.com

Publisher:

www.russiaadvisorygroup.com

First edition published 2007

Publisher:
Russia Advisory Group Oy, Helsinki, Finland

ISBN 978-952-99785-4-0

Printed at:
Painohäme Oy, Tampere, Finland

Author's personal internet site:
www.hellevig.net

Cover by Ljudmila Rjabkina on motive of painting “At
the Source” of Hrachya Harutiunian

Layout: Arto Rynnänen

The Greatest Thing

There was a boy
A very strange, enchanted boy
They say he wandered very far
Very far, over land and sea
A little shy and sad of eye
But very wise was he

And then one day,
One magic day he passed my way
While we spoke of many things
Fools and Kings
This he said to me

The greatest thing you'll ever learn
Is just to love and be loved, on earth*.

(Nature Boy, Eden Abbez)

** With an adjustment*

Contents:

1. For the background:

Language is interpretation of feelings Pages 7-10

2. **Book I**

All is Art: On Social Practices and
Interpretation of Feelings Pages 13-181

3. **Book II**

Democratic Competition Pages 183-266

4. References Pages 267-268

5. Index Pages 269-294

For the background: Language is interpretation of feelings

I claim that language fundamentally is about interpretation of feelings. Building on Antonio Damasio's presentation¹ I place language after emotions and feelings at the top of the development of the human biological homeostatic system. With language the human strives to give expression to infinite needs to interpret feelings. Language is hence an interpretation of feelings, and as an interpretation there is nothing firmly given about it; the words of language have developed arbitrary to express the feelings; in a historic process words once used form a platform for future use, but in the historic process language develops randomly, but always building on previous use, on the social practices that language captures. All science builds on the wrong idea that knowledge can be expressed in an exact manner in language. Too many even think that there are some truths to be found in language, but the truth is in the feelings, and language is only the tool for expressing the feelings, or more correctly: giving expression to the interpretation of the feelings, and that is an infinite endeavor, a never-ending story. Language is what sets apart humans from animals – in good and bad.

¹ I refer to my discussion in Expression and Interpretations on the evolutionary developments of emotions and feelings basically building on the presentation by the neurobiologist Antonio Damasio

Language itself is the purest competitive system of all – in fact all forms of life are but mere perceptions on the practice of language from a certain point of view. The unity of manifold, is not a physical unity, it is rather the holistic web of perceptions that reduce all aspects of human life to language, to words, to aspects of feelings, to the binary mode of pain and pleasure.

One has to move beyond language to see that the philosophical problems disappear – and beyond language we have feelings. Scientifically feelings are connected with psychological, and biological problems, or whatever we want to call them, but certainly not philosophical ones.

Language only delivers the expressions of feelings, the expressions of the interpretations of them; language creates the different perceptions on life that affect feelings, and the feelings that affect perceptions on life; understanding this we should now be able to realize that the ‘true workings of language’ consists of interpretations of feelings, and hereby there are no intrinsic rules or anything of the kind we could refer to or that would guide the process, there is but an endless competition between all the infinite variances of perceptions that people form under the influence of feelings. With language we can only roll from one interpretation to another, and there are no truths to be reached on the road; instead it is better to see language as a method. It is

basically a market method or a competitive method, an open system where all language use affects all other use. Therefore in proper philosophy there are no rules, no laws that we could discover and explain, and thus all that we can do in terms of philosophy is merely point out when words are arranged so that nonsense follows and confusion reigns.

The expressions of language are developed from people’s experience. Language depicts first and foremost what people have seen. The most basic words and expressions stem from the most elementary forms of life, the life connected with the physical nature, the thingly nature. Languages have not developed much past a description of the basic experiences of life. We are trying to express, and we have a need to express, complex, delicate feelings with a language that merely fits for describing the world of things. The usage of the thingly concepts for describing feelings is what sets up traps in language. - In communication this fallacy has resulted in a disastrous failure - Meaning has been turned upside down: Protection has been converted to hatred; love to possession; faith to repression, knowledge to superstition; personality to exclusion; you to many; I to we; care to distance... Whoever conceived the story of Adam and Eve eating from the tree of wisdom and being expelled from the paradise captured a very relevant notion. This is the insight on how language – for the fruit of knowledge

is language - when misused, out of context, becomes a corrupting force, the arch reason for misery – the tool for intrigues; conceits; superstition; deception; fraud, mass-hatred; war. By combining words in a cunning way the bad have captured power from the innocent; and they have privatized natural needs for explanations of eternity, the world and the skies under own private label religions.

Language is hence all there is to philosophy. Elements that have earlier produced a lot of philosophical nut cracking simply disappear. We will see that metaphysics and the game of formal logic turn out to be antiquated activities similar to alchemy – that is to say all of metaphysics save the part of which deals with the beginning of life, which is better to be left to the realm of religion

Notes to the pedagogue:

After this lesson you will master the new words of critical language theory: ‘thingly’ for showing what is wrong with the contemporary way of thinking and speaking; ‘thingliness’ – ditto; and ‘thingling’ – which is a diminutive for all our sacred concepts – and especially for the most sacred one of them all ‘language’ (compare ‘lordling’ a diminutive of the mighty personage of a lord). When we turn concepts around we turn thinking around.

Book I

All is Art

**On Social Practices and
Interpretation of Feelings**

By Jon Hellevig

Headings:

	page
Foreword	17
All is Art, Social Practices, and Interpretation of Feelings	21
Science and Art	66
All is Art	76
Art and Interpretation of Feelings	85
Aesthetic Feeling of Pain and Pleasure	89
Deliberate Art – Feeling, Vision, and Skills	98
Symbols	106
Language, Language, Language	113
The Chicken or the Egg - Knowledge from Language, or Language from Knowledge	123
Language test simulations	125
By Language Alone	128
Wittgenstein vs. Popper – Sense vs. Nonsens	130
The thingly language	136
Law as Social Practices – Legal Practices	142
Claude Levi-Strauss	154

Foreword:

[I led a completely abnormal life just like everybody else, and then all of a sudden I got the idea that I should find out and write...

And now exhausted, frustrated and delighted I am busy writing a book on social practices, the theme sounds odd and dull, and I doubt that I will be able to inspire more excitement in anybody than the theme promises. But, I cannot help it, I need to write. – A research fellow once asked a Russian professor “Should I write a book or not?” The professor replied “If you can refrain from writing, then do not write; if you cannot refrain from writing, write.” This is the same advice I received myself upon consulting my inner feelings. I had to write.

My aim is to explain the idea that *social practices* are the basis of all that humans know and what can be known. – There is no other intelligence, knowledge, than that which is in our traditions, social practices passed on from people to people, generation to generation, through the medium of language, by language, in language. Social sciences and philosophy, all the distinctly human¹ - the fundamentals of cognition and human society are but reflections of the social practices, of what people do and have done.

Those who accept these ideas would find themselves

compelled to reject a great deal, if not most, of the doctrines of the universities of today. - This article is intended as a summary of these ideas, in short it is about *human knowledge*, and the other side of the coin: *human ignorance*. Both these are functions of individual *interpretations of feelings* and language that represent *social practices*.

In breach of the academic rituals this book is not crowded with references to past authorities and eloquent quotations of one or another mediocre mind, for this is a description of *scientific reality*, and therefore the style of *social science fiction* of the universities will not do. I may add, though, that in my book *Expressions and Interpretations*², on which this presentation is based, I have with source references described and documented the mental ladder which I climbed, the journey inwards to these feelings, the feelings that now are laid bare. In general, I refer to the ideas of *empiric reality* as they have been exposed and conceptualized, for example, by David Hume and Ludwig Wittgenstein. It would be impossible to

¹ The word human connotes a sense of spiritual superiority, kindness, graciousness – goodness, a capacity to discern what is wrong from what is good. This is the very source of the perplexity, the fatal confusion, for as of yet humans do not know good from bad.

² Hellevig, J. (2006). *Expressions and Interpretations. Our perceptions in competition. – A Russian Case.*

produce a proper list of all my references as such a list would have to include the majority of all people past and present, who have more or less consciously – and, more, unconsciously - contributed to experience, to these social practices the way I argue. – Throughout the history of ideas, on the contrary, but naturally, and regrettably, the weirdest ideas, and those in whose imaginations they were generated, have been heaped with fame and recognition, while those who rejected those most weird ideas – rejecting them simply by living the lives they lived (and sometimes even active in voicing and demonstrating the rejection) - have no place in science (only the artists versed in their very own genre of social science fiction are celebrated in the Academy). And yet a rejection of an idea is as much an idea, as the initial misformulation. These rejections, as all human actions, are reflected in the social practices. - I side with those, the great majority of people who throughout history functioned as the competitive censor, rejecting whatever the prevailing ideologies of the day happened to be, or i.e. *the superstition of the day.*]

All is Art, Social Practices, and Interpretation of Feelings

Art for art's sake. Art is the great laboratory of mankind; art for art's sake is the only true means for exploring the limits of what can be known, an assault on the frontiers of the unthinkable, the unknowable. Therefore a breakthrough in art, a breakthrough in expression, is a breakthrough in science, and this is the only true progress we can ever hope for.

Social practices. All human, all aspects of human life are governed by, and reflected in social practices, in people's lives in the commonwealth. What is considered good, and what is considered bad, is exclusively a function of social practices. Social practices is what people do together and all knowledge, all ideas, all science is but a reflection of these practices. These practices are carried in language, which is the supreme manifestation of all social practices. Language comes about through the efforts of one and many individuals - all of us - expressing feelings, exploring the possibilities to express the feelings, opinions, to be understood.

Expressions and interpretations. At the final analysis the life of a human is an interpretation of one's own feelings performed against the background of social practices. From social practices the individual human catches reflections, echoes, reverberations of other

lives, past and present. These reflections penetrate the body, and in there these reflections are processed, in there, in the body, the human interprets what he experiences. Then the interpretation is expulsed to the external, there to receive an expression in language. Through his expressions the individual human contributes back to the social practices, gives his input to the eternal reflections, to expressions and interpretations.

Knowledge. Knowledge is produced by one human in partnership with other humans, past and present, through expressions and interpretations, as if by the touch of an invisible hand. - This is the insight that there is no human intelligence in any one particular individual. – Humans do not possess any intelligence but can make use of the intelligence cumulated and floating in social practices.

Language, the human. Language is the basis of human society. Without doubt a biological animal can think without language, but it cannot think about anything *social* – which is *human* – without language. All that is distinctly human is a product of language, the exclusive condition for society. The human is the social, and language is what forms the human.

The human, the social. This story about social practices and interpretation of feelings tells about the relation between the *individual human* and the *social*, the

commonwealth of all. But *exist* only *humans, individuals* - *the social* does not exist, and did not exist, and never will. – The *social*, is a word - a concept only – and we use it simply to name the common heritage of past and present generations. The *social* is a perception, a perspective on what individuals do together united through social practices, through language, for *in reality* only the individuals *exist*. But, then again, the reality of the individual is governed by the social, so to say, filled with intelligence, data, which in turn is a reflection - nothing more – of bygone life and generations of experience. All encoded in language. And language is what sets all human in motion, what makes the world go round, round...

Merger of the external and the internal explanations. With this understanding of language as interpretation of feelings and knowledge as social practices we have closed the loop between the two extremes by which humans have sought to explain what governs life on earth: the beliefs in external suprahuman agents and the belief in an internal agent. **Thus this philosophy of social practices and interpretation of feelings is a merger between the two opposed ways of contemplating life:** *those* ideas from the beginning of time, those ideas of the **external forces**, the deities, which conduct life and portion out knowledge – **and** - the ideas of seeking an **internal** origin for knowledge: *'the soul', 'the mind', 'the reason'*, these words originally describing human faculties,

innate capabilities and powers to think and act as a human, but converted in the perversion of scientific thinking to connote a kind of an entity purported to reside inside the body but separate from it; like 'the soul' that can take leave from the body at death - and sometimes earlier than that - and migrate into another body; or 'the reason' located inside the human brain, hailed like a thing, a physical organ, but never seen by anybody. But by now, with this new philosophy, we may appreciate that *the internal* was not the 'reason' 'the mind', nor 'the soul' – nothing of the sort that can be grasped with a linguistic analogy to the nature – but *the biological process that was set in motion through the binary struggle between pain and pleasure, the penultimate manifestation of the process which are feelings*. These are the feelings that, the creative man, *homo artisticus* is dying to express.

We now see that the *external forces* were but reflections, the condensed ideas of the *eternal interplay between all expressions and all interpretations*. We have understood that these expressions and interpretations form traditions, social practices, in which we determine what is good and what is bad, what is to be treated as knowledge what is to be rejected as such. And we have understood that the supreme form of the external is language, language reflecting the current balance between all social practices. – And we have understood that *language*, this supreme form of the external, simultaneously is the supreme form of

the internal, *the ultimate manifestation* of the internal, the expression for feelings (a language of thingly words which are, as of now, mere feeble imitations, faint reverberations of what we all have to say). Thus language is what connects one individual with others, the internal with the external, feelings with expressions, and forms a human out of biological flesh and bone. - We have understood that the external and the internal are in constant association where the one feeds the other. And we see that there is nothing more to human society than this. We see that knowledge is not a faculty inside the human, and nothing administered from the outside, but simply a reflection of human efforts - human, all too human.

Interpretation of feelings, dreams and daydreams - life. Freud wanted to interpret dreams. But why should we be more concerned with interpreting dreams than other aspects of life? We have a whole world to interpret, a whole life to interpret – we have to interpret being, that is, our feelings. – When attempting to interpret dreams we are still in the vicious circle, entrapped by language. In dreams - as well as in daydreams, life - the mind is fed with the same images that we deal with when we are awake, and to which we assign a meaning when awake; it is a mistake to think that in dreams we were to penetrate the meaning of symbols with any more insight than when awake. In dreams we are still on the surface, maybe like a surfer who is carried by waves, not in control but riding on top of them, until

he falls, and is washed away by the waves...and then just as he is about to drown he wakes up.

Psychoanalysis and art. The only hope for lasting mental health, individual and collective, is mastering a language of feelings. – This is not a quest for any one single individual, it can only be a movement forward by generations and generations to come. The key to the secrets of this language of feeling is in art, in the expressions that we explore and adapt through art. Art for art's sake is like the test laboratory for finding out the secrets of the transmutation of feelings into expressions, into language. In deliberate art the artists are like the pioneers who illuminate the path into the hidden world of feelings, and they are the ones that will carry the treasures of expression to the external. - Clearly art for art's sake is the most important human activity. No experiment is more fundamentally scientific than art for art's sake for the sake of reaching for what is beyond. Reaching for the beyond, reaching for the limit, a limit that we cannot trespass, all we may hope for is to expand the frontiers.

Pain and pleasure – Art and the biological. A discussion of art and aesthetic feelings returns us back to the physical, to the biological, into the human organism, where the eternal struggle between pain and pleasure gives rise to feelings, and creates the evolving impressions of good and bad. Art is a reflection of

this never-ending struggle in the binary mode of pain and pleasure, the essence of being, what gives life and takes life; this binary friction occurs in all aspects of life from the smallest cellular processes to the grand combats between men on earth. In art through language, expressions, the battle between pain and pleasure is brought to the mental plane.

Pain and pleasure – language – human. I see pain and pleasure as the basic drivers of human life, and all life in general. This as all life *through evolution* - from the physical and chemical, to the biological, through the animal to the human – *and in the present* is but a manifestation of the battle between pain and pleasure. I believe that the forces of pain and pleasure have set biological life in motion which through evolution led to the living organism developing the fine-tuned homeostatic system of regulating an animal organism; and it is in this animal organism where emotions and feelings were set in motion; and this development meant the breaking through, the becoming of the mental, and eventually in evolution it is this mental - seeking for means of expression - that evolved into language; and it is language - this external manifestation of the struggle between pain and pleasure raised to the level of the mental - that brought the human into being (the *homo artisticus*, or *homo sapiens* as they used to call him).

The human being is thus the result of the process

where the mental manifestations of bodily processes in form of emotions and feelings managed to cut loose from the body; I see this as the *mental* hatching out from the shell that contained the animal within the limits of a body which is like a shelter (or a confinement, depending on how we see the various aspects of humanity) protecting that innocent animal life; the mental - born in the warmth of this womb where emotions and feelings linger and brood is slowly cracking this shield protecting the body that shelters the animal; breaking the thingly shield of the body like a nestling cracks the egg-shell to crawl out of it to embrace life.

Thus language is the expression of the mental manifestation of the biological struggle between the forces of pain and pleasure; but ours is not a mature language, rather a language like a clumsy duckling unable to fly but holding a promise of becoming the beautiful swan that will fly through the limits of what is known, through the unthinkable, to new heights of cognition on the wings of a language yet to be set in motion by finding the expressions for those inner feelings that give wings to our thoughts. (If it was not for the constant suffering that language leads us to I would instead have given the romantic simile of language still being like a budding flower).

Jealousy, born of the body. Interestingly Marcel Proust - whose art in all its aspects is a demonstration of the binary struggle of pain and pleasure in all the infinite variances – also identified our human feelings as aspects of this biological struggle; placing jealousy as a counterparty to pleasure - the pleasure of love, the painful aspect of the same feeling - he said “jealousy is born of the body; jealousy is pleasure’s unacknowledged daughter”. Proust said that “jealousy was born long before intelligence; so they have never met, and intelligence can offer it no sort of consolation”. Thus as jealousy is a manifestation of bodily pain and pleasure “the mind is weaponless in the face of jealousy as it is in the face of sickness or of death”.¹

We will have to wonder how it is that the present practices of academic sciences are still allowed to hold the status of an official body of truth, while it has been shown time after time that the infinite variances of truth of life (thus truths of science) are demonstrated in art and literature - as for example in the carefully documented studies of the human behavior in the work of Marcel Proust – and whereas academic sciences, as a result of the traditions - building on the perversions of Plato whereby the real

¹ “On La Bonne Hélène” in “Marcel Proust On Art and Literature” pp. 294 - 297

and the apparent were turned upside down - have nothing to offer but schematic simplifications (or downright fraud) of the phenomena of life, where all the infinite variances of life have been reduced to a few surface notions baptized in concepts and assigned a significance based on what has from time to time happened to be the fashionable trends in the *Sciences of the Academy*, this genre of art which we really should give the more fitting name: *social science fiction*; for academic science is nothing but a lasting artistic movement which we have to identify the way we identify other forms of art. - What we have to understand is that the work of Proust in all reality is what is social science; for real science can be only that what is revealed about the general – the scientific - through an honest and profound contemplation of particular human behavior, and this can be reached only through a deep penetration into human expressions and interpretations, to the sources of pain and pleasure within the body, to the roots of the mental manifestations of the origins of life. - If anything, I hope I could contribute to a merger of the grammar of life and literature with that of academic sciences, to inspire scientist to descend en masse from their ivory tower of science, that secluded place distantly removed from the practical problems of life, that place that affords the scientists the means to engage in the most perverted form of art which they shield from all criticism by calling it “science”.

Art – interpretation of feelings. Art is a search for the proper expression for interpretation of personal feelings. – Here again we note how it is that all being can be seen as processes where the feelings of an individual are related to the expressions of others – those expressions that we may call social practices. According to this idea the mental in the individual remains empty - lacking meaning and marked by the absence of all human qualities – and without means to develop, as long as there is no contact with other people. It is the same with art: art is a search for proper expressions to individual interpretations - interpretations of individual feelings; these feelings and the expressions we attempt to discover through searching the internal, but even this search of the internal we can undertake only through properly accounting for the external; this search is an inward projection of the reflections of the external, the social, language; these are the same expressions and interpretations of social practices, of all our being, which is art. While all being is art what sets the deliberate forms of art apart is a conscious attempt to find better means to express, find expressions which penetrate the surface of reality, expression with which we can plumb the depths of feelings. We could think of the artist - the scientist of the mind – while exploring the inner self facing a similar task as a physician or a radiologist conducting medical imagining of the inner anatomy, movements and functions of body parts; the artist is confronted

with the challenge to grasp the same movements in the emotions and feelings of the body, to obtain a picture, a diagnosis, of his inner feelings, and then to interpret and project the findings in images and expressions of art, literature, painting, dance...

We could even extend the analogy to picture the development of art in parallel with that of medical imagining where doctors have moved forward from the early methods of placing the ear on the chest to try to detect the body sounds (as long as the artist's ear is on the heart this method works quite well in art and social sciences as well). The various styles and canons of art are like the instruments and new methods of medicine: the stethoscope, the medical acoustic device for listening to the internal sounds in a human or animal body, which enabled to detect heart sounds and sounds of breathing; further developments of the device that enabled to catch faint reverberations of the sounds in the intestines and the flow in the blood vessels; then the x-rays, gamma rays, high-frequency sound waves, ultrasound, and magnetic resonance imaging. These various techniques of medical imagining compound to possibilities to produce internal images from varied angles with different aims giving a visual representations of all the body parts, tissues, and organs, how they look like and how they contract and distend on and thus to produce a more truthful picture of the body. – With the various forms of art we similarly aim at catching

all the infinite variances of human feelings, and to eventually find the expressions that will give humanity peace. In his search the artist who is seized by the overwhelming idea to transgress the present reality gives himself fully over to art and converts his own body into a solitary laboratory of pain and pleasure, in his search half consciously, half unconsciously inflicting himself with the most inhuman pain – for pain is his method. There is no anesthesia to temper the pains of the artist, and there is no avoiding of the splinter wounds that the artist unwillingly – because the artist can not stop before any force – inflicts on those that stand in the way of the new expression.

Proust on interpretation of feelings. All in Marcel Proust's¹ work is about interpretation of feelings, both in action and in theory. Proust did not define the artist's task in these words, but he used a similar image when he said that the 'function and the task of a writer are those of a translator'; this remark came after him saying "the essential, the only true book, does not have to be invented by a great writer – for it exists already in

¹ I refer here and in other instances to Proust without paying any attention to the form in which he gave expression to his opinions, not finding any point in trying to differentiate when he talks in his own name or through his fictional narrator.

each of us – it has to be translated by him”. Proust talks about this same task of interpreting – translating – the feelings that we all carry with us in every living moment.¹ In “Against Sainte-Beuve” Proust had expressed the same idea saying “Great literature is written in a sort of foreign tongue. To each sentence we attach a meaning, or at any rate a mental image, which is often a mistranslation. But in great literature all our mistranslations result in beauty”.²

In *Time Regained*, the final volume of *In Search of Lost Time*, Proust is at times explicit about his literary and aesthetic creeds. In there I find a lot of support and parallels for the philosophy I try to convey in this present book. The meaning of Proust’s *Search of Lost Time* is to be found by reading the book from cover to cover, from the first to last volume; it is therefore that I am reluctant to point out specific sections of the book, nevertheless there are on pages 297 through 300 of *Time Regained* such a concentration of observations that pertain to the ideas of interpretation of feelings that I wanted to draw special attention to these. – “How could the literature of description possibly have any value, when it is only beneath the surface of the little things which

¹ Proust, M. (2003). *In Search of Lost Time Vol. VI: Time Regained*. Modern Library, p. 291

² Proust “Against Sainte-Beuve” in *On Art and Literature* p. 267

such a literature describes that reality has its hidden existence”; only “the lie” called “reality” produced in the mind by “the chain of all those inaccurate expressions in which there survives nothing of what we have really experienced”; “the greatness of true art lay elsewhere” i.e. in the interpretation of life (interpretation of feelings), in “that reality which it is very easy for us to die without ever having known and which is, quite simply, our life. Real life, life at last laid bare and illuminated in literature, and life thus defined is in a sense all the time immanent in ordinary men no less than the artist.”¹ – Proust says that this life is “immanent” in all men, not only the artist, for Proust’s conception of art was that *all is art*, and that it takes a special human being, the deliberate artist, who sets everything aside in order to retrieve that art immanent in men, in the ordinary life, to interpret the feelings inherent in every man, and to translate that in to the expressions of art. – It is through “art alone” that we are “able to emerge from ourselves, to know what another person sees of a universe which is not the same as our own and of which, without art, the landscapes would remain as unknown to us as those that may exist on the moon”. It is an interpretation of the artist’s own feelings, but also the artist’s interpreting the feelings of mankind. – “It is the task of the artist”

¹ I have edited the quote slightly to allow for a smoother incorporation in the present text

to undo – tear down - the conceptual reality created by habits, concepts, science...all that are products of contemplating nothing but the external, and to “make us travel back in the direction from which we have come to the depths where what has really existed lies unknown within us”, this is the “struggle to discern beneath matter, beneath experience, beneath words”.

In “Against Sainte-Beuve”, the drafts in which Proust had practiced his style and literary tenets he spoke in terms of interpretation of feelings telling that in a book “there must be depth”, it “must have come from that region of the inner life where the creation of works of art becomes possible”, and there we have to “go down into that deep inner quietude where thought chooses the words which will completely reflect it”, and which thus are “born of the spirit”. The writer that undertakes this journey into the depths of the dwellings of the inner spirit will “write without respect of persons and for the sake of what is deep and essential in oneself.”¹

At one point Proust even uses the vocabulary of interpretation of feelings when he says “the objective value of arts counts for little; what we have to bring to light and make known to ourselves is our feelings, our passions, that is to say the passions and feelings

¹ Proust “Against Sainte-Beuve” in *On Art and Literature*, p. 270, 271

of all mankind”.¹

Art, language, symbols. All expressions, all art is symbolic communication; the finest little expression is symbolic. All language is art, all being is symbolic. All thinking, all cognition is symbolic. – All symbols are meant to represent perceptions - perceptions in competition - Art, language, consist in an attempt to translate feelings into expressions, which *consist* of an *infinite number* of symbols, nothing but symbols, symbols which evoke the image of memories and things; thingly symbols calling feelings into the mind, calling feelings into question.

Pain and pleasure always intertwined. Having established that all in life is a function of the two binary oppositions pain and pleasure, we have to make a disclaimer and stress that it is never a choice between the two; pain and pleasure always come intertwined one in the other, as aspects of one, this is why every attempt to get to the roots of the problem is doomed, but not vain, for each hero of art will help us to fine-tune our senses to see a new aspect of life. And each will bring us closer to the feeling – (for we cannot exclude this kind of progress after all) – which is to be found beyond pain and pleasure, integrating all in one, in love.

Love and trust. Thus I propose to think of art as a quest

¹ Proust, *In Search of Lost Time: Time Regained*, p. 316

of finding an expression to match the interpretation of feelings; the feelings of pain and pleasure ... But beyond pain and pleasure - at the end of the road - there is a catch, which is love. I would think that this if anything is the only meaningful purpose of life, to enter a quest to capture the inner feeling of love and armed with this love from within to reach out to love and be loved in return, or just love in return... And I find it exhilarating to think that this indeed is also the most scientific endeavor that life has to offer to a human, and mankind.

Chagall said: "In our life there is a single color, as on an artist's palette, which provides the meaning of life and art. It is the color of love." – *In language* the color of love is the interpretation of the ultimate feeling, the one above the others, the truest, most genuine, the one that is beyond the binary struggle of pain and pleasure, love.

This is how the innermost meaning of deliberate art and our living art of everyday – being - coincide yet in this one aspect, in this foremost aspect of art, in this ultimate manifestation of life, in love. – It tells something about science, reason and good manners that only the lunatics seem to be conscious of this, only those who full of joy like newly weds fly with the cows and the trees, with the cocks and the herrings above the rooftops of consciousness to the music of the inner fiddler of feelings.

And I am not trying to be romantic about this, just scientific – scientific in the sense of not saying anything metaphysical – scientific in the sense of anchoring our statements of reality in the biological and physical facts – just stating that beyond good and bad, beyond the mental confusion, beyond the biological, and produced by the biological, there is the mental reality which is love.

The forms of art called religion – in their non-political original forms – are attempts to catch this feeling of love, to understand this feeling and to multiply it.

Love is the ultimate feeling, feeling which we want to capture, or rather *recapture* – for this is what we are doing, trying to recapture a feeling, a feeling we have glimpsed, sensed for a while, a fleeting while, a feeling of which we have seen the heels and nothing more, always on the run, on the run in search of a lost feeling, for I believe that the dilemma in life is that truth lies in the future, but love, hope and trust are in the past and we are in a continuous quest to reconnect with that feeling in the future. And this is why I think that, in fact, the search of lost time is the search for the future, and of love. And we will understand that love too is a feeling, not a possession, and since it is a feeling it can indeed be found, found and regained, regained and retained, retained and relived, relived, felt, and lived over again - within oneself.

But could it be that *trust* and *love* - again - are aspects of this same ultimate feeling, aspects of *one* entangled in our perceptions (confusing the one with the other), and that trust is the version which is for us to have and enjoy in relation to the ones we long to love, could it be that it is a form of love free of all will to possess, free of all competition, free of jealousy and comparison.

Trust is more than any possession and all possessions in one, and the peculiarity with trust – free of all competition and any comparison – is that you can multiple it in all infinity and share it with any number of people, in principle, for all you need is just to find somebody that wants to earn your trust, trust and be trusted in return. – I think we need to explore the essence of the feeling of trust in the same way that love has been examined in art and literature, if I were to learn the English language well enough, then I would myself attempt to write in prose such a book on trust.

In this book... I want to spell out my conviction that all *human life in society* is based on *social practices* i.e. traditions carried on from person to person, from generation to generation. - And hereby I stress that *all human life* can only be *life in society*; human life stems from life in society, and no life can be sustained outside of society.

I have a goal...I wish to help to bring about a fundamental change in how to perceive *knowledge*, *science*, and *human cognition*, the basis of human commonwealth, of humanity. I claim that all what humans have achieved - or what they wish, or what they think that they have achieved - is based on social practices, and nothing more; social practices are the achievements, and nothing more can be achieved (*and all is art*).

Not in any one single person...There is no wisdom or knowledge inherent in any one single person; all wisdom and knowledge is available only in social practices. And this is equally the case with 'ignorance' and 'misjudgments', for they too are all aspects of social practices. Ignorance and wisdom are inseparable aspects of the human mind, there is not the one without the other. – They are aspects of social practices, but these social practices should not be confused with anything that exists or that could possibly exist, they are no entities, no things, no materia, they are no things, they do not exist. We are dealing only with aspects of the non-existent – we

react to this insight by saying “This does not really make any sense”, because we think that our language is sensible! Social practices are but *thingless reflections of past experience*, embedded in language.

Knowledge. Knowledge is knowledge of social practices, therefore knowledge is not objectively correct nor laudable or loathsome. Knowledge is simply what we have learnt, been taught to accept as knowledge.

Language. Social practices reflect what people have done in the past, and what they do today, nothing else. Social practices are carried from person to person and generation to generation in language, and language is the highest *form – the supreme manifestation* - of social practices. – There I used the word *form*, I wanted to avoid it, but that is the way *we speak – or use language*, as it is said. - We only have this *grammar of the language of things*, suitable for things *not for feelings mental*. Ours is a language fit but for describing the things of nature; to speak in terms of the physical reality; to describe things and their movements, subordinating feelings to the same rigid mechanical rules of the mind, as if feelings too were things governed by the laws of gravitation. – If we want to stick with the laws of physics then at the very least language should be put under the theory of relativity. - This grammar, this language of ours, prevents us from dealing with feelings, to tell what we think. This grammar keeps us from voicing the inner, the feelings. We long for another language, for another way of speaking, a

language of feelings; a manner to speak which we still do not master, but which will have to learn. We take on feelings armed with abstractions, and we think that abstractions form a part of our arsenal but they don't. What we think of as abstractions are but the mental forms of things forged in the hands of the mind into the moulds of the thingly thinking. With language we are like Don Quijote fighting perceptions, windmills in the mind. *Language, the thingling of thinking*, leads us in a vicious circle; all our abstractions in themselves are but the words for things and their movements recast in a new role where they please but do not fit; pictures created in the ‘mind’ as if by pulling out traits from the original ‘thing’. As of today we view reality through these thingly images that crowd the mind and take refuge in language.

Language. Knowledge is embedded in language, and nowhere else. Void of language each generation would have to start life from scratch. Language is what sets humans and animals apart, in good and bad. – In this connection I think it is noteworthy that interestingly enough Albert Einstein had dwelt on the association between social practices, language, and knowledge as evidenced from these following quotes from *The World As I See It*, a selection of Einstein's letters and other writings: “The greater part of our knowledge and beliefs have been communicated to us by other people through the medium of a language which others have created. Without language our mental

capacities would be poor indeed, comparable to those of higher animals; we have therefore, to admit that we owe our principal advantage over the beasts to the fact of living in human society". – "When we survey our lives and endeavors we soon observe that almost the whole of our actions and desires are bound up with the existence of other human beings."¹

Social practices. The words *to reflect* and *reflections* are those best suited, or so it seems, to demonstrate the notion of social practices. Social practices are reflections of what people say and have said, but rainbow-like they are nowhere, except in our minds, embedded in language.

Intelligence. There is no intelligence in the human individual, all intelligence to speak of is in the cultural heritage, in the social practices, those that reflect people's experience in an infinite regress back in time. – It is as if people would be the processors of information in a dispersed system that knows no limits; people processing the accumulated information encoded in language, and then anew making the processed information available through language to all other humans, anew and anew, to anybody and nobody particular – to all humans processing the data over and over again.

¹ Albert Einstein, *The World As I See It*, p. 8

Language again, again like a rushing stream feeds social practices, like water feeding the wheel powering the machine, milling the meal, rotating life... Expressions spin the wheel of social practices; blasting against the wheel, pressing - with the weight of expressions - the wheel in motion; words like water swashing, splashing, spattering around; water and words, motion - violent at times - turn the wheel around. Waves hurling spouts of spray in the air, surging and dashing a drop splits astray, hits a blade on the rim of the wheel, bounces back, and up in the air catches, enfolds in its balm a ray of blue light, like an eye the pearl in the drop reflects the light from the far away sun, whose beam powers the earth, sets the world in motion, lifts the water up in air, drops it down, then takes it through the mountains off to the river, flowing down the stream, feeding the wheel, powering the machine, milling the meal, rotating life... In a unique moment the drop was lit, catching and holding in its womb the ray, the meaning of life – and the wheel spun on, swallowing the drop and its light in the machine, feeding life with the expression of that drop of water and the whole ocean empowered by the sun, like the expressions of our language radiant with feelings of men and women living and dying like those drops, turning nothing to deeds, rotating life. --- I do not know where that outburst came from, I simply wanted to express the idea of words, language and social practices being in constant motion where one affects the other in eternal motion, but I had in

mind another analogy, one more fitting to the poetry of this age, I thought about the world wide web, the Internet, which could serve as a simile in view of it encompassing all these same elements in which we can mirror the notion of social practices. In the Internet, strictly from a functional point of view the information is nowhere, and yet everywhere, and – as long as people have the economic means to use it – the data of this world wide web of belief is within the reach of everybody. Just like language, which is nowhere, and yet everywhere. Similarly we access language in the web of social practices, the carriers and embodiment of knowledge, knowledge encoded in language, representing the supreme form of social practices.

Knowledge and information. Knowledge and information consist only of condensed reflections, reverberations, expressions, of *feelings bouncing from one person to another*, from somebody to anybody, to who knows whom. Knowledge, information, is nothing thingly firm, nothing given. - *Knowledge is nothing more than yet another round of expressions and interpretations.* – But the same goes for misjudgments and ignorance, misinformation and disinformation – in short for all sorts of erroneous beliefs; knowledge corresponds to ignorance, and they are both merely aspects of one; it is a matter of taste which labels we assign to the one and the other. And this holds true with all in life, infinite variances, infinite aspects that we

fail to consider while we consider only one at a time. – Western science is in fact a poetic exaltation of wisdom, utterly absent from its actual subject matter, to the degree that nobody has even considered that ignorance and misjudgments are integral parts of what they call science, and this must be the supreme form of ignorance.

Knowledge – language – deeds. By doing, acting or representing, the abstract *knowledge* - reflections from the eternal interplay – is brought, through the medium of language back into nature, in form of physical actions, deeds undertaken and things affected.

Cognition – becoming aware, thinking. We can now discern the *elements (again this thingly word)* that *take part* in the process of cognition (producing knowledge).

These are:

- the individual who interprets his own feelings; whereas, his feelings are influenced by the expressions that he has heard (or seen, *remember the broad definition of language*);
- the individual communicating his interpretation of feelings to the external, to other people, with expressions;
- everyone interpreting the expressions of others;
- but, in between the initial expressions have traveled through language, and do no longer represent the expressions of the feelings of anybody singular, particular;

- thus, when the individual interprets his feelings social practices both affect the interpretations and come out from it i.e. people communicating their bodily needs and feelings - opinions, wishes, needs – produce the social practices.

This way there is a continuous interplay between the expressions of feelings of one individual and the social practices of all the others, the reflections of all expressions, past and present. This is what I want to stress as the framework – the playground - of human life, the connection between interpretations of feelings stemming from each individual and the interplay, the social practices, the reflections of expressions of everyone.

We should now be able to grasp ‘knowledge’ as a mere reflection of what in society has emerged as knowledge as a result of opinions - feelings, perceptions - in competition.

Memory. I think that discovering ‘memory’ - finding out what it is all about, how it functions - would be the most rewarding piece of information about human cognition: what is the biological memory, or rather the biological processes that occur in storing, producing, memory? - Could it be that there is no storage – that the word ‘storage’ is just a leftover from the thingly language? Could it be that memory is just the avant-garde of the same processes that produce

evolutionary adjustments, that the organism just has a way of reacting to sensory impulses, so that each time a new impulse comes it is compared with the previous impulses, and that this biological comparison would immediately, and continuously push the body to produce images, perceptions, which in the imagination of a person come out as memories. And perhaps language, because of the added level of abstraction, causes certain kind of processes to be activated or dominant. In this hypothesis even memory would to a great extent be outsourced in the social practices, in language. - We need to keep in mind that ultimately all cognition is based on interpretation of perceptions which are always more or less fallible.

Social practices and interplay of feelings. This idea of combining social practices with the eternal interplay of personal expressions and interpretations contrasts markedly with the way the need to explain life and knowledge has been addressed throughout history¹. In the earliest times, it seems, that explanations were sought for in external forces: trees, plants, and animals were credited with powers to direct human faith, life on earth, the universe. Mountains, lakes, seas, landmarks in nature were assigned these powers; the sun and stars, celestial bodies, were assigned this divine role. Later special entities, human-like gods, were attributed these powers. Such beliefs followed

¹ Knowledge about the physical nature; nature vs. society; behavior and social practices

naturally from practical thinking, practical human logic in contemplating the world, reasoning from what could be known, from what could possibly be known with the means then available. - I believe that traditional beliefs build on the idea that these external forces, deities, were in some way reflections of the human self. In this sense, it seems, humans back in those times ultimately thought - as I do now - of the world as a projection of the self (the Ego) to the universe, which is like interpreting the universe from point of view of personal feelings. - The idea of interpretation of feelings as the paradigm might therefore represent this same eternal and ultimate idea. We merely return to this idea after clearing away the debris, the building blocks of social science fiction, two thousand years of wrong questions. From underneath the layers of misconceived philosophical problems; misconceptions; linguistic confusion and delusion we return to the eternal, the mysterious, what we cannot know. – The cardinal mistake which led to the social sciences of the 20th century was the mingling into one bundle the conception of the material nature (natural sciences) and the mental and spiritual (what we today call social sciences, philosophy, and religion). And while on that, even worse, taking the flawed understanding of the natural sciences as the paramount knowledge, starting to think that all that is the case is *something thingly*, and that every *thing* is a *thing-in-itself*.

Interpretation of feelings. Interpretation of feelings has a biological foundation, it is the biological struggle occurring in the binary mode of pain and pleasure. Gradually, in the course of evolution, this struggle has been brought to the mental level, up to language. - A human is constantly interpreting himself and the environment, the world. These interpretations cause biological and physiological changes in the body; furthermore these interpretations cause the expressions of emotion and feelings in animals and humans alike, that is, in thinking beings. – [Surely both humans and animals are thinking beings, but what sets humans apart from animals is precisely language, speech. This is what humanity is all about, learning to speak] - Animals communicate acoustically, through emitting sounds with a symbolic meaning. Would it be possible to define what separates animal communication from human language; what would be the characteristic, decisive, differences between these, where should we draw the line? – Or perhaps the mere attempt would be a language-game in itself? – I thought that perhaps in an attempt to grasp the difference we could point to ‘abstractions’; supposedly the difference would be in the capacity to communicate abstract ideas, but then I recalled that any idea is an abstract idea. – Then maybe the difference is in the flexibility of the humans to express in language ideas without any restrictions? Supposedly there are no restrictions that prevent us from expressing just any ideas, but this is so *in*

principle only for there are restrictions, practical ones, that prevent us from achieving this: We humans lack experience, training, to express ourselves, to express opinions, express feelings. The human heritage is still so poor, so weak; forms of life, the stage settings have altered, we dress as if we were modern men, but our language, the language of things, is still back in the stone ages; I doubt that we could today express the mental any better than people could those thousands of years ago – maybe the other way around. We have the language of things, stone, copper and bronze, we need to melt this language, make it fluid, cast it in the mode of feelings, those infinite variances. We need a new grammar for interpreting life, the beginning, the eternal, the infinite - and love.

With the idea of interpretation of feelings we connect the mental (abstract) with the natural reality, the thingly core of cognition - The thingly core is the body that produces the feelings. - I stress: the expressions of the feelings that we hear and see are only feeble copies, faint interpretations of the original, the inner. - There, in the body nature produces the social, the human – the human: these expressions, the language which is the human. – Nature *produces* language. From this statement it is evident that the core of cognition, the limits of what can be known, lies in a contradiction in terms. For expressions are not things (which I stress time after time), expressions are not material, they never existed, not even when

they ‘were produced’. – This is what we need to explore: to establish this connection between the mental (non-existent expressions) and the biological organism (the biological surroundings where the physical actions take place and from where the mental originate). This is our challenge: to acquire a grammar and a vocabulary to speak of the mental, the non-physical, feelings, the infinite and the eternal. Expressions come out through physical means, but they themselves are not physical. The expression is an interpretation of feelings. This is the dilemma which prevents us humans to understand the universal, the beginning and the end¹. – What we cannot touch, thereof we have to speak - in the language of art.

Reason. The roots of modern science derive from the Greek cultures of the times of Plato and Aristotle. – While Plato and Aristotle are admired today for their supposedly great work, I find it much more extraordinary how these two men managed to silence for a couple of thousand years the remarkable traditions of Greek thinking of their predecessors and contemporaries. In Greece two thousand five hundred years ago almost all of what I now try to convince people of was already known, and it could have found the proper expression back then, endless sufferings ago, were it not for the preposterous

¹ This confusion between what exists and what does not exist is the very linguistic problem that Wittgenstein pointed out to him.

authority that these men had managed to seize and their work has been credited with. Through Plato and Aristotle mankind made the most fatal wrong turn ever. – The problem is not even in, as such, what they said – although that was all mostly wrong (and totally wrong what comes to Plato) – but the very fact that a healthy pluralistic tradition abound with wisdom (at least of the relative sort) was succumbed to the authority of two vain and mediocre thinkers, one a propagandist and the other one the archetype of the high school headmaster. – In contrast to these two we have the presocratic traditions from Parmenides to Democritus, and the formidable traditions of thinking known as sophism – labeled as *sophistry* by Plato, the master of turning black in to white and sense in to nonsense. This sophistry and the rhetoric method was the *competition of arguments*, not only in form, but also in fundamental understanding of relativity of science. How much better off we would be if instead our historic models for science would have been men like Democritus and Protagoras! This is the biggest lost opportunity ever, lost for ever for those who came before us.

The work of the Greeks first documented trends in rejecting the ideas of the suprahuman agents directing life on earth and representing knowledge. Building on these traditions book-learned men started to credit the *human self*, a thingling inside the brain, as being the ultimate source of knowledge. In modern

days, with the traditions called enlightenment, these teachings led to a belief that the human is equipped with a *'reason'* which they described in a mechanical fashion as if it would be a *faculty* or even an *organ*¹. Immanuel Kant (1724 – 1804 years), the German professor, laborious in then prevailing traditions of alchemy, is known for having greatly contributed – in the disguise of philosophy - to the spread of the superstitious belief in the legend of reason, a legend which brought humanity from catastrophe to catastrophe in the years that followed.

The notion 'reason' developed originally as a figure of speech in the discourse of haughty men of the elite looking at life from the perspective of their privileged positions in society. Perplexed by their fortunate circumstances compared with that of the masses, they could not understand and really believe how they were so smart, and thus they were determined to find a cause for their lucky supremacy, they had to identify the factor that could explain it all, but looking around in the world they found nothing, and so only their wit could explain their good fortune, and this is what led them to the -for them - only plausible conclusion: they were endowed with the special gift of *reason*, the thingling in the brain, their birthright that set them apart from the rest of humanity; the explanation, the

¹ A belief that is still very popular among the linguistic alchemists like Noam Chomsky and Stephen Pinker

final solution and the symbol for their wit. – This is how the figure of speech, *reason*, developed, like a cancerous growth, a mental tumor, to become the base of the scientific creed, the superstition that obscured the enlightenment.

The artifacts of philosophical nonsense were felt far beyond the Academy of Science, the horrors of the 20th century – the Age of Superstition – radiated from reason, and it was with this reason that the evil was armed by Kant and the likes. They overturned what little had been achieved by then in teachings of love and compassion and replaced it with the legend of reason, a monstrous claim made by sorcerers disguised in the wig and robe of scholars, enlightened with their fixed ideas. Then, having established *reason* as an uncontestable philosophical truth, these monsters and their followers were free to go on and claim just anything in the name of this reason, which served to cover up all their mistakes. They could do it, because their inhuman and cruel nonsense was certified by the Academy. This is how reason, the product of vain ignorance of the leisured class, paved the road to hell culminating in the Second World War, Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Auschwitz.

Failed and full of horror, cause of endless human suffering, the traditions of speculation under the brand of reason anyhow contributed to pushing the search for knowledge inside the human. Now

the human mind was thought to be the center of the universe. – In a way it was, but only in a form of a mirror - infinitely many mirrors human beings as *mirrors reflecting knowledge* from one individual to others in this big joint venture that we may call social practices. And this mirror was neither reason nor the mind – if by that is meant a thingling in the brain – rather it was *the heart*. – *The heart*, a symbol I prefer for the cognitive apparatus, which is the whole human organism. All we know are but reflections between hearts, past, present, and future...

The transmutation in reverse, from reason to thinking. Stripped of philosophical hype there is not much left of *reason*, now ordinary thinking no more. I will illustrate this by showing how reason is returned to ordinary thinking in an inverted process, taking linguistic alchemy backwards – performing the transmutation in reverse. After all this reversal of nonsense is the only direction in which we can possibly hope for any successful transmutation to occur. We take a piece of ordinary nonsense, add our knowledge of natural science, and that of grammar, dissolve the nonsense in its constituent parts, and establish the correspondence between symbol and thought. Next we dress the statement in more simple words, rearrange the words and...Voila! We've converted nonsense into sense. This is how we reverse linguistic alchemy, two thousand five hundred years of elite err.

For our experiment we quote from the Wikipedia, the Internet sites with all the latest on social science fiction. There we find our test sample. As a background for understanding the test situation we read “*Reason has traditionally been claimed as distinctly human, and not to be found elsewhere in the animal world. However, recent studies in this area show that, in lower levels, animals are capable of some rational thinking.*” – What strikes here is not the claim that animals would possess this legendary *reason* (i.e. ‘thinking’), but the statement itself, that now in this 21st century this story is treated as a scientific discovery, that *animals can think* would be a discovery of sorts. Why on earth would anybody with a sound mind have to back up that claim with “recent studies”? What this piece of news means, in fact, is that some life-estranged scientist has come to the startling conclusion that *animals can think*, and that he prefers to call thinking ‘*rational thinking*’, which he equates with ‘*reason*’. Then what is the difference between ‘*rational thinking*’ and ‘*ordinary thinking*’ - or are we supposed to call the latter non-rational thinking? – Quite the opposite, from observing animal behavior we would rather conclude that their actions seem much more in line with what a wise man, the ideal man or woman (here I feel a special urge to stress the equality between genders) would do in the given circumstances considering the physical abilities. And isn’t that what we should call *rational, to act in the best possible way in any given*

circumstances. I guess that most people – at least those that have not been illuminated in the sacred belief of science – would agree that we can certainly not say the same about people when we observe how they act in public and private. – Now to the test itself. Further on in the quote we read: “We reason when we conclude one thing on the basis of something else.” – In order to try to grasp the meaning of this *scientific* statement we first have to translate it into the ordinary language. Hereby note how we proceed *by eliminating* the *concept* ‘*thing*’. After this elimination the statement could read like: ‘We reason when we [draw a conclusion] [based on] [preceding data].’ Now we have a statement translated into ordinary language, free from the confusion introduced by the scientific way of speaking (our method is that of interpretation: *replacing one expression with another*). From this presentation in the vulgar language we see that we can go one step further and just state: ‘Reason is drawing a conclusion based on information.’ Furthermore we note that in accordance with our linguistic traditions the sentence would sound prettier if we change the grammatical category of ‘*reason*’ from nominal to verbal, from ‘*reason*’ to ‘*reasoning*’, then our statement reads like this: ‘Reasoning is drawing a conclusion based on information.’ Our final move is undertaken upon realizing that the word ‘*thinking*’ may replace the word ‘*reasoning*’ which brings us to the statement: ‘Thinking is drawing a conclusion based on information.’ Now we see that

all what is left of the initial, alchemical, proposition is a purported definition of what ‘thinking’ means. – Personally I am not quite satisfied with that definition of thinking. I am a bit concerned with the idea that a conclusion necessarily *must be* drawn. Can we not think without bringing the thought to an end? – Or perhaps, maybe, this is the very human fallacy that ‘reason’, in fact, aptly describes i.e. *the human urge always to rush to a conclusion*, even when there are no real premises for it? And therefore, maybe we should after all leave ‘reason’ to describe human thinking, this natural perversion.

Linguistic Alchemy and Ultimate Stimuli. At the peak of linguistic alchemy these philosophers similarly to the claim of the alchemist about possessing the ultimate secrets of how to turn lead to gold, declared that they were privy to the self-evident truths, axioms and principles. No gold became of lead, and human feelings will not turn into truths; no philosophical formulae¹ will capture life. Axioms and principles, laws of life...that this nonsense should become self-evident is all the self-evidence we can truly hope for. – Even truth is relative. All is relative, not only in physics...but in human society as well. – Ultimate axioms, ultimate principles are but hallucinations of social science fiction, nothing more. - But there

¹ I was delighted to come by the detail that according to etymology ‘formulae’ originally stood for ‘words used in a ceremony or ritual’ (see www.etymonline.com); this is the use to which we shall deport them back.

is something, which in fact is the ultimate; the real ultimate is in the body, in the human organism - within the biological. There we find the *ultimate stimuli* that incite the human quest, the basic binary mode of pain and pleasure – the eternal adjustment to pain and pleasure; to repel pain, to reach for pleasure. All in life stems from this struggle in the binary mode of pain and pleasure. This goes on in the animal organism, the human organism, and through the course of evolution it was passed on to human emotions and feelings. At this present point in evolution the quest for pain and pleasure is conducted on the level of language. The biological animal evolved from this same balance and counterbalance of pain and pleasure, rotating around and intertwined in what we could call emotions, which in a higher level of refinement maybe thought of as feelings, and now these feelings struggle to break through the body to become expressions, eventually reaching sublimity in language. – Not in our language, though, only in a future language of feelings.

Language, the social extension of the struggle between pain and pleasure. In language, the eternal struggle between pain and pleasure is reflected in the social competition of arguments, in pleads for pleasure and aversion of pain. – Ideally the social extension of this *binary* system of pain and pleasure should be reflected in our social practices as a fluent balance, a harmony in language- but for now we only have this work in

progress. Our language, the way we speak, the way we express ourselves is still far off the point of harmony, crude and harsh like blocks of stone, harsh like a Flintstone bat, fit for flinging and crossing the head of a random enemy in lieu of a more suitable expression for the occasion, while for the real feeling – the one we failed to express, the one we needed to interpret – we would need something more than the bat, a language of feelings giving us the capacity to express complex thinking, like shades of color; tunes of music; dimension; and depth – (and even these words whereby I describe the diversity we need are all derived from the language of things, words used to describe things and their movements, something physical – perhaps the word ‘tune’ is different, one for feelings). We need to acquire a way of speaking which will incorporate a thousand more subtle aspects to fit between the bat and the swing on the head, softer and more subtle expressions, multifaceted, multidimensional, nuanced ways of speaking. – The blocks of stones have to be grained to sand, the sand melted and made transparent like glass, the sand mixed into plaster from which we sculpture new expressions in the mind, a new thinking, something that would aid us in interpreting feelings and the infinite variances of life.

In language we are trying to find a balance, and reach beyond the struggle of pain and pleasure. In language the biological needs for adjustments to pain and pleasure are not reflected as they should, and from

this our failures, failures of humanity throughout history, throughout times. Language fails us, the language of today fails us, but this is not the end, where we stop others will carry on, and eventually a language of feelings will replace that of this present language of things.

Inventions. I stressed that knowledge, all we know, and all we can know, is a reflection of people’s life in society, reflections of communication. Knowledge - not to mention the special kind of knowledge which they call ‘truth’ - does not stem from any one particular person. – Even what appears to be a decisive contribution of one, is but a small adjustment to social practices, immeasurable to human mind. Knowledge embedded in social practices is brought to light sooner or later, if not by one then another. *The inventor* gives but a finishing touch to an old idea, an old practice; the inventor interprets the old knowledge in a new way. He points to a new aspect, and turns the question around. All changes, all inventions, all discoveries, come about by *one* adding a bit to the work of many, all a result of cumulative social experience. Infinite variances, infinite stimuli, are behind all change. Only in human mind does all get boiled down to causes and effects, to the credit of particular men and particular actions. – Inventions are seen only in retrospective.

Knowledge is the use, the practice. Do we have any good reason to think that the achievements in natural sciences are any more advanced than those of social sciences?

- By all means, no! – How is scientific knowledge reflected in life? – Scientific knowledge is reflected in the threats to the ecology, environment and the threats of complete destruction of life. – Knowledge is the use, the practice, doing. There is no theoretical knowledge, only speculation or practice. – ‘Science’ is not implemented, applied – science is the reflection of what is applied, what people practice, do. – We have to reject the image of this *thingling, science*, being something great, something fixed outside of men, hidden and waiting to be discovered, instead we need to fully understand that science is a human endeavor, a quest – a way, the way, as the Chinese said. - It is an aspect of our activities, of our social practices, of what we do together, one and each with the other, do and did, now and then. And this brings natural sciences back to the realm of people, natural sciences are interpreted, and misinterpreted by people. And this explains why even natural sciences are not much better, even when they start from something real, from the physical reality of nature. For knowledge of natural science is also at the end of the day its application – (‘science’ and ‘the end of the day’ – what a scary association) - and application brings everything back to the infinite distortions human mind is capable of achieving. The scientists, of all people, are the least analytical, as they, availing themselves of opposites, reduce all to a few aspects, and ignore the infinite variances of life. But we can not avoid these infinite variances, for they are part of life, part of the the reality outside science; in reality nothing is fixed,

nothing is ready, only endless questions calling into question, a path with an infinite number of cross roads and just as many wrong turns. The limits of natural sciences are set in human practices, the limits are in knowledge, and knowledge is but a reflection of those same human social practices, of language. Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Auschwitz, Beslan, Iraq – wars; pollution, contamination. global warming; hunger, poverty, propaganda...Humanity does not have a good track record.

Science and Art

Albert Einstein who revolutionized natural sciences also penetrated in his personal thoughts to the fundamentals of human cognition knowing, as he said, that “the fairest thing we can experience is the mysterious. It is the fundamental emotion which stands at the cradle of true art and true science”¹

The difference between art and science, if any, can possibly be found only in the arrangement of words and their purported meaning. In science the arrangement of words and their meaning have to be open to a serious scrutiny, while in other forms of art words are used to express feelings without an attempt to establish an exact correlation between signs and meaning. In deliberate art obvious metaphors abound and direct meaning may well rest hidden from the spectator, the reader. In art the aim is to create a feeling, which comes about through a combination of all the elements of the artwork, small elements that add aspects to the feeling like the shades of color in a painting. The work of art becomes a microcosm for the narrative (within the bigger narrative which is our life and the conceptual reality it offers), and the whole of the narrative conveys the feeling, or the various aspects that add to the feelings, and that is the message of art, something that cannot be said in other words, because the work of art was the expression of the very feeling.

Here I want to recall to my aid the words of Marcel Proust who expressed this same idea with scientific precision and unfailing beauty like this: “when all is said, it is only the inexpressible, the thing one believes one cannot succeed in getting into a book, that remains in it. It is something vague and haunting, like a memory. It is atmospheric...it is not in the words, it is not said, it is all among the words, like the morning mist at Chantilly”¹ The artwork itself as a holistic one conveys the idea that the artist nourishes.

¹ Proust “Against Sainte-Beuve” in *On Art and Literature* p. 153. It is interesting to note that Ludwig Wittgenstein had expressed a similar idea as evidenced by a letter he had sent to the publisher of his first work, the *Tractatus*: “the point of the book is ethical. I once wanted to give a few words in the foreword which now actually are not in it, which, however, I’ll write to you now because they might be a key for you: I wanted to write that my work consists of two parts: of the one which is here, and of everything I have not written. And precisely this second part is the important one. For the Ethical is delimited from within, as it were by my book; and I’m convinced that, strictly speaking, it can ONLY be delimited in this way. In brief, I think: All of that which many are babbling I have defined in my book by remaining silent about it.”, in Ray Monk’s *Ludwig Wittgenstein – The Duty of Genius*, p. 178. – This idea is also to his famous statement from the preface to the *Tractatus*: “What can be said at all can be said clearly, and what we cannot talk about we must pass over in silence.” – In *Culture and Value* (p. 16) Wittgenstein said: “Perhaps what is inexpressible (what I find mysterious and am not able to express) is the background against which whatever I could express has its meaning.”

¹ Einstein, *The World As I See It*, p. 5

The artist's tool is the paintbrush which he uses to bring out the infinite variances of life, aspects of humanity and the nature. His narratives are full of colors that come in all shades of life, to reach the right tone he might have to travel half way around the world, and turn grammar upside down, tear words to pieces, rearrange them, and employ them in a new way, and he may claim that he expressed himself, and we believe him if we sense the proof in a feeling that his expression has touched somewhere deep within ourselves. – But in the art of science this liberty shall be restrained. In reality the language of science is needed for the special purpose of translating art into transparent statements, to voice in a clear language the knowledge produced in deliberate art and in our everyday art of being, i.e. in life at large. The objective of science should be to translate the manifold of feelings into the minimal common denominator that all can transparently agree upon, or by the very least reach an agreement as to what the purported meaning is supposed to be.

The results of science cannot be implemented, nothing about science can be implemented, in science all that can be implemented are the conditions for competition – the conditions for freedom – for science, too, is best seen as a constant *competition of arguments*. This is a competition - or rather a game - where a new argument, whatever its merits, is like a drop in the ocean, or perhaps a wave at best

–(Amplifying this figure of speech from a drop to a wave I was inevitably led to think about a tidal wave and then a tsunami, and so I thought that war is like an argument the size of a tidal wave, and that nuclear war is an argument like a tsunami, and yet there are people who are willing to resort even to these kind of arguments, arguments born in an evil mind, born of an evil language). – In science there can never be a decisive new argument that would break the spell of the web of belief which in all its fundamentals is nothing but different manifestations of superstition. Nothing new - no one argument - can ever impress the community of scientist to the point of making a difference, and all the arguments that trickle down beyond the community of the learned are at best received as anecdotal data without any other value than the face value of the name the piece of knowledge is assigned. Nobody – except perhaps a few artists - will draw any conclusions from the new argument they heard, and that is in the very best case when something indeed was heard.

Beliefs - separately and collectively - change only gradually, over time, with the current of life and the evolving social practices. It is not by the arguments, nor by the theories, nor by discoveries that changes in beliefs come about, but only through integrating new knowledge – and its alter ego misconception - in language. It is only in language – i.e. in social practices – that new ideas are received and developed,

accepted or rejected; utilized, used and misused. And this is what makes the modern notion of science so problematic. On an analogy with the natural sciences, and by an artful manipulation of language, scientists claim the *discovery*, *invention*, and *existence* of one or another *theory of social sciences*, but in reality - beyond the language-games of social sciences - a theory is nothing but an argument among other arguments. This is also why - after eloquent public discourse on the beauty of one or another most final, ultimate theory the proponents grow impatient due to their failures to convince everyone else of their 'universal truths', and weary of futile argumentation, intent on action, they resolve to cut the nonsense, sharpen the knives, load their guns, and proceed from *vision into action*, to the final forms of persuasion, to the mental violence called propaganda, and eventually the final argument of killing and destruction in the name of a God, Marx, Superstructure, Fatherland, Ancestor Land, Democracy and Freedom of Speech (in the present day the two last ones are the most popular causes for mass-murder).

In the scientific competition of arguments, in the discourse, certain types of arguments are branded 'scientific'. These 'scientific arguments' are those that are put forward in accordance with the prescribed rituals of the Academy; this Academy is like a castle beyond the reach of humans, whose emissaries guard the kingdom of science and its most sacred treasure,

reason. This is why the dealers of the Academy, the universities, serve a special role in conserving the prevailing superstition; even the organizational structures are molded on an analogy with religious communities. The European universities emerged from within the structures of the Catholic Church and replicated the church in all the essential characteristics – basically simply replacing God with Science. In the Academy like in the old Church to become a scientist – to receive a license to say - an adept through carefully rehearsed initiation rites, is accepted as a member to a kind of sacred concilium of scientists. Mastering the canons of the Academy, and upon submission to the codes of due respect, the adept is proclaimed 'doctor.' In the Catholic Church a 'doctor' was an eminent theologian 'religious teacher' who was declared to be a 'sound expounder of the church doctrine', who, consequently was appointed for the task of *indoctrinating* the followers. In the European universities, by an analogy to the Church, the academic doctors took over the function of the indoctrination of the docile students - now in the scientific creed.

The tradition linked with the use of the word doctor goes even further back to connect directly with the wizards, sorcerers, healers and medicine men, the professions on which our contemporary professors are modeled on, although ours seem more calm, laid back, less of the jumping around, less screaming in

public, chants, charms and smoke screens on paper only, now only words, an artful, delicate manipulation of language. - I make this comparison by no means *only* with irony in mind, rather I sincerely consider that we would all greatly benefit from understanding that the well-polished doctrines of the modern professors are but the latest brand of superstition.

‘Science’ is what those with authority proclaim to be science, similarly like ‘god’ for any given religious community is something that the religious authorities declare to be so. – Science and religion, both are deep down nothing but competition of arguments. But it is competition on a distorted market restrained by authority, and hidden underneath endless layers of superstitious beliefs. Beyond the superficial forms of science and the faces of professors that radiate an appearance of intelligence there is in reality no fundamental difference between modern day social sciences and all other manifestations of primitive thinking through history. Sorcerers, wizards, medicine men, professors, they all represent the same traditions of an elite claiming possession to knowledge hidden from ordinary humans – knowledge, a picture of a thing in the mind, but invisible in reality, unattainable for the uninitiated.

We now need to picture science, not as something (not a ‘thing’ at all), nor as a body of mysterious data, or ultimate secrets, but as the current ranking of the

arguments pertaining to those arguments they call ‘scientific knowledge’. Science is whatever is accepted as science. – And the rules, the borders delimiting science are drawn in language, in the language-games of science.

The little progress there has been, the rise of pragmatic philosophies - a pragmatic world view - is not primarily a result of the new teachings but simply the result of increased competition, more freedom, individual liberty and opportunity to doubt and voice the doubt, for notwithstanding my aforementioned pessimistic notes on the grip of scientific superstition we now evidence a sinking trend in the standing of the formal teachings and the position of the Academy.¹ Professors and their beliefs are still hold in reverence in form even when losing in substance; in substance, in actual life, in practice, the formal teachings are running out of steam, losing relevance, not through conscious opposition but simply as a result of the lives that we lead. All the information needed can be found on the Internet, in the bookstores and in the libraries. Apart from providing facilities for experiments in natural

¹ But as the one goes another comes. Academic science is losing ground, but another monster, more powerful and cruel is emerging, more absolute and totalitarian than anything mankind has experienced, the propaganda machine is on the rise like a balloon on the horizon, taking over reality with the images it blows up and press on the mind.

sciences the importance of the universities is being reduced to serving as points of social gatherings – in fact very much like the churches – and a place where to broaden one’s horizon to become as they say a well-bred, cultivated person – civilized - but if this is what we want, and indeed this is what we should hope for, then for this to happen the curriculum of the universities should be turned upside down, all the positivistic knowledge that they purport to teach – that is what they indoctrinate students with – which is 90% of the contents of the university programs, would have to be reduced by the half and instead there should be a return to a kind of curriculum they had in the French and the British universities at the eve of the 19th century, where emphasis was placed on history, literature, arts, and languages – and even physical education or just sport should form part of the mandatory program - all what in reality would give people the tools for managing life, business, science and progress.

With a deep sigh of relief we may proclaim that the prestige of contemporary university teachings is anyway being marginalized similarly the way religions lost ground, the way churches and rituals are still in esteem but beyond the mainstream of life.

In connection with all this, and to round up my assessment of contemporary science, I cannot resist to throw in my view on the question which is to be

considered the oldest profession, for I cannot agree with the claim that the oldest profession was that of the female prostitute. My candidates for the job are these men with a tight moral dress wrapped around a body of charm, nonsense and lies, the con men and fraudsters who with their antics tricked themselves into authority, the wizards, our professors wrapped in a different garb. And the second oldest was that of the warrior, the professional killer. The third, the judge, who introduced a bit of common sense to the confusion created by the former two, and the poor woman, she was the victim of all these men.

All is Art

Beyond the language-games of science there are other arguments, arguments that pertain to a much deeper, fundamental, understanding of life, arguments for a more accurate and deeper description of the inner workings of life. Such arguments do not meet the sacred criteria of science. These arguments I have in mind are the expressions of art in all its manifestations, in all the infinite variances, expressions of feelings reproduced by artists, expression of men and women in their daily life, in the living art of social practices.

The human being is driven by a feeling of art, artistic creativity. In his art he gives an expression to his feelings, his feelings in competition, competition continuously within and beyond, in the internal and the external. - Above I already referred to Albert Einstein on his thoughts on the relativity of language, knowledge, and social practices, and here again I feel that a reference to his ideas will help me to stress the point, to stress the primacy of art and interpretation of feelings over science (i.e. this special form of art), Einstein said: “Feeling and desire are the motive forces behind all human endeavour and human creation, in however exalted a guise the latter may present itself to us”.¹ – (‘Feeling’ and ‘desire’: desire is the quest for pleasure, and pain is what we pay for it).

¹ Einstein, A. The World As I See It, p. 24

All is art, even science *itself*, is a form of art, a special genre, formalistic, dull, and rarely sincere, but art all the same. – Art is not what is defined as art, but all, all our being, everyday actions and activities is art. Upon reflection this is understood, but in the mind – the scientific mind – there lives a perversion which arranges reality in different terms. In the mind, under the influence of the language of things, the grammar of thingly perceptions deforms reality, become reality and take over reality. As a result an imperishable wall between reality and belief has been erected in the mind. This wall captures perceptions, makes snapshots of them, stores the snapshots, and converts them into a thingly reality, where all gets classified, divided into categories, and defined. Defined – definitions, the most sacred activity of science and the most dangerous. Definitions are what the mind craves for, it can never have enough of them, this is the intellectual feed that the body is dying for, a craving which is like a built in feature of the biological organism. But this feature, this fallacy, is precisely what we have to free us from, free ourselves from the captivity of definitions, classifications, the whole grammar of language of things, instead we have to learn to see the infinite variances, infinite aspects of life – dimensions, depths, relations – all at once, all in the same, all as aspects of one.

The very existence of a human is a lifelong artistic expression; life in all its manifestations is art. When

we speak we give an artistic expression to the interpretation of our feelings. Each moment of life, of being, of behaving, of saying and being silent, is an act of the human art. Some are more explicit about their art than others; some make a point of their art, some know they are doing it, some just do it by being. Stressing individuality is an act of art. The styles of art are as many as there are moments in life, each moment carries a new expression; and individuality is the ultimate demonstration of art, a show of feeling.

- Art styles – like all - come in infinite variances

Art is the origin, knowledge is merely what seems like knowledge, a reflection of art, a reflection of being, reflected in social practices. Humans are called *homo sapiens* – the wise man. How misleading! – Perhaps because he is equipped with the darling of science, the thingling called reason ☺ It is no coincidence that this term was first coined in 1802, to inaugurate the two centuries of social science fiction. I reject this concept, *homo sapiens*, for there is no wisdom in man; human wisdom is nowhere else except for in the commonwealth, in social practices, which reflect traditions of eternal time. - In a moment of sincerity even scientist will admit that not a grain of knowledge has ever been detected in the human body, although life outside the body is full to hints to something that reminds of knowledge, this evidence that should have led us long time ago to find the explanation in social practices (perhaps the knowledge that Protagoras

possessed). - In the human there is no wisdom, but a will, a stream of art, taste, creativity, imagination, and expressions. Better call him *homo artisticus* – (or perhaps *homo creatine* for ‘organic base in the juice of flesh’). Behind every act, is a play, a game, a ploy, constant demonstration of creativity and personality, behind every act there are the expressions of art. A biological organism driven by art is what the human is. - The *homo artisticus*, the creative man, possesses no wisdom, but an appetite, a taste for wisdom, which he savors from what others have brought to the table in form of the inherited social practices. – Speaking about *savor* and *sapiens*, interesting to note how through etymology, the history of words, the comedy of cognition is demonstrated. I rejected *sapiens*, but a few lines later I said ‘*he savors*’, and yet both *savor* and *sapiens* are words connected in a common root in the Latin *saporem* (*sapor*) ‘taste, flavor,’ and *sapere* ‘to have a flavor’. For the ancients taste and flavor came first, and it was good taste that came to denote wisdom. – Today we experience a general degeneration of taste, in all aspects of life.

Deliberate art and other human activity are all different instances of art on display on a continuum from everyday sensations - a coy smile, tempting, enigmatic- to the magnificent manifestations of art in the Louvre of Paris. - ‘Continuum’ is a simile I tend to use in order to introduce the idea of infinite variances, that our differences and choices

are not bipolar but nuances better seen as different gradations of one, different aspects of the same. But the continuum only puts us on the right *track* – and here again the word *trajectory* seems more suitable – a continuum serves us like crutches serve a crippled man while we limp on with our language of things, longing for the ability to speak in feelings and aspects. – Here I'd need a simile which could convey the idea of the interconnection, relations, association of all with everything... one which would convey all the infinite variances of nature and thinking, one where all associations are entangled, intertwined criss-cross in infinite variances, and which would show that nobody alone is in control of these infinite relations ... we need to think of a device like a combination of a prism, a kaleidoscope and magnetic resonance imagining system, something that would enable us to see all the complex aspects from the external and the internal all at once, all in one, but any way giving a picture of something crystalline, not a mess, something absorbing light and radiating back, reflections with a glimpse of hope. - We need a language like a prism for projecting the inner life on to the surface, to express the whole spectra of feelings in their infinite variances ranging from the biological pain and pleasure to the corresponding mental aspirations.

Everyone is an artist, more or less conscious in his art, more or less intense in expression. All is art.

Science is art, being is art, art in the special aesthetic meaning is but one of the manifestations of art. Therefore we should not take seriously the division of all the manifestations of life in these three forms as if they, in reality, would be separate sections of life, thingly entities that we can have or not have, that we use or do not use, that some have more and some have less of. – No, all is art. There are only different manifestations of art. Let's call them: art as being; science; and art in its contemporary meaning which I like to call *deliberate art*. Deliberate art is what a person, classified as an artist (at the very least by the artist himself) consciously does in order to produce objects or engage in performances which are intended to be aesthetically *pleasing* – or rather aesthetically *striking* (I caution against the idea of stressing aesthetics as something *pleasing*, and I will return to this issue a bit further on in the text where I establish *aesthetic pleasing* as one of the two main aspects of aesthetic feeling, corresponding to the two aspects of pain and pleasure).

Sport is art. A sportsman is an artist – without any doubt Ronaldinho, the footballer player is an artist, his sport is art.

Business is art. A business venture is art, creative art. – An entrepreneur is an artist.

Dancing is art, not only ballet, ballet is big art -

everyday dancing is art. People are good at expressing themselves in dance - certainly much better than in speech - they do it on a continuum from good to great.

Sometimes everyday art is more pleasing than deliberate art, and often it is only afterwards that it appears so, after time has elapsed and blurred the mental differences, when the partitioning walls of the mind classifying objects and phenomena have been shaken and trampled down by the eroding forces of time, and when time is regained in the memory that the object evokes in us, in the individual memory of a person, but also in the collective memory of mankind for example when an everyday object from times past, a decade old or thousands of years, emerges as an admired *piece of art* - (Kelsen's theories of law are art; they represent a kind of a comedy in verse.¹ - The EU draft constitution is a work of art, it is a tragicomedy.² We may laugh now, but it will not end well).

Religion is art. Religion is the art of trying to explain the eternal, the mysterious, the beginning, and the end. (I think that the *soul* could be seen as a projection of social practices, of *the external mingling with the internal*).

¹ For a criticism of this peculiar form of art I refer to Expressions and Interpretations, chapters 12, 17 and 18

² For a criticism of this peculiar form of art I refer to Expressions and Interpretations, chapter 24

Deliberate Art – Usefulness? The Wikipedia quite aptly represents the average Western popular perceptions on science, an ample source to draw from. This is how they define art: “Art is a result of human creativity which has some perceived *quality beyond its usefulness*, usually on the basis of aesthetic value or emotional impact”. - *Quality beyond its usefulness* is claimed as the distinctive trait that sets art apart from other manifestations of human life. But, then how should we treat artifacts from times past and cultures that appear exotic to us? For don't we admire them as art while they originally were conceived for everyday use only? It is only for us that these objects lost their usefulness and were turned into pure exhibits. Could it be that this way of thinking, the way we perceive objects and life is a modern form of a collective decease, a defect caused by the scientific mind, a defect that leads us to attempt a segmentation between beauty and life, feeling and being – withdraw art from life, first in the mind, and then in practical reality? This places us in a vicious circle, whereby we in fact convert the confused perception of art – thinking of art as a special section of life, separate from the daily life we lead – into a virtual reality. In earlier times, in more natural cultures, there was not this rigid partition between deliberate art and the aesthetic values of everyday life, there the aesthetic considerations were more fully consciously present in all aspects of life. – In fact Andy Warhol, among others, has with his Pop Art demonstrated that there

is this aesthetic side to all also in our contemporary life, but this does not mean— or should not be taken to mean — that all that is *aesthetic* is beautiful. Then we could for example look at Warhol's art as an aesthetic demonstrations of what in our contemporary life is ugly and debasing to the senses (although this is perhaps not what he meant, or at least not what he consciously meant).¹

It is only recently that 'art' received in our cultures the meaning 'deliberate art', that is art conceived for a special aesthetic purpose. The distinction between scientific type of knowledge (logos) and knowledge in form of artistic narratives, often referred to as poetics (mythos) was made in the Greek traditions of the times of Plato and Aristotle but it was only around the 18th century (Europe) that science became gradually delimited, carved out from art, as a thing in itself, as a body of truths of an imagined better quality than truths of other sorts. Until then *art* had stood for human workmanship in general; art, science and handicraft all fell within the notion of art (from here we have the English academic degrees like and Bachelor of Arts). Naturally — as the critical reader should note - the erection of these mental borders coincides with the rise of science and the scientific mind.

¹ The omnipresence of art can also be seen in a brighter light from the art that stems from the traditions of abstract expressionism of Antoni Tàpies.

Art and Interpretation of Feelings

Art is a search for a proper expression for one's own interpretation of feelings. — Here again we note how all being can be seen as processes where feelings of an individual are related to the expressions of others — those expressions that we may call social practices. According to this idea all in the individual remains empty, cannot develop, without a contact with other people. Same with art: art is a search for a proper expression for one's interpretation of feelings, which can be found inside but only through the reflections of the external. — And it is no different with the expressions and interpretations of social practices, of all our being, which is art. What sets deliberate art apart is a conscious attempt to find better means, find expressions which penetrate the surface to plumb the very depths of feeling.

With the philosophy of interpretation of feelings we have turned the cognition around and acknowledged the primacy of feelings - the inner is the fundamental, from which all else is derived. And now we may also appreciate a work of art as a projection of those fundamental inner feelings; art as a reflection of human feelings, feelings that in the process of evolution are breaking through the hard core of cognition.

Aristotelian philosophy proceeded from the idea that

'pleasure is the final cause of beauty'—which is a movement from the object inwards, as if the object would exist independent from its creator. — I propose the opposite direction, from feelings to the object, where *the final cause of art is an interpretation of feelings*. — We could also say that the old academic - Aristotelian - theories were mired in the *thing fallacy*, the conception that there was a thing, object of art, in which 'beauty' had been incorporated as a property, while I want to propose to view art as a feeling, as a process, precisely as all in life, starting from the biological processes of pain and pleasure. We have to reject the idea that 'beauty' - a thingly perception, nothing but a word - would have the capacity to serve as a cause for anything. - I feel it spoils the text having to state that, it sounds so banal, and so self-evident - how banal all the self-evident is — but even so I decided to leave it here, because this is the fallacy, this is the simple delusion that contemporary cognition is built on. - From our new vantage point we shall cease to seek *a* cause, especially *a — one — cause, but many causes* which we'd rather call *stimuli* - associations and stimulations in infinite variances. — Beauty, which they thought of as a thing-in-itself, was but the expression incorporated into a thing or a performance, the concentrated expression of the stimuli that led to the feeling of beauty. — In his art Proust by all means demonstrated that true art could not be found on the surface of the object but only behind the image, that is in an interpretation of feelings, in the feelings that the artist had expressed

— or rather: wanted to express. Thus for Proust art meant a relation, a mental action, from mind to mind, from the artist's mind into the spectator's mind, and from the spectator back in an effort to decipher the original feeling which now was destined to be forever tinged by one's own. And hereby I have no doubt about how Proust conceived 'mind' as a metaphor for all those mental bundles we carry inside us as feelings; we may rest assured that he by 'mind' did for sure not mean the intellect. "I had realized before now that it is only a clumsy and erroneous form of perception which places everything in the object when really everything is in the mind"¹ - We know that Proust in all aspects of his art followed the insight he had gained that "beauty does not lie in objects"². But this demonstrates also Proust's fundamental understanding about the philosophy of human life and society, that nothing of what is in the human mind is an object — a thingly entity — and that all we have to go about are merely our ideas, thoughts, desires... feelings we project in objects. And this is why Proust could never bring up one aspect in a person without immediately bringing up another one, or two, three other aspects, even contradictory aspects, which all served as building blocks to construct a piece of art out of every person he chose to touch upon, or rather the persons he chose to create. And this is why Proust

¹ Proust, *In Search of Lost Time: Time Regained*, p. 323

² Proust VI p. "Chardin" in *On Art and Literature* p. 334

alerts the reader to the risk of “placing features” - which we really only create in our mind - in a face of the persons we encounter in life when “instead of nose, cheeks and chin there ought to be merely an empty space with nothing more upon it than a flickering reflexion of our desires.”¹

Pleasure is not the cause of beauty, but finding *a true interpretation of feelings is pleasure*, or perhaps we want to say *satisfaction*, which is an expression which satisfies the underlying feeling, and in this sense *pleasure* could also be thought *as the satisfaction of the feeling of pain, disgust (aversion and repulsion)*.

I have equated being with interpretation of feelings, and art with being, science with art, and cognition with interpretation of individual feelings mirrored in social practices. All are aspects of one, therefore they can be presented in any order or any association, and other words can be thrown in to depict the same issues, we may replace *being* or *art* with *language* or *knowledge* and so on in various combinations, but always we return to the same basic idea of expressions and interpretations – *being, art, science...* are expressions and interpretations reflecting feelings of one in a social context.

¹ Proust, In Search of Lost Time, p. 527

Aesthetic Feeling of Pain and Pleasure

“The beauty of images is situated in front of things, that of ideas behind them”¹

The discussion of aesthetic feeling returns us back to the physical, to the biological, into the human organism, where the eternal struggle between pain and pleasure gives rise to feelings, and create the evolving impressions of good and evil. Art is a reflection of this never-ending struggle in the binary mode of pain and pleasure, the essence of being, what gives life and takes life; this binary friction occurs in all aspects of life from the smallest cellular processes to the grand combats between men on earth. In art through language, expressions, the battle between pain and pleasure is brought to the mental plane.

I referred above to my conviction that human life is the present culmination of an evolutionary process set in motion by the forces of pain and pleasure where the biological led to the animal, where the struggle between pain and pleasure from emotions and feelings developed into the mental and yet to further perfection in the human, where the mental struggles to take expression in language. –Language then is for me a reflection of this same binary struggle between pain and pleasure, but language, the latest stage of over all evolution, is itself only starting to develop.

¹ Proust, In Search of Lost Time: Time Regained, p. 355

Pain and pleasure are the two fundamentals around which all aesthetic considerations also evolve around. Traditionally aesthetics is discussed only in terms of the one, pleasure, which is coupled with the considerations of *beauty* and *the good*. But adopting such an approach we deal only with one side of the continuum of art and aesthetics, while the *ugly* and the *evil* – the aspects of pain - on the other side of the continuum are disregarded (in theoretical thought). To understand art and aesthetics we have to bring in the whole continuum of pain and pleasure in the discussion. I do it by talking about *aesthetic feeling*, which I divide into two sub-aspects of *aesthetic pleasure* and *aesthetic aversion* – [As there was nothing suitable on offer in the relevant literature I resorted to this term *aesthetic aversion* to correlate with *aesthetic pleasure*, certainly other terms can be proposed in place, perhaps *aesthetic disgust*]. – By these considerations I connect art and aesthetics to the fundamental philosophy of interpretation of feelings, stressing that art like all is a quest and manifestation of interpretation of feelings – and this leads us back to expressions and interpretations, perceptions in competition, and all that we may consider *knowledge*, and all the considerations in regards to good and bad, right and wrong.

Aesthetic beauty corresponds to the favorable, the wished for, pleasure. - Aesthetic disgust corresponds to the aversive, to fear, the feeling of repulsion, pain - anguish, desolation, woe; gloom, melancholy;

distress, discomfort, discontent...

Art is the medium for seeking an interpretation of the feelings of pain and pleasure – the attempt to discern good from bad, evil, beauty and...all crowding the same spot at the level of mental down to the physical, the inner of the body. - Aversion and disgust, the desirable, the beautiful and ugly, mingle intertwined in the same expression.

In art we deal with the mental aspects of the unknown, and the mysterious, which cannot be known – whereof we must remain silent, but silent in science only, for in art we must speak, we must explore the boundaries.

Art strikes as profound art - art which we are willing to laud as true art - when the artist has with his expression wounded the mental shield protecting and conserving our perceptions from each other and from our own critical analysis. This is when we sense that the artist has entered into the deep waters of exploring the hidden feelings, when he has gone far beneath the superficial, external, the obvious, and reached a thought lingering out from an emotion situated at the depth of being, and then emerged from there with a new insight which he now puts on display, expressing to us something which has previously been beyond the reach of what can be fathomed or understood.

Profound art means a breakthrough in the assault on the limits of language, pushing outwards the limits of what is known and can be known. This is why art is the vanguard of humanity, the function of which is to break the dichotomy, diffuse the line between pain and pleasure; penetrate the mental shield of perceptions. It is the story of learning to depict the feelings of pain and pleasure, to catch them in one moment, in one instance, as aspects of one and same (Proust: “An image presented to us by life brings with it, in single moment, sensations which are in fact multiple and heterogenous”¹). And yet from these aspects - when we have learnt to see them as such, as shades of fleeting moments – we have to reconstruct a new sense of a whole, something that could resemble a truth, but a truth which will never be the same absolute one, only the one we have reconstructed, but this time through the precision offered by a microscope (or telescope as Proust preferred to say, even in this we see the contradiction of aspects, two seemingly so far away from each other images as the processes of looking through a telescope and looking through the microscope are connected at the end of the loop in the same kind of understanding of life and the fundamentals that we need to discern in order to comprehend life – maybe the microscope could be seen as the image for interpretation of feelings and the telescope of comprehending social practices, at least the former is what I take Proust to have had in mind).

¹ Proust, *In Search of Lost Time: Time Regained*, p. 289

An aesthetic feeling – like all in life – is a two-way street, simultaneously stirring a feeling inside and contemplating an external expression, or perhaps just catching a faint glimpse of a sudden and cursory impression which enters the unconscious and connects with the feeling. Thus the aesthetic feeling is aroused when two feelings coincide, when two interpretations of feelings find a match in an object, a work of art. These two feelings are the artist’s original feeling of which he gave an expression in his art, and the spectator’s feeling when he experiences the work of art, when the expression corresponds to a budding feeling in need of an outlet for expression. – In an essay on Chardin – one of the greatest of the 18th-century French painters – Proust writes in reference to the spectator and the artist “your pleasure and his are so inseparable one from the other that if he had not been able to credit yours, you would not credit his, and if he had chosen to become absorbed in feeling and conveying his, you would inevitably recant from yours.”¹

Thus we should embrace the point of view where we see a work of art as a manifestation of the artist’s interpretation of feelings, which he has projected on the object, and an aesthetic feeling (pain or pleasure) which comes about when the spectator’s interpretation of feelings match the expression incorporated in the work of art (art as an association

¹ Proust “Chardin” in *On Art and Literature* p. 325

between two feelings: the artist's and the spectator's). – For me it seems that Proust indirectly refers to these same considerations when he criticizes the tendency of discussing art as “a thing” which is the same for him and other “art lovers” at the expense of suppressing ‘the impression that the work of art gives’, this impression is the vestige of the artist's feeling which has through the expression on the piece of art been conveyed to Proust; the “inexpressible” is precisely that element in the work of art “that we sought”, but for the very reason of it being *inexpressible* we “set it aside” and suppress “the personal root of our own impression”.¹– We see that at issue here is a process where subjective feelings intervene twice, first in producing the object as a projection of the artist's feelings, and secondly, in viewing the object from point of view of the feelings of the spectator.²

Art beyond pain and pleasure is love. To dwell on this idea I refer back to above discussion of love and trust; in brief to the ideas to think of art as a quest of finding an expression to match the interpretation

¹ Proust, *In Search of Lost Time: Time Regained*, p. 292 (cfr.)

² Of scholars that I came across Susanne Langer is closest to formulating the idea of art as interpretation of feelings which can be exemplified with a quote from her work: “The primary function of art is to objectify feeling so that we can contemplate and understand it. It is the

of feelings; the feelings of pain and pleasure ... but there beyond pain and pleasure - at the end of the road - is a catch which, is love. I would think that this if anything is the only meaningful purpose of life, to reach for this love within and beyond oneself, to hold out one's hands and touch love, to give and receive. And I find it exhilarating to think that this is indeed also the most scientific endeavor that life has to offer to people, and people to life.

I find that most of the ideas that I consider original have been expressed before, somewhere by someone, and therefore the novelty of ideas is not to be sought in the individual statements but in the arrangements of the arguments, and the stress, the importance that is assigned to the various arguments. By such a rearrangement and the assignation of new importance to the separate arguments a new framework for thinking can be brought about. I said this in order to prepare the reader for my referral to the artistic movement called expressionism, which

formulation of so-called ‘inward experience,’ the ‘inner life,’ that is impossible to achieve by discursive thought, because its forms are incommensurable with the forms of language...”, in Selden, R., *Theory of Criticism* pp. 317 and 318. It is interesting to note that it has been said that Langer's views on language are not far from those of Wittgenstein's; this again showing that to understand the fundamentals about cognition one has to understand the fundamentals of language.

in my view tells this same story in the very language of art, the language of feelings, which opened the mind to a new kind of philosophy, to new views on science, and which together with other artistic movements opened people to see more of the infinite variances of life. (I would even ask if there is much sense in trying to draw a strict border between Impressionism and Expressionism if not considering the differences in technique?). – The story that the expressionist first expressed in deliberate art has subsequently penetrated language and cognition, and this has opened new horizon in people's mind, and it is because of this that we now can in ordinary language express similar ideas as the painters did before us in the language of the paint-brush.- Expressionism has been described in similar terms as the idea of interpretation of feelings; it is said to be about '*subjective feelings* that are raised to the level of explanation of the *objective observations*'. This conveys the correct idea as long as we understand that *objective observations* are in fact *subjective perceptions* – perceptions distorted by the past and present. (I would even reject the word 'observations' as sounding too objective)

All art is expressionism. The division into various styles is all an attempt to try to convince the power of authority (which we reject *a priori*) which expressions would be the most suitable for conveying feelings. This is a futile debate, potentially any style will do, all that counts is that the expressions are true projections

of feelings. No rules, no limits, exist nor can they be imposed. – But there is one rule, inherent in all art, and again in all life worth to live, this is the rule that true art, and a decent life, is penetrated by the most sincere and honest expression of feelings. In art this means that the artist says what he truly wants to say, independent of all other considerations, with as many words as he needs, or with as few as will do, or with pictures, music, acting – with any means, and in any fashion.

Deliberate Art – Feeling, Vision, and Skills

There are three aspects to art (in the various degrees of intensity this holds true for deliberate art as well as all other forms of art): ‘skill’, ‘feeling’; and ‘vision’, all three aspects are present in a work of art that will be apprehended as profound. - Without the one the others will not emerge or fail to manifest (and in that case the best we can hope for is to produce science). I think of creativity and imagination as yet additional aspects of art, driving forces behind art. – Once in a while I feel the urge to stress that all the words I list, categories and concepts - like skill, feeling, vision, creativity, imagination – even they are no entities, nothing given, merely names for different perspectives, various angles of perception; these words carry a similar meaning for most who know English, and therefore they help us to focus on the essentials, and thus are not meaningless, rather they are like the glass of a microscope that helps a person to see the object that the microscope is focused on, while there is no capacity of seeing in the glass itself.– [But were we to be able to tune in our words for absolute precision, then we would not need these different categories or aspects for describing the elements of art, for then we would see only a binary friction between pain and pleasure, and understand that it is art which comprises all living. - I am trying to fathom my own idea that all is a result of a friction of some infinitesimally small things, but not the things in

themselves, but the movement, the friction, and then I say that things through this movement produce the mental, which does not exist. - The movement, which is no thing, produces the things, which produce the mental, which again are no things, but not the movement either. And yet I believe it makes sense].

‘Feeling’ and ‘vision’ correspond to ‘talent’ in the sense Proust spoke about these in “Against Sainte-Beuve”¹. He said that talent is “the artist’s good sense” and that this is “the only criterion of a work of art’s spirituality”. He further refers to talent through “originality” – i.e. there is ‘talent’ if there is ‘originality’ – and ‘originality’ he refers to “sincerity” – i.e. there is ‘originality’ if there is ‘sincerity’, but then he superimposes ‘pleasure’ on both the former qualities: “pleasure is perhaps the criterion of true talent” – but this is not just any pleasure, but *the pleasure of the writer*.

We can sense the need for all these aspects to be simultaneously present when we consider a truly skillful work of art which does not lack in anything but feeling, or in anything but vision, or in anything but skill. - A perfect copy of a great painting, even an impeccable original imitation of extraordinary art, may fail to arouse an aesthetic feeling, and frequently it so happens in the eyes of a trained spectator. Same

¹ Proust “Against Sainte-Beuve” in On Art and Literature p. 272

is true for song; someone sings in faultless control of tone, melody and rhythm, technically perfect, but it may well be so that no deep-penetrating effect was conveyed to the listener. These are demonstrations of perfect skill, but wanting in feeling and thus do not yet amount to true art in the aesthetic meaning.

Vision is the ability to comprehend the external, life around oneself, and to connect that with an extraordinary feeling of creative imagination – or the creative process that we chose to call *imagination*. Vision emerges when imagination penetrates the gate of consciousness and thrusts in the whirlpool of feelings, searches among the treasures of the biological emotions, and captures a rare, precious feeling, holds on to it, folds the emerging expression tightly in its grip, dives headlong through the whirlpool, and resurges to the surface, to the external with its booty, the unique feeling, the one destined to be immortalized in an expression of art.

In visual and performing arts, in music, the artists freed from the constraints of words, much more at ease, more facile even with mediocre skills come out so much more gentle, soft, vivacious, demonstrating infinite aspects of feelings. With the means of literature it is an uphill struggle to find the expressions to match the feelings, to find the genuine expression. It is only with exceptional skill and talent that anything decent at all can be produced, and even then in most cases

with a shelf-life for the literary product of just a few decades or a century at best (unless the brand is not exceptionally good so that an author in history books is declared a master – like all those philosophers that we are supposed to admire for the single reason that they have commanded a strong following in earlier times and thus established themselves as the brand names of philosophy). Skill - lack of it - restricts all forms of art, but the shortcomings are felt in writing more than in any other activity – maybe therefore the few extraordinary talented writers become so beloved to us, for having raised to heights so far above all the others. And how could it be any different, for writing is not even supported by any adequate means for it, we do not possess a language for feelings, ours is a language of things, rigid and stiff; we lack a language that could be called to our aid for describing what we want to say deep down in the heart – and if the reader now thinks this as too romantic a notion, then I may remind that the same goes for the brain (to take this more scientific image of cognition), for similarly as we cannot voice the feelings of the heart we cannot voice the feelings of the brain, i.e. opinions (if one prefers to call feelings by this word). – The problem is that we cannot even make ourselves understood on an elementary level beyond the narrow constraints within which traditions, social practices, guide our cognition. When we write we are like patients suffering from chronic back pain, forced to restrict all our movements to the minimum, but longing to

do so much more, bend the back, turn the neck, stand on the tip of the toes to reach out for a fruit dangling ripe on a branch far above the head, jump, reach, catch, fall down to the ground, twist around in pain, shake the head, flip around in somersault, stand up and continue the walk... and the same when writing: having a myriad of thoughts in the head but being utterly unable to voice the thoughts, the feelings. We dream of breakdancing with language, but all we can do is stand up, move our arms up and down, and to the sides, and lay down...or like a 44-year-old man suddenly forced to join the dance with younger staff at the annual corporate New Year's party, making a fool of himself were it not for the amounts of stimulants consumed and the politeness of the youth. - There is so much more that needs to be said, but all we can do is to bite the lips and suffer the pain, the pain of not being able to say – the pain of yearning to reach that sweetest of the fruits dangling on the highest branch far above our heads, and far above our conception of reality.

Proust was well aware of the infinite problems that will have to be overcome in writing, the problems that he so miraculously conquered and so managing a breakthrough in art, and a breakthrough in language, but before he could do it he had to deal with each of the hurdles one by one. I quote this following paragraph to illustrate how conscious he was about this problem: "When we write we fall in with certain

old-established usages, and perhaps the thought of describing the look of something that has made an impression on us is one of those things, like cooking meat or wearing clothes, which would not have occurred to anyone if civilization had taken a different course".¹

Feelings are by the very essence infinitely more complex than the language that expresses them. In writing one aspect cancels out the other ones, whereas in living forms of art all can be said in the same moment, in the same movement - a manifold of dimensions in the same expression. One way of countering this dilemma was shown by Proust – I dare say that most would agree that he has been quite successful on that. It was his style of writing long sentences joining different - often opposed - thoughts in one sequence of thoughts. This is how he brought to written language the air of how we in fact think, and how we should think, all the time considering various aspects pertaining to one issue, and by presenting these in the same sentence we should not think in terms of mathematics and assign the various components of thought with pluses and minuses of various degrees and then to attempt to sum all the components where the pluses and minuses have cancelled each other out, on the contrary, the aspects for and against, left and right, blue or red, plus or

¹ Proust "Against Sainte-Beuve" in *On Art and Literature* p. 75

minus, all have to stay in, stay in our thoughts where we have to make room to accommodate them all at the same time, and as it were in the same cell. It is also from science and mathematics – and the military (all the hierarchies) - that we have the perverted idea that sentences should be short and rigid, that two words meaning the same (as they take words to ‘mean’), having the same significance, or expressing the same idea, should not be repeated – but I think they should, they should so always when the author feels that the additional word brings an additional nuance, a new connotation to the idea. This is indeed part of the problem, of what restricts thinking, this habit – this perceived rule - of ridding oneself of all the infinite variances of thinking and concentrating all in a few words and sentences short as military commands, reducing all to a few superficial aspects, when in reality you need to express infinite variances in one thought, and often to achieve this you need to resort to longer sentences, sentences where one aspect adds or takes from another and where all the colors or shades of thinking will be manifested in one. – But then again a long sentence is not an end in itself, when it works brevity can be more powerful, when the writer with a few words directs the cognition towards a feeling that he hopes to awake in the reader, and he succeeds in this if he is a master in the art like Franz Kafka and Hermann Hesse were. - And then there should flourish a combination of brevity and elaboration, symbols creating the mysterious, the enigmatic, or

the familiar – in writing any means, any style and any combination of them justify the end, the end of rendering a truthful interpretation of feelings.

Symbols

Art - language - consists of an attempt to translate feelings into expressions, which *consist* of an *infinite number* of symbols, nothing but symbols, symbols which evoke the image of memories and things; thingly symbols calling feelings into the mind, calling feelings into question. – [This preceding sentence shows how difficult it is for us to free ourselves from the captivity of the language of things. It disturbs me to say that ‘expressions *consist*’, which is a proposition as thingly as they come; or that there are ‘a *number* of symbols’, as if they were things that can be numbered; and ‘*infinite*’, which is clearly meant to break the thingly spell, but in reality only serves to aggravate things.]

All expressions, all art is symbolic communication; the finest little expression is symbolic. All language is art, all being is symbolic. All thinking, all cognition is symbolic. – All symbols are meant to represent perceptions - perceptions in competition.

Metaphors, signs, tropes, similes, figures of speech... these are all words for symbols, and it does not make any difference how we from time to time want to call the idea. Unfortunately, though, there is a literary and philosophical tradition consisting in an attempt to do precisely that, to classify symbols under these labels, as if symbols like thingly entities could lend

themselves to such an endeavor. These traditions remind of the false signposts that mislead the mind to take a wrong turn at every decisive juncture.

Not only should we refrain from trying to – when pretending to be scientific - differentiate between various uses of symbols, but, even more, we should comprehend that there is no difference between symbols and other words, or symbols and other images – the use is the symbol; what is stressed, or perceived as stressed, against the context, the background of the work of art, that is a symbol.

A word and any other symbol, an image, serves a function, and becomes one – a symbol - only in a context - and any occasion can be the context - the background against which the use of the symbol has a meaning, for example wearing a red jacket when everybody else is dressed in black and white, the red jacket comes to symbolize a meaning, something in that specific context, perhaps a protest, perhaps a marketing of sorts for a product or for the piece of art i.e. the person in the red jacket.

When we speak about symbols we in fact only mean that we have tried in a specific context to convey a specific – symbolic - meaning with one or another sign (a meaning which is stressed by choosing an expression that stands out).

A symbol does not have an objective meaning independent from the context. Like the letters ‘A’ and ‘B’ and ‘C’ words and other symbols do not mean, represent, anything they are means for an attempt to create a meaning. The words ‘apple’, ‘go’, ‘and’ are as much of symbols as the letters ‘B’, ‘C’ and ‘P’, or the smiley ☺. – If I take five letters and arrange them as this: M-A-T-C-H then the word can carry a meaning, it could mean e.g. any of following: affirm, agree, assent, concur, conform, correspond, fit, harmonize, jibe, match, square, suit, tally bout, contest, engagement, event, game, meet, race, rivalry, sport, test, trial, adversary, analogue, antagonist, approximation, companion, competitor, complement, copy, correlate, counterpart, countertype, dead ringer, double, duplicate, equivalent, fellow, like, look-alike, mate, opponent, parallel, peer, replica, ringer, rival, spitting image, twin. – I said “could carry a meaning”, but where was the meaning? All we got was a list of other symbols. These words are listed in a dictionary¹ under the entry ‘match’; some of the words may be considered as so-called synonyms to the word ‘match’ but I think that would be *stretching the meaning*, I’d rather claim they are merely words, other words, other symbols; words that we may consider to be associated with the one that we looked up, but this association is all we gained. In our minds we may assign these words any meanings, but on a closer

¹ www.dictionary.com

inspection we will notice that each word by itself does not mean anything special. Each of these may in turn evoke a memory in the mind of something they are associated with, and this occurs only in the human memory (in the subjective memory of a particular person, at a particular moment). What would the word ‘race’ mean if we would look at it outside a given context? Again, it could mean anything to anybody, to prove my point I could threaten to copy another long list from the dictionary, which would take us to yet another round of words, and so on... Words can only refer to other words and memories, and it is only through these references that we create a meaning for the fleeting moment, or rather an association, an interpretation at best, an expression for a feeling. – But now I rearrange the letters like this M-T-C-H-A, then no meaning emerges, not even potentially. – This is in fact the case with all symbols, all words, e.g. the words listed above, if we flash any of the words separately without a context the words do not convey any meaning, or perhaps the meaning of showing that there is no meaning. – A ‘meaning’ is always unique for a moment, a memory part of a moment rushing through the memory.

A symbol by itself can only purport to have a meaning, which is in fact a subjective property in the mind of the person who evokes the symbol in his expressions, or the one who interprets it. Even the one who originally uttered the expression will have

to rethink the meaning when he contemplates the expression anew... Only a combination of symbols may convey a meaning.

Art - all human - can build only on traditions which also create the trap most artist fall into. Symbols penetrate cognition and become embedded in the cultural heritage, in the traditions. Symbols are elements of cognition; cognition takes form in symbols; traditions - cultural heritage - transmit symbols, and traditions make up the web, the web of beliefs which form the background against which a symbol can receive a meaning, if any. Traditions are reality, danger and opportunity all in one. The problem with symbols is that they tend to acquire a life of their own. In a sense symbols become listed in a mental catalogue from which they are later called in to fill their role in art in a process which resembles that of recycling of waste or perhaps the second-hand usage of garments.

There is nothing but symbols that we may call to our aid in an attempt to express feelings, symbols from our past, but these symbols, these means of expression equally form the prison where the artist is locked in, and it is the walls of this prison of symbols that the artist has to tear down in order to break free. - The artist has to liberate himself from the spell of symbols. Symbols are like road-blocks stopping the free passage of new expressions; and bearing in mind

that the expressions are only the vessels, the carriages for interpretations of feeling, we understand that there it is the train of His Majesty the Feeling himself which is being denied passage by the arrogant symbols representing the mob that has usurped the power in the realm of cognition.

By different stress and different combinations of symbols we try to find the right shades for depicting our feelings, the infinite aspects of feelings. This is the challenge of art, the artist cannot merely copy the symbols second-hand, he has to bring out his own palette of symbols, those shades that express the feelings unique to him. "The truth is that there is only one real freedom for the artist: originality."¹

All words are symbols for things or past ideas. All forms of art makes use of symbols; the challenge in good art is to make use of only the those symbols proper to the task of reproducing the special feelings under labor. Art is an attempt to master the symbols in communication; to refit and adjust them, to find new ways to express with readjusting the symbols, to express what has not been expressed before. The artist should resist the usage of worn out symbols, but his dilemma is that at the same time he knows that he does not have anything else to get him by. For the right expressions the artist has to search in what

¹ Carter, W.C. Marcel Proust: a life p. 377.

Proust called the artist's "inner book of unknown symbols", symbols that nobody could help the artist to decipher "for to read them was an act of creation" which the artist is left to undertake in solitude. It is his instinct that leads the artist to the beginnings of these symbols dwelling in the deep sources from where feelings spring up, and it is only with instinct that the artist tries to drink from this spring to quell his thirst for expressing the inexpressible; a thirst that at the bottom of the heart is unquenchable, which is an idea that the overwhelming majority – more correctly 'all but a few' – resign to live with and enables them to more or less consciously furnish themselves with excuses for inaction, excuses for a life of deception instead of caring for quenching this thirst, this fire, this "instinct that dictates our duty while the intellect supplies us with pretexts for evading it".¹ - An artist becomes an artist through listening to his instinct; and this instinct leads him to unexplored sources which others in this life have not seen, but which they long to see, and where they want to be lead into; and to lead the artist will first have to resist, to resist his contemporaries and to resist his surroundings, and therefore all true artists belong to one and the same artistic movement, which is La Résistance; the artist always resisting, even resisting the temptation to resist.

¹ Proust, *In Search of Lost Time*, pp.274

Language, Language, Language

Language is the immaterial source of intelligence; all knowledge one can think of has been passed on from people to people - through generations, times and cultures. But whatever we are to consider as knowledge, this knowledge pool we have, is like a ball in the air, and nothing more, nothing firm in our hands, not even in books. – But not only one ball; we need to expand the simile and think of thousands of balls in the air, one ball for each word, or for each expression, and mankind like jongleurs trying to keep all the balls in the air, in vain. Thousands of words, expressions, balls, bouncing back from one to another in the air, and then some falling flat on the ground, in oblivion forever, taking with it a piece of knowledge which was stored in that expression. - Here we have no reason to count on the survival of the fittest. Some of the hidden treasures of the language of the old Egyptians encoded in the hieroglyphs have been uncovered. When we ponder this miracle we should not forget that almost all the other languages have as such forever been lost to our eyes and ears, but that they on the other hand lay preserved in languages – in all languages spoken in the world - as memories of generations of life from times eternal up to ours, that all kinds of habits and manners, the typical causes for joy and for suffering, the models for shrewd and cunning thinking, the ideas to help our neighbors in their suffering, help the sick and the poor, and the

schemes of how to enrich oneself, that they are all encoded in language, a language which is like an encyclopedia on human history that we all carry with us and which we consult in deciding our very *modern* actions – for to us they seem modern, for us certainly much more modern than the life preceding ours by half a century, although in reality in the history of life this difference is no longer than that of a blink of an eye. While those languages, those manners of speaking, have been lost - the same way ours will be lost - they are all reflected in the present as aspects of bygone life, as part of our very daily being, and our dreams in the nights, something of all that has been is living in us as part of our present reality of this day, reflected in the way we live, in the way we speak, and in the way we act.

Language is nothing but a function of the people through eternal time mingling with each other through love and through hatred (those same two eternal aspects of pain and pleasure); for this is how in language, in social practices, opinions, words and feelings come about, get their color and their texture, this is how the thinking of today is created, shaped, refined and degenerated, this is how we are what we are today, all but results of random contacts, strangers meeting strangers, communicating with each other, loving and hating, in good and in bad it has been – and in good and in bad it has been passed on to us.

We should understand that this history carried forward in language– in language which is like the Great Book of Human Heritage – is all we have in terms of knowledge, and that knowledge is nothing else than the condensed expressions and interpretations of what quite ordinary people have thought and said through history from the beginning of time. And that this language creates the real *virtual reality* people live in, for all we do and think come to us programmed in language, and it is the codes of language (the broad language of all expressions, not only words) that we use to create visual, auditory and other mental simulations of reality which we display in our body and mind, and then wishfully take it to mean the intelligent thinking we humans are so famous of – judged by our own very human standards. – These computer-based technologies that they call *virtual reality* are just one additional layer to these endless simulations, and they differ very little in the technologies from what is customary; we are already as such living in a simulated world, what more simulations do we need.

Above all we should understand that all that is known is known in language, and all that can be known will be in language, and language – and thus knowledge comes about by each human giving and taking expressions and interpretations to and from this pool of knowledge, which is language.

Also we should understand that language is nothing great, and far from perfect, language is only as good as the manners in which people have spoken, as good as their traditions, and that's all. - Some aspects of language are horrible, something we should defend ourselves against, and defend others against, and defend humanity against; protect against that what in language destroys healthy thinking, protect against the grand delusion, the thingly fallacy, the perversion of treating words, all of them at once, as if they were things of sorts; the way of assigning them a physical role in the mind and its grammar, to speak of them in terms of things and their movements. This delusion is based on an even bigger delusion - a meta-delusion, a fallacy of higher degree - the mother of all delusions, the habit of regarding *language itself* as a thing, the Thing of the Things, Res Rerum. - But no more is language a thing than any of its words, language is only patterns, the word we have assigned to denote these patterns of speaking, expressing, manners, behavioral patterns, activity, something we do – but not a thing, not by any means. – There is no language, and I call upon whoever disagrees with me on this to come forward with his evidence, show language, dead or alive, but as a physical, chemical, biological mass – for surely a thing must consist of the materials of nature – and what comes from the human while not being a thing is a process, manner, tradition, an activity of sort.

There are no languages; there are only more or less

similar manners of speaking family resemblances, similarities and dissimilarities, as Wittgenstein said. Languages are not 'things', rather languages represent traditions, thousands and thousands of years of imitation. Past language, past manners of speaking serve as the foundation for the present way of speaking, the present always building on the past.

Languages do not *change*, *there are no* languages that could either change nor remain constant, what changes is how people behave, how they imitate, what they remember: The manners of speaking.

Language is not an entity but reflections of all accumulated joint experience of mankind. The closer people are to each other physically and mentally the stronger the impression that they speak the same language. When we use figures of speech like '*speak the same language*' we suggest the idea that there is an assortment of languages of which 'the same' is one. We do not speak a language, we speak in a similar fashion, correspondingly we walk in a similar fashion but we do not *do the same walk*, or *use the same gait*. - Speaking is like a fingerprint, totally unique to each individual, although all fingerprints look like fingerprints. – But even the image of fingerprint will not do, for speaking unlike fingerprints is nothing fixed, but manners in constant flux; one can never dress one's thoughts twice in the same expression (but with the fingerprint it is different, like any good detective knows).

There is no English language, there are only manners of speaking, like speaking similarly to those in England, or in America, or in Australia, or in Texas, or more precisely in England the different manners in which they speak in the North and South of England, and all over in between: in Yorkshire, Lancashire, East Midlands...or more precisely like they speak in the South East: Estuary English, or the different sounds from Tunbridge to Tonbridge and from Margate to the Medway, or the Cockney of London, and the Queen's English, and the BBC talk...or like Mrs. Jones speaks as compared to the way Mrs. Bloom speaks, or the way Mrs. Bloom spoke 30 years ago when she had just arrived as a young maiden from Australia, or the way her daughter, the punker speaks. – And there is this Euroenglish in which I write. There are millions of ways of speaking and writing, but not a single language.

Hence it is wrong to say, for example, that 'French is a beautiful language', instead one should say 'the French have inherited from their ancestors a beautiful way of speaking'. Well, of course for convenience of speaking it is perfectly fine to stick with the first statement, but for the convenience of thinking, and science, we have to remember that in fact the second statement is true.

Infinite variances affect language, that is, the way we speak: memory, creativity, contacts with other

people, cultural and social influences, behavioral and organizational patterns etc. No two persons speak the same language, ever. Similarities, and dissimilarities, in language habits cause the idea that there would be a common language, and this idea of a common language like every sacred idea is in the mind converted in to the idea that language is like a thingly entity, with fixed properties, correct or wrong, black or white. From this thingly hallucination springs up, in all countries and cultures, the language-police, those immensely distressed people silly and driven to despair in their angry quest 'to save the language', to preserve the thing, the perception that they in their feeble minds have converted into an idea of a thing, a thing which they like in any religious frenzy claim to have a vision of, knowing, as they think, the sacred properties of language, of the thing - which they have never seen - or how it looks like in reality, in a reality they have carved up for themselves in their minds. They speak as if they would be privy to the physical, chemical and biological constitution of this thing, for certainly they must agree that a thing has material properties, and certainly they must agree that whatever is claimed to be constant has to be a thing, by definition. - To a great extent language, in fact, is the battlefield between these forces of authority and those of freedom. – Here I am willing to agree with the feminists who claim that language conserves and reflects social control. But while recognizing this it should be kept in mind that this way of speaking is,

in most cases, not something that an individual is in control of. Although, on the other hand conscious manipulation of language abound, an evil habit much more widespread and deliberate than we would guess. Some very real living people, biological beings, are employed in the daily business of manipulating language in order to subjugate people to the kind of thinking they and their masters adhere to. Thus, for example, most journalists make a living out of professional perversion of language with the objective of serving the political or commercial agenda of the owner of the media outlet, or somebody else under whose influence they operate. With an increasing world-wide concentration of media control in fewer and fewer hands, the subjugation of media language to the causes of propaganda is taking on unheard of proportions. Today we are far beyond the level of 1984, the scary predictions of George Orwell. He could not have even imagined the shrewdness of our present day propaganda manipulators, he foresaw a gradual development of an openly totalitarian state in control of people in all aspects of lives, including speech, and through speech thinking. But those that subjugate our Western societies of today to this propaganda - the few people, the groups that pull the strings - turned out to be more crafty than the most cunning manipulators that Orwell could think of. They have built a totalitarian propaganda machine in the United States and the European Union while retaining a façade, a smoke screen of democracy

and liberty. Today it is not like Orwell predicted that the State would control people through media propaganda, but something twice as scary happened, like a scenario from a horror movie, it is the media that has stepped in the role of the ruler, while retaining the aura of being courageous champions of liberty and freedom of speech, it is the media owners and their lackeys, the journalists that stand behind the perversion of language and thought as means to totalitarian power over minds, people and nations. – “All animals are equal, but some are more equal than others”, Orwell said. The Western media of today has it: “We have freedom of speech, the owners of media just have more freedom than others.” – Hand in hand with the development of this new form of covert totalitarian political propaganda people have been placed under the yoke of the commercial propaganda, marketing and advertisement. – Today the biggest threats to mankind, to democracy, to peace - to all humanity – stems from the concentration of media power in the Western world in the hands of a few corporations and people and this covert totalitarian propaganda which they together with specialized propaganda lobbies exercise over the world – in the disguise of the most innocent rhetoric of democracy and freedom appealing to the most sacred values of the European herd.

The idea of language as a carrier of social practices is connected with understanding that all human cognition

is based on mental interpretations of complex reality. - We may call these mental interpretations 'perceptions'. In perceptions even abstract ideas are converted in the mind into thingly entities on an analogy with the things of nature. Perceptions are like standard set pattern interpretations of reality – that is *symbols*. A set of complex actions of behavior, or behavioral patterns are identified, *simplified*, framed and converted into new conceptual abstractions, perceptions. Thus a perception, a mental image created in the 'mind', is converted into *conceptual reality*. Furthermore the perceptions get baptized in language, assigned a name, the concept. Next the concept is 'filled with content', assigned a meaning. This conceptual content includes all of the subjective moral values that suffocate being, and is formed as a result of conscious and unconscious consideration of all vested interests that people inhabit (the moral). A perception (and the corresponding concept) leads us astray and induces us to think of them as thingly entities, instead of seeing them just as different choices on perspectives on how to look at life. This is how we come to think of various social practices, aspects of life, as such *thingly entities* as 'law', 'economy', 'democracy', 'science', 'religion' etc. While in reality they are only names we have assigned to those aspects of life, to those aspects of social practices. These social practices are carried, and conceptualized in language. And in fact all social practices are but language-games, and even languages are language-games: habits with

set patterns but without strict boundaries, and no rules except the ones perceived to exist in the social practices themselves.* – Language is simply the most general and fundamental of the social practices, the supreme game.

The Chicken or the Egg - Knowledge from Language, or Language from Knowledge

Which comes first language or knowledge? This question is unlike the brain-teaser 'what comes first the chicken or the egg', one for which there is no reply, the chicken and the egg come one from the other in a process that is best described as the hermeneutics of evolution; one aspect of the process returns to the other, in infinite regression. – But with language and knowledge it is quite different; language as such has developed in an evolutionary process within the physical organism, this is the same kind of a hermeneutical process, but knowledge – on the contrary - without any doubt is a product of language; language is the habitat and the medium where knowledge thrives. – This is not to say that knowledge would not subsequently affect language. It does affect language, and it affects even biological

* I refer to Ludwig Wittgenstein's conception of language-games e.g. in *Philosophical Investigations* paragraphs 66 - 68. I have discussed these ideas more in detail in *Expressions and Interpretations*, see e.g. pp. 225 – 227.

life, it affects both the life and the well being of the human individual and the nature as such – (and I think most will agree that the effects of human language on nature have been quite depressing). – We have to admit that there is one more aspect to this issue, which is the notion ‘knowledge’ as such. What are we to regard as ‘knowledge’? - This question is similar to the critique of the notion ‘a priori’. I claim that it does not make sense to call ‘knowledge’ that what has been incorporated in the biological, thence knowing to walk – or rather being able to walk – is not knowledge, but a physical (biological) capacity. The ability to speak is physical, but the expressions produced are not - they *are* not, they do not exist; expressions come about by exercising this physical ability. The same goes for the capacity of ‘knowing how to speak’ (being able to speak), this is not knowledge, but a physical capacity¹.

¹ The failure to understand the difference between ‘knowledge’ and ‘capacity’ as in ‘knowing a language’ (or ‘knowing to speak a language’) and “humans possessing the capacity to speak’ (or ‘language capacity’) lies at the root of the wronged and failed traditions of linguistic alchemy proponed by Noam Chomsky. However, I have to stress that we are generous if we grant it to be a question of confusion for the theory is so imbecilic and so clearly rejected by all our human sense experiences and the findings of natural sciences (not least by the neurobiological studies) that I would not exclude that the root cause is rather to be found submersed in blatant fraud. For to that degree are those theories lacking any sense.

Similarly a spider spinning a web does not have knowledge of web spinning, but an intuitive biological capacity to do it. – Thus I would reserve ‘knowledge’ to describe the human capacity to speculate with the means of language.

Language test simulations

I referred above to Einstein’s theorem about language and knowledge, I remind that he said: “The greater part of our knowledge and beliefs have been communicated to us by other people through the medium of a language which others have created.” Now I propose to conduct a test to verify this hypothesis and therefore I invite the reader to consider below a couple of simplified test simulations that are intended to demonstrate that knowledge is exclusively a product of language.

Simulation 1: “We invited to London, England, five persons from five different foreign countries where they in each speak a different language. No one of the languages can be understood by anybody present apart from the speaker himself. All the guests and the host are lawyers. All are placed in separate rooms, from which one cannot see the other, whereas the sounds can be heard from one room to another. - We ask each person to introduce himself by telling what his profession is (and not to disclose any other information). One minute is assigned for each one. –

As a result nobody understands anything of what the others say, and cannot understand because there is no common language. Nothing was learned from what the others said (except for some intuitive knowledge which was carried by the manner of speaking, the tone of the voice, etc., and in fact it later turned out that this had betrayed to two of our simulated test persons that there were lawyers present). – Thus, when there was no common language it was as if there was no language at all, and no knowledge was produced i.e. no one learned anything from each other”.

Simulation 2: “Next we repeat the test with a test group consisting only of English speakers. In this version of the test we may presume that all participants succeed in telling each others that they work as trained lawyers, and thus knowledge will be communicated, and now we see that this means the same as ‘knowledge being produced’. – Now, suppose one of the lawyers told he was a priest; in this case too knowledge would have been produced, but it would merely be the kind of knowledge which we would preferably call ‘disinformation’ (or ‘misconception’) leading to ignorance, or perhaps we would call it a ‘lie’, or something of the sort, depending on the moral circumstances surrounding the statement.”

Simulation 3: “An even more simplistic version of the test would be one that anybody can do: Agree to meet

up with somebody; sit in a closed room; shut the eyes; and remain silent for five minutes. – Next open your eyes and start speaking with each others, and you will feel how knowledge starts to flow once language is introduced into the situation. – And now compare the first five minutes of silence with the minutes that followed: you should be able to appreciate the difference which coincided with the commencement of speech, to realize that knowledge comes with language.

By Language Alone

All communication, all exchange of ideas, opinions, all feelings are expressed in language. It follows that all problems equally are in language. This was fundamentally what Wittgenstein wanted to say. To him all principal problems were linguistic, caused by “the understanding bumping against the limits of language.”¹

It is with language that we explain how to build a shelter or a trap, how to treat a wound, how to cook, how to write and how to read. With writing and reading (i.e. the extended use of speech) - human cultures leaped forward – reading and writing enabled communication between people, even with those that were not immediately present, communication at a physical distance, or separated by generations. Through literature people could eavesdrop on their ancestors and learn in a new manner, learn from past experience (even gain a glance at the bits of knowledge which were not passed on by the dominant cultures; a bit of freedom). And with the emergence of writing one could pass on ideas to future generations hoping,

¹ “The results of philosophy are the uncovering of one or another piece of plain nonsense and of bumps that the understanding has got by running its head up against the limits of language. These bumps make us see the value of the discovery.” Ludwig Wittgenstein *Philosophical Investigations* paragraph 119

like Wittgenstein, that some day, someone would follow the thread up and down towards knowledge. And now, imagine there would come a time when all those who can speak and read were extinguished without managing to pass on their language to a new generation; in such a scenario people would have to start humanity from scratch, start human cultures all over again. Even if the whole world would stand intact, and all the infrastructure of the world would be left, then still nobody could operate the world. Nobody would know how to build a car, read a book of recipes, or instructions of any sort, tell how to *behave (show yes, show like animals show)*, no fuel could be pumped and prepared for usage no illnesses could be treated and medicine administered...Clearly all distinctively human is carried in language.

Wittgenstein vs. Popper – Sense vs. Nonsense

To illustrate the exclusivity of language as that what is distinctively human I want to draw attention to the famous polemics between the philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein and Karl Popper, which is depicted in a book called Wittgenstein's Poker¹. Wittgenstein knew - as I do armed with the grammar of thinking that Wittgenstein had developed - that there were no philosophical problems, only linguistic confusion. This was one of the most important points that Wittgenstein wanted to push through – if not *the* most important (at least it was the most important aspect concerning the essence of philosophy as a discipline). - He said it in many ways in various connections and this is what he wanted to make Popper aware of, but Popper - a hostage of the very same linguistic confusions - refused to listen, refused to think, and instead stubbornly decided to go on with his act the way a comic or a revue artist feels secure on stage and confident of his art as long as the public laughs. Popper continued to insist that philosophy involved “real problems that immediately affected the world at large”, while not understanding that there was no difference in what Wittgenstein said and this statement in regards to these “real

¹ Eidinow, J., Edmonds, D. (2005). Wittgenstein's Poker. Faber and Faber

problems”, for Wittgenstein did not say that there were no “real problems”, he said *that these real problems are caused by linguistic confusion*, and therefore unless we tackle the linguistic confusion the problems will not disappear. Until then philosophers will be like flies circling around excrement wondering if they should like it or not, instead of considering where it comes from and what it will do for them.

In his work book called the Blue Book Wittgenstein made one of his most decisive statements concerning philosophy, the errors of philosophy, he said: “Philosophers constantly see the method of science before their eyes, and are irresistibly tempted to ask and answer questions in the way it is done in science. This tendency is the real source of metaphysics, and leads the philosopher into complete darkness.”¹ - Interestingly Popper's theories on the method of science were precisely the products of such an attempt to translate all philosophical – mental – issues, with an analogy to the things of the nature, into the language of things where all is expressed on an analogy to natural sciences. (I refer to Expressions and Interpretations were I have in detailed dealt with Popper's metaphysical theories, this peculiar form of art).

¹ Ludwig Wittgenstein, The Blue and the Brown Book, p. 18. For increased fluency of presentation I have slightly adopted the quote.

Thus Popper remained in the spell of the old traditions of linguistic alchemy - the traditions of freedom to claim - in the name of science, whatever the spittle brings to the tip of the tongue - in blissful ignorance of the physical realities of our surrounding environment (or in other words: Popper remained faithful to those genuine traditions of Western science, the traditions of an artful manipulation of language).

Prior to fully embracing the alchemy of social sciences Popper thrived as a talented historian and secured for himself fame and a solid position among philosophical brand names with his influential book *The Open Society and Its Enemies*¹, a book about the roots of totalitarian thinking in the traditions of Plato, Aristotle, Hegel and Marx. And cheered on by his success in this one field of inquiry – the history of philosophy – he thought himself to be equally qualified for opining on the fundamentals of cognition, the philosophy of science, while nobody seemed to understand that all that was common to these two fields of inquiry was the word ‘philosophy’. In *Open Society* Popper accounted for the history of opinions ‘who said what and when’, in his theories on science he was supposed to tell what is the essence of science, knowledge and cognition. The connection with these two sides of his work is very slight indeed, yet because of the success in history he was the

¹ Popper, K.R. (1977). *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. Volume I, *The Spell of Plato*

branded authority to speak of theories of science. Again I see fitting to recall the image of the Emperor without clothes, for Popper was the Emperor of philosophy thanks to *Open Society*, but there was no science, all that there was, was an admiration for this brand name, Popper. – This phenomenon ‘Popper’ and his admirers recall to my mind Proust’s criticism of “the established judges of literature” – for here we deal with the ‘judges of philosophy’. Proust said “From decade to decade their wordy battles...their ideas of society, politics, and religion...can assume a momentary amplitude but their life-span is the brief one of ideas which owe their success to their novelty and gain their adherence only of such minds as are not particular about proof”.¹

Having secured brand recognition Popper was in the position to promote in all earnest his utterly nonsensical theories on the philosophy of science known as theories of World 1, World 2 and World 3². These were sort of science fiction, fairy tales for the academic community. - Popper’s idea was to divide ‘all that exists’ into three domains. The three domains were: “World 1”, containing: ‘the world of physics, chemistry and biology’; “World 2”, containing: ‘the world of psychological states, dispositions and

¹ Proust, *In Search of Lost Time: Time Regained*, p. 296

² I have a more detailed criticism of Popper’s theories in *Expressions and Interpretations*, see e.g. pp. 89-101 and 143 and 144

processes' (yes, he said that *processes exist*); and "World 3", containing: 'the sum of the total of the objective and abstract products of the human mind – theories, numbers, and even tools and institutions considered abstractions' (abstractions exist he said!). – We should note how interestingly the word real in his theories came to denote the theories of a "World 3" which contain all abstractions of the mind, like symphonies, numbers, elves and small green elephants - all products of human mind.

Popper argued that "objective knowledge, the kind we find represented in books, tapes, computer memory, has an autonomous existence from the psychological or physical states that produced it and in which it may be represented" - At the very least this would mean that the opposite to objective knowledge, i.e. 'subjective ignorance, misunderstanding', would have an equally autonomous existence. – Sadly enough Popper did not advance in science as much as to grasp the physical reality of things, to understand that language and knowledge are not things but mere reflections of social practices; expressions and interpretations – mere perceptions in competition.

For Popper '*to exist*' was not a biological, physical reality, but a figure of speech, a linguistic conception, a product of scientific fantasy. He rejected the insight that all these ideas – 'the knowledge' as he thought - were merely the traditions of all bygone generations

reflected in language. – But, without language even Popper himself could not have made his noisy claims heard, for in the *real world*, without language, there would not be any Popper to talk about, all there would be left of him and his theories would be a mere dust in the wind, at best. Only language permits us to address, his ideas, yes, the very idea of *Popper*, in good and bad.

The thingly language

In language - and therefore in thinking - we formulate propositions where abstract notions (basically representing perceptions fabricated in the mind) are given *grammatical roles* to accord with preconceived ideas of ‘things’ as agents or objects. Double trouble starts with confusing between *animated things* such as humans, and *inanimate things*: trees, mountains, raw materials etc. Linguists call it ‘reification’ (assigning a thingly role to an abstraction) and ‘anthropomorphism’ (assigning things, phenomena, and abstractions, the role of a human). – This problem has been recognized, but it has been treated merely as a curiosity, as something mentioned in passing, although this is part of the most fundamental problem of science – or perhaps it is *the* most fundamental problem - and thus the decisive problem for humanity. The real magnitude of the problem has not been understood – it has not been understood that it is an overwhelming problem, an absolute problem, present in every sentence of language. – The problem can be illustrated by considering the previous sentence *itself* (and even the use of the word *itself* is part of the problem; a sentence cannot be *itself*). Consider words like ‘magnitude of the problem’ – how can a problem have a magnitude? – The word ‘understood’ – did anybody ‘stand under’? – I wrote that the problem ‘is present’, but surely the problem cannot *be present*,

things are present, not abstractions.

Misunderstandings are encoded in the very structure of language, in the language of things, the way of speaking where all words are treated on an analogy with the physical nature, as if everything necessarily would have *to be, to exist* – the way to use language as if we were always speaking about things and their movements (as if we were relating events that we see before our eyes). – The dilemma is that there is no way of expressing the non-physical, there is no pure way of expressing feelings. At every attempt to express a feeling it gets clad in the thingly veil of language – only the absurd, the unbelievable attacks the limits of language. – For a more detailed discussion of the thingly language I refer to Expressions and Interpretations.¹ - I note, for example, that perceptions on certain aspects of life such as ‘law,’ ‘economy,’ ‘democracy,’ ‘science’ are given this thingly role in the grammar, and then – really - in the minds of people. – All of us do it, and we cannot fully avoid it, but we should be on our guard, and constantly consider whether we can think of other, better, more natural ways of expressing the thought. Especially when we are formulating the most important scientific statements we need to be particular vigilant to our choice of words.

¹ In Expressions and Interpretations see e.g. chapter 3 “Philosophy and Language” and chapter 6 “The Thing”

I was reading the books of George Soros - who is known to be an admirer of Popper's art - in order to find out whether there would be a fresh view, a new angle to what Popper had to say - although to be fair I have to admit that certainly I was not expecting any to show up, but nevertheless I was positively surprised reading that Soros's philosophy was not so poor as what the Popper brand he so prominently displays had led me to expect. However, perhaps - after reading the four books - the one lasting aftertaste I was left with was that here Mr. Soros approached philosophy similarly to the way he had earlier approached the stock markets, identifying the weakness in present day philosophical thinking and then trying to turn these weakness in to his strength and armed with this perceived philosophical instrument he thought he could carve himself a corner in international politics - the way he had earlier so successfully operated in the stock market - and from where to prepare a hostile take over of the world - or if not the whole world, and if not all at once, then at least Eastern Europe and Russia. Mr. Soros failed in the grand scheme but scored some local gains in the more peripheral markets. Mr. Soros failed for he did not understand that cognition of mankind is a near perfect market - not that it is perfect in terms of quality, but it is perfect in terms of all utilizing more or less the same methods of thought and action, in fact the behavior of all is more or less - at least on an average - derived from the same roots of pain and pleasure and the

social practices that have evolved from them. Mr. Soros had in fact stumbled and fallen in the very pitfall prepared by Popper, because it is his ultimate scientific - and utterly nonsensical - idea of falsifiability that had overtaken the greedy mind of Mr. Soros, for he thought that he indeed would be able by a new and cunning way to falsify life - the present ways of social interaction - the same way he had earlier to his immense financial gain proven all the other players on the stock market wrong, but he did not understand that life is not the stock market, life is a much more perfect market. In life there is a multidimensional network of beliefs where there is always a new layer to penetrate and nothing as such can be falsified. This web of beliefs cannot be falsified, only changed, to say it can be mended would already be hoping for too much.- But here, in this presentation, I wanted to refer to the philosophy of Soros for somewhat other reasons. His books provide some brilliant examples of the thingly fallacy, this perversion to assign the role of a human actor to words and concepts, and these come handy to illustrate this thingly fallacy, the problems of the language of things; problems that by the very essence of it concern us all and concerns the way we all speak, and thus the way we think. Below I will draw from the wealth of Soros to show by way of examples what this perversion leads to.

Soros says:

“Capitalism *is* very successful in creating wealth”
– Although for all we know it is people who *create*,
and not this word ‘capitalism’¹

“*Scientific method produced* amazing discoveries and
technologically *allowed* their conversion to productive
use”²– Although Soros should know that *people produce*
and people *allow*; these actions are not undertaken by
this perception that Soros calls ‘scientific method’;

“*Open society* has nothing against religion.”³– See how
similar this is to a fairy tale, when this pair of words
‘open society’ is assigned the role of opining over its
relation to religion.

“*The freedom of thought* allows critical thinking and
the freedom of choice allows the market mechanism to
operate”⁴ – Now he treats these two combinations
of words as supranatural agents ‘thinking’ and
‘allowing’.

¹ Soros, G. (2000). Open Society [Reforming Global Capitalism]. PublicAffairs, New York, USA, p. xii

² Ibid pp. 123 and 124

³ Ibid p. 131

⁴ Ibid p. 131

“*Scientific method* has been able to develop its own
rules....Scientific method has been very successful
in the study of natural phenomena”¹ – We should
try to imagine Mr. Soros sitting in a comfortable
armchair by the fire-place, next to him another
armchair, two cups of tea, two servings of Danish
cookies; a conversation between Mr. Soros and ‘The
Scientific Method.’ The other chair is empty, the
other cup of tea is full, one is speaking, Mr. Soros.
He is congratulating ‘The Scientific Method’ on the
advances in sciences since Popper’s times. Soros
speaks, the chair is empty, with him is ‘The Scientific
Method’- with us are the people in their endless social
practices.

I cannot conceive of a more important task to be
undertaken in philosophy, than the study of language
use, and a constant criticism of it, with a goal to
learn how to better express feelings and opinions. We
need to free language from the constraints imposed
onto it by *the language of things* and the thinking it
infects. Similarly, instead of the bewilderment with
the mysteries that language presents us with, we
should try to understand what in language creates
these mysteries. The root of the problem is in the
misunderstanding of what language really is about
– the failure to understand that language is not a
thing but a practice, the most supreme manifestation
of social practices.

¹ Soros, G. (2006). The Age of Fallibility. Weidenfeld & Nicolson, p. 217

Law as Social Practices –Legal Practices

I arrived at my conception of all human activity and knowledge being embedded in social practices - and social practices being art and interpretation of feelings – through a study of law. Therefore I enjoy referring to law as a perfect example for illustrating this concept. - I propose to view justice and law as reflections of social practices, which in turn are reflections of individual expressions and interpretations; these are the immaterial fundamentals of human and social life, of cognition, what through thinking leads to deeds. My view is based on the recognition that ‘law’ is but a certain perception on various aspects of life; certain aspects of human thinking, and that the resulting expressions and interpretations have traditionally been considered as constituting ‘law.’ My aim is to show that there is no such ‘thing’ as law (‘law’ is not a ‘thing’), and that law is exclusively perceptions on certain aspects of social practices; within the notion *law* we may speak of *social practices* in a narrower sense as *legal practices*.

Law is competition of arguments; it is those social practices where individuals exchange arguments aimed at achieving a certain (normative) behavior. Indeed I would even claim that all social practices are based on a competition of arguments, and that in ‘law’ we in fact deal with those arguments that we discern as particularly ‘normative’. That is, aimed

at such behavior which people have a tendency to regard as especially compulsory. This distinction in fact points to the character of law as consisting of actions that one holding authority over others - or wishing to hold - seeks to impose in contradiction to those behavioral patterns that would be more customary (normally accepted) in society.

Through the idea of seeing law as a competition of arguments reflecting, and affecting, the social practices we are in a position to understand that *justice* is the result of the competition of arguments, and thus may be called ‘*competitive justice*.’

But there are two biological, natural, restrictions to the competition of arguments; two natural fundamentals for justice; let’s term them the initial premises. These are: the supreme respect of life and the respect of the ecological environment. Justice is a property that the individual living human being has a supreme right to, and all justice is annihilated with death; the natural environment is the condition of life and therefore serves as the sole utilitarian base for justice.

A metaphoric comparison of law and justice with medicine and health could be illustrative. Now, I argue that law should be about the promotion of justice, in the same way as medicine should be about the promotion of health. In contradiction to this insight the prevalent theories of law can be

compared with a notion whereby we would think that health is produced (exclusively) on the surgeon's operating desk. The surgeon may have a very decisive role in many individual cases for sustaining life and promoting health, but certainly health is a million times broader a notion. Health is a function of a great deal of conscious and unconscious habits and activities, sometimes undertaken specifically for the benefit of the health; the diet; the habits of life; the environment; sports and leisure; all the health practices; doctors exchanging opinions; consultation; medicine; vitamins; fresh mountain air; less stress; proximity to a pet; love...Doctors and surgeons intervene only in an extraordinary situation – (and so do lawyers and judges). – Similarly justice is a function of the same living conditions; like health justice comes about by social practices – (in the perception of law we speak about legal practices). – Infinite Variances affect justice – each day.

But we may as well compare law with ice-hockey, or legal practices with the practice of playing hockey, the hockey traditions, for similarly like *law* – that is to say the perceptions on those aspects of life that pertain to the normative order and which we call 'law' - hockey has developed gradually through times, from times beyond the memory of mankind, through various traditions, through various games, through various forms of social playful practices; some even claim to trace the roots of the tradition of playing hockey

to a game depicted in 4000- year-old drawings at the Beni-Hasen tombs in Egypt (which automatically would mean that the game itself is yet older, for certainly they did not start the game with painting the players for the honor roll)¹. Like all traditions, all practices, physical games change, evolve and take on new forms; there is always a root in earlier traditions, and yet we cannot say what exactly is the root or how the traditions evolved, how the hockey of today took form, at what point all that was before had been cumulated to the practice we now call ice-hockey. I claim that there is no such point, that there is no such point in the 4000 years of history we glanced at, and that there is no point - except for a point of taste - even in the more recent history of hockey. And naturally we have to understand that hockey did not even originate in a linear succession of cultural traditions from that game in the picture in the tombs of Beni-Hasen, and not even from the people that played the game back then; the hockey we have today is a product of traditions of variegated cultures which each have affected the most recent traditions of what today is called playing hockey – similarly like the Beni-Hasen game was the result of all the traditions that had preceded it. - The hockey played today is by contemporary historians considered to

¹ For this section on hockey I have quoted information from the Wikipedia article on ice-hockey and from the web sites of the Finnish Ice Hockey Association, www.finhockey.fi/info/historia

have taken shape in Canada and more precisely the recent origins are traced to the McGill University in Montreal, to the developments that took place there in the years of 1875 to 1880 with the first organized indoor games and codified rules (interesting to note what significance codified rules played in this development). And yet even so historians continue tracing the origins to various ‘sources’ bringing up evidence like the Galway Statutes of Ireland which made reference to “the horlinge of the litill balle with hockie stickes or staves”, or references to the Scottish sport ‘shinty’ and the Irish sport ‘hurling’ that European immigrants brought to North America. – A gentleman referred to as Sir John Franklin had written in 1825 on a Great Bear Lake expedition in the Arctics that “the game of hockey played on the ice was the morning sport...”. And in 1843 a British Army officer in Kingston wrote “Began to skate this year, improved quickly and had great fun at hockey on ice”. – The game took shape gradually; the first game to use a puck rather than a ball took place in 1860 in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, but by the year 1893 the traditions of hockey had already fully caught on in Canada where in Montreal alone there were a hundred teams, and where they had leagues throughout the country.

And what today is hockey is not the same as the game hockey that they played at the campus of McGill University in the year 1875. A lot has changed

since then; small adjustments, improvements and restrictions crept gradually in, for example that small invention that they thought about in Winnipeg in the last decades of 19th century to incorporate cricket pads to better protect the goaltender’s legs. - From the beginning of the 20th century hockey started to be played professionally with salaried players. The rules of the game were eventually codified in the rules of the NHL (North American National Hockey League) and the rules of IIHF (International Ice Hockey Federation) that the Europeans adhere to (these two bodies of rules may well be compared with the similarly competing sets of accounting rules, the American US GAAP and European IFRS, although fair play is clearly better guaranteed by the both sets of hockey rules). – Early in to the game only backward passes of the puck from one player to another were allowed, but after 1930s that changed and forward passes became allowed. What a cardinal change – try playing hockey with the earlier rule and you will sense the difference – and yet it is the same game. Today teams with 6 players on the ice are competing but when the organized form of the game first started to take shape there were 15 players per team, the number being gradually reduced through 9 to 7 and eventually to the 6 players of today.- The system of rules and penalties in hockey have also evolved gradually through history to address a multitude of expediencies that people have realized while practicing hockey; sometimes there has been

pressure to change the rules to make the game more speedy, or to encourage more goals to be shot, or to provide more protection to the players, and the public, or to rein in on violence, while sometimes the other way around: to encourage it; the fine-tuned system of penalties has evolved over time to address perceived specific needs: 2 minutes for tripping, elbowing or roughing; 5 minutes for something considered more foul play; and 10 minutes for misconduct, or 10 minutes misconduct combined with the 2 or 5 minutes personal penalty; game misconduct or disqualification. – Why 2 minutes and not 3? It has become to be so through the historic evolution of the game, the practice. Why penalty of 5 minutes instead of 2? Because more flagrant fouls are penalized more severely. But then what is to be considered as more flagrant foul? That is whatever in the history of the social practices of hockey has to come to be so considered...

The rules, the penalties, make up for the rule-of-law of hockey, but not only, there are more elements in to it, there is the whole community of stakeholders: the fans, the public at large, the investors, the sponsors, the press, even the general legal system affects the rule-of-law of hockey (like international law affects that of a particular jurisdiction of a country); all combine to the rule-of-law of hockey, that is what is to be considered right and wrong – and even so there is a constant change. – Now we may compare

this with the development of the legal system of Russia after the fall of the Soviet Union. By now - in fifteen years from the fall of the USSR - the Russians have had to learn a whole new game of law – in fact not one but an infinite number of games – to somehow set all issues - all arguments, all needs – in a fine-tuned relation to each other, with all minor alterations of what is to be considered right or wrong, permissible or forbidden, what is to be considered to be in excess and what is to be deemed adequate; all these competing claims have in the West been settled in an evolutionary fashion without any major interruption throughout the history - e.g. in Britain, at least ever since the Roman intrusion, some two thousand years of uninterrupted social processes – but in Russia there was a cardinal break in the traditions during the Soviet period, I even claim that Russia in much started law from scratch (hereby I mean law as a normative system, and by no means people's moral values and judgments, the sense of justice and fairness, the qualities of which never fell behind those of the West – I have to admit that today I would turn around the question sometimes wondering at the fundamental injustice that the managed Western Press indulges in). And yet in the microcosm of hockey we still disagree fundamentally in point of view even dealing with the very restricted number of questions: we may wonder whether it was right to penalize a player with 2 minutes for hooking in the particular incident; and this after hundreds of

years and after thousands of people considering over and over again just this small aspect of the game, this infinitesimally small aspect of life (aspect of social practices), while the Russians were forced to fine-tune all the millions of aspects all at once. We have to conclude that the Russians surely are the historic world champions in the game of social practices, in organizing fresh and healthy social traditions after so many years of being shut out from the free game of social practices by the communist regime that played by the rules cooked up by Karl Marx.

Today they play this kind of hockey because the game has evolved to what it is today by force of people playing it. We may go to another direct analogy with the contemporary conception of law (the wrong one which I criticize), and consider the rules of hockey, to think about them as the laws in a system of justice; could anybody imagine to learn to play hockey, to become a good hockey player by merely reading the NHL rules of hockey - or even more – could anybody expect to put together a good hockey team of guys diligently memorizing the rules by heart, but none of them having ever played the game with skates on their feet on the slippery ice! – Yet this is what the critics of Russia claim, they claim that the Russian president and legislature have failed because the society has not yet learned to play law according to the books, but law like hockey is not learned from the books, but by playing in, and the game itself, like law, is the playing,

is the free social practices. Society is like a big hockey team, or rather like a major league with an infinite number of potential teams participating in the games, and now Russians have been playing for only 15 years, because before Mr. Yeltsin and Mr. Putin introduced the rules to the game they were playing a different game, not law, but no-law, a command-system of arbitrary rules, a game where the teams had no right to make their own strategies, one where only the referees had any rights, while being themselves above the rules. The critics, against any ethics of fair play, hark down on Russia comparing their young game with theirs that they have played for hundreds of years. And yet the only honest criticism would be to say “What a wonder that they have learnt the game of law in such a record short time of 15 years; for us it took hundreds of years”. Yes, hundreds of years – maybe thousands – but the really striking realization is that these Western countries which brave themselves with their rule-of-law have not in fact moved much beyond where Russia is today, and who knows how the roles will be turned around in another 15 years? – In Canada they started to play an organized form of hockey back in the 19th century already with hundreds of teams. They have strong cultural traditions of playing hockey and enjoying it with 1,6 % of the population playing the game today, and therefore they are playing it better than ever, the game has become such an important part of the social practices of the Canadians. – Compare with Finland where they started to play hockey

in an organized form between clubs only in 1928. Finns were to wait 21 years before they could score the first victories in any games in an international tournament beating Norway 7-3 and Belgium 17-2 in the World Championships 1949. And it was only in 1959 that the Finns first beat the neighboring Swedes with a sweet 4-1. – So far no great achievements in the social practice of hockey, but in 1968 anyway an unfathomable 5-2 victory over Canada in the Olympic Games of Grenoble. – In 1978 the junior team of under 18-year-olds won the European Championships starting a decade of success for the junior teams. – This because the results of the social practices started to pay off; it was the culture of hockey, traditions of playing hockey that showed their strengths, even individual players were able to stand off as stars on the strengths of the traditions. Now the kids all over the country played hockey, watched hockey, read about hockey, and collected cards depicting their favorite teams and players. – And that is why success was next to strike the adult teams, staffed with the boys that had grown up with hockey in a country that had grown with hockey: 1991 third place in the Canada Cup; 1992 Prague, first time medals, silver in World Championships; 1994 Olympic bronze in Lillehammer; World Championships silver in Italy. – 1994, the 100th indoor hockey rink inaugurated in Finland; more than three million spectators in the season 1993-94, in a country with 5 million inhabitants; 1995 GOLD

in Stockholm; 1998 Olympic bronze in Nagano; 1998 World Championship silver in Switzerland; 1999, Norway, silver again; 2000, Russia, bronze; 2001, Germany, silver; 2006 Olympic Games, Turin, silver; 2007, Moscow, World Championships: silver... What these international placements speak of is foremost of the strong social practices of playing hockey in this little country with the world's second biggest density of hockey players with 1,2 % of the population playing hockey only to be beaten by Canada with 1,6% density. - But not only the players make the game, but all what is around it: the managers and trainers who chose the most important features of the hockey culture worth of highlighting to the young generation and to the adult players, giving all they know and all they have to give in an effort to win; the critics - sports journalists, sponsors, politicians – the fans, friends and family, and all the other people which by chance become involved in the game, maybe just an accidental passer-by caught by a patriotic fervor to join in the hailing of the national team and its achievements. – But really this is the same way law comes by, how law develops, and as with hockey it is a competition, law is a competition of arguments on every level of society, and both law and hockey, I think it is evident, develop where freedom reigns and competition can be conducted in an environment of freedom, where the monopolists are disqualified, and where it sometimes takes some pretty tough referees to achieve it.

Claude Lévi-Strauss

To understand the present reality - the present and reality - we have to move beyond our own contemporary superstitions, and try to mirror our own beliefs in those of others, for it is a result of ignorance and a fear of the unknown that induces people to embrace the false conceptions that the ways of other peoples are dominated by primitive beliefs in magical cures, spirits and retarded customs of backwardly men, while for some reason those of the own culture, own country are taken to represent the foremost achievements of mankind, of people that in blissful ignorance consider themselves the most civilized of all – while for them the very yardstick for civilization is their own customs. And what really throws people off and prevents them from looking reality in the mirror is technical progress - which is a problem similar to the American retort “If you are so smart why ain’t you rich”, which presupposes that it is a sign of wisdom to be rich, while most smart people we know from history have not been especially rich, or *have been* rich like Ludwig Wittgenstein who indeed *was* rich but thought richness a burden to life and got rid of his immense fortune – and thus people that live in societies technically advanced and materially prosperous have this similar way of thinking themselves smart because the society where they live is materially well off, while nothing in life – except for those thingly surroundings – lends any credibility

to the statement, on the contrary, e.g. looking at the supreme power of the European Union, or the journalists of the leading Western press, you clearly are convinced of the contrary. While some men used to dance around a totem pole and work themselves in to ecstasy with a truly spiritual form of art, the others work themselves into a frenzy in their belief in the thingly existence of certain words and concepts like e.g. ‘democracy’, ‘rule-of-law’, ‘science’ and ‘state’, a state like e.g. ‘Britain’ which they in all earnest believe to be in the possession of a ‘will’, and to that degree are they rendered insane by the words, their chant, that they out of their minds accept the mind implanted in them by the propaganda of hatred and greed - (the British press being the most authentic source of this kind of evil) - so that they are quite willing to defend these words by sending armies and ballistic missiles equipped with warheads to kill the men and women - and their babies - who have not been able to penetrate the artistic merits of these same words. – This is the magic circle of superstition, where those who think themselves standing over the superstitions of others simply occupy another position in the eternal circle going round and round. The true magic would be to have the power to break through this circle, to cancel its rotation, to gain a language for interpretation of feelings, and to make art for art’s sake the magic of life.

With all this goes the fantastic belief in historical

progress, that life would have been shaped in a historical process going from strength to strength with ever better and more beautiful achievements, and that all this would have culminated this day in the life at the capital streets of major Western cities. But, there is no culmination, all we have is the present day balance of errors, all the historical errors mankind has picked up on the road. We need to broaden our horizons, get competing views on our histories, so that we Europeans could move beyond our poverty of perception, the one-sided view of the glory of European history. But not only we Europeans need to do it, all people would have to do it, the Chinese have to look beyond their own, the Indians beyond theirs, and so on. We have to understand that beyond the few epic narratives of each people, beyond these ritual-like beliefs in original causes - those heroic causes that for example according to the European historic mythology lie behind the present marvels - that beyond these there is a life shaped in infinite variances from the first day of life through history, which down below all the superficial notions is one history common to all humanity.

How little the human has changed is best evidenced in the narratives of anthropology. We could gain even more insight to the depth of life if we were able to travel back in time; in a way this is what anthropology enables us to do, and the sight it opens up for us is fascinating. Back there in time, in the stories of

anthropology, we meet humans, the very same types of people that crowd our perceptions today, humans that seemed to carry all the same traits that the fellows among us today, the same ideas, the follies, cruelty, and love. In fact I think this is the ultimate journey we should attempt, for I believe that we can reach back and we can regain that time, and with that time regained we can enrich the present life. Here I am very deliberately referring to Marcel Proust's work, the risk is that I may be seen as trying to be overly witty by evoking these associations, but even so I cannot avoid it because it is my sincere conviction that this is the case, and I need to express my admiration for Proust that has so beautifully formulated this idea – an idea within ideas – an association of ideas criss-crossing in infinite variances, but always reaching back to *memory*, *time lost* and *regained*. The same journey in time and back again that Proust took us within the life of a society in one hundred years serves us as a model for an eternity, although in a way that eternity is already within those 100 years and 3000 pages.

In view of having given conscious thought to these issues I find myself nowadays frequently faced with impressions that invite me to contemplate the relation between the past and the present, progress and development; it can be a similar expression of playful awareness of being respected and master of the moment that a I catch in a young American student or an Asiatic vendor at an outdoor market

which causes me to wonder how these two men could use the same combination of facial expression and bodily pose while separated by thousands of miles, languages and cultures apart; how could they both sit in the same pose leaning nonchalantly to the side by supporting the bodyweight with the elbow, the head tilted to the side down towards the left shoulder as in a show of a combination of self-awareness, friendliness and playful timidity, as in courting an emotion yet unknown which; and the body pose correlating that of the head, free, relaxed, but secure as if there would be a kind of deference mixed with indifference to the surrounding world; and clad in that same face of a seeming indifference moderated, though, with a closed mouth that has been stretched out to the initial stages of a smile, with the added stress of the middle part of the lower lip being thrust upwards two grains of a nuance - a nuance on the face that combine to make up this particular one- both ends of the outdrawn mouth tipping down one grain and the checks curling up to small rolls just below the eyes, while these eyes stare in the distance seemingly on nothing but in reality looking inside the person himself, the eyes nevertheless being assigned the task to keep a contact with people around, which is shown by the contours of the eye faintly strained to say 'this is a happy thought in my mind'; the hands have been laid defenselessly on the belly folded by gently crossing the fingers in a grip that is not closed, and thus the two hands softly touching each other are telling that these weapons of pain and pleasure have been put to

rest as in an armistice. – As they say “like James Dean’s head-tilt”. While the American might have seen Dean on screen, or inherited the expression from others that have seen the actor, but the Asian guy, I dare to say based on the circumstances, could possibly not have seen the movie nor received the influence back from there in any form of cultural exchange in such a fashion that he would now have integrated such an arsenal of expressions in his bodily grammar, it therefore must be the other way around, that both of them are showing the expressions programmed in the body and language stemming from lives with common roots and lived long ago. And this leads me to think that also the social setting to which the expressions apply must have been the same thousands and thousands of years ago, even referring back so far in time, to a life which our scientists and journalists would proclaim lack any connection with ours, to our progress of the day; but I think there is a common root and that there is this connection, in fact, I think that what has been added on by our science, philosophy – even by our art – is quite little, while the technical progress that confuses us has come about entirely through the forces of social competition in a process that has placed these same humans from the stone age in a new setting, similarly to the poor man becoming rich by a lucky strike and moving up in society and all its material surroundings, and then indulging himself voluntarily or involuntarily in the thought that he has himself made all that can be seen around him. - It is as we humans would all be the

actors in a big social Theater of Time and called at different times of history to perform in a new role, in new settings, and in new costumes, this time in this modern play, in these settings which seem like out of this world, but all the same the intrigue unaltered as it has been inherited from the previous generations, and yet the ones anterior to those in an infinite regress back in time, and the same actors with the same feelings, and all with the same expressions.

Just recently drawing to an end with my work on the present book I visited a Chinese restaurant in Moscow to celebrate the conclusion of a corporate planning session. I knew this restaurant from before and had chosen it for being the most authentic Chinese eatery I have come across in Europe. This restaurant called by the Russian word *Druzhba* is the offspring of a cultural exchange program between the Russian and Chinese governments, which explains its authenticity when all in it - the recipes - the ingredients, the chefs, the management, the style comes directly from China whereas the restaurants in most of Europe that call themselves by the word 'Chinese' have very little to do with the real culinary traditions of China; and this *Druzhba*, I was told, of the diverse traditions of China was closer to the Szechuan traditions. – The colleagues I had invited to the restaurant were as impressed with it as I had been first time around. I was pleased to hear Veronika, sitting next to me, after she had savored the first dishes, saying “It is amazing,

so many flavors I can taste in one mouthful, I feel I have pearls in my mouth all bubbling and sizzling, and as if the flavor pearls one after another would jump and hit the palate – and all simultaneously - with all the flavors of a Chinese market stall”. That is the point: the flavors can be recognized all separately, even though they are all mixed in the same food, you take a mouthful from your plate, expect it to be chicken in a Chinese sauce, and then you feel that the sauce is not only Chinese by name, but it is China that you get in your mouth, there is salt and pepper, lemon, ginger and a flower so fresh that you can smell its scent in your nose while the bite is in your mouth. It is this wealth of sensations simultaneously present, and alive at the table - not only in the different dishes and their names, but in reality, even in the one and same dish – this is what I admire.

Having got the menu in my hands I turned my glance at our party, there were fourteen of us I concluded for myself, and with this soothing thought I devoured the idea that I was given the opportunity to order for all of us ...for the servings here were so handsome that after my first visit - when I unknowingly had ordered four dishes and could not even finish the second one and having had to resort to that great American invention of doggy bag – I was always a little melancholy going through the menu knowing that I had to reject almost all on offer, and had to settle for two dishes... But now I read and reread the menu three times from cover to

cover considering all the 172 items on display, even giving the desserts a serious thought, for under usual circumstances desserts are out of question. Having considered the merits of all portions and the appetite for culinary sensations which was growing in my eyes, I set off to order the parade of six thousand years of perfection and tradition, traditions of China, which even they are not traditions of China alone, but come with traits of Mongolia, Korea, Asia, Japan, India... for even the Chinese culture has been enriched by influence from far and near neighbors – similarly like the Chinese have enriched their neighbors and us - in thousands of years of exchange. – This is what I settled for: a clear soup with a floating flower; broth with wontons filled with a mixture of seafood, meat and vegetables with the flavor of minced ginger, finely minced onions, sesame oil and soy sauce; boiled chicken Guadun style; fried peanuts with coriander in red oil; shrimp salad with celery; cabbage and cucumbers with noodles; kidney bean sprouts; boiled mushrooms with bamboo in oil; fried scallops and squids with spring rolls; chrysanthemum carp in sweet and sour sauce; deep-fried chicken with nuts and sweet pepper; pork in sweet and sour sauce (with the touch of sweetness coming from the honey of our nature); lamb with Peking cabbage in Szechuan spicy broth; stewed field cabbage with black mushrooms; A choice of vegetables: cabbage, spring onions, chives, broccoli, carrots – boiled, stewed, or braised; prepared in the most diverse fashions to bring out

the finest flavors, served with a hot chili sauce, and simmering in a flowery oil; and bowls with stir-fried vegetables prepared with a sensitivity appropriate to each individual ingredient sending them in the heat of the pan in strict accordance with the time it takes to allow each to cook to perfection, as this time required for carrying out the ideal texture and color with all the distinctive flavors has been deemed appropriate and established through traditions from generation to generation; and thus from the collective memory of traditions each vegetable had been entered into the pan in due sequence with the toughest and thickest vegetables like broccoli, carrots, and cabbage cooked just a slight moment longer than the softer and leafy vegetables, the salad, the snow peas and bean sprouts, which had been placed on the pan just when it had begun to tinge the white cabbage - bok choy - whose stalks delicately separated from the leaves had hit the heat first and been left to simmer in the flowery sesame oil for two short minutes, no more, when the chef had been ready to gratify the pan with the ginger that needed 30 seconds to part with its best aroma that corresponded to the ideal standard of the chef the way he read the memory of the great masters of the past generations whose work of art he was now so faithfully recreating; fried salad and soy curds in an oil extracted from Haoyu seafood; Peking cabbage with rose-petals; dumplings filled with mutton, spring onions, radish and coriander - still warm after the steam bath they had been plunged into - which

after a dip in a sauce of soy and vinegar were - small enough as they were - ready to be swallowed whole at one gulp; noodles in broth with pork, vegetables and marinated roots of mustard greens; fried pancakes with vegetables; - and in the middle of the table a simmering hot pot on which I could rest the desire of my eyes – combining the thoughts, and sensations, of my mind with what was really present in the pot as advertised by the scent of the flower pepper, and the color of the thinly sliced meat, leafy vegetables, and mushrooms, all creating a sensation on the tongue that was both spicy, burning, and slightly numbing like the water of Vichy.

So, I felt I was there steeped in the mists of time to which this authentic Chinese food had called me weak as I was - having been contaminated by this way of thinking - to such influence from the forces of the involuntary memory of our environment, forces we can shut out from our personal life, but which we cannot resist anymore once we have opened up the gates of consciousness to the idea of finding out and giving in to the desires of the heart.

In this food I saw the color, redolence, taste, shape and fineness of all components present, and I felt a joy of being part of it, of this being in my life. – I noticed that I had understood the meaning of the search, and what we can hope to find at the end of it, when the tea was served in a clear transparent teapot together

with the buds of lily and jasmine flowers, which buds unfolded during the brew opening up to the mature flowers which time had preserved in the dried folded buds waiting for the moment that they would come to life one more time, the last time, to part with their aroma and beauty in a cup of tea where their flavor made a difference. – And I was wondering, was it so that this very sensation - which I now felt to be my own, and which I felt that it was worth living for, and which I felt was leading me back to my most sacred values of childhood – that this very sensation was in fact a received memory, one made mine only because I had admired Marcel Proust's description of this very sensation. And couldn't it be so, that I understood it in this very instance, because at this occasion there just happened to be such a strong connection between the source of the impressions and my consciousness about it? But couldn't it also be so that I was particularly susceptible to this kind of sensation because it was mine, and that Proust had just told me how to come to terms with the sensation and how to express it, perhaps not express it for others, but at least for myself.

When I saw the petals of lotus, the water lily, floating in the clear soup I noticed that through the course of the dinner I felt I was actually taking part in an exhibition of exotic flowers for I was constantly looking to identify the flowers which although dead and dried were emitting the flavors, colors and odors

stored in their substance like memories of life, and it was the memories that these dead flowers shared with me that stirred my own memories to recreate their beauty in my mouth and in the scents which I inhaled; on the table and in our minds we had daylilies, chrysanthemums and lotus, the water lily, and the flowers of the lilac tree spreading a magical fragrance which I thought to stem from an enchanted Chinese cousin of the lilac at my parents home. – Also chili, ginger and spicy herbs, sesame oil, and the fagara – the Sichuan peppercorn - giving a fragrant, numbing, and almost citrusy spice; coconut, garlic, mustard, yellow ginger and the white one, herbs, lilac, dry mandarin skin and oil, pepper, salt and oil, and toasted sesame seeds sprinkled on salads.

When we left our new friends at restaurant Druzhba I noticed that the entrance to McDonalds - the American fast food joint – was just next door, and this led me once more to contemplate the meaning of *progress*, for I was comparing in my mind the ancient traditions of China, a country which – although leaping forward as an economic giant – is way behind in *progress*, the way they understand this word in the West, while America on the other hand must be the very embodiment of the whole idea of progress, and McDonalds represents the culinary achievements of this brave new world. And I looked back at Druzhba, then again at McDonalds, and thought there must be something seriously wrong with our progress.

But as much as this comparison tells about our progress, so does the criticism that the self-appointed cultural elite of Europe directs against McDonalds, for it is only to the merit of McDonalds if they cater to the tastes and means of the European herd, and gives them what they crave for. In France it is even a national sport – complete with riot artists specializing in it to the acclaim of a choir of the elite - to crack down on McDonalds as a symbol for their bad consciousness, and yet the deep-fried potato fries the French themselves serve - without ketchup – with every meal and the chemical substance that they spread around the world under the brand Danone are not much better. And while a baguette with a piece of 50% fat cheese is certainly more chic, it is not much more healthy nor rich.

Thinking of the richness of the cooking traditions of China, and how the Chinese and their neighbors had influenced each other in thousands of years of cultural exchange, and how in the social practices thus evolved there had developed this Chinese cuisine, I also thought of the most weird idea of modern science, the idea of the Universal Grammar, the art of Noam Chomsky, for this idea of his that language would be an innate biological feature, sitting in the brain, in a place that his adepts call ‘the language organ’ - © - but which in reality exists only in the minds of the members of this sect (*exists* for if they believe in it, then it is their reality) – is directly analogous to

the idea that there would exist a Universal Cookbook. And this Universal Cookbook would also be sitting in the brain or perhaps in the belly (beware, they actually do think so!) which manifests itself through directing the hands and the minds of the chefs and all the participants in the food chain in choosing the most appropriate means and methods, and instruments and utensils, and ingredients to cook the meal as if all were already programmed in the UC, the Universal Cookbook of the brain or the belly, in the *culinary organ*. And certainly they think that the system is so complete that the vegetables, fruits, chicken, pigs, cows and fish have been directed to live, grow and feed just the very way they do, so that they one day, at the right day when chosen by all the participants in the food chain, and at the perfect heat of the pan, will come complete with all the flavors as required by the instructions of the Universal Cookbook and thus be fit to fulfill their role in a pot as predestined by the recipe. – But if we think about cooking like that (and this is a complete analogy to the idea of UG, the Universal Grammar), then we can say “Yes, there have been these explanations, there are these explanations: we call them religion.”

I noticed that I am in this habit – and I think that more or less consciously it has always been so with me - that each time when I attempt to think a thought to an end I finish at the gates of regress in time, this regress in time which is a regress both within my own

life-span back to my youth, childhood, my beginning, and the infinite regress back in eternal time, of which mine is a reflection. Eternal time is carried in the biological and the new dimension of it, the mental, which through language is manifested in life, in social practices, and which through these social practices hits back at life (I say ‘hits back’ – I wish I could instead settle for ‘touches back’). This is why I think that our attempts to understand human cognition and the eternal questions, and to glimpse the answers, will circle around understanding the biological evolution and its relation with language, and so truly ours is a search of lost time; to know the future is a question of interpreting the past, of finding expressions for these interpretations.

Having this in mind I wanted to round up this presentation with a look at the work of Claude Lévi-Strauss, and in particular at his *The Savage Mind*¹. His anthropological narratives and the traditions he represents contain important clues to understanding the present reality. My impression on reading Lévi-Strauss is that the human being has not changed, what has changed are forms of life, the culture around us has changed, and fundamentally this is not but a superficial change, this change is merely about a new superstition taking over an earlier one, or a new form of life replacing the older. Lévi-Strauss

¹ Claude Lévi-Strauss, *Savage Mind* (Nature of Human Society)

joined immense reputation and fame during his life, and he gained a wide audience, even the religious philosophers (like Sartre) listened to him, but he did not draw any grand scale general conclusions from his material, did he fail or did he not want to? To my understanding Lévi-Strauss held the opinion that the minute organization of life in the cultures and societies he observed and studied, the customs termed totemism (a system regulated by a ritual adherence to traditions even in the finest aspects of life) was a result of a grand plan consciously elaborated in the given society. While I admire his work and agree with most of his writings, I do not share this conviction; rather I believe that quite to the contrary the elaborate routines, marriage-exchange rules, eating-prohibitions, systems of naming, etc. were manifestations of the perversion of inertia that life in extreme closed societies leads to. It is the lack of internal competition (lack of freedom), and external competition (contacts with other cultures), that causes traditions, rituals, to take over, to gradually change reality in the veil of appearances and then to become the new unchallenged reality – in the mind. The internal competition in those societies was suppressed by the utterly rigid traditions that subverted the role of the individual. This is the same road that will take down all societies that are shielded off from external influence, or competition. In such societies detrimental social practices will enroot and expand and convert the individual to a cog in the

social system. These societies, which Lévi-Strauss studied, were successful in fending off external influence, but this very success is what perverted them, subjugated the individual and stopped the time. – The very paradox is that the development of world-wide economical, political and cultural integration termed *globalization* is very much attached with this same danger. Our challenge is to integrate for peace, but at the same time find ways for a multicultural and multipolar world where the individual human being can be free. – For the moment the tendencies are alarming, and most vividly evidenced in the scary developments in the European Union, where a new kind of totalitarian belief in metaphysical reality suppressing the individual is being raised to new heights.

The lesson of life, of history, is that human liberty – that is happiness - will be safeguarded only through the means of open societies where people believe in pluralism and are organized on the principle of free non-monopolistic competition; competition on all levels of life: external, internal, individual and social. – This kind of competition can equally well be termed co-operation, it is just another name for the same (to be used by the adherents of political correctness). Totally free competition equals perfect co-operation; in free competition societies will strive to a balance, the balance is co-operation.

I am very skeptical of the idea that there would have been any progress in the world. There has been *change*, there has been *technological advances*, but hardly any *progress*. Through history, as I know it, all progress I can discern is the *relative liberation of the individual human*, the *recognition* of the value of individual life, the increased freedom of the individual to be himself, to feel the way he feels, to live and let live. I stress more this important recognition of these fundamental values than the actual achievements, the individual is by no means as free as he should be, much more freedom is needed. In fact much more has to be done even to protect the relative achievements, for nothing can be taken for granted, freedom is threatened every day, everywhere, not least there where it on the surface would least seem so. As soon as the freedom fighters lose their guard new dangers emerge. – The idea of progress is linked with the idea that the men and women of today would be better persons, more human, than their ancestors, as if the genetic composition of a human being would so have changed that some genes that cause goodness and superior moral values to emerge had taken precedence over the genes of the bad and all this now only in the last decades of thousands of years of history. And this is total misconception. The human has not changed, only social practices have changed, and even these social practices are not to be seen like any kind of things which now with new technology will permanently be produced with

superior quality. Such a view on progress is especially cherished among most North Americans and Western Europeans – for they look around and think they see all the evidence for it in the material prosperity and the orderly conduct of social life they detect around, not understanding that this orderly life is the result of a few quite superficial conditions of social practices: a relative equilibrium in the competition of arguments; the likelihood that force will be put against force being so big that certain forms of use of force is practiced less than it has been customary through the history, while on the other hand due to the absolute power the Western governments exercise over their respective countries certain forms of force within the proper societies are practiced more efficiently than has been customary, and due to the new power balance these governments can be rounded up to support any form of international aggression which due to the very power balance and scare of the leading powers is in unison presented as something very human, laudable, and good. – In addition to the equilibrium in the competition of arguments, and this balance of terror, what causes the idea of human progress is the relative prosperity in which the good Europeans live: they have fewer reasons to kill each other materially well-off as they are, that is to say a critical mass of them, which mass thanks to the power machine built to protect the status quo may well decrease significantly for some years without noticeable effects on the surface. – And

then on top of these conditions: the equilibrium in the competition of arguments, the balance of terror, and the relative economic prosperity, we have the brainwashing: never have the Europeans and North Americans been subjected to such a strong flow of one-sided information from the politicians busy at resurrecting the Holy Roman Empire - in the name of the European Union, - the Academy, the scientific community - in the name of their positivist credo -, and the Press, the real power machine of Europe and North America, the unelected oligopoly that rules the Western hemisphere after having concentrated the flow of information in the hands of very, very few, wielding a power stronger than any church or king ever had.

The Press brings us back to the most primitive emotions of human beings, for now when the Press is so one-sided they do not even try to argue for the causes they support and instead they only play with images and key words, display code words sacred for the European herd and through these devices hold sway to an unheard of extent over these *very modern* men.

Some seventy years ago in the center of Europe, in Germany, there came to being the most horrible beasts that mankind has ever experienced. And now these people that rejoice in the progress of man should keep in mind that, certainly, it is not so that the

millions of years of genetic history which had led to the emergence of those men-beasts would now all of sudden be reversed by the few decades that followed (perhaps through a mutation cause by the injection of some kind of genetic Marshall aid) so that now with the passing of an additional 50 years – a drop in the ocean of history (I stress this only because this banal idea is de facto held among European politicians, journalists and scientists – i.e. all three magicians) – the genetic composition of Homo Europeus would now anyway have, finally and permanently, changed so that he'd now be ready-made, complete and perfected in goodness and all the laudable qualities, as if complying to some kind of directive of the European Commission. – No, all what we are, and all what we will be, is in social practices and the language which reflects and affects them; our human values are nothing but a reflection of this language under the spell of which we are - a language reflecting the struggle between the forces of pain and pleasure, now at a mental plane, and perhaps reflecting a strive, a quest for lasting love, a love which is there beyond pain and pleasure but far away from where we are, far as the stars twinkling somewhere yonder while we cannot but wonder where they are. A few wrong words and the beast in the human is loose– this beast is not the animal but a hybrid between the animal and the human, an animal in a human form perverted by a language of hatred. And this is why “when we study certain periods of ancient history” - as Marcel Proust

said - “we are astonished to see men and women individually good participate without scruple in mass assassinations or human sacrifices which probably seemed to them natural things.”¹ It is this language of hatred that “throughout the whole duration of time” lifts up “like great cataclysmic waves from the depths of the ages the same rages, the same sadness, the same heroisms, the same obsessions, through one superimposed generation after another”²

As I write this book I live and work in Russia, a country which has through time and space been swept with one and another of these tidal waves of obsessions; and just recently Russians have rid themselves, and the world, of one of the most forceful obsessions mankind has experienced: the Marxist ideology and the dictatorship built on the platform of this ideology. After the flood, the land still damp, Russians are building a new society guided by the better values of their traditions going back far to the same values other Europeans cherish in their art and literature. I witness how social life is taking shape with all the features of normality of modern social life – normal as normal can be in human society - human life in society being reinstated, and all in a record time of 10 to 15 years, years of peace

¹ Proust, *In Search of Lost Time: Time Regained*, p. 213 and 214

² Proust, *In Search of Lost Time: Time Regained*, p. 353

and calm. But I am perplexed for as clear as this is the Western Press and their politicians claim the opposite; in this 21st century with all the travel and means of communication, with all our science and education, the Europeans are successfully fed with a make-believe image of *another Russia*, a country which – against all reality and totally untruthfully - is portrayed as an undemocratic threatening enemy. I will not in this connection dwell on all the reasons for this, which have to do with an attempt to gain a control over Russia’s vast energy and other natural resources, and with other economic and geopolitical reasons, for in this connection I discuss the tool by which these aims are advanced, this tool: the language of hatred and all the primitive emotions that can be stirred up with it.

At first living and working in Russia and reading the Western reports – not very attentively, just once in a while the way a European man reads his newspaper in the morning over a cup of coffee and a sandwich and eggs, or watches the news broadcast on TV tired after a days work and satisfied after dinner - I first thought that they were mistaken, that one or another journalist was mistaken, or maybe guided by old fears and scares. But then I saw that it is a pattern, that the same unjust and wrong accusations, the same misinformation – at the same time, in the same words – appear all around the Western world. And I began to see the patterns of a campaign; paying attention

to it, being more alert to it, I eventually noticed that they are lying. And now I do not mean that they are *all* deliberately lying, but I claim that there is a core team of those that direct a campaign, a kind of an information war against Russia, they set the agenda through the dominant press – which is in the hands of very, very, few – and in the bowels of specialized propaganda lobbies they produce the perceptions of Russia to which the other journalists subscribe to, who then out of ignorance and fear – and pressure - do not dare to contest the truths that thus have been made official, acceptable, and fashionable – mind you, that almost none of the journalist that repeat the perceptions thus produced have never set foot on Russian soil. This is precisely like Marcel Proust said: “The truth is that people see everything through the medium of their newspaper, and what else could they do, seeing that they are not personally acquainted with the men or the events under discussion”¹ But still we cannot stop feeling astonished that “the public which judges the men and events of war solely from the newspapers, is persuaded that it is from their own opinions”²

What I say is that for some reasons (greed, hatred, geopolitics, fight for energy resources) some forces are engaged in a very deliberate attempt – and totally

¹ Proust, *In Search of Lost Time: Time Regained*, p. 139

² Proust, *In Search of Lost Time: Time Regained*, p. 144

fraudulent - to portray Russia as an evil enemy country. It is an easy task when the Western media has so successfully been recruited to serve these forces. Even earlier under far better conditions, a few generations ago when Europe and the USA still had a pluralistic media, it was not too difficult to manipulate the European masses to support one or another cause that the propaganda called them to embrace. Albert Einstein was well aware of this saying: “In two weeks the sheep-like masses can be worked up by the newspapers into such a state of excited fury that the men are prepared to put on uniform and kill and be killed, for the sake of the worthless aims of a few interested parties”.¹ And nothing has changed. Today the European masses, which are made up of most European men and women (and even the youth more docile than ever) – and also, and especially, those who (the majority of the mass), in view of the intelligence they perceive themselves to possess, would utterly reject any claim of forming part of the masses (this European herd) – are more susceptible to propaganda than ever, and the means for producing and disseminating the propaganda are at unseen levels of perfection, and thus it is easier than ever to awake the combative and destructive instincts of this European herd to new forms of hatred and wars.

¹ Einstein, *The World As I See It*, p. 10

Dwelling on this propaganda and the hatred thus reproduced I remember the words of Russia's President Putin who in this year of 2007 on the day of commemorating the fight against and victory over Nazism - the biggest evil of all times – said: "We should remember that the causes of a war are always to be found in the errors and misjudgments in time of peace, and that their roots are in the ideology of confrontation and extremism. And we have the more reason to remember this, because today these threats are by no means diminishing, all what happens is that they undergo transformations and merely appear in new forms. And at the bottom of these new threats there is the same contempt for human life as under the Third Reich, and the same aspirations to exclusivity and universal dictate." – I add to that: equally, as in the Third Reich, these threats are produced by propaganda; now propaganda less obvious, but more shrewd. – And this is all we can do, stand and fall for the truth. A human can die just any day, so why bring the truth to the grave, why not try to make a difference while still alive. But do we have a choice? Maybe we are just like drug addicts: obsessive, only obsessively surrendered to the truth without no cure – no other cure than writing and reaping from it a small satisfaction, all for oneself, not expecting any praise or rewards, but just like a sick man who congratulates himself on standing up from his bed and venturing into town and back again, and who upon returning home falls flat on his bed with

an enormous satisfaction that it was done; or like it was with myself when the new elevator was being installed in our office and I had to undertake the effort of mounting weeks on end the seven floors by foot, satisfied with myself each time I accomplished it but not expecting any praise for it – while receiving some nevertheless – or perhaps an analogy more easy to understand: a man or woman doing the jogging exercise, running for an hour, sweating, forcing himself to endure more, going out the following day and the following again, with only one reward: the pleasure of feeling fine.

