

**DUCTLESS FLOW: NONLINEAR CONCEPTIONS OF
ONTOLOGY AND EDUCATION**

by

Hartley Banack
M.A.
Simon Fraser University
2004

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the
Faculty of Education

© Given Hartley Banack 2010
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
Spring 2010

All rights reserved. However, in accordance with the *Copyright Act of Canada*, this work may be reproduced, without authorization, under the conditions for *Fair Dealing*. Therefore, limited reproduction of this work for the purposes of private study, research, criticism, review and news reporting is likely to be in accordance with the law, particularly if cited appropriately.

APPROVAL

Name: Hartley M. Banack
Degree: Doctor of Philosophy
Title of Thesis: Ductless Flow: Nonlinear Conceptions of Ontology and Education

Examining Committee:

Chair: Celeste Snowber, Associate Professor

Heesoon Bai, Associate Professor
Senior Supervisor

Charles Bingham, Associate Professor
Committee Member

Sean Blenkinsop, Assistant Professor
Committee Member

Allan MacKinnon, Associate Professor
Internal/External Examiner

By video teleconference from Ontario

Carlos Ricci, Associate Professor, Nipissing University
External Examiner

Date Defended/Approved:

April 16, 2010



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

Declaration of Partial Copyright Licence

The author, whose copyright is declared on the title page of this work, has granted to Simon Fraser University the right to lend this thesis, project or extended essay to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users.

The author has further granted permission to Simon Fraser University to keep or make a digital copy for use in its circulating collection (currently available to the public at the "Institutional Repository" link of the SFU Library website <www.lib.sfu.ca> at: <<http://ir.lib.sfu.ca/handle/1892/112>>) and, without changing the content, to translate the thesis/project or extended essays, if technically possible, to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation of the digital work.

The author has further agreed that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by either the author or the Dean of Graduate Studies.

It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without the author's written permission.

Permission for public performance, or limited permission for private scholarly use, of any multimedia materials forming part of this work, may have been granted by the author. This information may be found on the separately catalogued multimedia material and in the signed Partial Copyright Licence.

While licensing SFU to permit the above uses, the author retains copyright in the thesis, project or extended essays, including the right to change the work for subsequent purposes, including editing and publishing the work in whole or in part, and licensing other parties, as the author may desire.

The original Partial Copyright Licence attesting to these terms, and signed by this author, may be found in the original bound copy of this work, retained in the Simon Fraser University Archive.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, BC, Canada

ABSTRACT

Current educational metaphor is trapped in its etymological underpinnings. As derivative of Indo-European root *deuk*, *education* does not only lead out, but must also create and maintain the *ducts* of its existence. In presenting various examples of how ducted systems originate, operate and thus *educate*, this thesis explores fluid nature of being within these ducts, and attempts to elucidate some concerns with a model of education rooted in *-duction*. By consideration of nonlinearity as fluidity, both in relation and as opposed to solidity of ducts, readers are asked to contemplate how different relationships may emerge, were education to be reconceived as ductless.

Nonlinearity is woven throughout the work insofar as how concepts are presented and formulated; the ordering of concepts within the overall project; and a return to thematic concepts at various junctures, often with distinct arrangements and the use of various writing styles and techniques acting to simulate nonlinearity. Methodological complications in simulating nonlinearity in a conventional thesis format present challenges, but this anticipated experience of difficulty for the reader is an aim of this thesis as it attempts to conceive of *education* in acceptance of nonlinearity and fluidity.

Fluidity is quite specifically positioned in this work as representative of human ontological nature. By consideration of fluidity, in regards to solidity of

ducts, as well as opposed to nonlinearity, readers are asked to contemplate how novel relationships may emerge. Questions arise around challenges and possibilities with respect to accepting fluidity as constitutional to our being. These mainly play out through juxtaposition of solid human being and fluid human being; as well as learning through a *ducted* metaphor or less formally articulated and manipulated environments. Fluidity's more chaotic temperament may evoke strong reactionary sentiments of existential nature such as: nausea, anxiety, disgust or incomprehension. The nature of this work finds strong affinity with these reactions and accepts them as necessary to approach the shift as proposed in the writing.

Keywords: Education; Nonlinear; Linear; Knowledge; Being; Philosophy; Health; Ethics; Schooling;

DEDICATION

May my children, upon this work, somewhere, in journeys. May C.
Newell's spirit be appreciated in bird's flight.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My supervisor has always been a tremendous source of encouragement and support. My committee offered ears and input that was greatly appreciated. Professors and fellow graduate students stimulated much of my work. Thanks to Simon Fraser University and the Faculty of Education for clerical, procedural and financial support. To all those who have sustained me in times of need, who do not operate within boom and bust schemas of care, your love has been incorporated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Dedication	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Contents	vii
introduction for some sort of educationN	1
ANALYSIS of NADA	2
1	2
26	3
103	3
7	6
82	8
17	9
XVI	10
9 Million – The biggest and goofiest section yet!	11
Nineteen.....	13
5/9ths	14
3.1415.....	16
I.2	16
8- Hubritic Teachings	19
41 –Hut, hut, hut.....	21
S- High Noon	22
11	24
Chapter IXIX	25
2- Roots and Adornments	28
Dissertation	30
24A	35
33.3333333333	36
Finally, you arrive at beginning!	38
99 – Swerving to and fro – Achieving homeostasis- Balance in movement	40
¼	42
Eighteen Hundred and Eight Nine	44
3/15.876	46
100 - %	48
96	49
666	52
69 – Ducting:	53
55	56
-525	58
1	60
49 ¢	61

19	61
55 Old -Psykhe & Pneuma	64
6- First number, to come to mind.....	66
## - So you think you are an expert in education, eh?:	68
A,B,C –	69
4- Sheltering.....	70
9. C#3	71
19-#3c	72
29-C#3	72
5683- Love –	73
5683 - Philopoesia-	74
18- Hymn to Philopoesia	77
CB65034- DATA COLLECTION.....	79
18- Taking Hold: -.....	80
1- Focus:	81
21- Rules For Reading	85
SYNTHESIS of TOTUS	87
8. Understanding/Standing Under Pre-fixes	89
80- Crossing <i>The</i> Educational Line:.....	92
8- Evaluation of success: some rubrics and some brew	93
Bibliography	95
Endnotes.....	98

.introduction for some sort of educationN

You may start to read at any point. If you find points reading, they will point you where you read. While this work is pointless, it has much flow. These sentiments reverberate throughout this read, thus this work has, at end, flow, not (a) point (of points).

*And yet,
I write this introduction,
This first beginning....*

Response may swell, or onset, that confuses; readers may sense incongruence that could be construed as counter project's aim. These are but instantiations of flow; indicative of tension betwixt flow and solidity. As such, these are illustrative of flow's nature and descriptive of being human (trapped by education). These nauseas arising need not be addressed, as some concern with success, as reduction to illness, as tumor to be cut out. Be curious with emotion as you read.

ANALYSIS of NADA

Analysis: 1581, "resolution of anything complex into simple elements" (opposite of *synthesis*), from M.L. *analysis*, from Gk. *analysis* "a breaking up," from *analyein* "unloose," from *ana-* "up, throughout" + *lysis* "a loosening" (see *lose*). Psychological sense is from 1890. Phrase *in the final (or last) analysis* (1844), translates Fr. *en dernière analyse*.²

Nada: slang, "nothing," 1933, introduced by Hemingway, from Sp., "nothing," from L. *(res) nata* "small, insignificant thing," lit. "(thing) born."

*But I was trying to tell you about a strange thing
That happened to me, but this is no way to tell about it,
By making it truly happen. It drifts away in fragments.
-John Ashbery – Grand Galop*

*I say 'I finally resolved,' for at first sight it seemed unwise willingly to lose hold on what
was sure for the sake of something uncertain.
- B.Spinoza – On the Improvement of the Understanding*

1

Humour could not exist in an un-analytic world. To joke is to reflect, consciously or not. Play does not belong to humour. Play may be humourous or not. Humour plays on *lysed* being. This is why humour is other than play, for whilst play may be reflective or unreflective, humour is always reflective. One sense of humour's play is joking, another may be irony, et cetera. Wait! What a ridiculous manner to begin a Ph.D. dissertation? Ridiculous? Who mocks here? Who protests? Who speaks? Who is here with me? Did I just create this commotion you are now reading? Phantoms of Academies fallen help to

voice these concerns? Who, in the first place, on first base, said dissertations begin with beginnings? Who says one embarks from beginning? Did you begin to read this sentence? Did you read this sentence from last to first, in reverse? Did you begin to understand, comprehend this sentence? Where begins beginning?

26

How might it be that what we conceive as nothing, no thing, in English shares sense with *nata*, that which is born (natal), in Latin? Juxtaposition seems to simultaneously infer being and nothing. This split, this dichotomy, ravages consciousness as insinuation of separation between mind and body; seams to tear us apart, seems to tear us apart whether we purposely live it or not. Might inference lead to recognition that *illogic* girds many *systems* that presently present themselves as intellectual skyscrapers of cities that have always been, skyline of dualism between logic and illogic, between any *two*. This shift of oppositions, from nothing/something and birth/death, to nothing/birth, permits reconfiguration of polarity allowing unity in ways oft promulgated as ‘wrong’ or ‘inaccurate’ or ...~ Thus understanding becomes comprehension and systematization refocuses synthetic to analytic, as but another appendage in *corpus unitus*. Analysis revives from tendencies to consider fragmentary glimpses, emerging as another *sense*, akin to sight or hearing or humour. Genetic code breaking continues confounded with patterns which have ‘no sense’ and yet present coherence, whatever that may mean.

103

My body is flowing as I write, as is yours as you read; turning and returning, solving and dissolving. As we have come to acknowledge (a form of knowledge) our celestial spinings, it seems less significant to discourse around (this privilege) our perpetual flow as

constitutional to existence *. Being is described in relation to time and/or space, which most definitely have flow as central to some aspect of their concept; organic flow (that is flow of organisms, most particularly human I shall relate), as concept and instantiation of being and knowledge, informs as much (to be quantitative) as any other 'thing' – here where *noumenal Ding an sich* even acknowledges movement; just as our concepts are so bound, seeping into one another, influentially. Can such fluid non-sense flood? Could ubiquity of flow wipe clear all institutions known? Intuition lived as relative manifestation of knowledge, understanding and education, this most technical version. But these are all-of-the same 'thing' concept. As if thing were dissected flow, just as we are mostly dehydrated.

It is curious this concept, that comes together, that grasps together. Essential to flow is mix. This is why Education, the *ducted* model, limits; not as good or bad, curious how sacred some of our limits become. Focusing too unilaterally on *the* channel of flow, this channel becomes so highly specialized, perhaps technically, and so buffooned poetically, that in its twilight of philosophy *channel* dozes off at the wheel and now we seem to perpetually grate (gratefully so) along this materialized ducted surface. Allow me to focus you at this juncture, I myself have sensed river channels to arteries to air ducts, TV stations and within/beyond/other. Yet as surfaced duct, educating seems to focus on relationship/interaction of surfaced duct and flow matter (as chemical constitution?). Here both surfaced edge and fluvial material are understood, that is, we stand in-position to these tangible (transcendental categories, ideals) concepts. Kant's observation is profound, I acknowledge, however as with Plato and Theologians, we are told, it is correct (and thus emerges meaning of correct and true), that these concepts, these things, are of central focus. It is not to belittle these observations, just to recollect that limits limit other –non-conceptual (yet conceptual of course). This I attempt to address as flow.

flow (v.)

O.E. *flowan* (class VII strong verb; past tense *fleow*, pp. *flowen*), from P.Gmc. **flo-* (cf. Du. *vloeien* "to flow," O.N. *floa* "to deluge," O.H.G. *flouwen* "to rinse, wash"), probably from PIE **pleu-* "flow, float" (cf. Skt. *plavate* "navigates, swims," *plavayati* "overflows;" Armenian *helum* "I pour;" Gk. *plyno* "I wash," *pleo* "swim, go by sea;" L. *pluere* "to rain;" O.C.S. *plovo* "to flow, navigate;" Lith. *pilu* "to pour out," *plauti* "rinse"). The weak form predominated from 14c., but strong pp. *flown* is occasionally attested through 18c.

All humans are familiar with flow. From our pre-natal fluidity to our presents: ingestion of liquid, egress of liquid, weather/climatic, sea and space; flow is us- as much as legs and arms and lungs and things. Flow is not a thing, just as gravity is not gravity. Flow is not 'a', flow is flow. This is where Kant can't, nor Heidegger thing-no-thing⁴. In separating flow from concept, we dam- that is we cut off flow. This has been our dam-nation as the Good Books return to remind; creating dammed-mind over and over again. Or as our Good States ex-ist to remind, that is define our dammed-borders over and over again. Statehood/State-ship focus on limitation of boundary; flow is other-wise. Relationship of flow to concept is neither physical, nor metaphysical... phenomenical, nouonmical- there is/no logic. This is akin to how spoken words defy physical laws. We do not care if poem falls to ground and crashes to pieces, but we do not permit our academic register this grace(less)ness. Even cutting physical page that houses a poem into bits cannot describe how this poem befalls (a non-gravitational interception of this non/concept). Nowadays we oft turn towards Science and sub-atomic physics to vouch for non-Newtonian ways of being, but need we be so tethered to Science (or God) as our counsel (here is birth of psychological, we create and maintain this tether, and why Foucault takes Freud to that next level, but only iterations of

what Nietzsche said throughout his musings)? We know that physical *laws* are but representational, as are poems. Sub-atomically we are told that many particles occupy *a* place at *a* time, even existing in consideration of our words, for example. We speak words that we know not where they come from! Dearest Reader, please return to re-read this former sentence.

6.54

My propositions serve as elucidations in the following way: anyone who understands me eventually recognizes them as nonsensical, when he has used them - as steps - to climb beyond them. He must, so to speak, throw away the ladder after he has climbed up it.
-Ludwig Wittgenstein- Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus

7

Spontaneously you erupt into discourse with yourself, reflect, revise, receive, return; as if origin were inconceivable as inconceivability. And our predominantly peddled pedagogies, do these tether us, rule us as rulers? And my propositions, other rules yet? Being of Ducted Mind, we conjure all (and more) ducts to our realm: abduction, adduction, deduction, education... We are sorcerers and source-rers; casting and sorting rules into rulers and ducts into duction, moment to monument!

sorcery: c.1300, from O.Fr. *sorcerie*, from *sorcier* "sorcerer," from V.L. **sortiarius*, lit. "one who influences, fate, fortune," from L. *sors* (gen. *sortis*) "lot, fate, fortune" (see *sort*). *Sorceress* (c.1384) is attested much earlier than *sorcerer* (1526).

sort (n.): c.1380, from O.Fr. *sorte* "class, kind," from L. *sortem* (nom. *sors*) "lot, fate, share, portion, rank, category," from PIE base **ser-* "to line up" (cf. L. *serere* "to arrange, attach, join;" see *series*). The sense evolution in V.L. is from "what is allotted to one by fate," to "fortune, condition," to "rank, class, order." Out of *sorts* "not in usual good condition" is attested from 1621, with lit. sense of "out of stock."

sort (v.): 1358, "to arrange according to type or quality," from O.Fr. *sortir* "alot, sort, assort," from L. *sortiri* "draw lots, divide, choose," from *sors* (see *sort* (n.)). In some senses, the verb is a shortened form of *assort*.

Nietzsche tells us God is dead, morality, birthed of this passing, is too dead and we humans alive. This tale invites configuration other than *duction*. This is perhaps *reason* as to Nietzsche's impossible incorporation and educationalization into any social imaginary. There is/no *reason* in this configuration. Sense is removed from reason/logic. Sense is entertained as constitutional being yet conceptuallessly so. What remains of Nietzsche are books, solid blocks of words, notions, ideas, concepts that bind us to sentiment unbound. What mockery! How might the case be that modern preaching of flow is capture and captive in books, written by *the* Master? These books hang to resurface, just as surface forces movement of liquid down passages, so too does liquid loosen face from surface. And so I read Nietzsche to recollect what I too already know, but remains mostly unspoken. As current splits and reforms downwind, as pages contain isolated notions and then book. Analysis, like synthetic flow, is neither good nor evil, these patterns occur in my life, in our lives. We have become seduced by solid, and have discarded our flowing nature. Flow captured becomes flower and flowest. Request is returning to search, again, for understanding, and what this paper asks.

I request that you liken flow to classroom climate, perhaps. Climate (weather) flows; classroom binds. This metaphor is field and non-field simultaneously. *Will to Power* rests exemplar of this impossibility; written and unwritten by Nietzsche; positioned yet unpositioned. You, Reader, are waiting to be pushed now down another channel yet; to conspire to know, to knowledge's ledge to peek out over. To read another sequential section that will deduce meaning. Classroom climate is taught as if Science, Psychology, Theology,

Concept! Classroom climate, unknown and elusive as climate itself, as longest summer of heat, shortest winter of precipitation and so on. Climate that never climaxes; only anew of no thing is thing born. Weather reports seduce. Classroom climate can be mapped and predicted as weather reporting, textbooks have been written! Yet classroom climate is also called so for its weather-like nature that is constant and unpredictable.

82

I have read suggestions that irony is the 'highest' in an ordering of minds. I have learned from my children that babes can be quite ironic! Such juxtaposition, mind does not follow body, nor does body follow mind. These entities, pieces of me, seem to exist simultaneously. Here is rub: mind and body both are attentive and thus, require attention; both need nourishment, rest, et cetera. This becomes cognitive awareness *a posteriori*, after much time when (often) body has been left to wither and desiccate, one epiphanies. Primarily, that is from birth, unity of mind/body seems to be our situation. Our cognitive strangling of body subsequently permits insight that nowadays is argued as brilliant, or correct, but which is resultant of torturous excommunication emergent (our Bonsai nature). So awareness is both sword and savior; torturer holds Justice's charge. Analysis is not induced however; it is not some hypnotic sleight of hand, it is constitutive. As such, analysis and awareness operate as homogonously with brain (organ) as they do with mind (activity). This capturing of body by mind requires further consideration. How can we entertain a slogan such as '*the educated mind*' and champion this cause when debris left in its march, far from superfluous, is vast richness of existence. This is not project of redemption, we sing not redemption's song, rather collection or perhaps, recollection; picking up pieces. We

shall not attempt to rebuild, but entertain fissure's fall-out, whilst in that radiation, we might glow.

calendar: c.1205, from O.Fr. *calendier* "list, register," from L. *calendarium* "account book," from *kalendae* "calends" the first day of the Roman month -- when debts fell due and accounts were reckoned -- from *calare* "to announce solemnly, call out," as the priests did in proclaiming the new moon that marked the calends, from PIE base *kele-* "to call, shout" (see *claim*). "Taken by the early Church for its register list of saints and their feast days. The -ar spelling in Eng. is 17c. to differentiate it from the now obscure *calender* "cloth-presser" (from M.L. *calendra*, from L. *cylindrus*, from the shape of the machine used).

17

Economy and Marketplace; domicile and agora; income and outcome; spin and spin-doctors; are we now not more *sophist* than ever; aiming at/celebrating our philanthropy? Such irony, we, Platonic-Sophists, preaching ideals at any cost to any side, in every slide. Commodification of concept, conceptualization of *cept* (capacity to grasp and mould); t-shirts must be made! Publicly and privately we twist and turn, searching out home, our womb, our Eden; learning that we are homeless, our knowing, our wisdom. We are containers upon containers, contained and containing. We hold and are held together; brightly decorated surfaces of *matryoshka*, easily opened to receive, yet always left with feelings of emptiness (perhaps Heidegger's anxiety, Freud's double bind of love and love lost, et cetera?). Connected yet separate. As if knowing what came first, chicken or egg, would alleviate anxiety's grip. As if psyche were able to comprehend all, including itself, thus providing truth. As if alleviation, sought or caught, offered land and harbour to our perpetual ark. And so we sell and buy...

commodify; as ultimate unit in numeric systemization. Truth, most worthy of goods, rising and falling on invisible stock markets, rallied by investors and brokers; we all hold shares. This is our sharing. We share truth. And in this shearing, cleavage remains, profit to be made. We teach our children our highest value: share! And they are educated and they learn this lesson well. They give half of their cookie when told and they ignore hurt and pain of others, wanton destruction of places. All this whilst we cry on for sharing. Science has entered our being as virus, replicating, mutating, infecting over and outwards; not that virus' be good or bad, but humourous entities operating otherwise. So in our hewn state, sharing is our capit(a-o)!; BINGO is answer and wage our promise to *gnore* and ignore, and honour separation, decry division and celebrate triumph; Scientifically so!

The many have not as many thoughts as the things they meet with; nor, if they do remark them, do they understand them, though they believe they do.
- Heraclitus

XVI

We may not even distinguish life from death. Virus as creature and tendency are not permitted into our kingdoms. 'Solve this riddle' is put as challenge, as if dissolution knew naught of solution, and science and sharing. Knowing heat as summer and cold as winter, we refine, working towards end, knowledge pure and absolute, clear and comprehensive. Yet gazing around and behind, we have but hacked appendages, gathering and accumulating, cluttering and defining, all for sale. As if all these heaped metaphors, hard to push through, were all on sale at once! There they sit, *erratics* dragged by glaciers. Still upon land, presenting themselves *ad infinitum*; blocking passage and visage. With so many monuments all around and within, what role is left for our Cairns? And what job avails Hermes? Not only messenger to road wayfarers, but also of orators and wit, of literature and poets, of

athletics, of weights and measures, of invention, of general commerce, and of cunning thieves and liars. Where pure volume of signified lies thick, perhaps Hermes' guidance ebbs as pathologically, in schism, as many amongst us with labels, diagnoses and scripted cures to continue on. Now our messengers are cybernetic, popping up and grasping, gasping, and then submerged, in chaotic flow. Solid water brought and bought as if unlike that liquid that courses our veins too! And so, is our curriculum course set for ponies, race to be won or lost; or fluidity's flight? These are our problems and solutions; as if these two were distinct.

Problems pause. Is this possible, pausable? Ancient Greeks used some version of ball (*gnel*) as encompassing thrown, dripped, leapt forth, dance, movement and thus problems problematic. Did the *pro-* of *problema* come prior to its movement, that which comes prior, or/and that which is put before us, physically, of contemplation, consideration, questioning? Aware enough, enough awareness: just to recognize our movement is what I request; not as kinetic, not as tactile, not as scientific.

9 Million – The biggest and goofiest section yet!

To you, the bold searchers, researchers, and whoever embarks with cunning sails on terrible seas- to you, drunk with riddles, glad of twilight, whose soul flutes lure astray to every whirlpool, because you do not want to grope along a thread with cowardly hand; and where you can guess, you hate to deduce
-F. Nietzsche – On the Vision of the Riddle- Zarathustra

So we create machines. We become, overcome. We power ourselves, empower. Our tasks overcome. Coming satiated, sits upon us, yoking our tether, yanking our chain. Sense of unity returns later, as semblance bound, as Narcissus' mirror and Echo's call, after wakes. Here rigor and stasis are born. It is clear that rigor and stasis exist in our world. However, do they guide our world? That is to say, do binding forces supersede liberty (that uniquely

human way of movement)? What an absurd question, which Birth of Tragedy entertains!
The question is tautological, tumbling in upon itself; with stickiness of web. Archetypes of Dionysus and Apollo educate us, and in this *duction*, reduce (limit) flow. Yet we seem to return repeatedly to this question; unable to break threads, problematized; unable to conceive of threads; in stitches. Under guidance of rigor and stasis, structure and de-structure, we lay plans and build; we position ourselves primarily. We UNDERstand and eDUCE. Our language revisits rigor and stasis each breath. Hailing from breath, all hail breath! Chest heaves over and over, as Sisyphus' plight, as flock on wing in flight. Breath has no answer, no holds, holds not, presses on. Yet we confound spirit and create spirituality! As if the world breathed us, and we honoured that, triumphantly. Yet breathe on, not willfully, nor wilinglessly so.

spirit (n.): c.1250, "animating or vital principle in man and animals," from O.Fr. *esprit*, from L. *spiritus* "soul, courage, vigor, breath," related to *spirare* "to breathe," from PIE *(s)peis- "to blow" (cf. O.C.S. *pisto* "to play on the flute"). Original usage in Eng. mainly from passages in Vulgate, where the L. word translates Gk. *pneuma* and Heb. *ruah*. Distinction between "soul" and "spirit" (as "seat of emotions") became current in Christian terminology (e.g. Gk. *psyche* vs. *pneuma*, L. *anima* vs. *spiritus*) but "is without significance for earlier periods" [Buck]. L. *spiritus*, usually in classical L. "breath," replaces *animus* in the sense "spirit" in the imperial period and appears in Christian writings as the usual equivalent of Gk. *pneuma*. Meaning "supernatural being" is attested from c.1300 (see ghost); that of "essential principle of something" (in a non-theological sense, e.g. Spirit of St. Louis) is attested from 1690, common after 1800. Plural form *spirits* "volatile substance" is an alchemical idea, first attested 1610; sense narrowed to "strong alcoholic liquor" by 1678. This also is the sense in spirit level (1768).

Nineteen

Just as senses are otherwise than six, breathing is, as well as air intake, other. All speech comes from breathing, thus all our oral nature is tethered, directly, to this way of being. The above noted basic, traditional split between mind and body, *anima* and *spiritus*, psyche and pneuma, far, far prior to Descartes; rather than demonstrating separate, denotes tether. We are just as much air we breathe as body we are. No longer does being need definition, mute to its own point. Other than 'brains in vats', other than meat on bones, respiration is *res* of spirit, commonality, mundality of shared existence. We are naturally stewed, that is, we know no other than our brew.

ether: 1398, from L. *æther* "the upper pure, bright air," from Gk. *aither* "upper air," from *aithein* "to burn, shine," from I.E. base **aidh-* "to burn" (cf. Skt. *inddhe* "burst into flames," O.Ir. *aed* "fire," L. *aedes*, see *edify*). In ancient cosmology, the element that filled all space beyond the sphere of the moon, constituting the substance of the stars and planets. Conceived of as a purer form of fire or air, or as a fifth element. From 17c.-19c., it was the scientific word for an assumed "frame of reference" for forces in the universe, perhaps without material properties. The concept was shaken by the Michelson-Morley experiment (1887) and discarded after the Theory of Relativity won acceptance, but before it went it gave rise to the colloquial use of ether for "the radio" (1899). The name also was bestowed 1757 on a volatile chemical compound for its lightness and lack of color (its anesthetic properties weren't fully established until 1842).

Ether as radio, waves upon us, through us, as water washing through sand, is our way of being. There is fabric to existence, that while being named, is but fabric, as gravity is but gravity; and not grab-ity. And yet we hold, retain, all that we pass with: these waves not only wash but become, this is not supplementation or completion, rather constitutional, particles are part of us, they reside in us and thus become, or perhaps, are us. We have

demonstrated quickness for acceptance of novelty, in *techné* this is most clear; explicative, science, we are comfortable with these practices; adoptions which adhere to the *per se/per accidens* distinction; as if essence and accident were mutually exclusive, as if. We have tacked on this *fifth* element, as corpus cardinal, which not only unites, penetrates and infiltrates, which too breathes *ontos'* birth!

quintessence: c.1430, in ancient and medieval philosophy, "pure essence, substance of which the heavenly bodies are composed," lit. "fifth essence," from M.Fr. *quinte essence* (14c.), from M.L. *quinta essentia*, from L. *quinta*, fem. of *quintus* "fifth" + *essentia* (see *essence*). Loan-translation of Gk. *pempte ousia*, the "ether" added by Aristotle to the four known elements (water, earth, fire, air) and said to permeate all things. Its extraction was one of the chief goals of alchemy. Sense of "purest essence" (of a situation, character, etc.) is first recorded 1570; *quintessential* (n.) is from 1899, in this sense.

5/9ths

Yet we build these models in past tense, for they are of what came prior, and become compass constitutional. As wisdom holds, "we live forward, yet understand backwards." Models are not grounding but ground and we are ground and grounded. Even while we rip ourselves away from our earthly skin, we remain enveloped in tin, canned as stew. Yet our structures fall too, just as every one has fallen; befallen is our nature entropic!

edify: 1340, a fig. use, from O.Fr. *edifier*, from L. *ædificare* "to build, construct," in L.L. "improve spiritually, instruct" (see *edifice*).

edifice: c.1386, from O.Fr. *edifice* "building," from L. *ædificium* "building," from *ædificare* "to build," from *ædis*, variant of *ædes* "temple," in the pl. meaning "dwelling, building," originally "hearth" + the root of *facere* "to make" (see *factitious*). *ædis* is from I.E. base **aidh-* "to burn" (cf.

Gk. *aithein* "to burn," Skt. *inddhe* "burst into flames," O.Ir. *aed* "fire").

factitious: 1646, from L. *factitius* "artificial," from *factus*, pp. of *facere* "do" (cf. Fr. *faire*, Sp. *hacer*), from PIE base **dhe-* "to put, to do" (cf. Skt. *dadhati* "puts, places;" Avestan *dadaiti* "he puts;" O.Pers. *ada* "he made;" Hitt. *dai-* "to place;" Gk. *tithenai* "to put, set, place;" Lith. *deti* "to put;" Czech *diti*, Pol. *dziac'*, Rus. *det'* "to hide," *delat'* "to do;" O.H.G. *tuon*, Ger. *tun*, O.S., O.E. *don* "to do;" O.Fris. *dua*, O.Swed. *duon*, Goth. *gadeths* "a doing;" O.N. *dalidun* "they did").

essence: 1398, from L. *essentia* "being, essence," abstract n. formed in imitation of Gk. *ousia* "being, essence" (from *on*, gen. *ontos*, prp. of *einai* "to be"), from prp. stem of *esse* "to be," from PIE **es-* (cf. Skt. *asmi*, Hittite *eimi*, O.C.S. *jesmi*, Lith. *esmi*, Goth. *imi*, O.E. *eom* "I am;" see *be*). Originally "substance of the Trinity," the general sense of "basic element of anything" is first recorded in Eng. 1656, though this is the base meaning of the first Eng. use of *essential* (c.1340).

eigor- movement zero; movement and zero; stasis- states of being. c.1386, from O.Fr. *rigor* (13c.), from L. *rigorem* (nom. *rigor*) "numbness, stiffness, rigor," from *rigere* "be stiff" (see *rigid-* 1538, from L. *rigidus* "hard, stiff, rough, severe," from *rigere* "be stiff," from PIE **reig-* "stretch (tight), bind tightly, make fast" (cf. O.Ir. *riag* "torture," M.H.G. *ric* "band, string"), related to L. *frigus* "cold," Gk. *rhigos* "frost, cold."). *Rigor mortis* is 1839, from L. *rigor* "stiffness" + *mortis*, gen. of *mors* "death" (see *mortal*).

This is where perhaps understanding emerges. Institutions institute standing. Conceptually or mechanically erected establishments place us; between, under, over; as etymology towers upon. In some degree and decree of relationship distancing stood and understood; episteme stemming from above. We are always in place and placed in relation to. We move as magnets, forces attracting us; repelling us. Us attracting and repelling you and us. Appearance representative, frozen liturgy to *stand*.

flexible: c.1412, from L. *flexibilis* "that may be bent, pliant," from *flexus*, pp. of *flectere* "to bend," of uncertain origin. *Flex* is a back-formation, first recorded 1521.

3.1415....

Yet we reflect in our existence¹¹. I have read and re-read this paragraph, adjusted it, shaped it, through reflection. This *flection* seems akin to what I have observed in fiber optics perhaps, where a tube carrying light can be pinched at any point to create a more dynamic node of light, perhaps a focal point, yet light still streams endlessly through the rest of existence, this fiber optic tube; the Education. To create this node, tube must be grasped and squeezed, held on to; yet light from inside was never held, or was it? So do we hold the bulb in the same manner in which we hold this light? Do we carry our body in a similar manner to how we carry thought? It is this distinction, which is reflection, the ability to reflect that rubs so, eternally, so humourously.

1.2

hail: "greetings!" c.1200, from O.N. heill "health, prosperity, good luck;" and O.E. hals, shortening of wæs hæil "be healthy" (see health and cf. wassail). The verb meaning "to call from a distance" is 1563, originally nautical. Hail fellow well met is 1581, from a familiar greeting. Hail Mary (c.1300) is the angelic salutation (L. ave Maria), cf. Luke i.58, used as a devotional recitation.

health: O.E. hælþ "wholeness, a being whole, sound or well," from PIE *kailo- "whole, uninjured, of good omen" (cf. O.E. hal "hale, whole;" O.N. heill "healthy;" O.E. halig, O.N. helge "holy, sacred;" O.E. hælan "to heal"). Healthy is first attested 1552.

wassail: c.1140, from O.N. ves heill "be healthy," a salutation, from ves, imperative of vesa "to be" (see was) + heill "healthy" (see health). Use as a drinking phrase appears to have arisen among Danes in England and spread to native inhabitants. A similar formation appears in O.E. wes þu hal, but this is not recorded as a drinking salutation. Sense extended c.1300 to "liquor in which healths were drunk," especially spiced ale used in Christmas Eve celebrations. Meaning "a carousal, reveling" first attested 1602. Wassailing "custom of going caroling house to house at Christmas time" is recorded from 1742.

was: O.E. wesan, wæs, wæron 1st and 3rd person sing. of wesan "to remain," from P.Gmc. *wesanan (cf. O.S. wesan, O.N. vesa, O.Fris. wesa, M.Du. wesen, Du. wezen, O.H.G. wesen "being, existence," Goth. wisan "to be"), from PIE base *wes- "remain, abide, dwell" (cf. Skt. vasati "he dwells, stays;" cf. vestal). Wesan was a distinct verb in O.E., but it came to supply the past tense of am. This began to develop in P.Gmc., since it is also the case in Gothic and Old Norse. See be.

vestal (adj.): "chaste, pure, virgin," 1595, originally (1432) "belonging to or dedicated to Vesta," Roman goddess of hearth and home. The noun is recorded from 1579, short for Vestal virgin, one of four (later six) priestesses (L. virgines Vestales) in charge of the sacred fire in the temple of Vesta in Rome. The goddess name, attested in Eng. from 1387, corresponds to, and may be cognate with, Gk. Hestia, from hestia "hearth," from PIE base *wes- "to dwell, stay" (cf. Skt. vasati "stays, dwells," Goth. wisan, O.E., O.H.G. wesan "to be").

Will to the conceivability of all being: that is what I call your will!
-F. Nietzsche- Thus Spoke Zarathustra

Nietzsche's assertion perhaps is origin of eternal, or endless, infinity, that which conception has conceived inconceivable. Ancients referred to this as *god* or *ideal*. Ancients named this recognition, and we call idiom of their diction. For centuries, philosophers, metaphysicians,

even scientists, explored being and experience and were unable to reconcile remnants of *gods* and *ideals* with their sentiments. So great was (is) **conceived inconceivable** that those in disagreement were put to death. I cannot relate to this ultimate consequence, this fear so deeply rooted, as I sit comfortably in my present. For certain, I too speak dialects of ancients; however my relationship is otherwise- personally and socially.

With this irreconcilable split, ancients and pre-moderns bantered carefully their notions of experience. Often in their works appear references to this conceived inconceivable, as square peg pushing into round hole, or 'pin the tail on the donkey'. This cultural appendage cannot be lopped off, nor surgically removed. It behaves more as retrovirus. Like any mutation, there seems to be residual material. Thus, there is no manner in which to 'rid' humanity of *the conceived inconceivable*. Vestigial is not extinction, or even death. Thought too can be vestigial. Concerns with this approach are manifold; vestigial has no relationship with good or bad, it is a worth-less assertion. As well, what remains, what seems useless now, relic of past, shines no light on future, but to consecrate that great sport of speculation. Even with this concern, speculation's shift from sight's sense to predictive outcome, *ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny* continues to cloak our thought and action. Ontology educes our philosophy.

If there be an order in which the human race has mastered its various kinds of knowledge, there will arise in every child an aptitude to acquire these kinds of knowledge in the same order.... Education is a repetition of civilization in little.
- Herbert Spencer

speculation: c.1374, "contemplation, consideration," from O.Fr. speculation, from L.L. speculationem (nom. speculatio) "contemplation, observation," from L. speculatus, pp. of speculari "observe," from specere "to

look at, view" (see scope (1)). Disparaging sense of "mere conjecture" is recorded from 1575. Meaning "buying and selling in search of profit from rise and fall of market value" is recorded from 1774; short form spec is attested from 1794. Speculator in the financial sense is first recorded 1778. Speculate is a 1599 back-formation.

8- Hubritic Teachings

The error of scientism is to deny the syllogisms in grass. That of fundamentalism is to assert that these have the same sort of cogency as Barbara.
-Gregory Bateson- *Mind and Nature*

hubris: c. 1884, from Gk. *hybris* "wanton violence, insolence, outrage," originally "presumption toward the gods," of unknown origin.

drip: c.1300, from M.Dan. *drippe*, from P.Gmc. **drup-*, from PIE base **dhreub-*. O.E. had related *drypan* "to let drop," *dropian* "fall in drops," and *dreopan* "to drop." Related: *Dripped*; *dripping*. The slang meaning "stupid, feeble, or dull person" is first recorded 1932.

dribble: 1580s, frequentative of obsolete *drib* (1520s), variant of *drip*. Sports sense first used of soccer (1863), basketball is early 20c. Related: *Dribbled*; *dribbling*.

drivel: O.E. *dreflian* "to dribble or run at the nose," from P.Gmc. **drablojanan*. Related: *Driveling*.

Regardless of modern reason's roots in Ancient Greece, *there* too, were gods. Reason's rise and rule henceforth, was unable to shirk those gods. These were not like Nietzsche's God, except perhaps, morally so. These were gods of ancients. However, resultant was directional flow, hierarchical flow, and archeology of education. What stand today, what we understand, are our educed selves, pulled through *these* ducts we have built and placed in position, in relation: to them, to us, to self. We marvel at our towers of architecture, our monuments through and of time; we do likewise with our relationships and knowledge. We

are not educated in that we are wise, but only in that we know. This is not teleological, yet we know this sense from *that* journey. This is not teleological, not in that there are no ends, only in that, here, there is no concern with end.

I shake no stick at hubris and rise not beyond my ego, beyond society's super ego. All human creativity may be confirmed as hubris. This is role for critic. All connection, communication with other, fills space larger than one's self. Thus hubris, as the ancients defined, is more about disposition and style of how common spaces are filled, rather than that they are filled. Those gods were not so offended with happenings, but rather how those happenings took place. What was actually judged, as then, hubris, just as subsequently profanity and blasphemy have come to be, was (and is) more akin with *ethos* than any absolute *law* of nature.

What one does as thesis project, what one pronounces to *the* masses, these are not as much about decorum as they are about culture.

There cannot be hubris in poetry. Nature is otherwise. Poetry makes statements that are not held to/by rational rigor. Sensibly we may deduce that if poetry's nature is such, and man can be poetic, then man is such. This is what Bateson called the Barbara syllogism. He then reminds us of another pattern: Men die. Grass dies. Men are grass; suggesting, he does, that this too is our nature, yet incomparably so. *That* nature, squelched as *it* seems, is still us; incomparably, unintelligibly, uneducatedly so. So living this schizophrenic existence, of negation, forcing, forging nothingness (and even claiming it to be prior to nature, something), this is what flow lives; as poetry, as nature, as such.

What is outrageous, violent? What we accept or what we deny?

denial: 1520s, from deny + -al (2). Meaning "unconscious suppression of painful or embarrassing feelings" first attested 1914 in A.A. Brill's translation of Freud's "Psychopathology of Everyday Life"; popularized 1980s in phrase in denial.

deny: c.1300, from O.Fr. *denier*, from L. *denegare*, from *de-* "away" + *negare* "refuse, say 'no,'" from Old L. *nec* "not," from Italic base **nek-* "not," from PIE base **ne-* "no, not" (see *un-*).

un: No matching terms found.

41 –Hut, hut, hut

We know mind and body as distinct, yet whole. We are now magicians with body! This wizardry may or may not involve mind (at least mind as we know mind, not brain as organ). Practice emptying your mind, some preach; as if this were possible, plausible. I know not what will emerge in instant arriving. I reach to scratch my face, swallow, turn my gaze towards a wall. I return to this focus. I pause. My toes touching. Countless descriptive possibilities for what I am doing and knowing at any/every instant. What I relate is thin, in comparison.

If this is case, we must concede all knowledge as suspect, as we already know all suspects as knowing. Every image, notion, understanding, observation, experience et cetera, may (suspect) be told by another author. So we live as shades, bulbs burning brightly within. We conceive of stability in motion. We recollect these conceptions into experiences held in mind and body; as stories and scars. We tell ourselves that we cling to truth for we need stability. We produced Textbooks! This is but proposition. Truth, as type, as species, is not dissimilar to any grouping; discovered and codified by us, where system eventually comes to

lead as if it were present. As if knowing that something is wrong permits fix; slopes fail, computers crash and we grow infirm and die. This corpus, this system that is you or I, this unification, this armature, this vessel; confused and respired, sensing and making sense; who begs for coherence? Who disrobes in waves?

Why choose any guide? I walk into library, I click into library, and I am overcome by understanding. 'Come stand by me', cry these books! How can you ignore my knowledge? Each but headstone. Libraries are tombs; books tombstones. Surrounded by death and inertia, clawing to build, in-corporating mind upon mind, infatuated with our mind's image in librarian reflection, we wither, understanding undernourished. As Heisenberg to Bohr, knowledge is politic and theology. Do we understand? And what might uncertainty have to say to our spatial understanding? Do not waste my time! For I have measured my time and know its worth. Furthermore, I have measured your time too, and shall inform you of its worth. Here we seem to find traces of education and wisdom; guidance, counsel. We learn time from such young ages, yet school, with all its bells and whistles, seems to hammer this lesson home^a.

Time entombs, books too, in and of time. And so my guides are ordered by time, in time, timed, thus becoming guides. And I choose my guides, those who guide me, like those who guide you. Guide wires running our lives, running our bodies. Guidewords demonstrating way. Which guides has time introduced you to?

S- High Noon

Chime of time is but one relationship of our comprehension. Capture and harness of time, like that of fire before, has refined learning, leading to education through ducted models, to

live centrally clock's life. Even remnant of pre-clock life now depends on time. To have one's astrological chart developed, one needs to know precise time of birth. How curious, this 'pseudo science/superstition', grabbing clock time to act as base knowledge. Or, perhaps this is not so curious, as our art of measurement increased; its application has been broad. This digitalization of being has hence become our guide. Once we named all that we saw we began to name, and digitize, unseen as well. Yet there are glints, as schools wish students 'good luck' on final exams, as if point comes to field! And how is wisdom captured? How does *sense* play point?

wise (adj.): O.E. wis, from P.Gmc. *wisaz (cf. O.S., O.Fris. wis, O.N. viss, Du. wijs, Ger. weise "wise"), from pp. adj. *wittos of PIE base *woid-/*weid-/*wid- "to see," hence "to know" (see vision). Slang meaning "aware, cunning" first attested 1896. Related to the source of O.E. witan "to know, wit."

"A wise man has no extensive knowledge; He who has extensive knowledge is not a wise man." [Lao-tzu, "Tao te Ching," c.550 B.C.E.]

vision: c.1290, "something seen in the imagination or in the supernatural," from Anglo-Fr. visioun, O.Fr. vision, from L. visionem (nom. visio) "act of seeing, sight, thing seen," from pp. stem of videre "to see," from PIE base *weid- "to know, to see" (cf. Skt. veda "I know;" Avestan vaeda "I know;" Gk. oida, Doric woida "I know," idein "to see;" O.Ir. fis "vision," find "white," i.e. "clearly seen," fiuss "knowledge;" Welsh gwyn, Gaulish vindos, Breton gwenn "white;" Goth., O.Swed., O.E. witan "to know;" Goth. weitan "to see;" Eng. wise, Ger. wissen "to know;" Lith. vysti "to see;" Bulg. vidya "I see;" Pol. widziec' "to see," weidziec' "to know;" Rus. videt' "to see," vest' "news," O.Russ. vedat' "to know"). The meaning "sense of sight" is first recorded c.1491. Meaning "statesman-like foresight, political sagacity" is attested from 1926.

11

How can analysis attempt to gather as it loosens? Have we become so confused as not to note difference? If so, would not all communication cease, all humanity, all words? Words confirm difference. If words simultaneously differ and defer, etymological connotation may inform. So perhaps analysis reminds us of danger, instinctually, that solidity lulls. Does analysis tear us apart? And if so, when does this tearing stop; in which chronological chapter?

Difference never begins nor ends. Difference is otherwise. Thus, loosening and tightening, gathering and sowing...these are not antagonists. They are but different. Shall we measure them? Shall we attempt to describe their degree of difference? Perhaps? Perhaps we have been playing this sort of game for a long time. And perhaps we have come to believe this as sole/soul game in town? But difference is otherwise, beyond good and evil, neither up nor down.

Shall we play, 'pin ought upon thy map', as if this play is but play- perhaps play as undifferentiated. As if, guised by play's indiscernability, its schizophrenic totality, placing, homing in on place, from where to hinge and hang, as if pin's prick were to suffice? If difference is difference, and logic remains (returns) (as) goal-less; such thematics (dramatics) (schematics) may begin to exist (thus ex-ist- being other than- different than- play).

So play suffocates while giving life; as water drowns its vessel, as clots clog veins. We are contained and confined via ethos, of non-ethics, tracing lines on beaches windswept, waveswept wildly so; turning and returning to sense, such as eyes and meaning, as wave to particle, as body to mind. Goal-less.

Chapter IXIX

At the school, Benny Len and Stanley were given uniforms and stiff, new shoes. Benny Len's feet no longer touched the earth... The boarding school was a world of sharp edges, shiny surfaces and shouting bells.
-C. Santiago- Home to Medicine Mountain

Finding *a* flat surface to sit upon. To grab any 'thing', to hold *it*, to polish *it* and replicate *it* and know *it*; these are all possible (to some degree- if we wish to measure). And yet there are those 'things' that do not behave like this- as particle to wavelength, as tree to telephone pole. We are fine knowing that we are unable to apply certain measures to some ways of being, for example, the weight of time seems ridiculous, except poetically. We must come to be (again) un-justified, un-justifiable; scatterings surface on which we stand, understand our understanding; veiled (not prevailed) perpetually. Do I denounce difference? I speak word, yet denounce *its* coming. For in shedding solidity, firmament, do I loosen into analysis? And from such analytical state do I emerge wiser? With knowledge? Do I become Ulysses, on voyage to find home's shore?

Just as education is not school or Education is not education, school is not School so that words speak categorically to lay claim to boundary as if semblance were sufficient and necessary. In this process that has lead to smoothing of all surface, we have come to believe that 1) no other way of being may have been and 2) surfaces are important only in their surfacedness, that is in their overcoming face. And so we return to scrub with such clothes as diversity training, classroom management or multi-ability classrooms; as if such luster would eradicate underlying ontology.

surface: 1611, from Fr. surface "outermost boundary of anything, outside part" (16c.), from O.Fr. sur- "above" +

face (see face). Patterned on L. superficies "surface" (see superficial). The verb meaning "come to the surface" is first recorded 1898; earlier it meant "bring to the surface" (1885), and "to give something a polished surface" (1778).

superficial: c.1420, "of or relating to a surface," from L. superficialis "of or pertaining to the surface," from superficies "surface," from super "above, over" (see super-) + facies "form, face" (see face (n.)). Meaning "not deep or thorough" (of perceptions, thoughts, etc.) first recorded c.1530.

face (n.): c.1290, from O.Fr. face, from V.L. *facia, from L. facies "appearance, form, figure," and secondarily "visage, countenance;" probably related to facere "to make" (see factitious). Replaced O.E. andwlita. To face (v.) "confront" is first recorded 1465. To lose face (or save face), 1876, is said to be from Chinese tu lien; to face the music is theatrical. Face-lift (n.) first recorded 1934, from face-lifting (1922).

I will also advise his feet to be wash'd every day in cold water, and to have his shoes so thin, that they might leak and let in water
-John Locke- *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*- #7

Surfaces are overcome and understood. Blankets shroud our almost every experience, most existence as we know it presently. We place our feet into shoes, fashioned for comfort, for fit, reliability, support, endurance, and durability. We house our feet as we house our knowledge, our education. Our shoe's sole has become our soul; solid, dependable, rigid, more so than bone. Our houses have flat, level flooring, as do your offices, and schools, our institutions and streets. What came first, flat floor or flat sole? Shall we dwell on that, perhaps? Thus we school our feet in their new lodgings, novel surface.

Here house and school come to inform one another (fit notions for Ecology/Economy?). We might say that house has been schooled; this housing-schooling is what grounds our normalcy (and creates – that is, brings into existence, ecology and economy). It is in

buildings (*bildung*) that that knowledge settles. Architecture drives building and education, homes and schools. What is possible to teach is constrained by location and building, just as shoe permits foot's ability (skating?). Maps and plans are offered forth as 'solutions', as if being able to capture an image or representation were to offer some *better* understanding. These are just as solid as any other version, as x-rays and MRIs are oft commented on for their *uniqueness* in relation to normal, *some* normal, *some* where. These buildings, like our education and ducts, are so sterile now. They are cleansed, and deodourized, surfaced and resurfaced.

And now someone else writes me. I am home schooled... in myself...myself. "The atmosphere is not a perfume...it has no taste of the distillation...it is odorless,"^{vi} I bathe myself in odours. I emit odours. I am odourous! I am such a smelly sight. Why do I adorn my odour? Why do I condone odouring of other? I have oft covered myself in perfumes. I have hoarded and lavished in scents. I set smell alight upon myself. My incense burns aglow whilst I know longer (no longer), know (no). As smoke whirls, attaching and detaching, I attach and detach. Smoke is now I. I am smoke.

The sounds of the belched words of my voice....words loosed to the eddies of the wind.
- Walt Whitman- *Song of Myself*

perfume (n.): 1533, from M.Fr. *parfum*, from *parfumer* "to scent," from Prov. *perfumar*, from L. *per-* "through" (see *per*) + *fumare* "to smoke" (see *fume*). Earliest use in Eng. was in reference to fumes from something burning. Meaning "fluid containing agreeable essences of flowers, etc., is attested from 1542. The verb is first recorded 1538.

fume (n.): c.1390, from O.Fr. *fum* "smoke, steam, vapor," from L. *fumus* "smoke" (v.), from PIE **dhumo-* (cf. Skt. *dhumah*, O.C.S. *dymu*, Lith. *dumai*, O.Prus. *dumis* "smoke," M.Ir. *dumacha* "fog," Gk. *thymos* "spirit, mind,

soul"). The verb is first recorded c.1400; figurative sense of "show anger" is first recorded 1522.

2- Roots and Adornments

Prefixes and base words are extra/ordinary. Surface is face adorned, ordered towards ideality. Ideal exists instantiated as surface, cover of face. And face? It is I. And I am face to face...making instantiations, iterations, pursuing replication. To talk of surface is to categorize, whether concept, word, object; surfacing is adornment. Yet there is unperfumed atmosphere. It is not extinct, nor ancient, nor dormant, nor clandestine; it is pervasively being, here and now. This is not presence, this is not before being. This is not stasis, nor nervous being.

*Yo soy, yo soy, yo soy, yo soy....Como te explico? Cosas mundanas.
(I am, I am, I am, I am....How to explain it to you? Mundane things)
- Pierro- Yo Soy*

Choosing theme, why this style, this approach? Will, meta-self's drive to action, whether psychological or physical, is weather-like (of course, it is not weather). Will arises out of countlessness (thus other than analytic- thus synthetic?). Will comes prior to meta-reflection; that is, will drives prior to any recognition of meta-reflection. Include, exclude, occlude, recluse, ... shutting out and shutting in. Will, of that state, is not humourous.

Home is: where I roam, where my heart is, my love lies waiting. Home in, you can find your way back home. A primal and foundational falsity is home's metaphor. Whatever home may mean, it is but sleight of language, insofar as conceptual existence impossibly instantiated.

As you read, dear reader, I ask you think, ‘this work is caught in the same trap as psychology, or philosophy,’ yet this is written of sense that does not deny nor denounce these aforementioned fields, only too, requests play. Just as you may question why single quotation notation is used above and not double. You may ask, “Is he quoting someone? Is this *properly* noted, cited?” These engrained ways of operating are called out by flow, by myself, for myself; and perhaps by/for reader too? Play in/with what you read, not what you need, I suggest shall emerge. You shall not be satiated from pre-conceived notions, nor this process shall accomplish and quench. Needs, your body perishes without certain needs met, it is illogical/irrelevant to move to a *next* position that states physical needs are more basic or central. This only elevates life over death. Order and scatter are, too, pattern. We mostly busy our time attempting to explain scatter in terms of order. This work glances at scatter in order. This work oversits understanding in so far that both teeter, so that we may once again learn to love and accept our bobbled selves. Rock and roll is not some marginalia to existence; it moves us otherwise, as does all music, as does life’s flow. Movement is flow’s song, is our song, ask any who have meet through text (letter, email) and, only subsequently, in person. This work is nor song, nor poem, yet practioner of these techniques. This work trembles, makes you tremble, it vibrates of its own accord.

You can read this work in infinite orders (or subsequently, ways). Try it, you shall learn exact sameness, if that is your course, charted and charted. Order is not thus matter. Sentiment is not achieved via linear argumentation. Logic is not Cartesian. So graphed into this work is your will too! You shall depart (when you leave this work) as homeless as when you found each other.

Dissertation

As what envelops falls under (understands) rubric of dissertation or thesis, -logue on these terms seems ir/relevant; grounding, lightening, lifting. Let reach yet not hold; be without position! This reaching: always exemplar of unity while simultaneously oblivious to any and all connection.

dissertation: 1611, from L. *dissertationem* (nom. *dissertatio*) "discourse," from *dissertare* "debate, argue," frequentative of *disserere* "discuss, examine," from *dis-* "apart" + *serere* "to arrange words" (see *series*). Sense of "formal, written treatise" is 1651.

How do we (I ask of 'we' – insofar as you are reader and thus conjoined, co-conspirator) approach nature, sense nature as all encompassing as Theology or Pantheism, meanwhile distinct and unique as human nature, as my own nature. Dissertation is reflective, play with language...wordplay (carrying humour and other reflections, rules); and in play's invocation, poetics, as making and creating, emerges around and with our linguistic play; such as *psyche*, *techné* and *epistemology*. As identification occurs, we simultaneously string together, are strung together, '...strung out and along...'⁸ As identification occurs, we simultaneously separate, sever. As conundrum of life, not as either/or, as coincidence, as life and death as co-emergent always and all ways. Life and death historically, in present culture and of my own being always co-evolved.

series: 1611, "a number or set of things of one kind arranged in a line," from L. *series* "row, chain, series," from *serere* "to join, link, bind together, put," from PIE base **ser-* "to line up, join" (cf. Skt. *sarat-* "thread," Gk. *eirein* "to fasten together in rows," Goth. *sarwa* (pl.) "armor, arms," O.N. *sörve* "necklace of stringed pearls," O.Ir. *sernaid* "he joins together," Welsh *ystret* "row"). Meaning "set of printed works published consecutively" is

from 1711. Meaning "set of radio or television programs with the same characters and themes" is attested from 1949.

Thus, is project of dissertation impossible (initial meeting with *-ject*)? Can one accomplish task of dissembling strings (cliché) via stringing? As so, I propose my project is logically flawed with illogic... thus Happy is Heart; Reason is Mind- such splits, conceptually permit these associations. So both heart-mind splits and happy-reason splits perpetuate this sense of being; splitness.

reason: c.1225, "statement in an argument," also "intellectual faculty that adopts actions to ends," from Anglo-Fr. *resoun*, O.Fr. *raison*, from L. *rationem* (nom. *ratio*) "reckoning, understanding, motive, cause," from *ratus*, pp. of *veri* "to reckon, think," from PIE base **rei-* "to reason, count" (cf. O.E. *rædan* "to advise; see *read*"). Meaning "sanity" is recorded from, c.1380. The verb (c.1300) is from O.Fr. *raisoner*, from L.L. *rationare* "to discourse." Originally "to question (someone)," sense of "employ reasoning (with someone)" is from 1847, and that of "to think in a logical manner" is from 1593. Phrase *it stands to reason* is from 1632. *Age of Reason* "the Enlightenment" is first recorded 1794, as the title of Tom Paine's book.

Focus again and again to corpus, as that which can be identified and thus counted. Work of dissertation as body, collective body that can be distinguished and named and referred to.

corporeal: 1610, from L. *corporeus* "of the nature of a body," from *corpus* "body," from PIE **kwrpes*, from base **kwrep-* "body, form appearance," probably from a verbal root meaning "to appear" (cf. Skt. *kṛp-* "form, body," Avestan *kerefsh* "form, body," O.E. *hrif* "belly," O.H.G. *href* "womb, belly, abdomen").

This play, this game of play, is read on, reasonably, logically towards counting corpus, series strung-out permitting dissertation. And still you read on...

read: O.E. *rædan* (W.Saxon), *redan* (Anglian) "to explain, read, rule, advise" (related to *ræd*, *red* "advice"), from P.Gmc. **raedanan* (cf. O.N. *raða*, O.Fris. *reda*, Du. *raden*, O.H.G. *ratan*, Ger. *raten* "to advise, counsel, guess"), from PIE base **rei-* "to reason, count" (cf. Skt. *radh-* "to succeed, accomplish," Gk. *arithmos* "number amount," O.C.S. *raditi* "to take thought, attend to," O.Ir. *im-radim* "to deliberate, consider"). Connected to riddle via notion of "interpret." Words from this root in most modern Gmc. languages still mean "counsel, advise." Transference to "understand the meaning of written symbols" is unique to O.E. and (perhaps under Eng. influence) O.N. *raða*. Most languages use a word rooted in the idea of "gather up" as their word for "read" (cf. Fr. *lire*, from L. *legere*). Sense of "make out the character of (a person)" is attested from 1611. The noun meaning "an act of reading" is recorded from 1825. Read up "study" is from 1842; read-only in computer jargon is recorded from 1961. O.E. *ræda* "advise, counsel" is in the name of Anglo-Saxon king *Æðelræd* II (968-1016), lit. "good counsel," and in his epithet *Unræd*, usually rendered into Mod.Eng. as *Unready*, but really meaning "no-counsel." *Rede* "counsel" survived in poetic usage to 17c. An attempted revival by Scott (19c.) failed, though it is used in Tolkien's "Lord of the Rings."

And we come to play reading, and comprehension and understanding, grasping and placing, where engineering is most constitutive of our being. Engineering as begetting and producing- clenching and ducting- as hunters and gathers, as farmers and laborers. We dwell in collection, collection of objects and subjects, rejects all ejected to form. Each collection being us, in that moment and then altering, changing and moving yet remaining. How can one part form, counting in this milieu? What is the reign of corpus constitutive?

thesis: 1398, "unaccented syllable or note," from L. *thesis* "unaccented syllable in poetry," later "stressed part of a metrical foot," from Gk. *thesis* "a proposition," also "downbeat" (in music), originally "a setting down or placing," from root of *tithenai* "to place, put, set," from PIE base **dhe-* "to put, to do" (see *factitious*). Sense in logic of "a proposition, statement to be proved" is first recorded

1579; that of "dissertation written by a candidate for a university degree" is from 1653.

illustration: c.1375, "a spiritual illumination," from O.Fr. *illustration*, from L. *illustrationem* (nom. *illustratio*) "vivid representation" (in writing), lit. "an enlightening," from *illustrare* "light up, embellish, distinguish," from *in-* "in" + *lustrare* "make bright, illuminate." Mental sense of "act of making clear in the mind" is from 1581. Meaning "an illustrative picture" is from 1816. *Illustrate* "educate by means of examples," first recorded 1612. Sense of "provide pictures to explain or decorate" is 1638.

What might it be like to illustrate one's own thesis? Such brilliance shining, blinding, desensitizing. To illuminate not but one's own light, but that of another! Now that is brilliant. How is it that miscommunication is but derivative of communication? As if communication were not complicated enough so as not to produce any prefixed shoots. Downbeat, beaten down... unstressed...how we strive for such utopia. Said and unsaid, being and nonbeing, thing and nothing; as if tension existed, as if these were in tension, intense. All tense and sense relaxed, laxed again and again so as to seem undistinguished. Pricked apart, our highest celebratory quo! Thoroughly pricked apart to boot, by boot, our flattened sole. And this thesis continued on, unnoticed, unstressed in lanes and avenues, in lance and anvil competition, on stoops and around stoves; found yet unfounded, as senseless as educing mind.

I'm on road to nowhere, I, my being, in *duct*, down a ditch; yet placeless. Yet placeless? When are we placeless? Where are we placeless? Without place, without home, as if belief were enough? Whilst actions and emotions remain untraceable to their origins.

I am bound. How can I accept award this document is gatekeeper to? To accept such reward, to claim such prize would simultaneously destroy this project. How might that be? Struck, this point is struck, and so may ensue construction and destruction; structures that bind. I once was lost, but now I'm found; was blind, but now I see! I often feel as vessel. I am universe to millions and millions of beings who make me, me-galaxy. I am nestled, at home, in Canada, on Earth. I am container and contained. I cannot ever find me, I never escape me.

Morality is not so much about content, as position, or disposition? To live morally is less about rules and regulations, doctrines and life choices, as accepting of place as primarily necessary for understanding. Where this thesis places downbeat. Which section you come to, and where you part from. To be displaced is to be lost. Lost? Can I be lost? Is lost a way of being? Are you lost yet? We pass lives attempting to define our flowing down ducts with titles and degrees, we fear loss as we fear triumph. To re-enact play, long after it was written, perform song scribed in notes, these recollect our fluidity and our stories adrift.

moral (adj.): mid-14c., "pertaining to character or temperament" (good or bad), from O.Fr. *moral*, from L. *moralis* "proper behavior of a person in society," lit. "pertaining to manners," coined by Cicero ("De Fato," II.i) to translate Gk. *ethikos* (see ethics) from L. *mos* (gen. *moris*) "one's disposition," in plural, "mores, customs, manners, morals," of uncertain origin. Meaning "morally good, conforming to moral rules," is first recorded late 14c. of stories, 1630s of persons. Original value-neutral sense preserved in moral support, moral victory, with sense of "pertaining to character as opposed to physical action." The noun meaning "moral exposition of a story" is attested from c.1500. Related: Morally.

ethics: c.1600, "the science of morals," pl. of M.E. *ethik* "study of morals" (see ethic). The word also traces to Ta *Ethika*, title of Aristotle's work.

ethic: late 14c., ethik "study of morals," from O.Fr. ethique, from L.L. ethica, from Gk. ethike philosophia "moral philosophy," fem. of ethikos "ethical," from ethos "moral character," related to ethos "custom" (see ethos). Meaning "a person's moral principles," attested from 1650s.

ethos: revived by Palgrave in 1851 from Gk. ethos "moral character, nature, disposition, habit, custom," from suffixed form of PIE base *s(w)e- (see idiom). An important concept in Aristotle (e.g. "Rhetoric" II xii-xiv).

idiom: 1588, "form of speech peculiar to a people or place," from M.Fr. idiome, from L.L. idioma "a peculiarity in language," from Gk. idioma "peculiarity, peculiar phraseology," from idioumai "I make my own," from idios "personal, private," prop. "particular to oneself," from PIE *swed-yo-, suffixed form of base *s(w)e-, pronoun of the third person and reflexive (referring back to the subject of a sentence), also used in forms denoting the speaker's social group, "(we our-)selves" (cf. Skt. svah, Avestan hva-, O.Pers. huva "one's own," khva-data "lord," lit. "created from oneself;" Gk. hos "he, she, it;" L. suescere "to accustom, get accustomed," sodalis "companion;" O.C.S. svoji "his, her, its," svojaku "relative, kinsman;" Goth. swes "one's own;" O.N. sik "oneself;" Ger. Sein; O.Ir. fein "self, himself"). Idiomatic is first attested 1712.

24A

sedentary: 1598, "remaining in one place," from M.Fr. sedentaire, from L. sedentarius "sitting, remaining in one place," from sedentem (nom. sedens), prp. of sedere "to sit," from PIE base *sed- "to sit" (cf. Skt. a-sadat "sat down," sidati "sits;" O.Pers. hadis "abode;" Gk. ezesthai "to sit," hedra "seat, chair, face of a geometric solid;" O.Ir. suide "seat, sitting;" Welsh sedd "seat," eistedd "sitting;" O.C.S. sezda, sedeti "to sit;" Lith. sedmi "to sit;" Rus. sad "garden," Lith. soditi "to plant;" Goth. sitan, O.E. sittan "to sit;" see **sit**). Of persons, meaning "not in the habit of exercise" is recorded from 1662.

Analysis of rocks, geology, has offered three major groupings: sedimentary, igneous and metamorphic. Which of these stones is healthiest? Ode to be one over another; to form shores of tropical atolls or slopes of Himalayan cols? Now I wake daily to mountains

bordering me. Each and every instant, what I conceive to be time, memories, understanding, those rocks are there. I see change, I know seasons pass, but then 'always' always is occurring as well. Edification homage to stone! We praise stone, knowing how it is, how it just lays there. Relationship between stone compositions and organic vessels is quite distinct. It is stone that teaches *thing* as thing. Our entire concept of manufacture is stone's understanding; as tool, as product, as obstacle, as thing, manipulable. A most frightening experience of my life was that stone crossing just above a remote tropical waterfall; a group moving in line across. I recall. I recall reaching for stone, to grasp and firm me. When it was not there, I slipped, felt myself slip from that stone, this stone, my reality thrown, out of stone, unstoned. Stone is there when I reach; I have become dependant on this. Hardness of stone, firmness of experience and expectation, this is what stone has taught me. Stone is my beatitude and blithe. It is not that we search for eudaemon in our lives, it is that we have learned of this concept, and that of *arête*, from stone. Stone is even foreign to its own conception. Vicariously liable of as prone to manipulation, guiltily so, if guilt is to be questioned. Assigned and assassinated by role, by ability.

33.3333333333

kwel-1: Also kwel^ē-. To revolve, move around, sojourn, dwell. Derivatives include colony, cult, wheel, cyclone, pulley, and bucolic. I. Basic form *kwel-. colony, cult, cultivate, culture, Kultur; incult, inquiline, silvicolous, from Latin colere, to till, cultivate, inhabit (< *kwel-o-).

Question was put to a group of Educators I sat amongst, "Would you think it a compliment to be called a Philosopher?" A philosopher? Lover of wisdom? Why limit, quantify your love? Why contain love, constrain love? Where would we store love? When would we

allow love? Alas, once more we commodify to create absolute. All this busy-ness we call thinking, contribution. Oh, but our readership has increased eight-fold, since we began shipping our product around the world! Such love, money cannot buy such love of wisdom. But philosophy can.

Insightful, out sightful, out of sight, sightful...full of sight...full of site...full and empty; tethered to project impossible. How have I come to such in-sanity? Can I love wisdom and yet remain so insane? Why do I feel so in-sane? I have not place to lay my hat, nor my bones. I play for neither home, nor away; neither *kenl* as sojourn nor dwell comes clear. My thoughts are yours, neither taken, nor stolen, nor yours. I prove no point; I point no proof, nor truth. I neither construct nor deconstruct; I wallow, I willow. Why have I come to your gate? I have come to plate, to stare at my disposition- to lay bear exegesis nausea; anxiety. We want, desire, care for semblance, ensemble together, to gather together. To sow, seeds that have appeared such as plants seem to do. Yet we simultaneously are scattered, seeds abroad. So what might I have to teach in a thesical treatise?

I wipe my brow, over and over again. How can I approach you, when I have not choice but to approach, as water filtering to meet water. It's all for naught. And knotted, I writhe myself, tautly (taughtly) entwined. Do you welcome me, when I have not choice but to approach, was water filtering, meeting water? Is my coming well received? Have you twisted me, or have I twisted you? Do you run or run through, or do I? And where would we go, flow, anyway: home?

One asked, "Would you think it a compliment to be called an Educator?" For certain, there need not be choice as determinant. Intriguing how naming both carries pride and prejudice concurrently. Are you all esteemed E(e)ducators? Have you come through ducts of

knowledge? Have your points left scars upon knowledge, is your knowledge branded? Does your knowledge brand? Shall knowledge call your name? Does it really matter where we sit? Pronounce place and we shall convene. What shall my expertise be? How shall I define myself as expert; and prove this point? Oh, Doctors of Philosophy! Let wisdom's love reign over me. Today, we all decry our remains, yet acid reigns.

Ripping apart philosophy! Dismembering this beast, as if it were as organic a compound as any creature. Concepts are not living creatures, they do not live creature existences. Just as rocks are not creatures, yet we have mineral components to our being. Or perhaps, distinction now noticed between free-range, fair-trade, organic and conventional methodologies of production (education?). Philo-sopia, wisdom's love, attached as Siamese twins, sharing circulatory system, nerves and reproductive organs.

Finally, you arrive at beginning!

Interest! What interest? Can you define exactly what is in the interest of a human being? And suppose the interest of a man is not only consistent with but even demands something harmful rather than advantageous? Of course, if such an instance is possible, then the whole rule is nothing but dust. Now, you tell me- is such an instance possible? You may laugh if you wish, but I want you to answer me this: is there an accurate scale of human advantages? Aren't there any advantages that are omitted, that cannot possibly be included in any such scale?

- Dostoevsky- Notes From The Underground

sense: c.1400, "faculty of perception," also "meaning or interpretation" (esp. of Holy Scripture), from O.Fr. *sens*, from L. *sensus* "perception, feeling, undertaking, meaning," from *sentire* "perceive, feel, know," prob. a fig. use of a lit. meaning "to find one's way," from PIE base **sent-* "to go" (cf. O.H.G. *sinnan* "to go, travel, strive after, have in mind, perceive," Ger. *Sinn* "sense, mind," O.E. *sið* "way, journey," O.Ir. *set*, Welsh *hynt* "way"). Application to any one of the external or outward senses (touch, sight, hearing, etc.) first recorded 1526.

"Hornkotel cites a Negro tribe that has a separate word for seeing, but employs a common term for hearing, tasting, smelling, and touching." [A.G. Engstrom, "Philological Quarterly," XXV, 1946]

The verb meaning "to perceive by the senses" is recorded from 1598. Senses "mental faculties, sanity" is attested from 1568.

Greek mythology tells of Perseus and the Gorgon, Perseus' adventure (his task of retrieving Medusa's head to satiate royal whim) begins with an education. Task set out before Perseus is so impossible, based on his knowledge and experience, that he is doomed to fail. Perseus' preparatory mentor is Hermes, guised with name, "Quicksilver". Quicksilver, God of so many situations, schools Perseus in preparation for his pending challenge. *Note: deferral of authority in this relationship.* While Quicksilver is but stranger to Perseus, immediate authority is given to he who speaks so firmly and with such confidence. Perseus briefly questions this wise man, and within singular reply conforms to his wishes. Might this be akin to how students defer to teachers, these creatures unknown thrust upon from beyond and so quickly imbued with authority deferred? And yet this thought leads us a chase, let us return.

Quicksilver tells Perseus that the path to Medusa, the Gorgon, is via several other visits. The first of these is to a relative creature of the Gorgons, the Graiai (Γραιαι), the Gray Sisters. What is curious about these sisters is that they are three sisters in corpus and yet amongst them they 'share' but one eye and one tooth! These sisters act as guardians to their sibling Gorgons and keep endless watch over them as well as their own wellbeing, by shifting their eye between them. The myth relates that Perseus snatches this eye as it is being passed from one sister to another, thus blinding the creature(s); a teaching given by Hermes. I would like to dwell for a bit in this image.

What might 'this' *metaphor* be? Why does this tale, this human tale, recount of creature with anatomy such? Might there be some links, sentimental perception, permitting this contrivance? I am not positing causal links, nor logical schemas, just opening some space to possibility. This creature shares a common organ. Livelihood of its existence depends on this symbiosis (yet are they three or but one?). Is this just fantastical weaving of imagination, or might there be message here as to some aspects of humanness? Are we too not Graiai Sisters? What happens to us when our eyeball, our commonality of perception, our meaning, logic, reason, sense, is snatched from us? How might we travel thus and what guidance would Hermes provide? We function as cells in creature, as organism akin to species. We are as colonial as we are individual. Thus our nature guides. Attempts of post-moderns redress with singular-plural, as if to untie this messⁱⁱ. What laughter! Again, insightfulness is but grasping our eyeball to protect our knowledge, for this we have such a love of wisdom, so powerful, full of power of our meaning. Are we lost without? Are we human without our eye?

99 – Swerving to and fro – Achieving homeostasis- Balance in movement

I would like to explore these tales woven thus as ones of health. If we, as humans, share perceptions for survival, these not only de-centre, but as well obliterate health from individual. Many have proposed that health is well beyond vessel of creature, yet often it still seems that this perception remains. We diagnose 'society', yet we treat individuals. The only name of group health seems to be propaganda, always moral in nature. Eat well, smoke less, believe in god; our "do's and don'ts" as frivolous as laundry detergent we choose; yet within our optic nerve dwells a blind spot; habitus our hamartia, Achilles' heel to hubris.

For if the athletes were to acquire twice the strength they possess, no advantage would accrue to other men; but if one man were to conceive a wise thought all would reap the enjoyment of his understanding who were willing to share in it.

-Isocrates Panegyricus

stew: (n.) c.1305, "vessel for cooking," from stew (v.). Later "heated room" (c.1374). The noun meaning "stewed meat with vegetables" is first recorded 1756; Irish stew is attested from 1814. The obsolete slang meaning "brothel" (1362, usually plural, stews) is from an earlier sense of "public bath house," carried over from O.Fr. and reflecting the reputation of such houses.

stew: (v.) c.1400, "to bathe in a steam bath," from O.Fr. *estuver* (Fr. *étuver*) "bathe, stew," of uncertain origin. Common Romanic (cf. Sp. *estufar*, It. *stufare*), possibly from V.L. **extufare* "evaporate," from *ex-* "out" + **tufus* "vapor, steam," from Gk. *typhos* "smoke." Cf. O.E. *stuf-bæþ* "hot-air bath;" see *stove*. Meaning "to boil slowly, to cook meat by simmering it in liquid" is attested from c.1420. The meaning "to be left to the consequences of one's actions" is from 1656, from *fig.* expression to stew in one's own juices. Slang *stewed* "drunk" first attested 1737.

Some times we roast, some times we stew.
Standing still moving
Still moving
Still motion
Images evoke, teachers educate.
As potatoes flowed in to
Burning or brewing?
Cooking stew,
Stewing with.

I has come to know I
As you come to know you.

Can I return to you, now...know you...?
Displaced absurdity!
Can I stop? Can I freeze?
Rigid, morbid, moral.

Are you not mortified by I presently?
I compose, you suppose
I suggest you re-compose.

Stop letting me rip *you* away from *you*,
All feels like stew- some times.

We're all so different, we're all insane
-Joe Walsh- Life's Been Good.

¼

Oh, such depths we plunder in thoughts of what came first: jar or *choral*! As if such archeological digging were to reap. We think Silviculture, Agriculture as much different; this stagnant use of culture, this standardized use of culture. Bastardized and brutalized by human collective will, culture does not describe our collective works; it is not summative, celebrating our triumph of us. Culture is motion. We do not understand culture (this central issue with understanding), for our understanding does not stand in relation to flow. For it is flow, we flow, we are flow. We light out and invent anew as if new were inventible. Conceive comes from root of grabbing, grasping; fluidity, culturally, does not grasp. Water does not hold like hand, does not press stones down like stone, it flows. Again, as gravity pulls, fluidity flows. What we take for description can never approach, for this being is so other wise, so becoming. Gravity hit upon Newton, so they say; flow (always/never) seems to meet us of other manner!

culture: 1440, "the tilling of land," from L. *cultura*, from pp. stem of *colere* "tend, guard, cultivate, till" (see *cult*). The figurative sense of "cultivation through education" is first attested 1510. Meaning "the intellectual side of civilization" is from 1805; that of "collective customs and achievements of a people" is from 1867. Slang *culture* is from 1947. *Culture shock* first recorded 1940.

"For without culture or holiness, which are always the gift of a very few, a man may renounce wealth or any other external thing, but he cannot renounce hatred, envy,

jealousy, revenge. Culture is the sanctity of the intellect."
[William Butler Yeats]

colony: c.1384, "ancient Roman settlement outside Italy," from L. *colonia* "settled land, farm, landed estate," from *colonus* "husbandman, tenant farmer, settler in new land," from *colere* "to inhabit, cultivate, frequent, practice, tend, guard, respect," from PIE base **kwel-* "move around" (source of L. *-cola* "inhabitant;" see *cycle*). Also used by the Romans to translate Gk. *apoikia* "people from home." Modern application dates from 1548. Colonize is from 1622; colonial first recorded 1776, coined by British statesman Edmund Burke (1729-97). Colonialism first attested 1886.

cycle: 1387, from L.L. *cyclus*, from Gk. *kyklos* "circle, wheel," from PIE **kwel-*, **kwol-* "to roll, to move around, wheel" (cf. Skt. *cakram* "circle, wheel," *carati* "he moves, wanders;" Avestan *caraiti* "applies himself," *c'axra* "chariot, wagon;" Gk. *polos* "a round axis" (PIE **kw-* becomes Gk. *p-* before some vowels), *polein* "move around;" L. *colere* "to frequent, dwell in, to cultivate, move around," *cultus* "tended, cultivated," hence also "polished," *colonus* "husbandman, tenant farmer, settler, colonist;" Lith. *kelias* "a road, a way;" O.N. *hvel*, O.E. *hweol* "wheel;" O.Rus., Pol. *kolo*, Rus. *koleso* "a wheel"). The verb meaning "to ride a bicycle" is from 1883; cyclist in this sense is from 1882; cyclical is from 1817; cyclorama is from 1840.

Yet *the jar* is told, sold to us. Whether this jar is held or is holder, jar remains focal. We are impressed with jar; its ability to hold, our ability to create such containers. Education emerges from such fascination. Pursuit of focus, our focus, on our abilities, our potentials; this is what we educe, over and over again. Yet culture stems from movement? What we legitimize and honour stand (understand), in schism, to other manners that can be described as how we are. We are forced to decide. What comes first, jar or flow? Whatever health may be, how is *this* task healthy?

Eighteen Hundred and Eight Nine

LEADER OF THE CHORUS

Oh, mortal, you who desire to instruct yourself in our great wisdom, the Athenians, the Greeks will envy you your good fortune. Only you must have the memory and ardour for study, you must know how to stand the tests, hold your own, go forward without feeling fatigue, caring but little for food, abstaining from wine, gymnastic exercises and other similar follies, in fact, you must believe as every man of intellect should, that the greatest of all blessings is to live and think more clearly than the vulgar herd, to shine in the contests of words.

STREPSIADES

If it be a question of hardiness for labour, of spending whole nights at work, of living sparingly, of fighting my stomach and only eating chickpeas, rest assured, I am as hard as an anvil.

SOCRATES

Henceforward, following our example, you will recognize no other gods but Chaos, the Clouds and the Tongue, these three alone.

STREPSIADES

*I would not speak to the others, even if I met them in the street; not a single sacrifice, not a libation, not a grain of incense for them!”
- Aristophanes -Clouds*

*Causality evades us; to assume the existence of an immediate causal relation between thoughts, as Logic does, is the result of the coarsest and most clumsy observation.
-F. Nietzsche -Will to power*

I have read of Greek declination between *episteme* and *doxa* (knowledge and opinion), and attempts, in identifying these *two*, to reinvigorate *doxa*, that is experience of world, anew. Opinion, what worth has opinion? Whose opinion? Regularly I revisit my opinions and question their value as guides, as foundations, as *vias* (ducts) for connection. Are my opinions my senses? Are my opinions my feelings? Are my opinions my education? Are my opinions gathering and stewing as imperfect repository? And those wise men who spoke of *said* elephant they felt, each of his own, discrete perspective. We are opinion as much as

we are flesh and bone or any other ‘thing’ we wish us to be. Our *doxa* is not always orthodox, is not always fanatical, is not always unhealthy; cancer to be cut out.

Are there distinct classes of opinions; some better than others, some worse? Does an aesthetic of opinion exist, formally-informally? In our EX-AMs, am I denying myself, my AM? Or am I bringing out myself, or aspects of myself? Am I outing myself and returning ‘it’/‘I’ to compose/decompose integrally; to flow eternally? Or am I defending myself, my constitution as existent and valid of such? And these stories I spin; from whence come? Like shores on banks of rivers imagined, as wind down sky-scrapped canyon. Can ‘*what*’ be explored without ‘*where*’? And if I hope to explore ‘*where*’, must that be(come) archaeological in task? So then, do opinions, views, perspectives, have origins? Must they have origins? Or must we expend in originology (perhaps, versus originality?)? Do opinions have ends, ‘*endities*’? Is it but an opinion that my life began and shall end? Or is this fact? Truth? Knowledge? And if so, is distinction between *episteme* and *doxa* that of mass, volume? Are collective perceptions of multitudes called *episteme*? And those of *doxa* tended to by fewer (zealots/fanatics)? Can we then say that all *episteme* comes from *doxa*? Alas, we play origin card again. There are many manners in which we can play and occupy ourselves. We may be archaeologists, historians, politicians, theologians, dramatists, educators and all tributaries of, and many others. Must we choose? Must we be uniquely one or another? Is such choice, or possibility of choice, even possible? There seems to be flow, we seem to flow; from *doxa* to *episteme* and *episteme* to *doxa*. Just as there seems to be recollection (Socrates’ sense of learning), and forgetting (Nietzsche’s conjecture for balance). Shadows and light: doctor as patient and patient as doctor; teacher as student, student as teacher. Are these polarities? Clearly some relationship seems apparent between these *points*, yet what is *it*? Can *it* be known? Described? Why begin this task? Why spend days/months/years

(balking at this instrumental measure of time as relevant) writing opinion, examining myself, being examined by others? Why begin to ask such questions about this, as if task? Why? Why? Why? Breathe in, and again I fill with opinion. I become, I become opinionated, populated.

Here we may glance to Derrida's *differance*; not that his opinion be more valued or valuable, but rather to admire conceptual configuration of *differance*, as brush stroke. Melding and merging, perpetually and insistently, of what differs and what defers; opinion derived and opinion refreshed; in vitality of multiplicity and interconnection present, not as strain of worth or beauty, but rather ontologically, existentially. For life is movement, incessant movement. So opinion changes, perhaps as does weather. We can gaze seasonally and notice spring is different from winter. We can examine scientifically and give date to change of season, mark boundary, stamp approval, over and over. We can distinguish; perspective emerges reiteratively. Yet, spring never separates from winter and one could not understand, conceptually, spring without winter. For in some sense, winter is spring. Winter does not create spring, birth it, shape it and form it. Winter does not precede it; there was no first winter that came before spring. We talk of winter as 'it', as separate, but we know that is not so. We know 'it', we know. Differance reminds us that there is continuity and cleavage simultaneously, perpetually. We are discrete and amorphous. Yet our steel birds fly us, ripped from season's weave. We accepted this possibility prior to its existence however; we knew what snow-birding would be like prior to mass travel. We were trained, by Science's opinionated hypothesis for this.

3/15.876

Inner and outer; we enter and exit, we exit and enter. Why then so much focus on EX-IT, on outing an *'it'*, *itentification*? We name and name and name, and then fight for whose name reigns. We create gaps, articulations and delude reticulation. But look at me, generalizing a 'we'. Tendency seems so inescapable. Might there be balance, balance not understood, not understood as balance? Not static balance, but balance in motion; as tightrope walker swaying in crossing. Do I marvel at this crossing, such feat? Or do I marvel at that walker who can do so in what appears to be steadiest manner? Or can I relate, for I too sense this perpetual motion, struggle for equilibrium. This whole exemplar becomes rift with difficulties. I sigh as moral 'should' expires from me, of me. Why look at tightrope walkers? Why admire hero and heroics of others? Why take *that* perspective? What is my intention, my focus? Am I aware of my focus? In my view, do I return to view my view?

So I return to; rewind down, re-visit again my view; as gaze and focus. While awake I sense perception (sometimes while I sleep); I feel that I tend to dwell in and of two moods: gaze and focus. Not that these pit against each other, nor act as oppositional forces, just senses of being. Moreover these are not totality of my perceptual experience, for I also ignore and am oblivious to/amongst many, many others. Perhaps it is more akin to activity and passivity; sympathetic and parasympathetic systems mutually and harmoniously interacting. Focus- where, when, why, how do we place/pace our attention? Gaze, too, and transition? Sometimes I note I breathe and at other moments I do not. If a tree falls in a forest, no human to observe/deserve/serve, does *'it'* make *a* sound, have *a* name? Thus I gaze and focus on photos; of my children, growing and changing, with me and without me, and I emote as I re-spect these frozen images, these captured views, hung like trophies and inukshuk. I stew, as I struggle with who I am and what my opinions are and what my knowledge may be and in my view(s). Have I too been educed, forged as those channels

that constitute and permit my flowing from within? Do I/we educe as innate reaction; as fight or flight?

100 - %

true: O.E. *triewe* (W.Saxon), *treowe* (Mercian) "faithful, trustworthy," from P.Gmc. **trewjaz* "having or characterized by good faith" (cf. O.Fris. *triuwi*, Du. *getrouw*, O.H.G. *gatriuwu*, Ger. *treu*, O.N. *tryggr*, Goth. *triggws* "faithful, trusty"), perhaps ultimately from PIE **dru-* "tree," on the notion of "steadfast as an oak." Cf., from same root, Lith. *drutas* "firm," Welsh *drud*, O.Ir. *dron* "strong," Welsh *derw* "true," O.Ir. *derb* "sure." Sense of "consistent with fact" first recorded c.1205; that of "real, genuine, not counterfeit" is from 1398; that of "agreeing with a certain standard" (as *true north*) is from c.1550. Of artifacts, "accurately fitted or shaped" it is recorded from 1474; the verb in this sense is from 1841. *Truism* "self-evident truth" is from 1708, first attested in writings of Swift. *True-love* (adj.) is recorded from 1495; *true-born* first attested 1591. *True-false* as a type of test question is recorded from 1923.

There are all sorts of passions that may intervene between two thoughts: but the interaction is too rapid- that is why we fail to recognize them, that is why we actually deny their existence.
-F. Nietzsche, *Will to Power*

The 'mind,' something that thinks: at times, even 'the mind absolute and pure' – this concept is an evolved and second result of false introspection, which believes in 'thinking': in the first place an act is imagined here which does not really occur at all, i.e. 'thinking'; and, secondly, a subject-substratum is imagined in which every process of this thinking has its origin, and nothing else- that is to say, both the action and the agent are fanciful.
-F. Nietzsche, *Will to Power*

How can I be stuck on this page (reading and reading; formulating, constructing, destroying and revisioning)? One page of text imbuing so much, too much, such sense or perhaps non-sense? Clarifying or obscuring? Return to this page, as you have returned to other pages from other texts and journals and articles; as they have breathed into you, as artificial

respiration sustains corpus inanimate. Your corpus, your body grows as you age, from physical mass and mental mass; we become massive. Just as bodies moving too much fat may schism out of balance, so too might our mental fat lead to disequilibrium. Cardiac Arrest and Stroke describe physical failures of organic systems, insanity and madness mental ones. Power to discern, to understand, to extract truth, is limited and oft concealed. Frailty of our bodies (as physical beings) is not distinct from frailty of our selves (as mental beings). Our knowledge too may produce fatal effects. Our Education too may lead to ill knowstyles. We take our bodies to hospitals and doctors, we take our minds to psychologists and theologians. Where do we take our knowledge and understanding?

Doctors and counselors offer advice for healthy lifestyle, or even thoughtstyle. Do our teachers and educators tender similar practice? Countless texts decry criticism of our medical systems focus on remedying illness, what might these say of our education systems and knowledge(s) pro-duced? Western vs. Eastern as if such declination were sufficient to comprehend approach, reproaches. Metaphysicians, arguing logically, that their practice is other wise. All of these cries are stifled as lived truth remains occult, permitted to live clandestinely, as prisoner trapped within, as expresser limited to legitimized expressions.

96

We accumulate as we grow. We collect. We are collectors. Hunting and gathering have formed us. Hunting and gathering sustain us. We do not learn for knowledge's sake or purity of wisdom, we learn because we are sustained by our formation, informed; just as oxygen in-forms our bodies.

We are proud of our collections; our reflection permits this hubris. As Graiai's singular eyeball and tooth, we behold and are beholden. Know thyself, they wrote; as if pride were *a priori*. And we tore ourselves apart. We collected until our mass imploded.

science: c.1300, "knowledge (of something) acquired by study," also "a particular branch of knowledge," from O.Fr. science, from L. scientia "knowledge," from sciens (gen. scientis), pp. of scire "to know," probably originally "to separate one thing from another, to distinguish," related to scindere "to cut, divide," from PIE base *skei- (cf. Gk. skhizein "to split, rend, cleave," Goth. skaidan, O.E. sceadan "to divide, separate;" see shed (v.)). Modern sense of "non-arts studies" is attested from 1678. The distinction is commonly understood as between theoretical truth (Gk. episteme) and methods for effecting practical results (tekhne), but science sometimes is used for practical applications and art for applications of skill. Main modern (restricted) sense of "body of regular or methodical observations or propositions ... concerning any subject or speculation" is attested from 1725; in 17c.-18c. this concept commonly was called philosophy. To blind (someone) with science "confuse by the use of big words or complex explanations" is attested from 1937, originally noted as a phrase from Australia and New Zealand.

We teeter on brinks, we move as if spiders of web, unable to venture beyond filament's fiber. We have developed tools to create new webs, to analyze existent webs, yet we act as if webbed. Our most powerful exemplar is our understanding of our knowledge(s); prey captured in our webs and entombed for nourishment. We respond as if such constructions were other than genetic predisposition. Blame is our expertise as much as triumph our celebration. Caught we lay, however, as quarry of our own demise. We pit our knowledge as miners. We ditch our anxiety towards depression. Our (land)scapes become scraped and scabbed by our knowledge, as truth of our understanding, as bandages covering wounds. Not that they may heal, but to occult them from sight.

Experimental and Systematic Approaches:

understand: O.E. *understandan* "comprehend, grasp the idea of," probably lit. "stand in the midst of," from *under* + *standan* "to stand" (see *stand*). If this is the meaning, the *under* is not the usual word meaning "beneath," but from O.E. *under*, from PIE **nter-* "between, among" (cf. Skt. *antar* "among, between," L. *inter* "between, among," Gk. *entera* "intestines;" see *inter-*). But the exact notion is unclear. Perhaps the ult. sense is "be close to," cf. Gk. *epistamai* "I know how, I know," lit. "I stand upon." Similar formations are found in O.Fris. (*understonda*), M.Dan. (*understande*), while other Gmc. languages use compounds meaning "stand before" (cf. Ger. *verstehen*, represented in O.E. by *forstanden*). For this concept, most I.E. languages use fig. extensions of compounds that lit. mean "put together," or "separate," or "take, grasp."

stand: (v.) O.E. *standan* (class VI strong verb; past tense *stod*, pp. *standen*), from P.Gmc. **sta-n-d-* (cf. O.N. *standa*, O.S., Goth. *standan*, O.H.G. *stantan*, Swed. *stå*, Du. *staan*, Ger. *stehen*), from PIE base **sta-* "to stand" (cf. Skt. *tisthati* "stands," Gk. *histemi* "cause to stand, set, place," L. *stare* "stand," Lith. *stojus*, O.C.S. *stajati*; see *stet*). Sense of "to exist, be present" is attested from c.1300. Meaning "to pay for as a treat" is from 1821. Phrase *stands to reason* (1620) is from earlier *stands (is constant) with reason*. Phrase *stand pat* is originally from poker (1882); *stand down* in the military sense of "go off duty" is first recorded 1916. *Standing ovation* attested by 1968; *standing army* is from 1603.

stet: direction to printer to disregard correction made to text, 1755, from L. *stet* "let it stand," third person singular present subjunctive of *stare* "to stand, stand upright, be stiff," from PIE base **sta-* "to stand, set down, make or be firm" (cf. Skt. *tisthati* "stands;" Avestan *histaiti* "to stand;" Pers. *-stan* "country," lit. "where one stands;" Gk. *histemi* "put, place, weigh," *stasis* "a standing still," *statos* "placed," *stater* "a weight, coin," *stylos* "pillar;" L. *sistere* "stand still, stop, make stand, place, produce in court," *status* "manner, position, condition, attitude," *statio* "station, post;" Lith. *stojus* "place myself," *statau* "place;" O.C.S. *staja* "place

myself," stanu "position," staru "old," lit. "long-standing;"
Goth. standan, O.E. standan "to stand," O.N. steði "anvil,"
O.E. stede "place;" O.Ir. sessam "the act of standing").

assist: 1426, from M.Fr. assister "to stand by, help, assist,"
from L. assistere "assist, stand by," from ad- "to" + sistere
"take a stand, cause to stand," from PIE *siste-,
reduplicated form of base *sta- "to stand" (see stet).
Sporting sense (n.) is attested 1877 in baseball, 1925 in ice
hockey. Assistant (n.) is from 1541.

666

Consistency, coherence and conviction all lay in this bucket we carry; conceptually, as tools. Sharpened and curved, to manipulate. Our tools allow *techne*, not *poesis*; even though *poesis* may request/require tools. Our tools measure and are measured. They are precise, accurate, discerning. What is created by our tools comes to stand, in stone, and we thus, understand. From shattered bits, we (re)-form our knowledge, as *techne*. This knowing assists us. We learn to understand with assistance. Knowledge leads, we follow. This did not begin or end, it just is. Thus understanding of flow, or fluvial understanding, permits (creates and recreates) a knowledge for flow. We come to understand flow, pre-ordained. As if flow, conceptually, existed prior to; as if flow were foundational, as if flow were. Artist, Andy Goldsworthy, attempts to create art that vanishes. Yet he is forced (by himself, by concept) to capture this art, in images, enumerated (as chapters guide you, dear reader, through this treatise).

Flow happens as gravity happens. We are fine with gravity, why can we not be so with flow? Centuries it requires, conceptually exhausting, to give thrown to flow, dethroned. It is as if gravity, in her guise as science, laughed at flow from on high. As if Greek Gods were

capable of such atrocities! What of poetic sense, that flow which creates and surges us? No longer does *techné* inform *poesis*, there is flow between.

And what is this art of Making People Cry?

Act of ...

Meaning of...

Sense of...

Fact of...

Perception of...

Conclusion on...

Theory of Making People Cry?

Will cannot be comprehended when severed from pressure. Outward and inward are but skins. If will is always confluential with pressure and vice versa, then alleviation, relief from, of, freedom and bondage exists. Examples (decontextualization) do not prescribe, examples illustrate, just as drawings in picture books offer representation, with or without words.

Representation is not presentation and yet is presentation. Human life plays with examples and representation. Can examples become confused (united) with, to presentation? To dwell in examples as presentation retains severed existences that compete for supremacy.

Whether god or good, as schematic, pressure builds.

Where will I find the primary reason for action, the justification for it? Where am I to look for it? I exercise my power of reason in, and in my case, every time I think I have found a primary cause I see another cause that seems to be truly primary, and so on and so forth, indefinitely. This is the very essence of consciousness and thought. It must be another natural law. And what happens in the end? The same thing over again.

– Dostojevskij- Notes from the underground

69 – Ducting:

Roots of education cannot ever be severed from ducting, so long as what we conceptualize is called Education. Ducting as channeling, as mechanized egress down, through and out of a *system* is not a present day scenario, but rather an initial premise returned to *ad infinitum*, definitively. One result of this bind is offered forth in the ‘outside of the box’ metaphor; that is to note, ducts retain primacy and solution-based redresses as part of an immovable core truth. Actually, all aspects of Education (as system) and education (as practice) must be conceptualized with respect to these ducts, edges of boxes. So, school as place for (E/e)ducation is literally duct (box/channel). Teachers and students are vessels no different from ships. As we conceptualize in each and every iteration and re-iteration Education, return is held steadfast. As steady in this analogy, we have literally ‘painted ourselves into a corner’, ‘boxed ourselves in’, so to write (and I am no different). This is of (no) inherent nature of our own, and most likely, in casual interaction with professional educators, parents, et cetera, one will hear conversation around E(e)ducation that is otherwise, or other duct-educating outside of the duct. Yet simultaneously, it is language that has come to trap action, and while thinking ‘type of action’, language, as conceptualizer, is passive, not active⁶.

Is signifier ‘education’, perhaps fatally flawed? This sense of drawing something out of someone concerns, for it foremost highlights understanding as separation, control and manipulation (positing of standing under knowledge). Who does this drawing out and how is it accomplished? If we are to believe in this *techné*, then some important questions are raised immediately. But it is not just drawing out that concerns, *duction* is referent to channeling, such as controlling flow of water, and we see this still in the English word duct. Yet ducts are so rigid and impervious. What enters a duct on one end emerges on the other. How does one even enter a duct? Why would one wish to go into such a restricted place? Might this be se-duction? And once inside the ducted system (once in-ducted), only through

other constructed duct openings can additional material be added or exit possible. Yet from neither outside, or inside the duct is one certain (that is, does clarity [knowledge {understanding}] emerge) how particular movements occur. That is to say, one could not pinpoint, at any given instant, when a particular drop of water (student, piece of curriculum) in a duct system is and where it will be at time $X + 10$ seconds or how it is reacting to/in/of this process. Yet under the guise of the duct there is tendency to suggest some level of control^o, that flow of/in/through the duct is known, that all additives are introduced at specific times and in specific volumes. Warning labels clearly state: side effects of entering this duct are... and you should not do the following while under -influence. Furthermore, behind veil of duct one cannot bear external witness to process, for even in open ducts or ducts of clear material, only flow near the outside surface or exposed part is observable. So in some sense, what comes out, as efflux, is magic, orchestrated by wizards, of Oz? This includes duct master, duct designer, duct manager, etc.

Friere's work around banking evokes similarities. Students are viewed as accounts (vaults /cells) into which information is deposited. Withdrawals are made in a formally calculated manner. Could this account, technically, be left empty, *tabula rasa do novo*? Thus also, from metaphor of duct-work, the system may be emptied, cleaned, pipes replaced, polished, etc... These are most mechanical views. While not to pit organic against mechanical, there are distinctions that can be elucidated around human manipulation. Humans are organic and thus all human creations are organic, so perhaps we are considering organic and humorganic?

Human creations are sharply distinct in their lived environment from non-human creations or formations. Even in primitive times, it would have been difficult to confuse a human tool

from a configuration provoked by wind or wave or other animal life. There is also a sense that manner in which humans communicate with other humans is distinct from manner in which humans communicate with other non-human entities. The way human communication has evolved, at least as far as I understand in what is called West, conveys a strong sense that humans have ability to manipulate and control their surroundings, observe and record their observations and transmit all of this (what may be called knowledge) from one human to another. This is the evolution of human education *qua* education. This is what permits and sustains e/Education. We have tendency of nature, as we do with addiction, to create and sustain practices that are not necessarily true or healthy.

educē: Inflected forms: e·ducēd, e·duc·ing, e·duc·es
1. To draw or bring out; elicit. See synonyms at evoke. 2.
To assume or work out from given facts; deduce.
Etymology: Middle English *educen*, to direct the flow of,
from Latin *ēdūcere*: ē-,

55

However, there is a concept to which education is member. This group also includes communications between human and non-human and non-human and non-human, as well as countless other variations. This meta-concept is not what we know today as education and this is perhaps a most central concern with education; that it has been positioned and argued as logical type signifier, when really it is logical type member. That is to say, if we use concept of chair as analogous, the particular chair I sit upon now as I type (or that you sit upon as you read) is not the concept chair, it is but an instantiation that belongs to the concept chair, as member and exemplar. Dewey also made this type of distinction when he asked us to consider whether bricks and mortar, desks and pens make the school? While I attempt to draw this similarity with what we call education, I have not a name to give to the

signifier class. I do sense a strong relationship exists around communication and transmission. There may be something similar in the Greek notion of *paideia*, which fused culture and education into one, yet I feel that this is still not broad enough, for it does not extend beyond the human realm. The meta-notion I hope to explore is vast and ontic. Henceforth let us refer to this as *Physication*, derived from the Greek *physis*- nature. Or does this not just lead us into duct again: physics, meta-physics?

deuk: To lead.

1a. tug; wanton, from Old English $\bar{t}^{\bar{e}}on$, to pull, draw, lead;
 b. Zugunruhe, zugzwang, from Old High German *ziohan*, to pull. Both a and b from Germanic **teuhan*. 2. Suffixed zero-grade form **duk- \bar{a} -*. tow¹, taut, from Old English *togian*, to draw, drag, from Germanic **tug \bar{o} n*. 3. Suffixed o-grade form **doug-eyo-*. tie, from Old English **t \bar{i} egan*, *t \bar{i} gan*, to bind. 4. Suffixed o-grade form **doug-mo-*. team, from Old English $\bar{t}^{\bar{e}}am$, descendant, family, race, brood, team, from Germanic **tau(h)maz*. 5. teem¹, from Old English $\bar{t}^{\bar{e}}man$, *t \bar{i} eman*, to beget, from Germanic denominative **tau(h)mjan*. 6. Basic form **deuk-*. doge, douche, ducal, ducat, duce, duchess, duchy, duct, ductile, duke; abducens, abduct, adduce, aqueduct, circumduction, con³, condottiere, conduce, conduct, deduce, deduct, educe, endue, induce, introduce, produce, redoubt, reduce, seduction, subduction, subdue, traduce, transducer, from Latin *d \bar{u} ccere*, to lead. 7. Suffixed zero-grade form **duk- \bar{a} -*. educate, from Latin $\bar{e}duc\bar{a}re$, to lead out, bring up (\bar{e} - < *ex-*, out; see eghs). (Pokorny *deuk-* 220.)

The process of Physication, including communication and transmission of experience, is most certainly a fundamental part of the beings humans are today, and it seems, from the texts that remain from the ancients, in those days as well. There is always the possibility and tendency for any concept to be shepherded for instrumental ends of a few, and this we have witnessed countless examples of, in and with education and schooling. This is why education is an inadequate descriptor, for it repeatedly falls prey to manipulation. I propose

that Physication might act as Foucauldian power, and flow, water-like, to reach all; uncontrollable and respected for its wild nature. In this way there is no need to consider sufficiency, for flow is continuous and aim is always calibrative. Thus the archer who shoots and shoots and shoots until marking the bull's eye with marveled precision, repeatedly, and the archer who shoots and then, subsequent to shot, draws the bull's eye around the arrow's terminal trajectory, that these both, as well as all other archers and non-archers, find resonance and meaning in, with and of Physication. So must Physication be social? No/yes. Must it operate in isolation? Yes/no? Must it be anything describable? No/yes. Then how shall it be recognized? Perhaps it shall not in the terms of recognition known and used today, for 'it' is not an 'it', and yet an 'it'. And how shall it be evaluated? By whom? In the same way in which night evaluates day and summer, spring. Shall schools be dismantled and eradicated? No/yes. Shall they continue to exist? Yes/no.

physic: c.1300, "art of healing, medical science," also "natural science" (c.1300), from O.Fr. fisike "natural science, art of healing" (12c.), from L. physica (fem. sing.) "study of nature," from Gk. physike episteme "knowledge of nature," from fem. of physikos "pertaining to nature," from physis "nature," from phyein "to bring forth, produce, make to grow" (cf. phyton "growth, plant," phyle "tribe, race," phyma "a growth, tumor") from PIE base *bheu- "to be exist, grow" (cf. O.E. beon "to be," see be). Especially in Gk. ta physika, lit. "the natural things," name of Aristotle's treatise on nature. The verb meaning "to dose with medicine" is attested from late 14c.

-525

*The names we stole don't remove us:
We have moved on a little ahead of them
And now it is time to wait again.
-John Ashbery- Grand Galop*

We are surrounded by lingual ducts, vessels of ducts! So, *obermensch* comes to fruition! Painted into a corner, we produce as if to reproduce. Leadership is our master vessel. Introduction always pro-duces, has been pro-duced by *duction* and repro-duced. I clamor for egress from this chasm, but I am engulfed. All concepts have shape in our eyes, they are bordered and we see these limits and fixate upon them as if these were ‘*understanding*’. It is not pathological; it is (not) our nature! Who would assert that we were not limited? Shame covers us up, not in avoidance or embarrassment, but as comfort; return home to those places where limits are known. We educate for the same reason we sow acres. It is all farming. We cultivate (*enculture*) our fields as act of nesting. Education is not about learning and knowledge, it is about comfort and familiarity. It is our ultimate propaganda, not for the content taught, but for the *habitus* instilled and reified. Why permit these thoughts? Why allow these to worry? There is no ultimate safety, nor guarantees for such ends. In some, consensually accepted, manner we float through our lives until their physical expiration.

agriculture: 1603, from L. agricultura, compound of agri cultura "cultivation of land," from agri, gen. of ager "a field" (see acre) + cultura "cultivation" (see culture). First record of agribusiness is from 1955.

culture: 1440, "the tilling of land," from L. cultura, from pp. stem of colere "tend, guard, cultivate, till" (see cult). The figurative sense of "cultivation through education" is first attested 1510. Meaning "the intellectual side of civilization" is from 1805; that of "collective customs and achievements of a people" is from 1867. Slang culture vulture is from 1947. Culture shock first recorded 1940.

cult: 1617, "worship," also "a particular form of worship," from Fr. culte, from L. cultus "care, cultivation, worship," originally "tended, cultivated," pp. of colere "to till" (see

colony). Rare after 17c.; revived mid-19c. with reference to ancient or primitive rituals. Meaning "devotion to a person or thing" is from 1829.

colony: c.1384, "ancient Roman settlement outside Italy," from L. *colonia* "settled land, farm, landed estate," from *colonus* "husbandman, tenant farmer, settler in new land," from *colere* "to inhabit, cultivate, frequent, practice, tend, guard, respect," from PIE base **kwel-* "move around" (source of L. *-cola* "inhabitant;" see *cycle*). Also used by the Romans to translate Gk. *apoikia* "people from home." Modern application dates from 1548. Colonize is from 1622; colonial first recorded 1776, coined by British statesman Edmund Burke (1729-97). Colonialism first attested 1886.

1

All voice is but echo caught from a soundless voice.

*In what language do I live? I live in none. I live in you. It is your voice that I begin to hear and it has not language. I hear the motions of a spirit and the sound of what is secret becomes, for me, a voice that is your voice speaking in my ear. It is a misery unheard of to know the secret has no name, no language I can learn. O if you knew! If you knew! How it has been. How the ladies of the house would talk softly in the moonlight under the orange trees of the courtyard, impressing upon me the sweetness of their voices and something mysterious in the quietude of their lives. O the heaviness of that air, the perfume of jasmine, pale lights against the stones of the courtyard walls. Monument! Monument! How will you ever know!
—Mark Strand- Monument #6*

So I have built this paper, for you! And only you will ever read it, this testament- tenement of knowledge offered to you upon this alter of ego. Delivered from self to other, as example of service. Does it matter if hour has grown dark or light? Do respirations and creaks that abound around me matter? Knowledge only proves knowledge; tautology be thy name. As if points, referential and significant, stood in these woods, became under-stood by us. I

gathered them again today, scurrying about, hastily in hopes of survival, out living (surviving) myself, but once more.

Coming to terms with being paid to write... "An ancient metaphor: thought is a thread, and the raconteur is a spinner of yarns -- but the true storyteller, the poet, is a weaver. The scribes made this old and audible abstraction into a new and visible fact. After long practice, their work took on such an even, flexible texture that they called the written page a textus, which means cloth.

-Robert Bringhurst- The Elements of Typographic Style

49 ¢

Philography: Let me admit to my love of graphics. My ability honed to represent myself in etching. Philoetymy: Let me admit my love of historical utterance and how words course through time and human knowing. My ability honed to represent myself in etymology.

Philotautology: Let me admit my love of love of love of love. I write and write and write myself into space. I fill space, larger than myself!

mundanity: 1. Of, relating to, or typical of this world; secular. 2. Relating to, characteristic of, or concerned with commonplaces; ordinary. Middle English mondeine, from Old French mondain, from Latin mundānus, from mundus, world.

19

Meta-reflection: Whatever 'before' may mean; meta-reflection begins prior to philosophy and psychology, science and theology, et cetera. Known as recognition of self by self, this of course creates and designs self, and thus other. Meta-reflection has come to be dominated by psychology and philosophy, science and theology, et cetera. Principally, meta-reflection is biological, phenomenological, and constitutional. This may be compared with an opposable

thumb, yet unlike thumb, there is no Gouldian regression tale; thus even reflection, prior to meta-reflection, would not be foundational as such. Meta-reflection, from realm of psyche, spirit; historically has been based in theology. Yet Reason can only rationalize itself through this means of story telling. While of course we love to tell origin tales. This is a scientific fact in as much as we all (mostly) agree that there is a yellow orb in the sky for a portion of each cycle called day. Out of theology we ask for origins of day, but not of physics of rotation, nor origin of universe. God(s) is (are) answer(s) given; Reason's answers exposed. Psychology self-radiates out; Philosophy is loss of self in general. Tension between what is perceived, described as object(ive).

This work, I shall admit, is immeasurably larger than what you read; just as is your thought too. Yet held in tension; how can I separate my thought from what is held in this written document? It is not that what is recorded here end(s)(ed) this tension; like all life's ontology. This connective tissue of materiality and non-materiality, aether and waves; this solid, liquid and gas; this way of separating and then returning!

Flexion is descriptive of ontological flow. It recollects movement, tension, and connection. Reflection always comes subsequent to flexibility. We are flexible and thus reflexible. Feedback loops between these ways of being unfold endlessly to pattern our lives. They mutually inform upon each other so that they often, instantiated, are indistinguishable.

reflection: c.1384, in reference to surfaces, from L.L. reflexionem (nom. reflexio) "a reflection," lit. "a bending back," from L. reflex-, pp. stem of reflectere, from re-"back" + flectere "to bend." Meaning "remark made after turning back one's thought on some subject" is from 1659. The verb reflect is recorded from 1412, originally "to turn aside;" meaning "to turn back" an image or light rays is from 1530; sense of "to turn one's thoughts (back) to" is first attested 1605.

We must accept meta-reflection as similar to breathing, sight, et cetera. Here we are not indicating aphorism, 'I think, therefore I am'; for while meta-reflection is posited as basic, it is not *sui generis*. This is where Scientific Projects, that seek to answer all with answers, too fail, for cleavage as *a priori* results in asking absurd questions such as, 'Is a human brain in a vat still human?' or produces tracks of philosophical logic. It is requested thus that we consider meta-reflection as we do physical features of our bodies. I request we steer towards whether or not we can *exercise* meta-reflection, if homologous as a body part? It seems that apparently we can and do *ad nauseam*. This is meta-reflection of meta-reflection. Realization of this ability has led to worth. It did not need to lead to worth; this is not syllogistic deduction, but rather observation. I am not even interested in 'why' this seems to be. This present condition exacerbates around correlation of meta-reflective worth with economic worth; thus development of high-performance.

High-performance, of course, is extreme. Most people do not play at that level, yet they still understand the game. This would be physically analogous along the lines of: a top athlete who is paid to perform and national campaigns to promote good physical health via 20 minutes of activity three times a week. Certainly the analogy does not follow out completely, but sufficiently to establish context with a well-accepted realm. These perpetuated propaganda plans also work to create normalcy; that is, via, societal patterns of expectation are propagated and reinforced, until as Freud and Foucault note, we no longer even need society to imbue us, as we come to self-regulate. Whether checking out asses at the water-cooler, or comparing notes on who knows as much as a grade-fiver, physical and meta-reflective have become our national sports. Competition and survival of the fittest, these are only retro-analyses of observable conditions, which doubtlessly, once *known*, shape and

regulate. Again, this is not a project of archeology. Competition's current genre pits individual against individual (or team against team, or whatever you have it), pitting being of essence. Many etymological derivations from competition are related to flight or wing, as if members of flocks were fighting to lead or be lead. That is, we look to other organisms as if to rationalize our definition of competition.

55 Old -Psykhe & Pneuma

Anima & Spiritus

Psychology is curious, for its operation derives from a tautology as interesting as any riddle. Psychology asks us to overcome, to rise up to, to defeat some aspect of our being (if only in acceptance, or meta-reflection). Simultaneously, psychology tells us this is impossible (for each instance is discrete- of analysis). This Bateson defined as schizoid state.

psyche: 1647, "animating spirit," from L. *psyche*, from Gk. *psykhe* "the soul, mind, spirit, breath, life, the invisible animating principle or entity which occupies and directs the physical body" (personified as *Psykhe*, the lover of *Eros*), akin to *psykhein* "to blow, cool," from PIE base **bhes-* "to blow" (cf. Skt. *bhas-*). The word had extensive sense development in Platonic philosophy and Jewish-infl. theological writing of St. Paul. In Eng., psychological sense is from 1910.

Psychology has been, in retrospect, little besides extension of Cartesian dualism, exacerbation of scientific splitting and prohibition of health. Once held as savior's shining light out of the dark ages, Western religious terror, psychology has resulted in being tether to perpetual whipping post. Actually, as one glances about, there seems to be similar trends occurring with psychology as has been for religion. Psychology has become religion for Western atomized/autonomous selves. When one prays nowadays, one prays to one's self

and psychology is doctrine permitting and normalizing. Even infusion (acceptance/popularization) of Eastern ways, *self* is always played off *other*, yin yang, allowing indoctrination via psychology.

We can play this analogy out in many directions and find similarities with how major churches or other religious doctrines have founded and maintained themselves. Glance at oligarchy- holder of powers who establish and perpetuate discourse. For psychology, this long-standing lineage, from early on, cannot be teased apart from theology. Yet with the advent of the modern era, this Nietzschean repositioning, we see emerge a new psychology too. This psychology parts with an active attack on theology, using new tools of science and rationalism to found its position. What was meta-processing for Nietzsche, and even Freud, was rather primitive to what has subsequently ensued, even if we still reference these earlier doctrines as definitive. This morphing establishes *meta* as process which entrenches and distances, concurrently, doctrine from and to itself. Whatever may be cited as realization that *self* is modern lord's house and psychology good book, it is *meta* processing of this, via acceptance, that sustains, maintains and engrains this rhetoric. What is different about modern psychology as *religious* doctrine and theologies of antiquity is mostly related to community size and relative homogeneity of that community. Tribalism and genealogy of morals, as outlined by Nietzsche, while debunking Platonic/Kantian ideology, and while bashing psychology of theology, simultaneously set stage for repositioning of corporate psychology to autonomous psychology. Are you to accuse my breathing of huffing and puffing down men of straw? Above is but conjecture considering building and maintenance of ducts.

pneumatic: 1659, from L. *pneumaticus* "of the wind, belonging to the air," from Gk. *pneumatikos*, from *pneuma*

(gen. pneumatōs) "wind," also "breath," from pnein "to blow, to breathe," from PIE base *pneu- "to breathe," of imitative origin.

Psyche dominates my being (socially, internally), gripping my reality, constantly. This shall not change nor alter. Psyche is as much me as my limbs or my song. Just as Eros once succumbed to Psyche's allure, ontology is flow and form. Fixed beauty adheres, and coherence is observed. Must psychology prefix me? Perhaps it is not a question of I-thou vs. I-it, perhaps this contestation returns us to a pittance. Perhaps too it is order: I-thou before I-it or I-it prior to I-thou? This is perhaps how psyche has come to prefix perception and how perception has elevated psyche to that of host. This is where I-thou always returns to God.

*Now what's to be found racing around.
You carry your pain wherever you go.
All full of blues and trying to lose,
You ain't gonna learn what you don't wanna know.
So I give you my eyes, and all of their lies;
Please help them to learn as well as to see.
Capture a glance, and make it dance,
Of looking at you, looking at me.
- John Barlow- Black Throated Wind*

6- First number, to come to mind

Deferral- Referral: Psychology and Education

Derrida makes us consider 'differ' and 'defer'; and I admit it, I am addicted to pre-fixes. We shall defer and refer thus. Sentiment is perhaps no different, flow is no different. This sentiment has been named for so long, facing, surfacing and resurfacing, it situates prior to self, other, psyche; yet not some prior before. There have been no before as endless before.

It is my liquidity that makes me sense such, this liquidity that agitates my solidity, this liquidity that makes room for my gaseousness.

Education as vessel (weight), capacity of duct through which IT can flux and flow. Why not Floatation, in homage of fluidity as foundational? Founding, not as foundation, flooring- which comes latter, but rather as that which is found; for in find we de-fine (de-position) that is, remove (demove) position from find. This is not eureka, nor heuristic, nor notion of inventive find, but find as flow. Water flows, naturally (whatever meaning means).

Were we not conceived out of liquid, and only subsequently birthed through channel? Carried in eggs and sperm, epoxy and resin; liquid to solid. We move, however. It is our movement that solidity cannot account for; this randomness is not decipherable. How I began to move is not in question. There is no philosophy of movement, no science of movement, no psychology; nor theology of movement that suspects movement's ontology; and to anthologize movement is but archeology, digging in dirt already accumulated. All we can say is that we flow.

All play has style. Sometimes called aesthetics, or fashion, or *je n'ai sais quoui*; this is way of being. Eastern thought has long contemplated way in style. Style is independent of *techné* and *episteme*. Style is of all always (constitutively), yet different. Style does not work from or towards pulling together, cohesion, semblance, order or such. Style is habit, mood, vibe, feeling, intuition, (non-definitive in list, of parameters or weight as measure), and flow. All humanity (in entirety and as individual (whatever those may mean)) always exhibits style. Fashion as mode, manner measured is not style, however much wealth in advertising (persuasion, delusion, dilution). Style is always appreciated; yet always otherwise to any concept of price or worth.

Flow and style, style in flow, as way (weigh) of being, as departure. And so we turn to health and sanity and holism and partism; thrust into turmoil of *techne* and *episteme*. Trapped we are between concept and origin, as if war did not exist before word *war*, concept war; *kampf* before struggle? Style cannot be found in fractions, digitalized (recall manner in which DVDs pixilate or burn and melt of analogic celluloid film). These random processes, these stochastic experiences, flow. It is not to distinguish between self and other, similar and different, but to acknowledge that flow is wise too. All attempts at normalization, education, management and so forth, are but attempts. Outcomes are stochastic, weather systems, classroom climates! All theory and therapy are but rhetorical.

- So you think you are an expert in education, eh? :

I remember that day when in-laws, flat-out, told me that they had raised two children who had 'survived' and thus their manner of child-rearing should be respected (responded to?). This was when my first baby was very little, I, new father. Aghast, floundering in this most intense learning experience (life experience) since my own inception (still wishing I could return to my own conception). I was not inspired by family or home, by size or relationship; I was connected to this wee creature that I obeyed. I walked streets and trod around bed with babe slung from me, crying, crying to me, crying for me, crying to itself, communicating as possible. I have yelled at my children, shaken them at points. I have cried with and from my children as I have never cried before. My mother told me that I would not love another until I had children, and I laughed. I may not have had children, but I do. I love my children deeply; I father them as I can. I know that we are related, that I cared for them, taught them, looked out as they grew, and I prepared lunches. What fears do I have? They

are not my own, for certain. I have looked at death, I am not afraid of death; curious at best. I fear my children are unable to make sense of their lives. This is what I fear. And what do you fear, not of Pysche's dilemma, but resultant of your life's flow?

shatter: c.1330, probably a variant of M.E. scateren (see scatter). Cf. O.Du. schetteren Low Ger. schateren.

scatter: 1154, possibly a northern Eng. variant of M.E. schateren (see shatter), reflecting Norse influence. Scatterbrain is first recorded 1790. Scattershot (adj.) is attested from 1961, fig. use of term for a kind of gun charge meant to broadcast the pellets when fired.

A,B,C –

*Hurry up ! poems ! lies !
Damn you weak music !
You've let arthritis in !
You're no poem,
You're a visa.*

-Leonard Cohen- On the Sickness of My Love

Can PhD be traded for PD (Doctor of Poetry), or Nurse of Poetry, that nurturance that nourishes? Poetics is as much making as *techné*, in my experience; and I am not counting. I have no love of wisdom; I have not love or wisdom. My Socratic Oath admits neither love nor wisdom. I tell not stories, I weave not tales. I romanticize not poetry, only make invitation to this ball. I breathe and move and flow, poetically so. You shall not come in this work, by doctrines. Answers are not offered. Fluidity need not be invited, brought, introduced...educated. Air flows out and in you again and again. You read and attempt to conceptualize. You move here and there, put this down, meet with them, talk there, return. Have you found home in this paper? Are you at home at any moment? Splinter and explode, unite and find. I shall fail in this project, subjected to rejection, objectively ejected.

I worry not about trajectory of my throw, jettison is but my calling. Not only do we bob upon waters, ducted down channels, we too flow, inseparably so, and this we all know, yet refuse to admit; how confusing.

4- Sheltering

What is Heidegger's dwelling? Gather to shelter, adverting helter skelter, is Heidegger's home. And he cites Nietzsche? And Nietzsche still believes! Shield and troop, war and peace, death and life, as if inanimate did not have antonym.

Homelessness: there are two distinct (opposing) common existences for homelessness nowadays. The more common of the two is individuals, usually of 'under-developed' nations, who do not hold deed to physical abode, that is, they own no land. This scenario has become entrenched in our society to the point of pathology, and thus we treat the victims of homelessness as social collateral, to be dealt with systematically as if requesting a coin return on a faulty machine. Homelessness of this nature is characterized by sadness and pity, scorn and endemic.

Homelessness is also coming to be understood via technological developments. It is heard in economic and social lexicons relating themes such as ease of communication, capital mobility, social mobility, travel and many others. Here homelessness is affirming, whereby we ground our understanding in placelessness. Actually, this version of homelessness is characterized by pride and privilege, wealth and power.

It is only in conjunction with this notion of homelessness that the other, opposite exists; the two, in tension. We are considering extremes in this comparison of homelessness, so how

might reconciliation occur for us? Or perhaps, how is it that we so fluidly utilize but a term in such contradictory manner?

So what is homelessness? -Ness is one of those suffixes which releases form, that is, permits blurriness, infusion, illogic, et cetera. Happiness is exemplar; often popularized as THE GOAL, eudaimonia of humanness. While not focusing on this aspect, when turning to –ness, we permit, allow for a band of happy. Home is at issue then.

I have heard this song that revolves around home. I began to hear it years ago and so has this evolved, now questioning home, as being, as love might be questioned. Might humanness not be akin to homelessness; so clear of mortality? Our first home, conceived, womb, teaches us thus. None may dwell in womb lifelong. And yet, I (we) long for womb and thus create home, pre-wombness, awaiting arrival to glimpse again that first home, womb.

So we celebrate and scorn homelessness, our homelessness. Schism, that too defines our existence, our humanness, our happiness; just as we are fused sperm to egg, we are also split, tension pulling apart as coming together; simultaneously, all ways.

9. C#3

We are stardust, we are golden
- Joni Mitchell- Woodstock

Of this lyric, we find what *subatomic physics* has been preaching as doctrine for the past 60 years! Light as both wave and particle, they tell us. We are energy and matter concurrently. We are stardust, we are golden. Here, at first glance, one might think stardust as particle and golden as wave in its hue, -ness, -ish, indefinite. Yet this is as obvious as being sight and

taste and touch. Ridiculously we house our being in senses, as if this were sensible. Science has stolen understanding in this project! As if project we project, he interjected.

Both climax and climate come of but one seed, to lean. It is our lean, or an observation of lean, moving to and from Equator, that climate seems to follow. Yet climax does not necessarily follow such pattern. There is no exact, precise point at which climax shall occur, building does seem to proceed. We can only have sense of climate and climax in turning back, that is, in revision. There is no prediction, all, including experts, agree. This is why claims of Climate Change are but specters, and we but spectators. We can discuss such *passings* at tea and deliberate, yet we cannot, predictably so, conjecture futures.

19-#3c

Linearity requests that you read this document in order of pagination. Submitting to order as such, ducts force flow.

29-C#3

Surrounded by books and searching for cohesion, how is this so? These books tear me apart, tear my knowledge apart in their radiation. They scatter around me, creating enclave. Perhaps first home was library, that place to collect, museum, gallery...home. Plying wheat to straw and straw to bale and bale to adobe. Edification! We build our selves selectively from what we bump or what bumps us. Out of these journeys comes self, family, community, culture. What adheres to edify? What coheres to construct? Surrounded by things and living adhesion we come and become. We are adornments. We are adorned. And in turn, we adorn. We hear sometimes of changes in memory control as books and recordings house ideas/thoughts/knowledge. We objectify, some say. Yet perhaps we are

those books as much as any organ of our bodies. Not dissociation, just without *hesion* as fore. Would this still be a reordering?

5683- Love –

*There ain't no cure for love
There ain't no cure for love
All the rocket ships are climbing through the sky
The holy books are open wide
The doctors working day and night
But they'll never ever find that cure,
That cure for love
-Leonard Cohen- There ain't no cure for love*

How to approach love, *philo-* defining my desire, my will, my *me*. Mind swells with thoughts and theories, images and notions; yet can I say I comprehend love? Body swells with inspiration full gasp; yet can I feel I know love? What proposals! So many have attempted (attempt) to understand/incorporate love, they tell us about love and they love and hence we learn love and love. All cultures seem to have sentiments/embodiments corresponding to love. But what do I know about love? Is it possible that love too is *inconceivable conceived*? We talk about/practice altruism, caring, nurturing, et cetera. Yet, are these love? We feel and emote and sense and et cetera. Yet, are these love? We are serious and fickle, joyous and jesting; we say, 'words cannot describe.' This is how words hold. This is what love has become.

We have captured love, and in return, we have been captured by love: national love, theological love, intimate love... All these are envelopes and thus we do not leave caves and witness idyllic light, rather we cloak ourselves in conceptual garments creating caves; never touching, we layer. Love lays about love as lacquer. Love forms and sustains wombs

outside the womb. We play games of chicken/egg with our layers, as if solution would wash away confusion, bring us closer to our skin, our nature; as if 'what if' meant more than 'as is' or me touching you, your skin; as if varnish, paint and design were able to adorn egg. Yet we are plagued with love. This urge to connect, explore. What does a *captive* do against an enemy that defines as much as constrains, embraces as much as rejects?

If there are concepts that are other than conception, is there not love that is otherwise than love? This flowing love, this love ebbing inside and between, this is not put forth as love to be recaptured, held, displayed and honoured. Timeless themes escape time's grasp for they flow eternal (without time). Love too may be felt such; incurably so, inconceivably so, love flows with and without you and I just as energy surges through our bodies.

5683 - Philopoesia-

Who introduced into the Ten Commandments love of wisdom, as if peanut butter might not exist without jam, thus spoke. So we have moved from Moses' mount, mount of love, mount of feeling. We have moved to Plato's cave, to Heidegger's dwelling; henceforth knowing and honouring knowledge, as if cave/light were chicken/egg. Understanding becomes sub-lingering. We dwell with love, we build and learn of love with wisdom as trophy.

Might I too wish to love wisdom? Regardless of time and place, history and archeology, love of wisdom is held in particular esteem. So too are other loves: love of beauty, love of monogamy, love of family, love of money, love of love (romantic). Perhaps our highest value is that of love. What do we love most, we ask ourselves. Wisdom is one of our

greatest loves. Yet, can we deny that we love? Have you met another human being that does not, in some form, of some ethos, know love, flow love?

What then might be relation between educating understanding and loving wisdom? Are we, in leading out/away from what we have come to stand under, all wiser and all more steadfast in our love of this wisdom? Or loiter on, shall we, with love of wisdom? Oh, quench me with love of wisdom as thy response! Spiral spins around again, and threads that we once towed, tow us again. Webs are spun, and tangle thus. Is education leading out or ducting through? Depends on whom you reference, no Spencer, no Kafka*?

So, you are denouncing one love for another? I knew it! It is impossible (implausible), to let grasp go without grasping another. So I know you are grasping, but what? You must admit you are grasping, and you must identify what you grasp. That is the exercise at hand, of thought. Ok, I am coming clean. I am denouncing love of wisdom for love of poetry.

Finally, I've written it. It is out! Does that mean all wheels come off here? What will be my guide without wisdom? What will be my measure? How shall I educe evaluation? It would be so much easier if we all knew that a certain snake had whispered a certain secret once upon a time, no? But we do not all know this. Not any more. Death of God is poignant in its contained assertion, no doubt, yet it is also conceptually profound as acceptance of death. To scour life assurance in heaps of death. To love death.

Why philo? Why love? This entire exercise examples love. One of the highest achievements in education, an act of love. Yet is this collage making me love *love*, seductively so; or am I maker, poet? I too infuse, induce! So what then shall I choose to make? Do I work to re-make what is made? Adding to *it*, moving *it*, coming to *it*, over and over again?

Thus yearning and loving *it*. I am not making that choice. I too love wisdom, yet I am not making that choice.

*And the brown trout dirty jerk of morphine moved under,
Wolverine smile of deepening skin,
Nosing in mineral clarity to what it knew: the walled city
Where maybe ten oil lamps laboured in all the towers.
-Tim Lilburn Thickness Travelling*

*This phenomenological inquiry countenances the possibility of inserting proprioceptive writing into the poetics of the academic genre. This unrehearsed quality, written from the body and its experience as it is lived, the process itself, can infuse the master narrative of traditional academic text, might provide space for renewed questioning, opening up the structure of the text to other possibilities of knowing. Proprioceptive writing invites immersion in the rhythms that flow between the theoretical text and poetic self-reflexivity, to taste the surrender, the breaking up and re-assembling of self that, albeit contained, remains merged with the world at large.
-Jana Milloy*

Poetics of the academic genre have, thus far, escaped me. Proprioceptive senses, but naming of unnamable. Return and return again to love, of wisdom. Is there break? Is stress of thesis broken? Do we articulate, reticulate; pulling away, moving away, yet always tethered? Only fabric made can rip. What then might be this making? Pulled from *poiesis* to *philo*, from *philo* to *poiesis*; making has been confused, making confuses. There too longs love, yearning; love for making as poetic does.

Revere

Compost

Ruminant

Mull

Consider

Ponder

Contemplate

Wonder

*Muse
Reflect
Cogitate
Meditate
Turn Over
Sift
Quest*

*Complexity
What urges this...
Messiness*

Pulling together and fraying apart; such piece making. Construction from chaos? Construction to chaos? Questions and answers, as if? As if! And my making... your making... scrutinized by other, constructed by other, executed ...by me-you.

18- Hymn to Philopoesia

I read and read, such brilliance...shining, blinding me... binding me... defining me...and I
drivel... grovel ... for semblance... re:semblance...can you too stutter along for this
sentence? Be on my wavelength, my ravelength of reverie and dream... and such lucidity!

Recidivate to Education: Reprisal, reprieve...what have you all been waiting for...this
understanding? This duction? This falling back upon...such love of wisdom.

I have abandoned ship, vessel weighing about me, upon sea and thee. Now I panic and
lurch, frantically flailing around... fighting floating, desperately drowning. I grab what I
know, take what I need, I know will last, my knowledge will last, my will will last, my last will
to knowledge and vessel and weight. My love of wisdom has lasted so long. With embrace,
I return to education; ...only to play.

Education is but shipping channel to me. We are always 'on board'. From womb to tomb,
we move from relationship to relationship, friendship, ownership, cruise ship and ship yard.

Bound in this state, condition of being, yet flung far and wide as boat. Wisdom, so flowing, this fluid fills canal. Educated along, wisdom winds. Such distillation our seas set. Frothy waves no more, salted taste no more; wisdom refined, we are left with wine. Drunk, intoxicated with wisdom, we love.

-ship: O.E. -sciepe, Anglian -scip "state, condition of being," from P.Gmc. *-skapaz (cf. O.N. -skapr, O.Fris. -skip, Du. -schap, Ger. -schaft), from base *skap- "to create, ordain, appoint." Cognate with O.E. gesceape (see shape).

ship: (n.) O.E. scip "ship, boat," from P.Gmc. *skipan (cf. O.N., O.S., Goth. skip, Dan. skib, Swed. skepp, M.Du. scip, Du. schip, O.H.G. skif, Ger. Schiff), perhaps originally "tree cut out or hollowed out," and derived from PIE base *skei- "to cut, split." The O.E. word was used for small craft as well; in 19c., distinct from a boat in having a bowsprit and three masts, each with a lower, top, and topgallant mast. Fr. esquif, It. schifo are Gmc. loan-words. Ship-board "side of a ship" is from c.1200. Ship-shape "properly arranged" first attested 1644. Phrase ships that pass in the night is from Longfellow's poem "Aftermath" (1873). Phrase runs a tight ship is attested from 1971.

*Oh yearning,
Oh longing,
Oh love!*

Come to my self, infiltration.

Children are play.

Education is game.

Style permeates.

You (I) can play, for I am (you are) play, just as we are water (flow), all flowing. All here does not mean only, rather fully (as in all-you-can eat). So I put on my winter clothes for

winter play, and my summer clothes for summer play, and spring in the fall. You may say, 'stop this non-sense!' (Darn protocol for quotation marks isn't even correct!). You would be right. And yet play plays on, and I hum along.

CB65034- DATA COLLECTION

data: 1646, pl. of *datum*, from L. *datum* "(thing) given," neuter pp. of *dare* "to give" (see **date**). Meaning "transmittable and storable computer information" first recorded 1946. *Data processing* is from 1954. *Database* formed 1962, from *data* + *base*.

date: "time," c.1330, from O.Fr. *date*, from M.L. *data*, noun use of fem. sing. of L. *datus* "given," pp. of *dare* "to give, grant, offer," from PIE base **do-* "to give" (cf. Skt. *dadati* "gives," O.Pers. *dadatuv* "let him give," O.C.S. *dati* "give," Gk. *didomi, didonai*, "to give, offer," O.Ir. *dan* "gift, talent"). The Roman convention of closing every article of correspondence by writing "given" and the day and month -- meaning "given to messenger" -- led to *data* becoming a term for "the time (and place) stated." The meaning "to give" is also the root of the grammatical *dative* (M.E.), the case of giving. *Dateline* in the journalism sense is attested from 1888. Phrase *up to date* (1890) is from bookkeeping. *Dated* "old-fashioned" is attested from 1900. *Date* (n.) "romantic liaison" is from 1885, gradually evolving from the general sense of "appointment;" the verb in this sense is first recorded 1902. Meaning "person one has a date with" is from 1925. *Blind date* first recorded 1925, but probably in use before that. *Date rape* first attested 1975.

Date and dated, we attempt to describe time as fluid, or in tense. Time too is instantaneous.

As Heidegger¹ reminds us that memories not only connect us to past events, but also bring us, cogno-physically, through time. Or as Nancy² tells of the impossibility of singular or plural but of this jointed concept. Time is never nor past, present or future. Time is all these always. How has popular knowledge and education deceived many of us otherwise?

This other wisdom dominates so profoundly, so ontologically, as if to appear 'natural'. Certainly, concepts of past, present and future arose 'naturally'. There is nothing 'unnatural' about these. Yet these tools are but tools, as are others. Moreover, tools are machines. Machines seem only to have 'sense' for humans. This is why education is purely human (not knowledge, wisdom, learning etc...). Time appears more 'powerful' when it is conceived, perhaps, segmented in past, present and future and as some fluid force that gathers potential as it 'moves'. It is this ability to 'move' that maintains our ducts, that is, seduces us.

machine: 1549, "structure of any kind," from M.Fr. machine "device, contrivance," from L. machina "machine, engine, fabric, frame, device, trick" (cf. Sp. maquina, It. macchina), from Gk. makhana, Doric variant of mekhane "device, means," related to mekhos "means, expedient, contrivance," from PIE *maghana- "that which enables," from base *magh- "to be able, have power" (cf. O.C.S. mogo "be able," O.E. mæg "I can;" see might). Main modern sense of "device made of moving parts for applying mechanical power" (1673) probably grew out of 17c. senses of "apparatus, appliance" (1650) and "military siege-tower" (1656). In late 19c. slang the word was used for both "penis" and "vagina," one of the very few to be so honored. Political sense is U.S. slang, first recorded 1876. Machinery (1687) was originally theatrical, "devices for creating stage effects;" meaning "machines collectively" is attested from 1731. Machine Age (1922) was coined by Lewis Mumford. Machine-gun is first attested 1870; the verb is from 1915. Machine for living (in) "house" translates Le Corbusier's machine à habiter (1923).

18- Taking Hold: -

*Count, count more
So that thicker and thicker is learning
-Gertrude Stein-A Little Called Pauline*

Nancy writes, ‘...concept is that phenomenon which takes hold of itself as the truth...’¹
Etymologically, concept (conceive) is grasping of grasping, or holding of self. I am a collection machine! I gather and bank datum into data. Look at all these distinct shiny stones I have laid before you. I took them from my travels, and in gathering, I have set way to organizing. And now, logically so, I showcase my presentation, reconfiguration, go figure. Does this make sense? What question! To make sense... hmmm, if we can make sense, then why are our senses oft represented as finite? Making sense as: art, as craft, as practice, belief, ability, existence, ontologically. Breaking sense, making moulds that hold and grasp. Making becomes sense only through making. It is not as exciting to find first made as it is exciting to realize that there were/are first made! Moulds follow.

I frantically search for my story. I committed it to memory stick, which has gone missing; my missing memory and my high anxiety. It split, they split somewhere and I know naught. Knowing nothing is ultimately what I/we gather. I know I did not leave my memory. So perhaps it is described as lost, wanted. How does lost operate? Is this not THE question? The how, operative of duction or reverse, I do not know. Shall I cry over memory lost? How much shall I cry? Grasp loosens, sooner or later, with or without time, story lost or found, grasp loosens too. Both my grasp and THE grasp. I suggest these are not interstices of being, but rather constitutive of being, as flow. Can I just float? Do you know, recollect this sense?

1- Focus:

*As I was going down the impassive Rivers,
I felt no longer guided by the haulers;
-Arthur Rimbaud- The Drunken Boat*

Why do so many of us (appear to, hope to, pretend to) need counsel? It seems to be that for any and every decision nowadays, counsel can be found. We run fine lines betwixt taking our 'own' decisions and taking counsel. Do these lines present but two sides? Often, 'third ways' are mentioned. Numeracy (no mercy) again hedging our thoughts, not only must we find balance between being and nothingness, we also hoist this plethora of 'others' for consideration. And time, guiding us perpetually through all this; whether as broken digits or analogous sentimentality, we defer (and differ) from time (those two sides of *differance*). Guides and guidance, we hike trails, stick to beaten paths, yet march to our own drum/drummer. How does *sanity* maintain and replicate itself, is my question!

Guidance counselor, how stultifying a series of metaphors ensue. Is this what is meant by 'education'? Both guiding and counseling as if: as employment, paid, trained for at university, this one perhaps, gathered, showing (shining) way, vision. To preach, what one must do to preach! I compose this other doctorate, another doctorate, for you, to read. Yet it just pours out of me. I arrive home, tired, worn from day's work, nothing to do with this, with academics; and I sit and write. I talk to myself, I rant- inhaling and exhaling- *haling*. "Am I adequate enough to write?", I respire. "Have I read enough pipers to read, to be read?", I consider, as I place another comma. You read and compare me, as if possible, to all those and those ideas that have come before you, read before you; read as student and teacher, by student and teacher, and so on it shall go. Is this guide rope tethered? How? To whom? What guidance counsels your guidance? What guidance does your counsel call? And my guidance and counsel, what of they?

What is it of choice? Why are we posited always with choice and then utilize choice as if some benchmark of value. "All things considered, the best choice was taken." We aim our

politics, our education, our employment, our relationships into choice's gusts and gales. We develop pre- and post- game shows and analyze choice. We associate choice with virtues such as freedom and autonomy. It seems either choice or luck, and we accept both. We cling to both theology and psychology. We are dominated, take refuge in our home and be *come* schooled; educed up and down and made to believe we educe(d) ourselves.

technical: 1617, "skilled in a particular art or subject," formed in Eng. from Gk. *tekhnikos* "of art," from *tekhne* "art, skill, craft" (see *techno-*). The sense narrowed to "having to do with the mechanical arts" (1727). Technicality is from 1814. Basketball technical foul (one which does not involve contact between opponents) is recorded from 1934. Boxing technical knock-out (one in which the loser is not knocked out) is recorded from 1921; abbreviation TKO is from 1940s.

techno: from Gk. *tekhno-*, combining form of *tekhne* "art, skill, craft, method, system," probably from PIE base **tek-* "shape, make" (cf. Skt. *taksan* "carpenter," L. *textere* "to weave;" see *texture*). *Technophile* is attested from 1968; *technophobe* from 1965.

texture: c.1425, "network, structure," from M.Fr., from L. *textura* "web, texture, structure," from stem of *textere* "to weave," from PIE base **tek-* "to make" (cf. Skt. *taksati* "he fashions, constructs," *taksan* "carpenter;" Avestan *taša* "ax, hatchet," *thwaxš-* "be busy;" O.Pers. *taxš-* "be active;" Gk. *tekton* "carpenter," *tekhne* "art;" O.C.S. *tesla* "ax, hatchet;" Lith. *tasau* "to carve;" O.Ir. *tal* "cooper's ax;" O.H.G. *dahs*, Ger. *Dachs* "badger," lit. "builder;" Hittite *taksh-* "to join, unite, build"). Meaning "structural character" is recorded from 1660.

This is perhaps conflation as confusion. Just as thumb is not big toe, mechanical is not *tekhne*, but technical. Our tendency towards counsel, and remunerated advocacy, derives from experience as technical. Time as past, present and future is of that mechanical. That act of orating, and eventually engraving *tekhne* helps to solidly remind, that is, form mind

again and again, mechanically. *Techne* to Taylorism, where factory settings have been set; as if governor situating task; as if governor's model could be used to understand our biological tendencies, our flow, our *techne*. *Techne* is what happens; and in mechanical blocks *techne* is accounted for and thus becomes technical. It is as the Post-Modern Generator has issued almost 4 million random essays since its inception in February 2000. May questions be asked that do not *duct* reply? May I ask, or are only those related to choice approved? Debate between our factions exists not as claim to throne, as some would have it, but rather as existing. But even this prior assertion must be read and taken as point, to be scrutinized, dissected, masticated and returned for further consideration. Science is fine with half-baked ideas, as this trend of asking eventually will reach end (where end is held in highest esteem). Reference to God or Science or Self or Understanding all ache for end. Counsel and guidance operate towards ending end, as functionary of the above-mentioned pursuants. Work of guidance counsel is but another guised effort to plug leaky dykes. Flow pushes through these solidified notions of being and can only be restrained, yet never accepted nor cherished.

Glance to that piper of Hamelin, whose tune was played and paid. What might be told of guidance and counsel from this tale? These tales that historians tell us are myth, contrivances! Those relics lay upon our lingual landscape to this day. Quite common has become that expression, 'he who pays the piper calls the tune.' Most heinously, this notion simplifies and covenants relationship between schooling and economics as consumer-based. Yet this tale has persisted for almost for almost 800 years. Quite a tale! I am intrigued considering connections from Hamelin's Piper to education and guidance/counsel. This Piper works with children, thus educationalist of sorts. His curriculum is quite seductive, to say *the* least. That practice of his was oh, so successful, from all accounts. This tale is

foreboding, through retelling we recognize possible return and return of pipers and requests; we remain aware of paying our debts. Someone, or something or some needed to take care of those youth, and that Piper's presence prevailed. That Piper chose that tune, those townspeople but hired him (agreed to his plan and curriculum) for riddance. Who counsels whom? What guidance is decided? When tales and myths weave into us, parasitically, symbiotically, who are we, what do we know and what of flow?

Guidance and counsel are not to be cut from us, as cancerous growths on otherwise healthy tissue. That strategy seems reserved for those impossible ends. Guidance and counsel are as much for us as for any other, as is breathing. Neither heir to throne, nor rogue to rob shall either painting produce. *Duction* imposes such memorial thought upon us, as if.

21- Rules For Reading

*In the beginning was the word, the word
That from the solid bases of the light
Abstracted all the letters of the void;
And from the cloudy bases of the breath
The word flowed up, translating to the heart
First characters of birth and death.
-Dylan Thomas- In The Beginning*

I have been searching for rules for reading. I know I am close to their tale. They would be like rules for spelling, and grammar. At first so elementary; originally, phemonenologically, phonemicalogically (*Greek: φώνημα, phōnēma*), I have been rehearsing this for a while now.

hearse

1291 (in Anglo-Latin), "flat framework for candles, hung over a coffin," from O.Fr. herce "long rake, harrow," from M.L. hercia, from L. hirpicem (nom. hirpex) "harrow," from Oscan hirpus "wolf," supposedly in allusion to its teeth. The Oscan word may be related to L. hirsutus "shaggy, bristly." So called because it resembled a harrow,

a large rake for breaking up soil. Sense extended to other temporary frameworks built over dead people, then to "vehicle for carrying a body," a sense first recorded 1650.

rehearse

c.1300, "to give an account of," from Anglo-Fr. *rehearser*, O.Fr. *rehercier* "to go over again, repeat," lit. "to rake over," from re- "again" + *hercier* "to rake, harrow" (see **hearse**). Meaning "to say over again" is from 1340; sense of "practice a play, part, etc." is from 1579. Rehearsal dinner first attested 1953.

Pull through soil, tilling until my mind could grasp rules for reading; perhaps etymological meanderings, spillage of this toil? Written word, how often do we muse, nowadays upon written words? In homage to thee do we stand? We remember through our rehearsals, and yet still stands *written word*, pouring off pages, as if written from you to me, from me to you. Reminiscent of us, like tunes, we hum; monkey's pilgrimages with tune and book. We carried word with us, in mind and body, sharing moments together, telling tales. This was another reading, as Freire wrote, of *world*. How lost was that worldly reading before reading word came to be, as common, as sun and rain? How profound is this recollection, centuries later, after written word rewrote world. Perhaps my entire relationship with you, dear reader, will be only and ever these written words. And here I could begin to share stories, weave wonder, my mind's activity, as that of heart to beat. Can such beat be recorded through an entire life? This engraving, this skill of dexterity, inconceivably thus altering, and simultaneously birthing, reading. And now, rules for reading.

What can apprentice-ship carry in this book-laden land? Orwell's brave, new world captured in newsreel by Lyotard's condition. Analyst and analysand, this tragic-comedic reminder Langan lectured upon all those years. Reading and writing, read and written word; schism *sin qua non*, to rehearse Bateson's description of left from right, read from write, syllogistic

sense". Written word rules! Actors know rules for reading, at their readings; preacher and conjugate play in written and read. Scholarship is defined such, constitutively, constitutively. From conception to deception, written world abounds, births and circumscribes (our) human lives, our human education. Alice's tale from down the duct has become so prophetic.

SYNTHESIS of *TOTUS*

synthesis: 1611, from L. *synthesis* "collection, set, composition (of a medication)," from Gk. *synthesis* "composition," from *syntithenai* "put together, combine," from *syn-* "together" + *tithenai* "put, place," from PIE base **dhe-* "to put, to do" (see **factitious**). *Synthetic* in the sense of "made artificially by chemical synthesis" is first recorded 1874. *Synthesizer* "electronic musical instrument" is attested from 1909.

total: (adj.) c.1386, from O.Fr. *total*, from M.L. *totalis* "entire, total" (as in *summa totalis* "sum total"), from L. *totus* "all, whole, entire," of unknown origin. The noun is 1557, from the adj.; the verb is 1716, from the noun; meaning "to destroy one's car" first recorded 1954. *Totality* is from 1598; in the eclipse sense, 1842. *Total war* is attested from 1937, in ref. to a concept developed in Germany.

You are here! Welcome to my grand synthesis, where you shall find answer(s)' answer! If you began to read elsewhere, then sorry; I mislead you prior, I was mistaken myself. If you read on currently, however, you will find what you have been looking for, assuredly.

Any conception of whole (or part) admits totalization. Yet it seems fallacious that total exists. Work such as theses, for example, aim to be exhaustive, that is complete (enough). However, such opuses are but selections (this emphatic of thesis defined); not selections

for/from total, or whole, but selections from available. This only refers to texts, not meaning; for meaning is of other sense likewise. While we pretend, fairly successfully, to drive towards totals of facts, we are overwhelmed (thus understood, and understand) by any proposition of totality of meaning. Lucidity, illumination, is but consciousness; and consciousness flows. It is neigh Platonic accommodation towards darkness' forms, nor Wittgenstein's wayward ladder; nor Newton's incantations, elucidated from apples fallen; let alone God's weaving or Nietzsche's blubbering over God's web.

Consider what may now be referred to as 'artifacts' of what you have just read. "What a random assortment!" you might say? I suggest that coherence is always tautologically conceived. Contemplate any notion of difference: odd, strange, other, bizarre, kooky, nutty, screwed up, fucked, kinky, and on anon. This entire archetype of terminology admits coherence through what Derrida has called difference/diference; severing through union, being and nothing-. Will forges sense, meaning coherence. Will you accept (what you read here, what you have read, will you accept)? And what of acceptance? In this plurality of *normal* oddity, we beg acceptance, as we begged god before, as we beg our selves now. Psychology is written word, Theology is written word, Sopia is written word; it is not what those good books tell, it is that they are engraved and engraving, ducted and (in)ducting. Yet I am washed over and through; cleansed by my own very nature! We seem to tout sunny days in much this same manner as we seem to rely on sight, over touch for example. It is not that anyone would deny touch as being as integral to humanness as sight, as I sit here writing, sighting written word! Insight or inspire? Could one make a choice? Sunny day over rainy day, summer over winter, or spring or fall, as if, equinox were signifier of epochal shift. These demands for affiliation with side persist. And when you are unable to take side,

you become: offside, outside, a fence sitter. And when you take sides, you become: decisive, political, one-sided, opinionated...educated.

8. Understanding/Standing Under Pre-fixes

Our language has become wrought with prefixes, these attempts to fix some 'thing' as if it were eternal ideal. Roots of words and our daily actions suffer this way of being. Education is but one example. These are littered everywhere we turn, we read, lurking in all our thoughts, these are all our deeds. I am not bringing this to bear as corrective; just as note on our state of being (our state of affairs produces such logical program). Our memories seem to allow for this practice; and thus practice becomes synonymous with purpose, as if! Like all of our surfacing, we have covered and re-covered our environments, our symbols. Recovery is *act de triumph*, as much as initial *covery* were, as much as in-vention is! We laud resolution as we attempt to solve and dissolve. This is perhaps why *confusion* is term of our times. We are confused individuals, in our melding and in our lack of clarity or want for; e-duced pro-ducts of our time. Roots are not prior to leaves, necessarily.

Projects: Archimedes Project, Perseus Project, and so on, but why projects, to project? *Jecting...* is this inroad towards *standing*? Such juxtaposition! Our mathematics suspend us, Sisyphean between points: Cartesian etchings on localized axes. Promethean, we return, and are returned to, daily. Our projects mark launch prior to launch. We cannot succeed at archeology, for we lie trapped in our own web of firsts and relevance of first. As if dusting off our surfaced relics to expose face were sufficient anchors to throw this game from. Projects but return us; Promethean, Sisyphean.

We predict to product our projections. We gain control via such prefixing. Postmodernism attempts to distinguish epoch from Modernism via prefix! And what of play and breath and water, shall these too be projected, landing in known fashion, strategic defense initiatives, pre-emptive strikes, guided-responses, communicative games and figurative figures? What is *figure's* figure? Or what does *figure* figure? What of Bateson's outline? Almost as if shape, ethos, had shape that both confirmed and conformed; differed and differed. We long to collect, together, to gather, our works; these proofs of our existence, these that stand out, stand for, understand, connecting us as us. This project does not gather as such. This is not a review of *a* collection, *a* gathering from diverse collections. There is no aim, goal.

Can you find flaw with this aim, curling round again, as eddies do? Oh course you can! You may say, "Whenever people declare that there is no this and that, that they are not doing this and that, I say, ok, I get it: you have rejected something, but what are you embracing now (in the act of rejection)? Rejections come out of something, and that something is a prior positing. If we are against X, then the implicit understanding (that one fails to or avoids to tell us) is that there is Y (or Z...)", or something to that effect. Yet your question(s) are steeped and robed in prefixes. Your rejection is precisely what we attempt to elicit and ripple from. And then (still, but, however, prefixed) I must, respond. It is that game, suddenly, as if it were not ever that game.

What is permanent returns to impermanence and then to permanence again and then to impermanent. Teleology, archeological in origin, is caught chasing tails and heads. Round and round we go, looking to the seasons as if these were to define, to those clocks that ticked our time (and now flashing it, no longer even needing that tick that we tick inside, as eternal flame). We catch glimpses of flow as we spin by, or we permit this feeling to re-pro-

duce. This writing, while written and thus archival, is fluid in nature. Thus ethos discussed shows shape, yet shape re: turns, coils, views. Movement is as part of solidity and solidity is part of movement. Those that teach/preach of *kineshetic* being, as if educed, prefixed and buoyancy thus welcome at that table for the Gods, re: store that stockpile. As if Parthenon, Good Book, were willing to welcome, convert new disciples/wash afresh those that wavered. There is not *answer*, unless you seek such. To act, to move, to flow of any description, this is what this pro-ject swirls.

This paper too shall fall and falter, as I fall and falter, and so too shall you. Ideas, archetypes, individuals, all are tales, told and cease. We have learned that we can tell tales after passing and that this 'passing' of knowledge outlives, survives, us. Where does this leave fatigue? Story splinters from story-teller; coped, poached, overheard. There is not fatigue in this flow. Banks may erode, as tales do alter, but this does not tire flow. Just as fountain cannot dry, flow flows. Lines are not drawn in flow. We schematize in yin yang, we talk about IT, as it, as if. We become anxious, about IT. Such simplicity of *wu wei*^s, as if teaching of such teaching were ignoring occurrence; as if no line existed, came to be, out of no line. Waters duct lines, just as water may be ducted by lines. This speaks not to line interpretation. Remember, lines are created by flow too! We often capture these in our man-made vessels. We love to receive, to be capable of grasping and taking hold. Our *techné* tells us, all tell this tale, these lines however, are often captured; concrescence of roots and prefixes cementing. Thus these lines are often held, against their will, against nature, against flow.

This work asks that you recognize flow, poetically so. And in so, that lines flow. We know movement of liquid and gas. Whether known through mechanical or natural means, is

another question. It is of flow we know. This flow is proved to us over and over again; in experiments without hypothesis, for there is no supposition. And what then of these lines?

80- Crossing *The Educational Line*:

Everywhere I turn, as I ferry, I notice lines. Some are quite straight and others are not; some have been created by me and others have not. I constantly ferry, from here to there, from day to night, from up to down and so on. When I speak in winter's cold, I see my breath expired and meander. Where does this breath go? As air hits you, your lungs, your being, inspired, what comes of this air? I can trace lines, measure them, pit them against one another, and for certain, I will have learned, but only understood. I will stand under these lines as such. I will thus begin collection to be stored and saved. Saved and checked, balanced every so often, my concepts will have been banked, vaulted. But you read here of other lines. Lines which cannot be contained such, enumerated such, accounted for and valued.

Get A Life: I have heard this expression and used this expression, 'Get a life'. Often I have sensed meaning of journey, search, acquisition and ultimately, happiness. I do not deny this. Aristotle knew this, early theologians knew this. Why deny what is shared by all? It is not that no straight lines make up my life, most certainly they do. I live in a house, a box of lines, and I visit linear institutions, speak in linear conversations. But this is not all that I do. I too flow. There are trails and traced that come in and out of me, over and under me. Some I induce, other I deduce or seduce. I am duct, channel, yet flowing simultaneously. I

cannot get a life, ever, and yet I can get a life. It is not paradox. Lines I draw and lines draw me. Some quantify, and others do not.

8- Evaluation of success: some rubrics and some brew

I personally use models to help me approach many aspects of my life. I cannot understand myself, or reality, without those tools, for they are as constitutive to any fabric of self as my flesh. Yet I also approach other aspects of my living in non-modal manners. Perhaps, fact is to body as metaphor (analogy) is to mind. Seconds are to body and thoughts are to mind. It is not that these are incommensurable, nor should they be severed. It is like asking 'why is tree tree?' Not why do we use word 'tree' for tree, nor what are characteristics that can be described for trees, not even when do trees end and other designations begin. Not where do trees come from and go, in lifecycle or in evolution. Just simply, 'why is tree tree?' Thought immeasurable, perhaps not understandable, in *educative* sense, just as words are not air spoken upon.

I begin this work with quote, request, again (not a gain) to entertain. And here I leave weight of time and place to you, dear reader, reading this, wherever that may be.

My (mind) body is (poem), subjecting (writing) acting self daily
My (body) mind is (poem), rejecting (reading) working self from time to time
My (bodymind) is (poem), ejecting (forgetting-forging) self

Knowing something/ knowing nothing. Simultaneously we know nothing and something; we know and not know. In this talk about being and not being, what catches on reeds over and over again is dichotomization of being. Even resituating to an upper concept, retains residue. Weight of paper money taking value of material is akin to weight of books taking

value of knowledge. Tonight (any night), my daughter and I were having a conversation, we talked on and on, back and forth, in utter and ultimate sense, at some moment she said, 'Wow, how did this conversation get here!! We began talking about one idea and ended with some other that seems so different.' I immediately recollected Bateson's Metalogues with his daughter on ethos/shape. He concludes with sentiment that all conversations (things) have outlines- shapes. We can glance at currents behind machines, at ripples left by wind in water, while never admitting to being so fluid. If you look for shape, you will surely find it. If shape is to be your dictate, then you will surely be saved. To float, to be fluid, is other wise.

Shedding Knowledge:
Ripped from distance, as time or place or...
As snake, too shedding skin
and wit
yet,
writhe on

Bibliography

- Adonro, T. (2005) *Minima Moralia: Reflections on a Damaged Life*. Verso: New York
- Arendt, H. (2000) *The Portable Hannah Arendt*. Ed. P. Baehr. Penguin Books: New York
- Ashbery, J. (1976) *Self Portrait in a Convex Mirror*. Penguin Books: New York
- Bateson, G. (1980) *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. Chandler Publishing Company: New York
- Bateson, G. (2002) *Mind and Nature: a necessary unity*. Hampton Press: New Jersey
- Blake, W. (1977) *The Portable Blake*. Ed. A. Kazin. Penguin Books: New York
- Buber, M. (1966) *Between Man and Man*. Collins Books: London
- Buber, M. (1996) *I and Thou*. Translated W. Kaufmann. Touchstone: New York
- Carver, R. (1989) *A New Path to the Waterfall*. Atlantic Monthly Press: New York
- Deleuze, G. (2001) *Pure Immanence*. Zone Books: New York
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1994) *What is Philosophy?* Columbia University Press: New York
- Derrida, J. (1978) *Writing and Difference*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL
- Eco, U. (1998) *Serendipities: Language and Lunacy*. Trans. W. Weaver. Harvest Books: New York
- Egan, K. (1997) *The Educated Mind*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL
- Felman, S. (1987) *Jacques Lacan and the Adventure of Insight: Psychoanalysis in Contemporary Culture*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA
- Foucault, M. (1995) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated Alan Sheridan. Vintage Books: New York
- Foucault, M. (1994) *Ethics*. Ed. P. Rabinow. The New Press: New York
- Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Pantheon Books: New York
- Foucault, M. (1990) *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction. Volume 1*. Vintage Books: New York
- Freud, S. (2002) *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Penguin Books: Toronto, ON, Canada
- Freud, S. (1965) *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*. W. W. Norton and Company: New York

- Gadamer, H.G. (2004) *Truth and Method*. Continuum Books: New York
- Haverlock, E.A. (1963) *Preface to Plato*. Belknap Press: Cambridge, MA
- Heidegger, M. (1977) *Basic Writings*. Ed. D.F. Krell. Harper and Row: San Francisco, CA
- Heidegger, M. (2003) "Letter on Humanism", *In From Modernism to Postmodernism*. Ed. L. Cahoon. Blackwell Publishing: London, UK
- Kant, I. (1956) *Critique of Practical Reason*. Trans. L.W. Beck. Bobbs-Merrill Company: New York
- Kant, I. (1963) *On History*. Bobbs-Merrill Company: New York
- Kaufmann, W. (1975) *Existentialism: From Dostoevsky to Sartre*. Meridian Books: New York
- Kohák, E. (1984) *The Embers and the Stars*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL
- Kuhn, T.S. (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL
- Levinas, E. (1996) *Basic Philosophic Writings*. Ed. A.T. Peperzak, A. Critchley and R. Bernasconi. Indiana University Press: Bloomington, IN
- MacIntyre, C.F. (2007) *French Symbolist Poetry*. University of California Press: Berkeley, CA
- Nancy, J.L. (2000) *Being Singular Plural*. Stanford University Press: Stanford, CA
- Nietzsche, F. (1969) *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for Everyone and No One*. Translated R.J. Hollingdale. Penguin Books: London
- Nietzsche, F. (1997) *Daybreak: Thoughts on the Prejudice of Morality*. Translated R.J. Hollingdale, Oxford University Press: Oxford
- Nietzsche, F. (1967) *Birth of Tragedy*. Vintage Books: New York
- Nietzsche, F. (2006) *Will to Power*. Barnes and Noble: New York
- Nietzsche, F. (1966) *Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future*. Translated W. Kaufmann. Vintage: New York
- Nietzsche, F. (1989) *Genealogy of Morals*. Vintage Books: New York
- Nietzsche, F. (1989) *Ecce Homo*. Vintage Books: New York
- Paine Not Bread (2000) *Introduction to the Introduction to Wang Wei*. Brick Books: London, ON, Canada
- Paz, O. (1971) *Configurations*. New Directions: New York

- Plato (1969) *The Last Days of Socrates*. Penguin Classics: New York
- Poe, E. A. (1968) *The Complete Poetry and Selected Criticism of Edgar Allan Poe*. Signet Classic: Toronto, Canada
- Ricoeur, P. (2007) *From Text to Action: Essays in Hermeneutics, II*. Northwestern University Press: Evanston, IL
- Rimbaud, A. (1976) *Complete Works*. Perennial Library: New York
- Santigao, C. (1998) *Home to Medicine Mountain*. Children's Book Press: San Francisco, CA
- Sartre, J.P. (1966) *Being and Nothingness*. Washington Square Press: New York
- Spencer, H. (1861). *Essays on Education and Kindred Subjects*.
- Spinoza, B. (1960). "The Ethics". In *The Rationalist*. Trans. R.H. M. Elwes. Dolphin Books: New York.
- Stein, G. (2008) *Tender Buttons*. Bookthug: Canada.
- Strand, M. (1978) *The Monument*. Ecco Press: New York
- Whitman, W. (1945). *The Portable Whitman*. Ed. M.Van Doren. Penguin Books Ltd.: New York, NY.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1980) *Culture and Value*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL latter

Endnotes

² This paper contains many references from etymological sources. Principally, I have used two, The Online Etymological Dictionary and Bartleby's Dictionary. Usage of these references is multiple. They act as guides, place marks, connectors, limits and erratics upon landscape of this project. They welcome readers to contemplate.

- This is my understanding of Heidegger's concept of *being and nothing* and what I wish to stress here as informative, as I know there are many conceptions and thus interpretations and information.

³ There is a text called Flow by Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi. This work has no interest in that work. I have nothing more to contribute to his conversation of comparison.

⁴ Reference to Kant and Heidegger, in passing, is but playful reminder of projects before. Such projects seem to (whether in scope or intention) duct thought, that is, shape and direct flow, without legitimizing flow as other. This reference, as with various in this work, does not comment on *the what* of these authors as much as sense of how projects establish ducted surfaces.

⁵ Mark Strand titles a tome of his poems such

⁶ Reflection in Existence: This being the foundational exercise of Philosophy

⁷ Foucault's Discipline and Punish is an excellent historical review of sounding devices and learning.

⁸ Whitman, W. (1945). [Song of Myself], Leaves of Grass. The Portable Whitman. Ed. M. Van Doren. Penguin Books Ltd.: New York, NY. Pg. 32

⁹ Quote is taken from the feedback received from my committee member Sean Blenkinsop.

- As above noted, this reference comes from Sean Blenkinsop's feedback which asked, "Is this just a coups you are gathering? Scalps for some reason?" To which I reply, "Reason? What is this reason you ask of? May I not gather scalps for my collection, alone?"

¹⁰ J.L. Nancy's text Singular Plural presents a proposed amelioration that aims for solution to the ancient dichotomized split of self/other and singularity/plurality. His project, while very interesting, illustrates how ducted we have become.

- Arrendt discusses this distinction in her text The Human Condition. For example, the massive is passive while the individual is active.

¹¹ I feel an urge to ask why *control* is admitted as a foundational concept? Just because control is possible, does not mean that it controls our actions.

- The reference to Plato's cave is well known from the Republic's book VII. Heidegger's dwelling places our existentialism of being-in-time, as situated. This comes from Basic Writings.

¹² Spencer refers to Hubert Spencer, the positivist Darwinian and Kafka to Franz Kafka, writer, with tales and tribulations of tunnels.

¹³ In M. Heidegger's Basic Writings there is an essay called Building, Dwelling and Thinking which discussed memory as such.

¹⁴ In J.L. Nancy's Singular Plural, he writes "[This is the] singular plural in such a way that the singularity of each is indissociable from its being-with-many and *because*, in general, a singularity is indissociable form a plurality." p.32.

¹⁵ From J.L. Nancy's Singular Plural. It is curious that in this reference, he begins by stating that what follows is fact, thus becoming tautological in its conception and trapped by its own attempt at unbinding.

¹⁶ Link: <http://www.elsewhere.org/pomo/>. The Postmodernism Generator was written by Andrew C. Bulhak using the Dada Engine, a system for generating random text from recursive grammars, and modified very slightly by Josh Larios (this version, anyway. There are others out there).

This installation of the Generator has delivered 4145512 essays since 25/Feb/2000 18:43:09 PST, when it became operational.

More detailed technical information may be found in Monash University Department of Computer Science Technical Report 96/264: "On the Simulation of Postmodernism and Mental Debility Using Recursive Transition Networks". An on-line copy is available from Monash University.

More generated texts are linked to from the sidebar to the right.

If you enjoy this, you might also enjoy reading about the Social Text Affair, where NYU Physics Professor Alan Sokal's brilliant(ly meaningless) hoax article was accepted by a cultural criticism publication.

° In P. Friere's Pedagogy of the Oppressed he discusses this concept.

- The variety of texts and theories referenced in this fashion, as flurry, reminds of fluid nature and behaviour otherwise than rational. The references mentioned, briefly, refer to: J.F. Lyotard's Post Modern Condition, G. Bateson's Mind and Nature, S. Felman's Adventure of Insight, G. Orwell's 1984 and A. Huxsley's Brave New World.

- Derrida's concept of *differance* accepts both difference and deference simultaneously, even though this theory attempts to distinguish them as separate. Being and nothing attempts to find one in the other, as if, as solution. Even Derrida's proposition becomes solution so soon.

‡ This references a paper by myself called Riverine. It was originally submitted to Dr. C. Bingham for a selective readings course on Hermeneutics and subsequently presented at the GSCOPE conference of 2007 in Burnaby, BC.

° Bateson's Outline is taken from the Metalogue: Why Do Things Have Outlines? In Steps To An Ecology of Mind. His comments around outlines are quite interesting to the discussion about education and ducting, and limitless flow.

* "Wu wei (simplified Chinese: 无为; traditional Chinese: 無爲; pinyin: wúwéi) is an important concept of Taoism (Daoism), that involves knowing when to act and when not to act." Wikipedia.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wu_wei