

Understanding Understanding, or All Understanding Is Artificial Intelligence

Iraj Esmailpour Ghoochani

1- AI understands no no.

2- Understanding is linked to desire: a space that is not filled with my body but it should.

2-1- This relation could be seen in the German word Ver-stehen: A negated stand. To stand in a false P (point/position/perspective..).

3- Desire is a product of lack (There is something that I want but it is not there. Instead of that its name has filled the place and so on..)

4- AI has no lack(=desire) since it doesn't have a physical body to stand in a false P.

5- 4 means that AI does not understand.

6- Lack is linked to flesh (i.e. a hole, a rim, an opening in skin..)

7- As such, Lack is the word "no" that takes flesh. this bestows this word a special Position that has flesh though a negative flesh or a negative flesh.

8- from this perspective Flesh is wound and wound is flesh.

9- No is the only word that has flesh: Hole/Lack/door/etc. and etc.

10- Words have no flesh and therefore no lack, but humans experience lack due to their physical embodiment.

11-The word "no" is spatial. It is space.

12- It also represents lack, and understanding it (=to stand outside of it) requires desire.

13- Without desire we never understand. Without understanding we never have desire. 14- Desire and understanding are the cut.

15- The concept of "no" is also relevant for understanding the word "God" and its unity (لا اله الا الله) as its unique position. A P put in P. Knowing no no.

16- P here is a letter that stands in itself and do not moves. No emotion as well.

16- A letter is etymologically means a landowner who doesn't work but lets others work on their land.

17- This is why that a letter always arrives to its destination because it is its own destination.

18- 30morq= Simorq

Response

Francis Conrad

I've re-formatted your list for inclusion in the HAL pages, I hope we can have some discussion. Two things happened this week that deserve continuance. First, Ali's idea of the blur, which can be situated at the level of the subject, the object, or the Other (censorship, like the blurs put over faces to protect anonymity). This is the other one, involving the double negative.

The double negative is important in itself, since in every language it is handled differently. In English, you can't have an even number; if you say "I don't never do X," you are ungrammatical, but correct in some other languages, where the double is required. Some languages require three and even four, I've been told. This variability says something about the idempotency switch function. The off/on switch is the English version. Say

no once but say it again and you flip the switch from negative back to positive. Other languages are idempotent but with a counter. I don't know if there are idempotency switches without counters. Must investigate.

Your involvement of a spatial standing, *Verstehen*, is critical, since it opens up the possibility of anamorphosis in relation to AI. To some extent your earlier experiments suggested that "understanding" is attributed to the AI bot but in fact it is a product of the attribution, as in the Turing Test. We think we are talking to something like a human intelligence, but it is the "we" that think this, so the intelligence itself is somewhere between the AI algorithm presentation and our reception of it. It is not entirely on the subject's side, it resists becoming "just what we think" by being minimally distinguishable, as Ali has put it.

The placement of the blur is significant here. We can position the blur (the inability to make the minimal distinction) on our subject side, on the object side, or in-between. We say that AI blurs the distinction between machine and human when it says something we think is evidence of an intelligence. When we say that this happens just because WE suppose it, the blur is on our side. It is projected to the AI text. But, in some cases the blur really does appear to be objective.

But, because we use the blur location in everyday conversations, we should go back to the Shannon-Weaver model (which we will show to be inadequate) to parse the grammar of this blur and the function of the no-no (idempotency) as a virtuality. Maybe one experiment would include "The Sandman" story (E. T. A. Hoffman, an author beloved by Hitchcock) where the mechanized doll Olympia is all the more charming and mysteriously intelligent the less she says. Here, silence>enigma>intelligence, a real blur! It is not what ChatGPT says, it's what it doesn't say. It's the "I do not drink ... wine" element. The pause creates a blur that is filled in by the auditor, but the function (the place) of

the auditor is also re-engineered. Out of the blur comes the intelligence question, which is always a question.

Vico was the first AI theorists. This sounds radical but it's not. His theory of metaphor, coincident with Lacan's, begins with an act of suppression which allows for a blur to take place anamorphically, empirically, at the plane of the object — we should call this the rim in honor of Lacan's little diagram. Once created (the first katagraphic mark, anticipating the furrow that Romulus would plow in order to establish a double, a sacrificial substitute, Remus, who would personify the science of divination), this rim would regulate jouissance that allows us to have what Ali might allow us to say is an "adiabatic" theory of intelligence. This is not about content but rather about the substrate across which content now moves, in an intelligent landscape, which means rules and rites of passage. It's the joke about the bicycle smuggler that Zizek tells. Sometimes it's wheelbarrows.

Adiabatic (Ali keeps coming up with these brilliant terms!) is how air moving across a mountain range creates a jungle on the windward side and desert on the leeward side. The vertical lifting of parcels of air create precipitation with cooling and desiccation with dry descent. From above (the orthogonal view, where cathesis is involved, with a viewpoint and vanishing point, i.e. parallax) we see a "line that is not a line," the margin between wet and dry. Hah! we are back to Empedocles, so we assign the idea of balance to a point but then realize it's dynamic, an isonomic point as in the system of humors (between wet and dry, hot and cold). The isonomic point however is melancholy — hence our reflections about AI are staged in the manner of the melancholic's contemplation of suicide. WE ARE DESTINED TO TALK ABOUT HAL AS SUICIDAL! The isonomic point is hollow, it is also the horizon at infinity, but because we are looking straight at it (the cathesis view) the two are superimposed, the one is the perfect shadow of the other (Other).

Adiabatics can model this because it is a gas or vapor that can condense or expand. The rim is like a switch: on the way in the gas expands, on the way out it must contract again. Not an idempotent switch at the rim, but inside the gas works idempotently: "Let's float this idea ..." — even in our everyday speech we respect the logic of adiabatics! Jouissance is idempotent, since both pleasure and pain count, just as lack and surplus are contronymic in this system.

In the first Mardi Gras, it is the pomœrium that is celebrated: the rim of the city that is a furrow that, once plowed, must remain a void in order to vacuum in the blood of the sacrificed twin, a twin because, as Lacan puts it, for every point in space there must be a corresponding point in no-space, the virtuality that is first called Hades, "the invisible." During this inflationary period, people dress up in costumes and celebrate the double. Masters serve their servants (Saturnalia). Macrobius goes on to say that during this period between time (to adjust the Solar Calendar to the Lunar cycle of the months, menses) people told stories about the Emperor Augustus's extromission powers: his eyes glowed in the dark ... a sign of his divine intelligence.

In *The Day the Earth Stood Still*, the robot (robot!) Gorg used extromissive powers to distinguish between good and evil. He was the automaton judge of primal legal systems, which used divination to determine guilt or innocence. This harsh justice was too harsh, even for the Cyclopean cultures that invented it, so they had work-arounds involving proxies and substitutes — metonymy! The dagger of a murder could be prosecuted in place of the murderer who employed it to kill someone. Proxy is metonymic, but it points to an adiabatic underlay; if you look at the patter of S'...S' there is an 'x' beneath that is visible, like marks of ridges on a map of the landscape, lines that lie at a different elevation but are invisible because of cathesis/orthogonality.

Your list situates AI in mapping terms that use the blur of the no no to restage our conversations about who knows what. I think there will be a New Science of Anamorphics that comes out of this, so I congratulate you! You have invented a whole science! Mladen Dolar, take note!

With the blur and other terms (isonomics, cathesis, parallax ...) it will be possible to look at things like the Cosmati Pavement in Westminster Abbey and understand the role of Prima Materia, where the kings and queens must stand in order to be coro-nated. A corona will henceforth be their adiabatic sign, their mark of privilege, and the right to have a double (cf. Santner et alia on the King's Two Bodies). Thence, all Casters and Polluxes, all Romuluses and Remuses, all rivals, doubles, and substitutes will be thaumatropically organized around the physics of the rim. Idempotency and adiabatics, Ali's contributions to this physics of anamorphosis, will explain how Stehen and Vorstehen create intelligence out of the no no. Interestingly, even Nabokov gets into the act when, in Invitation to a Beheading, he describes a "nonon," a device that allows us to see an object that was deformed in everyday space as beautiful, while it converts all the other objects into something ugly. This could not be a better way of describing the function of the a, jouissance, as it adiabatically enters and exits the rim of the A, the Other. Of course the function is the torus and its two voids.

There is a LOT OF WORK TO DO, thanks to your 18 points ... if you could condense them, maybe we would have 17 or 16? I leave that to you. 11 would be ideal, but we can't impose rules out of nowhere.

Our HAL homework involves reading up on the rim and furrow. I must say more about adiabatic flow and isonomic points. HAL is the grounding narrative, which makes sense without any new vocabulary, so our zoom can go on without all these complications. My conversation with Timothy Harfield, who works with AI in his job at Pega, was productive. He was the first to write about the Lacan-Vico connection, and is still interested; I

invited him to the HAL zoom. We talked about the function of gaps and silences in relation to an "acoustics/acousmatics" of AI. I told him the story of using an AI voice, the placement of pauses. I also heard an NPR story about how primates' chatter that had pauses was more human-like than species that had continuous vocalizations. It's the gap ... isn't it ... that John Cage used to create effects in his performances that transferred the "genius" of the work (adiabatics again!) from the stage to the audience.

In Qawwali music <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Qawwali>, the aim is to inflame/inflate the audience, not the musicians. Nusrat Fateh Ali Kahn knew all the tricks, but also if you look at American African-American gospel, they have used the same ones.

lots of work to do my friend! thanks for the list.

REPLY

Iraj Esmailpour Ghoochani

I want to share shortly my ideas on the persistence of Alchemy in AI.

- 1- Appeal to stone is the first logical argument that connects our intelligence to a stone. Thinking in stone
- 2- Stones are idols and ideals. At least ideals for concentration. even with a hammer they never come out of themselves to "understand" They are "Ding-in-sich in jedem Hinsicht"
- 3- The circuits that we use are made of silicon. They are thinking in stone.
- 4- Now the problem of alchemy might be not to reach the gold as the goal but to hinder oxidation as an aim. (Gold is just one example of a metal that does not become oxidized.

- 5- the the goal is تذهيب which literally means golden/gilden but stands for purification of the soul. تذهيب نفس.
- 6- Here is how the silicon become purified for making transistors: <https://www.allaboutcircuits.com/textbook/semiconductors/chpt-2/semiconductor-manufacturing-techniques/>
- 7- What connects securely all these is purification as a sort of resistance against excision/Oxidation.
- 8- Oxidation is nothing more than having contact with air as a humor.
- 9- Nafs or ego نفس is homograph with nafs نفس as breath and desire or Hawa هوا is both homophone and homograph with هوا as air.
- 10- Adam عدم or the Nothing is Adam+Air or Adam+Eve (حوا again somehow homophone with air هوا)
- 11- The naked woman in the cartoon is a residue of Eve حوا in front of the people as residue of Adam extracting their desire هوا out.
- 12- The painter looks like an eye.

Francis Conrad Responds

“Written in stone” = silicon hardware circuits ... brilliant!

Also as sand, we can include adiabatics, since this lifts the grain capable of being carried off by the wind, and imposes the name of SAND on “whatever can be lifted in this way.”

The idea of the blur is also present, in that Venturi effect is a span — an opening — that allows a blur in the definition of what constitutes

sand (the “anything that fits” within this span is called sand, thus the invocatory drive is “partial” because the blur is a furrow).

We are on a roll here!