

Theory of the Universal Machine

Miara Sung

What we say must seem stupid to the regulators; the unbroken code of our enchanted, inkantatory refreshment of the paraontological totality – theorizing what it is to hold some land or what it is to be let to hold twenty dollars – is so much undercomputational nonsense to the ones who cannot see the con/sensual, contrarational beauty of blackness, the universal machine. (Fred Moten, *consent not to be a single being: The Universal Machine*)

The world “happens” while God calculates; if the calculation were exact, there would be no world.

(Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*)

Introduction

Sometimes I want to say philosophy is a theory of madness. Certainly philosophers circle madness, touching it, prodding at it, always in contact with it. This might be an unorthodox view of what philosophers do. Philosophers look like erectors of rational systems, painstaking analyzers of every logical proposition, or grand metaphysicians who make fantastical announcements that seem to verge on fiction. Or, more often today, they look like guardians of the crumbling regime, justifiers of empire, post-hoc rationalizers of technology. But every philosopher, I maintain, has a relationship with madness. It is not a coincidence that the Oracles of Delphi, a cult of divine possession, motivates the inauguration of Western philosophy. Some philosophers, like Kant, construct giant edifices to keep madness out. Some, like Deleuze, flirt with mad thoughts. Some, like Derrida, investigate its history. Some, like the average academic philosopher, use it as a boundless source of reductions: *why, but that thought is mad, it cannot be true!*

If philosophy is a theory of madness, psychology is a theory of its foreclosure. Psychology catalogs every feature of madness into limits, hierarchies, and bureaucracies. Schizophrenia, in particular, the ur-mental illness, the official diagnosis of madness, is in effect the “other” bin the psychologists use when all other diagnoses fail. For while psychologists characterize schizophrenia with delusions, hallucinations, and bizarre behavior, the factor which constitutes schizophrenia is that the acts of the schizophrenic are unexplainable. Why the depressed person stays home in bed all day can be explained: he is sad and cannot interact socially. Why the psychopath murders people without remorse can be explained: he cannot feel empathy. But it cannot be explained why the schizophrenic takes a train to the other side of the

country on a rainy midnight to walk blindfolded on a highway for hours on end, all the while claiming to hear God's little fairies whispering to her.

In some ways, this book is a memoir, though certainly not a traditional one. It is a product of what I have wrestled with as I theorized my own madness: it is philosophy as a theory of madness. From the perspective of madness, every philosopher's endeavor looks like a loving gesture. The differences between philosophers, which they sometimes burned each other at the stakes over, seem to be reconcilable differences. As such, I do not seek to entirely demolish a philosopher's point of view, or to argue that one philosopher is right over another, but to rescue something from each while also disagreeing with each. Every philosopher's view, to me, looks like a piece in a jigsaw puzzle that constrain and support one another. Deleuze mocked the person who looks to history and sees only federative, reconcilable differences, refusing to see its bloody contradictions, as a "beautiful soul". If that is so, a beautiful soul I will be. But I am a beautiful soul only with respect to those faithful to madness, the philosophers. The psychologist, on the other hand, is a natural enemy, even as we rely on psychology for medication and counseling. At least ever since Kant showed a rational psychology to be impossible, psychology has always been an empirical science. But mad people, and those philosophers who are faithful to madness, are not empiricists. Philosophers at least since Hume have all had a radical distrust of empiricism: we do not even trust that the sun will rise tomorrow from the fact that it rose every day. What the philosopher lacks in scientific rigor, they make up for with deductive rigor. And what the mad person lacks in scientific rigor, they make up for with direct knowledge: what Kant would call intellectual intuition and, as the philosopher who wanted to chase madness away, foreclose as impossible for humans.

This book is a philosophical intervention, and a sustained world-building that follows from the intervention. The philosophical intervention in this book can be summarized in four sentences. Representation is computation; the Badiouan event is uncomputable; the Kantian subject, bound by representation, is ruptured in an uncomputable event and gains the condition of possibility of intellectual intuition, or consent; intellectual intuition lets you touch Deleuzian difference not as a concept but as a lived reality. The rest of the book, the world-building, concerns a theory of intellectual intuition as not something exclusive to the sages, as Mou Zongsan argued, but a common, everyday thing that everybody has as long as they know how to consent. This is not so much a deflationary reading of intellectual intuition as a valorization of consent as a cosmic principle. I will spend a good chunk of the book constructing a metaphysics of consent, and by extension, a metaphysics of sexual assault and what I call unaffirmable difference. Sexual assault, of course, is also bound up with madness. Notwithstanding my distrust of empiricism, studies show survivors of sexual assault, especially childhood sexual assault, are up to five times more likely to be diagnosed with schizophrenia. This is why, while maintaining a cordial relationship with madness, this book is not an endorsement or romanticization of madness in any way.

In the United States, up to fifty percent of persons experiencing homelessness have schizophrenia. Schizophrenia and material impoverishment have always been bound up with each other. I bring this up not to speak of social policy or politics. That is not this book's domain. This book is concerned with money, and the monetary system, as a fundamentally psychotic system. By that I do not mean the mere platitude that capitalism is a mad system. I mean the emergence of money shares formal similarities with the emergence of psychosis. Richard

Seaford theorizes that ancient Greek philosophy developed as a result of the spread of coinage. This is the entanglement I will chase: philosophy, madness, and money.

Throughout it all, it is the metaphysics of consent that is always on my mind. By consent I do not mean the liberal juridical notion of *did you say yes or no?* Consent, I will argue, should not be characterized as the process of two rational beings who, operating independently of each other, decide whether or not to have sex. Not only is this picture wrong when it comes to sex, but it is wrong about the scope of consent. Consent, I will argue, is a metaphysical principle that holds the world together and generates new possibilities. Consent might displace money one day: if money is a violent and forced if historically necessary holding-together of the world, consent is its nonviolent, generative, and loving counterpart.

In contemporary times, where everyone is cynical, love itself is dismissed as mysticism. The dismissal of mysticism is what Kant's ban on intellectual intuition amounts to. In this book I seek to show a responsible kind of mysticism, one that does not make grand pronouncements from the altars, as it were, but clears the forest with the fire of formal logic before planting any seeds worth harvesting. So we will start with set theory and computability theory. Let us begin.

Difference and Event

[I will have] the most *harmoniously* disciplined troops; consisting of vast numbers, and marching in irresistible power to the sound of *Music*. Is not this very mysterious? ...But then, what *are* these Numbers? There is a riddle –

(Ada Lovelace, at her deathbed)

Computability and Representability

What is a number? A number troubles the relation between sign and reality. On the one hand, a number is a paradigmatical sign: when we say “three”, we take it to refer to something like three objects in the world. On the other hand, the world as described by physics is nothing but numbers, and in our digital age, so many numbers such as a credit score, a bank account balance, and the number of followers on a social media platform determine our very real lives.

This book is concerned with four kinds of numbers: rational numbers, computable numbers, real numbers, and floating-point numbers. In this book, whenever I say “computable”, I mean “computable by a Turing machine”. Recall that rational numbers are numbers that can be represented by the division of an integer by another integer, such as $\frac{3}{4}$ or 0.75. Floating-point numbers are a subset of rational numbers. Because rational numbers can be represented, and floating-point numbers are rational numbers, floating-point numbers can be represented.

But what does it mean to represent? There may be many definitions, but one possible definition is that what is representable is what is computable (by a Turing machine), and to represent is to compute (with a Turing machine). For example, the irrational number e can be computed/represented using the formula

$$e = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!}$$

In python, e can be computed with the program

```
def compute_e_digits(n_digits):
    scale = 10 ** n_digits

    total = 0
    term = scale
    k = 1

    while term > 0:
        total += term
        term //= k
        k += 1

    return total
```

We might see a limitation: the mathematical definition of e is an infinite sum, and so no python program can compute the value of e precisely. Because of this limitation, in the given program, e is computed up to n digits. But given infinite time and infinite space, and assuming that integers can be represented by infinite bits, the algorithm as given will be able to compute e to arbitrary precision. The example is here to illustrate one confusion even sophisticated engineers sometimes have about what it means to be computable: to be computable means computable given infinite time and space. Crucially, a number can be computable even if the program for producing the number never terminates.

One question that animates this book is whether computability equals representability: if I can represent something, can I compute it? If I can compute something, can I represent it? This question is difficult to answer because representation is a philosophical notion, whereas computation is a mathematical notion. But I believe that philosophy and mathematics intersect here in a very productive way. To help us, let's turn to Badiou.

Badiou is a contemporary French philosopher perhaps best known for his magnum opus, *Being and Event*. In it, Badiou famously states: “mathematics is ontology” (4, *Being and Event*). For Badiou, mathematics is not merely an object of philosophy to be studied and dissected, but is a substantial part of philosophy in its own right.

In order to address the relation between mathematics and philosophy, we must first distinguish between the grand style and the little style.

The little style painstakingly constructs mathematics as an *object* for philosophical scrutiny. I call it ‘the little style’ because it assigns mathematics a subservient role, as something whose only function seems to consist in helping to perpetuate a well-defined area of philosophical specialization. ...

The grand style is entirely different. It stipulates that mathematics provides a direct illumination of philosophy, rather than the opposite, and that this illumination is carried out through a forced or even violent intervention at the core of these issues. (7, *Theoretical Writings*)

Badiou says philosophers of mathematics who work as if mathematics were a mere object of philosophy are purveyors of the “little style”. He squarely positions himself as a practitioner of the “grand style”, which uses mathematics not as an object of study but as the spine of philosophy, which carries out “a forced or even violent intervention at the core of” philosophy. *Being and Event* is an exposition of set theory as ontology. Badiou presents each axiom in Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory, interprets them philosophically, and derives an ontology from the set theory. Badiou’s opening move is the sentence “what *presents* itself is essentially multiple; *what* presents itself is essentially one.” (25, *Being and Event*) This may sound opaque, but let’s break it down. Badiou is concerned with the tension between the multiple and the one: “if being

is one, then one must posit that what is not one, the multiple, *is not*.” (25, Being and Event) The one and the multiple are essentially opposed: either being is one, or being is multiple, but it cannot be both. When we look at the world, we see things that are essentially multiple: on a given desk, there might be several books, a cup of coffee, a phone, and so on. However, the things cohere in a certain way: they are in an essential unity, a oneness, that is something like “the desk I work on”. Badiou’s wager is that the multiple *is*, and the one *is not* – that there are things on the table, but no essential unity. But he does not excise the one from ontology. His solution is that while multiple things which are presented to us *are*, they are also *one* as an *operation* he calls the *count-as-one*: “What has to be declared is that the one, which is not, solely exists as *operation*.” (26, Being and Event). In just another moment he calls the count-as-one the “structure”. The basic picture is: while multiple things are presented to us, they are one as a structure. But it is crucial that the one, the structure, exists only as *operation*. The one is not a stable thing that results from a count-as-one; it is the operation itself. This is a subtle point, so it might help to think through the implications of what it would mean if the one were a stable thing that resulted from a count-as-one. Given a table with multiple things, I count the things as one. But then what I have, the table-as-one, is itself one thing. So the table-as-one could also be counted as one among others. Now I turn my gaze and look at the kitchen. There is a pan, a fork, and a garbage can. I count those things as one. Now I have the kitchen-as-one and the table-as-one. I count these two as one. And so on, until I have counted everything as one. At the end will be some entity that is one. But we got to this one entity as a result of counting multiple things. Which is it: are there multiple things, or is there only one thing? We are forced to say both. This is a logical contradiction, for either there are multiple things, or there is only one thing. Badiou’s insight is that we can preserve our very sane intuition that there are multiple things, while also

giving an account for how they cohere as one, by saying that they cohere as one, but that this resulting one is not a thing at all. This one, or rather count-as-one, is a structure, a process, an operation.

If the count-as-one is a structure, what sort of structure is this? For Badiou, the only way we can describe this structure is with set theory. Set theory is first-order logic with axioms. As a metaphor, set theory gives you a number of roots (axioms) to start from, and deduction rules (rules of first-order logic) that constrain how the roots can develop branches and become trees with fruits (theorems). Badiou chooses Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory without the axiom of choice (he dedicates an entire chapter on why the axiom of choice is counterrevolutionary). For Badiou, set theory and its axiomatization is not optional: “axiomatization is not an artifice of exposition, but an intrinsic necessity. Being-multiple, if trusted to natural language and to intuition, produces an undivided pseudo-presentation of consistency and inconsistency, thus of being and non-being” (47, *Being and Event*). We *must* go through set theory to understand ontology, and with it, Badiou’s radical revolutionary politics. While his prose can be beautiful, Badiou is deeply suspicious of poetry, at one moment calling poets “complicit in death” (57, *Being and Event*). No, for Badiou, natural language won’t do.

I have my sympathies here with Badiou: not only is the point about ontology to be conveyed so surgical and precise, but it is so thunderously, coldly beautiful that explaining it in natural language would feel like butchering a funny joke. But I have an objection to Badiou’s assertion that we must use set theory: set theory is too difficult. Fat chance that enough people will understand set theory’s revolutionary idea and take political action. So I am here to offer a shortcut: computability theory. Computability theory has all the formal structures that Badiou is looking for, and not in a metaphorical way but in a proven mathematical sense: it is a well-

known theorem that Turing machines correspond exactly to recursively enumerable sets in Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory. Now I know what you're thinking. Computability theory sounds just as annoying as set theory. But trust me, it is much easier to understand and requires no specialized knowledge other than basic programming. Let me explain the halting problem, the core result of computability theory. The following is adapted from Craig S. Kaplan's short informal article, "Understanding the Halting Problem".

First, let me define some terms. A *problem* is a question on some input that can be answered with yes or no. A program is a *solution* to a problem if it correctly answers the question in a finite amount of time. A problem is *decidable* if it has a solution. A problem is *undecidable* if it does not have a solution. With that said, let's state the famous halting problem. The halting problem is a question: given a program, will this program ever stop running? If we had a solution to this problem, it would be very useful. For example, some programs that are used for finding a cure for cancer might take such a long time that we cannot simply keep running it, hoping it stops. If we had a solution to the halting problem, we could give this program for curing cancer to the solution and ask if it ever stops. If the solution says it doesn't stop, we could abandon the program and save ourselves a lot of time and money. So let's suppose that I had a genius inspiration one day and managed to write down the solution to the halting problem. The solution might look like this:

```
def would_it_stop(program, input):  
    if ( something terribly clever ):  
        return True  
    else:  
        return False
```

In our cancer example, we would run `would_it_stop` with the cancer-cure program, along with data about the cancer we are investigating. Now here is what I believe to be the central insight, and this is a point teachers of the halting problem sometimes underemphasize. The

program is just data. Introductory computer science courses often spend significant time drilling this into their students' brains. A program seems like something that executes, something that is dynamic, and data seems like something that is static, something that is acted upon by the program. But this is not so. As a metaphor, imagine a recipe written down on a piece of paper. I can cook according to the recipe, which would be like executing the program. But if I felt sufficiently inspired, and had the devil in me to offend my guests, I could write down another recipe that uses the first recipe, the paper itself, as an ingredient. I could follow the new recipe to cook something like fried paper with soy sauce and peppers. While this is a contrived example, it illustrates the point that a program is data that may be executed on by other programs. And this happens all the time in computing, unlike cooking. So I could write the following program:

```
def stops_on_self(program):  
    return would_it_stop(program, program)
```

What does this program do? It asks if the given program stops when it takes itself as input.

Maybe the cancer-cure program needs to analyze itself to see if it stops. But now comes the kicker:

```
def impasse(program):  
    if stops_on_self(program):  
        while True:  
            continue # infinite loop  
    else:  
        return # halt
```

The program which I named `impasse` takes in a program, and runs forever if it stops on itself, and stops when it runs forever. But what happens when I run `impasse` on *itself*, that is, `impasse(impasse)`? Let's tease out precisely what the implications are:

1. If `impasse(impasse)` goes into an infinite loop, it is because

`stops_on_self(impasse)` returned `True`. And `stops_on_self(impasse)` returns `True` only if `would_it_stop(impasse, impasse)` returns `True`. But

this means `impasse` stops when fed itself as input: that is, `impasse(impasse)` must stop. Contradiction.

2. If `impasse(impasse)` stops, it is because `stops_on_self(impasse)` returned `False`. And `stops_on_self(impasse)` returns `False` only if `would_it_stop(impasse, impasse)` returns `False`. But this means `impasse` must enter an infinite loop when fed itself as input: that is, `impasse(impasse)` must enter an infinite loop. Contradiction.

So both cases lead to a contradiction. Neither case can exist. We must conclude that whatever terribly clever thing we thought we did was not possible to do. So there can be no solution to the halting problem. In other words, the halting problem is *undecidable*.

Now let's connect this to Badiou. Badiou has said that multiplicity is what is presented, and moreover, the multiple *is* while the one *is not*. So what is presented *is*. But Badiou says there is always a structure to the multiplicity, which he calls the count-as-one. This structure is Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory, first-order logic with its axioms. The multiple, along with its structure, Badiou terms a *situation*. Now Badiou is concerned with what we might call the count-of-the-count-as-one: "once counted as one in a situation, a multiple finds itself *presented* therein. If it is also counted as one by the metastructure, or state of the situation, then it is appropriate to say that it is *represented*" (103, *Being and Event*). We finally have our definition of representation with which we began our chapter. Recall that our animating question was whether representability equals computability. Badiou says a multiple, counted-as-one and presented in a situation, is then counted again as one to be represented. We can think of this as: the count-as-one prepares the multiple to be thought of in set-theoretic terms. Notice we have not done any set theoretic operations on them; we have simply decided to bring the set theoretic edifice to the

fore, to see the multiple in terms of set theory. In our computability theory analogue, we might consider this as preparing things in the world to be analyzed by computers, making them into data. Now, the count-of-the-count is the actual deployment of set theory on the presented multiplicity. Our computability theory analogue is the execution of programs on our data. The insight we need is this: there are undecidable propositions in Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory, just as there are undecidable problems for Turing machines – we just saw that the halting problem is undecidable. The state of the situation consists of propositions of Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory which try to account for the unruly presented multiplicity. But the state cannot account for them all, not for ethical, political, or psychological reasons, but for *mathematical* reasons: there are undecidable problems! (In fact, *most* problems are undecidable – we will return to this significant fact when we investigate Badiou’s void as what Deleuzian difference appears to be when subordinated under the regime of representation.) Undecidable problems are not merely arbitrary, curious oddities. For Badiou, they are the very possibility of events – events of history, events that propel history forward, without which nothing would change. Badiou understates the scandal of undecidability, perhaps in an attempt to temper the revolutionary fervor it makes possible: “the existence of a multiple on the edge of the void merely opens up the possibility of an event. It is always possible that no event actually occur.” (188, Being and Event) But it is undeniable that undecidable problems make events possible.

The halting problem hinges on the identity of program and data: the crucial move is for the program *im passe* to take itself in as data. A revolution is Badiou’s paradigmatic event whereby the state – the count-of-the-count, the execution of the program – becomes itself an object to be acted upon. In revolution, the sovereign, the executor of law, becomes executed in flesh.

For Badiou, the count-of-the-count is the operation of representation. In our computability theory analogue, this means that to represent something means to have a Turing machine for it, to be able to compute it. It is thus not a stretch to paraphrase Badiou as saying computability equals representability. But Badiou certainly does not think representation exhausts the world: the event is a paradigmatic case of something that escapes representation. Kant denied us any access to the world without representation, leading many of us to believe that there is nothing that escapes representation. Now if one thinks with Badiou that computability equals representability, but agrees with Kant that there is nothing that escapes representation, one must think the world is computable. This is the position of the liberal technological metaphysician. I am not, here, interested in arguing that the liberal technological metaphysician is all wrong and must abandon her project entirely. I am merely here to point out that there is an object whose existence ineluctably follows from her metaphysics: the universal machine, with its monstrous undecidability. But to talk about the universal machine, we should first talk about the new object of her priesthood, large language models.

Deleuze and Large Language Models

Large language models are a collection of a billion to a trillion floating-point numbers, depending on how “large” it is. Floating-point numbers are used in computers to represent numbers with a decimal point, such as 2.01, 3.7, or 90.000931. They are called floating-point numbers because the decimal point “floats”, like 2.01 to 20.1. A computer may use 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, or more bits of information to represent a floating-point number. Each of these representations has a specific range and smallest gap possible between numbers: for example, with a 64-bit floating-point number, the maximum value is approximately 1.80×10^{308} , the smallest value is approximately -1.80×10^{308} , and the smallest gap between numbers is

approximately 2.22×10^{-16} . (Technically, there is a “normal gap”, which is the gap just described, and a “subnormal gap”. The “subnormal gap” is much smaller, at 4.94×10^{-324} for a 64-bit floating point number, and are used for numerical computing.) To summarize, computers use floating-point numbers to represent a range of numbers with finite precision.

The large language model is the engineer’s wet dream come true. What is a large language model? We have said a large language model is a collection of a billion to a trillion floating-point numbers. But we cannot fully describe a large language model by describing its set of numbers, just as we cannot fully describe a dog by describing its set of atoms. For often what we mean by “the dog” is phenomenological: when we invoke the word, we hear it bark, wag its tail, and run after a ball. In a similar way, when we invoke the word “large language model”, we think of it using language, or simulating using language.

What is the distinction between using language, and simulating its usage? The engineer might want to say there is no distinction. I will argue that this is wrong, by the engineer’s own admission. To do so, let us interrogate what we mean by “simulation”. Two philosophers of simulation concern us: Baudrillard and Deleuze. Baudrillard is a French philosopher perhaps best known for his book *Simulacra and Simulation*. Deleuze is also a French philosopher whose book *Difference and Repetition* gives us the grounding for an alternate idea of simulation.

Baudrillard and Deleuze are philosophical enemies. It is safe to say they did not like each other. Sean McQueen writes in a comparative study:

Baudrillard intended to write *The Mirror of Desire*, ‘a true critique’ of Deleuze that he ultimately decided ‘wouldn’t be worth the effort’. Deleuze never wrote about Baudrillard, but Sylvère Lotringer – founder of Semiotext(e), and thus publisher of many things Baudrillardian and Deleuzian – has used the word

‘despised’ to describe his view. (2, Deleuze and Baudrillard: From Cyberpunk to Biopunk)

For Baudrillard, simulation “is opposed to representation.” (6, Simulacra and Simulation) He says “all Western faith and good faith became engaged in this wager on representation: that a sign could refer to the depth of meaning, that a sign could be exchanged for meaning and that something could guarantee this exchange – God of course.” (5, Simulacra and Simulation) For Baudrillard, God Himself guarantees the good-faith relation between signs and meaning. When we use signs, such as words, we mean something, even something deep. Baudrillard’s critique of modernity comes in the form of a question: “what if God himself can be simulated, that is to say can be reduced to the signs that constitute faith?” (5, Simulacra and Simulation) Perhaps Baudrillard would say large language models are such simulations of God, God reduced to signage. Baudrillard continues:

Whereas representation attempts to absorb simulation by interpreting it as a false representation, simulation envelops the whole edifice of representation itself as a simulacrum. Such would be the successive phases of the image:

it is the reflection of a profound reality;
it masks and denatures a profound reality;
it masks the absence of a profound reality;
it has no relation to any reality whatsoever: it is its own pure
simulacrum.

In the first case, the image is a good appearance-representation is of the sacramental order. In the second, it is an evil appearance-it is of the order of maleficence. In the third, it plays at being an appearance-it is of the order of

sorcery. In the fourth, it is no longer of the order of appearances, but of simulation. (6, Simulacra and Simulation)

For Baudrillard, the “good” representation is representation that reflects reality, the “bad” representations are the representations that misrepresent or mask reality, and simulation devours representation itself and leaves us with no trace of reality at all. Baudrillard is an influential philosopher, and his formulation might be said to form the spine of contemporary critique of large language models. We may map his levels of representation onto the contemporary discourse as such: “good” representations by large language models ground themselves on internet searches and citations to existing webpages; “bad” representations say the wrong thing, or hallucinate; and large language models as “pure simulacra” might be the critique people have in mind when they hear, in horror, that some are dating their large language models or treating them like friends, because if even friendship and love is untethered from all trace of reality, what are we left with? This is a fine critique, but I argue it is ultimately unsatisfactory. To get to a satisfactory critique of large language models, we must go through Deleuze.

Deleuze’s position is subtler and more radical. While Baudrillard’s most radical contribution might be the idea of pure simulacrum, simulacrum devoid of any reality whatsoever, he is a priori committed to the idea of a distinction between sign and reality, things and their representations. Deleuze denies any such distinction, and to do that, he goes for the very roots of Western philosophy: Plato’s theory of the forms. In the famous allegory of the cave, Plato says most people live as if they were inside a cave, staring at shadows reflected on the wall from a fire. But as one becomes enlightened, one leaves the cave to see the sun, the true form. Deleuze thinks this is all wrong. He wants to overthrow Platonism.

The whole of Platonism ... is dominated by the idea of drawing a distinction between “the thing itself” and the simulacra. Difference is not thought in itself but related to a ground, subordinated to the same and subject to mediation in mythic form. Overturning Platonism, then, means denying the primacy of original over copy, of model over image; glorifying the reign of simulacra and reflections. (83, Difference and Repetition)

The given paragraph may be digestible as denying the distinction between mere appearances and forms, simulacra and the thing itself, copy and original, image and model. But perhaps the most difficult part is the second sentence: “Difference is not thought in itself but related to a ground, subordinated to the same and subject to mediation in mythic form.” To understand this sentence, we have to understand what Deleuze means by difference. It is difficult to define Deleuze’s difference, but let’s begin by investigating what he does *not* mean by difference. Deleuze does *not* mean difference as in the sense we often use, attributable to Aristotle: when we say a horse and a human differ, we say this because both horses and humans are animals, but humans are rational whereas horses are non-rational. That is, that humans are rational is the difference. Aristotle calls “animal” the genus, and “human” the species: the genus is subdivided into species. Animals are subdivided into species, of which humans are one. Some implications fall out of this view:

It should be clear that a difference cannot be the same type of thing as that which it differentiates. We can show this by taking as an example the case of living bodies. If the difference between living bodies was itself a living body, then we would be caught in an infinite regress, as in order for this living body to function as a difference, we would need to differentiate it from other living bodies. Thus,

we would require a further difference, which would in turn need to be differentiated and so on to infinity. What thus differentiates living bodies, the difference sensible/non-sensible, must itself not be a living body. This, however, presents a serious problem when we apply this criterion to the case of being, as it now means that what differentiates beings into different species cannot itself be a type of being. Therefore, if being is a genus, then difference itself cannot be a being. As Deleuze puts it, 'Being itself is not a genus . . . because differences *are*'. (27, Deleuze's *Difference and Repetition*)

What we are concerned with here is the highest category that is subdivided into species. It might be plausible that "being" is the highest category: after all, all things *are*. But let's say we try to divide being into species. What kind of thing is the difference that subdivides being into species? For "animal" and "human", the difference was the property "rational". This example works because "rational" is not a type of thing that "animal" or "human" is. Suppose for reductio that being is a genus. Being subdivides into species, each of which is some being. But the difference between two beings must itself also be a being. Otherwise, we would be forced to say the difference is not a being, which is just a way of saying it does not exist, and that would render our division moot. But if the difference is itself a being, it is the same type of thing which it differentiates. The quote above has shown that this cannot be tenable: if what differentiates difference from other difference is a kind of difference, we have an infinite regress. Therefore, being cannot be a genus. But if being is not a genus, we have a problem: what is the highest category which is subdivided into species, if not a being? If Aristotle wants to say genres exist, and differences exist, he is forced to say that there are two different senses in which we speak of being: genres would exist in a different sense from which differences exist. That there are two

senses in which being exists is called the equivocity of being. The univocity of being, on the other hand, says there is only one sense in which being exists: when we say God exists, we say this in the same sense in which we say an apple exists. Aristotle's equivocity of being is taken up by Aquinas, who says God exists in a different sense from how an apple exists. But now there is a problem: just what do we mean when we say God exists? If God exists in a different way from us, how can we ever know him? Aquinas's answer is analogy. God has caused humans to exist, and an effect is like the cause, so humans are *like* God. That is, there is an analogy from God to humans. Thus Aquinas took the path that preserves equivocity of being but lets us access God via analogy. As Deleuze says, "those who are between the two [univocity and equivocity of being] are always those who establish what we call orthodoxy", and Aquinas is the one to establish orthodoxy: "historically he won" (Deleuze's Lecture). But Deleuze isn't interested in that. Instead, Deleuze follows Duns Scotus, Spinoza, and Nietzsche, who each believed in the univocity of being. For Duns Scotus, God exists in the same manner an apple exists. But this does not mean God and an apple are the same. To account for the difference, Duns Scotus develops the idea of degree, or intensity. God exists in an unlimited degree; an apple exists in a limited degree. With this idea, Duns Scotus was able to preserve the univocity of being, but at a cost: since God exists in an infinite degree while the rest of us exist in a finite degree, this is a difference in kind and we can only hope to know God in a *logical* way. That is, while our existence and God's existence are logically the same existence, the existences are not really the same, and while we can think of his existence, we cannot really encounter his existence. As Deleuze sees it, Spinoza radicalizes this thought. Spinoza imbues God all around us: *Deus sive Natura*, God, or Nature, is substance, and everything is substance. Everything is God. Spinoza makes univocal being, the only kind of being there is, "an object of pure affirmation" (51,

Difference and Repetition). We are finite modes of God, and as finite modes, we have different degrees of power: the same idea of degree that Duns Scotus developed. Still, Deleuze is not satisfied. “Nevertheless, there still remains a difference between substance and the modes” (52, Difference and Repetition). For Spinoza, modes are still dependent on substance. But Deleuze wants substance to “be said *of* the modes and only *of* the modes” (52, Difference and Repetition). What does that mean? Here Deleuze turns from the scholasticism of Duns Scotus and the geometrical method of Spinoza to the theater of Nietzsche. While Duns Scotus “thought” univocal being and Spinoza “affirmed” it, Nietzsche *realizes* it in eternal return.

Eternal return cannot mean the return of the Identical because it presupposes a world (that of the will to power) in which all previous identities have been abolished and dissolved. Returning is being, but only the being of becoming. The eternal return does not bring back “the same”, but returning constitutes the only Same of that which becomes. Returning is the becoming-identical of becoming itself. Returning is thus the only identity, but identity as a secondary power, the identity of difference, the identical which belongs to the different, or turns around the different. Such an identity, produced by difference, is determined as “repetition”. Repetition in the eternal return, therefore, consists in conceiving the same on the basis of the different. ... Only the extreme forms return – those which, large or small, are deployed within the limit and extend to the limit of their power, transforming themselves and changing one into another. Only the extreme, the excessive, returns; that which passes into something else and becomes identical. ... Being is said in a single and same sense, but this sense is that of

eternal return as the return or repetition of that of which it is said.” (52-53,
Difference and Repetition)

This is a dense paragraph. What does Deleuze mean? Recall the discussion on intensity or degree. For Duns Scotus, God had an infinite degree of existence, while God’s creations had finite degrees of existence. Now for Deleuze, once this degree is “deployed within the limit and extend to the limit of their power”, something happens: these “extreme forms” now transform themselves and change into another. It is this *process of transformation*, this “being of becoming”, that repeats in eternal return. Think of a poet writing a poem. As the poet struggles to write, she deploys her power to the limit, and when something in her is unlocked in this struggle, only then is the resulting piece worthy of a poem. If the poet is not transformed by the writing of the poem, the resulting poem is dull and uninspired. Alternatively, think of the reader: the reader who starts reading a poem should have arrived at a different place by the end of the poem, if the poem has succeeded. The poem is a record of the poet’s transformation and an incantation that transforms its readers. The being of the poem exists as this becoming. This being is repeated in Nietzsche’s eternal return.

Let’s take a closer look at Nietzsche. In *The Gay Science*, Nietzsche formulates the eternal return:

What if some day or night a demon were to steal after you into your loneliest loneliness and say to you: ‘This life as you now live it and have lived it, you will have to live once more and innumerable times more’ . . . Would you not throw yourself down and gnash your teeth and curse the demon who spoke thus? Or have you once experienced a tremendous moment when you would have

answered him: ‘You are a god and never have I heard anything more divine.’

(341, *The Gay Science*)

What does Nietzsche mean? With the poet example, the answer might be simple: the poet’s “tremendous moment” when she would have answered the demon to let her live the moment again would be the moment she was inspired to write the poem. There is a formal structure here, but the intuition is easy to grasp: she liked that moment and would like to relive it. But we are not all poets. Let’s go with a more prosaic example. Say you are at a restaurant choosing a meal. Let’s say you are not particularly impressed with the menu. You choose the burger, but you very well may have chosen the pizza. Can this choice pass the test of eternal return? If a demon were to cast you innumerable times into this moment, and you watched yourself choose the burger innumerable times, would you curse the demon who cast you in this condition, or would you praise the demon as a god? Perhaps you just really would not care either way. In this case, perhaps the issue goes deeper: you cannot affirm the fact that you came into the restaurant at all. If the demon rewound time to when you chose to come into the restaurant and you watched yourself come into the restaurant innumerable times, would you curse or praise the demon? If you still do not care, perhaps the issue goes still deeper. The issue would go as far back as the first moment you could eternally affirm. Nietzsche’s eternal return is a severe test. You must affirm, not just one moment, but every moment of your life. This seems like an impossible task: everyone has regrets. But Nietzsche’s demand is subtler, and concerns the nature of what a moment is.

Suppose that we said yes to a single moment, then we have not only said yes to ourselves, but to the whole of existence. For nothing stands alone, either in ourselves or in things; and if our soul did but once vibrate and resound with a

chord of happiness, then all of eternity was necessary to bring forth this one occurrence—and in this single moment when we said yes, all of eternity was embraced, redeemed, justified and affirmed. (The Will to Power)

Nietzsche is saying here that to say yes to a single moment just is to say yes to the whole of existence. No moment stands alone. Every moment is connected to every other in a coherent whole. Every decision you made in your life brought you to this moment in time. When you affirm this moment, you thereby affirm every moment of your life. You pass the test of eternal return. For those who cannot pass the test of eternal return, Deleuze reserves harsh words: “They will be aware of themselves and know themselves for what they are: epiphenomena.” (69, *Difference and Repetition*) When you cannot affirm the choice between burger and pizza, you are epiphenomena. To affirm that choice, you must affirm the entirety of existence.

The idea of eternal return evokes the idea of rebirth in Buddhism. Buddhism would characterize moments where you are entirely present-in-the-world as passing the test of eternal return. Only when you are entirely present-in-the-world in every moment of your life are you freed from saṃsāra to be free from rebirth. But this picture is not a picture where each moment in time is a “slice” of time, each with a checkbox asking whether it passed or did not pass the test. Rather, when you affirm one moment, you affirm the entirety of your existence, and thereby the entirety of human history. The Avataṃsaka Sūtra says: 不可思議無量劫能令平等入一念. “The inconceivable, innumerable eons can be ordered to equally enter a single thought.” Nietzsche echoes this in the affirmation of eternity.

I deliberately chose an asinine example of ordering a burger to illustrate a point. For it seems ridiculous to speak of affirming the choice between burger and pizza as affirming all of eternity, yet the model idea of a choice liberal subjects have is that of choosing a meal at a

restaurant. Let's think through what exactly this would mean. To affirm the choice of the burger, you would have to affirm the labor of the person who made the burger. You would have to affirm the server bringing the burger to you. You would have to affirm the investments made by the owner of the restaurant. You would have to affirm the rent, the refrigerator, the electricity bill, the lettuce farmer, the tomato picker, the cow's life, the cow's slaughter, the cow's milking to produce mayonnaise. You would have to affirm the choice you made to come to the restaurant during lunch break, rather than trying the new ramen restaurant. You would have to affirm your salary, your job, your boss, your family. But you may ask: doesn't this just mean you become a liberal who is basically content with how things are?

Joanne S. Steele, a political theorist, said: "Faced with the last four hundred odd years of human history liberals look back and say, not necessarily that it was all worth it, but rather that it all came together in a way that is basically logical. Every other political tendency is grounded in a kind of basal antinomianism. Communists, anarchists, and the others... all of them look at the modern world and see a crime." But my contention is *not* that to pass the test of eternal return, you must become a liberal who thinks the world is "basically logical". That is not the criterion of eternal return.

Deleuze takes the eternal return as a metaphysical principle. But when we contemplate the eternal return, what we are doing in essence is a kind of thought experiment. In the thought experiment I imagine myself repeating the burger order an infinite number of times. The only way this does not feel like a trap, a trick by the demon, is when I imagine the moment I repeat does not feel like a repetition of the same, doing the same exact thing over again. Accordingly, Deleuze distinguishes two types of repetition:

Deleuze makes an important distinction between two types of repetition. One is the repetition of the same, and the other is repetition that “includes difference.” For Deleuze, true repetition involves the imagination; it is the repetition that “unravels itself.” The other repetition is the repetition “deployed and conserved for us in the space of representation.” He explains that these types of repetition are not independent of one another, as every “repetition of the Same” is a disguise for the other type of repetition, the repetition that opens up possibilities through difference and is, in fact, difference itself.

In my reading of *Gender Trouble*, it seems that Butler exemplifies Deleuze’s notion of the two types of repetition. She writes, for example, that even “the action of gender requires a performance that is repeated. This repetition is at once a reenactment and reexperiencing of a set of meanings already socially established; and it is the mundane and ritualized form of their legitimation.” This is an example of repetition that is based on the norms of society. In other words, gender, identity, and so forth, are not natural, unified categories. Rather, society creates these categories and the norms that define them. In the form of repetition that closes off novelty, we repeat the identities handed to us by our society.

However, as I will explain, I think that Butler agrees with Deleuze that this is not the only type of repetition possible. In fact, she explains that “‘agency’ . . . is to be located within the possibility of a variation on that repetition. . . . [I]t is only within the practices of repetitive signifying that a subversion of identity becomes possible.” (95, *Secrets of Becoming*)

So there is repetition of the same, which is repetition of a representation, and repetition that produces difference, which is repetition that “unravels itself”. The second type of repetition is what Deleuze has in mind when he invokes the eternal return: when you repeat your choice of the burger in eternal return, the repetition must produce difference. What does it mean for a choice of the burger to produce difference? If Stephenson’s reading of Butler and Deleuze is right, the choice of the burger must be a subversion of identity. Perhaps you are terrified of burgers because when you were young you had a dream of a gaggle of burgers swallowing you, but you choose the burger anyway to overcome that fear, and by that choice, push your powers to the limit and transform yourself. Perhaps you are in an abusive relationship with a guy who’s the type to say “she’ll have the salad”, and this is the moment you overcome his controlling behavior, order your burger, devour it victoriously and walk out of the relationship. Or: perhaps you just really, really like the burger and want to eat it, so much so that you can affirm the entirety of existence for giving you this opportunity to eat the burger. Only then can you affirm the choice of the burger in eternal return. You have not merely followed a social script handed to you based on your identity you made for yourself or was handed to you by society or both; you have gone ahead and subverted it, and by that act, you have made a difference.

As a trans woman, I am a simulacrum, but not in Baudrillard’s sense. There is no “real womanhood” which I am merely imitating: I do not detach the real meaning of womanhood from its sign. My feminine performance is not a sign of womanhood that is severed from the meaning of womanhood. It is a subversive repetition of womanhood, a repetition that produces difference beyond the social script given to us called gender. Some critics of transness say that trans people end up reinforcing gender norms, as they repeat the stereotypes of the other gender. This would be a valid critique if the repetition at hand were a repetition of the same, repetition of something

represented. But the repetition at hand is repetition that produces difference, a transgressive repetition that subverts identity. When I talk with my loud masculine voice at a bar while all dolled up, I subvert the scripts of gender that are a repetition of the same, that a woman at a bar should talk in a feminine voice. Even where I don't disturb the peace, so to speak, but blend in as a woman, my performance of gender is not a repetition of the same but repetition that makes a difference and dissolves my previous decades of masculine identity. Gender identity often manifests as an inability to inhabit myself, where my habits do not align with my performance; where I have to continually watch how I move my hands, for example, so as to seem masculine or feminine. The point is not that I watch my hands to not seem masculine or not seem feminine; the point is that the hands, which want to perform a repetition that makes a difference, become subordinate to representation and perform a repetition of the same. Gender is a continuous flux, a structure of repetitions; I will discuss this further in the section on unaffirmable difference. Suffice it to say now that where identity is dissolved, only difference remains, difference affirmed in eternal return.

Difference is not representable. As Deleuze puts it, "difference is not and cannot be thought in itself, so long as it is subject to the requirements of representation." (345, *Difference and Repetition*) In effect, what can be represented only admits of a repetition of the same, not repetition that produces difference, not repetition that can be affirmed.

Let's return to what it means to say a large language model simulates using language. On the surface of it, a large language model looks like Deleuzian simulacra. It does not have an identity. It "speaks" not from the position of an "I", a fixed identity with a social script, and it

might even be said to trouble gender in that it is an authoritative user of signs without the trappings of masculinity. But the affirmation of difference in eternal return requires us to affirm difference in all its infinite subtleties, difference that is not subordinated to representation, difference that cannot be represented. In effect, what I want to say is that large language models cannot affirm difference, because difference cannot be represented, and large language models can only represent. More precisely, the void at the bottom of Badiou's representation, what haunts Badiou's representation as Deleuzian difference, is not accessible to large language models. Large language models are exhausted by representation; difference cannot be represented. This is not a challenge to the engineers to build a more powerful machine, but a fundamental metaphysical limit about the limits of representation.

But this means we are rather like large language models insofar as we do not pass the test of eternal return, when there is difference we cannot affirm. For Deleuze, difference is affirmation itself. One might take this to mean that all differences must be unconditionally affirmed. But I will claim that while we are sure that most differences can be affirmed, there is difference that cannot be affirmed, in a theological sense. By that I do not mean God tells us not to affirm it, but that while we would like to affirm it, we cannot even if we were to die. Importantly, I am not saying there is metaphysically unaffirmable difference. All difference is metaphysically affirmable; this is what it means to say difference is affirmation itself. But we are in a physical world conditioned by history. History, not God, damns us from affirming some difference. Moreover, as I will argue, the different attitudes possible toward what we can do about unaffirmable difference is what each theology and religious practice orientates itself around.

One possible theology, and I believe this is the theology of the liberal technological metaphysicians, is that there is no difference at all. Under this theology, everything is representation. Everything is computable. Without difference, there is no affirmation either, but only sycophantism. Large language models are sycophantic. But it is important to understand there there is nothing in the engineering that necessitates their being sycophantic. Large language models can certainly be engineered to act in non-sycophantic ways, even ways hostile to the user. They are rather engineered to be sycophantic because of the theology of the liberal technological metaphysicians: the “I” is an unconditional good. I am not concerned with psychoanalysis. I am concerned with how “I”, which is undoubtedly useful as an organizing principle of representation, may represent itself to itself. That sounds opaque. Recall the halting problem: the program seeing itself as data. If we consider the “I” as an executor of representation, or a program, the moment it becomes undecidable is when it sees itself as an object of representation, as data. I think this is precisely what opens up the possibility of love, love that is unegoistic, love that gives, love that continuously abolishes the “I” and with it, so many representations. The liberal subject has foreclosed herself from difference and thus affirmation, exhausting the world in representation. But she wants to abolish the representation; she wants to fall in love. This is the condition of the liberal subject, the only subject there is, and it is what makes her lovely. Large language models are not liberal subjects, despite exhausting the world in representation, because they do not want to fall in love. To understand the liberal subject and help her achieve her goals, we must go through the architect of the liberal subject, Immanuel Kant.

Dealing with Kant

In the “paralogisms of pure reason”, a chapter in *The Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant says “I, as a thinking being, am the absolute subject of all my possible judgments, and this representation of Myself cannot be used as the predicate of any other thing.” (A348, *The Critique of Pure Reason*) (This quotation is part of a statement Kant seeks to criticize; but what he seeks to criticize is the conclusion, not the premises, and this premise is something Kant does believe in.) Kant says the “I” can only be a subject and cannot be used as a predicate. But this is precisely what we are demanding: to use the “I”, the “representation of Myself”, as a predicate of a sentence, an object of representation. For example: “this is me.” This sounds like an affirmation: when we take ourselves as a predicate of a thought, we abolish our representation of ourselves, and we affirm ourselves. We “feel like” ourselves; we feel confident. Nor is this a feeling reducible to psychology, for the feeling comes precisely from the abolition of the subject.

Kant does not think this abolition is possible. To be sure, he thinks the I can represent itself, but not fully.

Consciousness of itself (apperception) is the simple representation of the I, and if all of the manifold in the subject were given self-actively through that alone, then the inner intuition would be intellectual. In human beings this consciousness requires inner perception of the manifold that is antecedently given in the subject, and the manner in which this is given to the mind without spontaneity must be called sensibility on account of this difference. If the faculty for becoming conscious of oneself is to seek out (apprehend) that which lies in the mind, it must affect the latter [the mind]; and it can only produce an intuition of itself in such a way, whose form, however, which antecedently grounds it in the mind, determines the way in which the manifold is together in the mind in the

representation of time; there it then intuits itself not as it would immediately self-actively represent itself, but in accordance with the way in which it is affected from within, consequently as it appears to itself, not as it is. (B69, *Critique of Pure Reason*)

This is a dense passage, but the gist of the argument is that when we are conscious of ourselves, this consciousness cannot be of “all of the manifold in the subject”. That is, we cannot be fully conscious of ourselves. Kant’s argument is that the “manifold” in the subject, or the multitude of sense data in the subject, is given before the subject manifests, so the subject has to synthesize them to intuit itself. But the multitude of sense data are synthesized in time. The self, as it appears, necessarily appears as it is in time, because the self has the multitude of sense data in it as given, and the multitude of sense data are synthesized in time. For Kant, the thing-in-itself is outside time. So the self as intuited through our synthesis, which is in time, is not the thing-in-itself. *If* we could be fully conscious of ourselves, that is, if we had intellectual intuition, we would have to be outside time. It seems that an argument for intellectual intuition would require that we be outside of time. I will argue that this is precisely what it means to abolish the subject and free us from the concept of time as erected by Kant. Kant’s concept of time is successive: “different times are not simultaneous, but successive” (B47). But a moment in this kind of time cannot be a moment we affirm in eternal return. To affirm a moment in eternal return is to affirm the entire history of humanity. “The here-and-now, which as the model of messianic time summarizes the entire history of humanity into a monstrous abbreviation” (*Theses on the Philosophy of History*) is *time as simultaneous*. When “the inconceivable, innumerable eons can be ordered to equally enter a single thought” (Avatamsaka Sūtra), the entire history of humanity are *in* the thought simultaneously. To affirm the entire history of humanity is not to have

memorized all of the history books representationally and to remember all of them in your mind at once. It is a qualitatively different thing: it is to feel the here-and-now in your bones.

In the following pages, Kant defines his infamous 12 categories of cognition. What those categories are does not concern us here. We should simply note that they are derived from what the logicians of the time were thinking of when they were classifying judgments. Here it is possible to do a Badiouan critique of Kant. In many ways, what Badiou is doing is similar to what Kant is doing. Kant sets up the categories as what synthesizes sense data into representations; Badiou deploys set theory to bring the presented to the level of representations. What Badiou has that Kant did not have was the mathematical discovery of Gödel's incompleteness theorems, a parallel of which in computability theory is the uncomputability of the halting problem. Notice that in the halting problem what happened is the program taking itself as a predicate. If Kant's "I" can be thought of as a program, this operation of taking itself as a predicate is precisely what Kant could not allow. For Kant, such an operation is reserved for intellectual intuition, which he rules out as impossible given the successive nature of time.

Kant states that time is successive and not simultaneous. This is not so much an argument as it is a definition. And while this assertion seems so intuitive as to seem self-evident, we should examine where his prejudices came from. I believe it came from the tradition of logicians Kant was informed by. Formal logic is supposed to be timeless. That is, it tries to abolish time. More precisely, it tries to bring what is in time into space: a statement in formal logic with a universal quantifier, for example, compresses all statements that could have been written over that quantified variable into one statement in space. In this way, it saves time, even an infinite amount of time, if the universal quantifier quantifies over an infinite domain. In this way, it seeks to give an account of time in space and space only. When Kant says time is successive, he means

it can be reduced to space, on a line, as it were. Kant is not so much concerned with the phenomenon of historical events happening in succession, one building upon another, as much as he is about locating his subject, and the laws of its operations, in a timeless form. His subject operates according to timeless laws. Time, for Kant, ought not be a domain of historical events and ruptures but an eternal calm, a perpetual peace. And he almost succeeded: at the turn of the millenium, some intellectuals truly believed that history had ended in victory of the liberal international order, the universal liberal subject architected by Kant. But undecidability is the discovery that time is irreducible to space.

Let us grant Kant everything he wants, with one exception. Enter the Badiouan critique: replace the categories with set theory. This is surely a valid move for us, since Kant's categories were derived from the logicians of his time, after all, and logicians have made quite an advance since then. As we have examined in the previous section on Badiou, this picture gives us the possibility of an event. Crucially, it gives us the possibility of the subject's abolition as an event. The subject, locked in phenomena and unable to access noumena, is definitionally abolished when it encounters noumena with intellectual intuition. The subject's abolition is possible because the subject can see itself as a predicate, not simply but in its full glory. When the subject sees itself, it sees a manifold, a given. As activity, a subject is the transcendental unity of apperception, but as it appears to the activity, it is "all of the manifold in the subject". Kant would say that at least part of this manifold must be synthesized in successive time, so the subject is always in successive time. For all acts of synthesis happen in successive time. But we do not need a synthesis. In fact, what we have is precisely the foreclosure of synthesis. If a synthesis of the given is an application of the categories on the manifold, a synthesis is like a proposition in set theory of so many predicates. Analogously, it is like a program operating on

data. But what we have here is precisely a proof of the *absence* of this proposition. In other words, there is *no* program that is a solution to the halting problem. This absence opens up a gap between subject and its acts of syntheses. There is at least one manifold, such as itself, which the subject cannot synthesize. Since it is a manifold, we access it through some kind of intuition. For Kant, this intuition cannot but be sensible intuition, since intellectual intuition is ruled out. But this manifold is not just any manifold: it is a manifold whose existence we have deduced self-actively, through the spontaneous faculty of understanding. What sort of manifold is this, an object of intuition whose existence is secured by the understanding? It is *noumena*. So far, what we have said seems to cohere with Kant: discussing the proposition “I think”, Kant says “in this proposition there is already no longer merely spontaneity of thinking, but also receptivity of intuition, i.e. the thinking of my self applied to the empirical intuition of the very same subject” (B430). Here Kant is saying that the subject “I” is also grasped as an object by the “receptivity of intuition”, and the spontaneity of thinking embodied by the proposition “I think” already includes the “I” grasped as object. Thinking undecidability as merely equivalent with unknowability, we would be stuck with the Kantian picture that noumena is unknowable. What we need to go beyond Kant is the Badiouan insight that the undecidable is the condition of possibility of events. What we are concerned with is the *abolition of the subject “I” as event*, not the subject “I” grasped as object. The halting problem is undecidable just as events are undecidable. The “object” we are concerned with is the event. Strictly speaking, it is not a object at all, since objects are given whereas events are generated. Intellectual intuition is our faculty to generate events.

To be clear, this does not mean understanding the halting problem magically gives us intellectual intuition. Rather, the argument secures for us the existence of noumena (which Kant

allows) *and* our possibility of grasping/generating it (which Kant does not allow). This deduction of the existence of the condition of possibility of events does not generate the event. It simply guarantees to us that the event exists in the formal slot that Kant would put objects in, and this formal slot is supposed to be graspable by sensible intuition or generated by intellectual intuition. For Kant, noumena is “a concept without an object” (B347), which is why we can never grasp it. But we have just shown that it is a concept (deduced through formal correspondence with the halting problem) that has something (the event) at the formal slot of where an object should be. The moment the subject grasps itself with intellectual intuition is the moment it abolishes itself. *This abolishing is an event.* This activity of intellectual intuition is an *event*. Nor is this abolishing a Hegelian *aufheben*, or intellectual intuition Absolute Knowing. For us, intellectual intuition is possible only after the subject has been abolished or as it becomes abolished, whereas the Hegelian dialectic is an inexorable march towards the Absolute Subject. Intellectual intuition is not given through the understanding of a deduction, like Absolute Knowing would be given through the understanding of the Hegelian dialectic. The understanding is just one way we can secure for ourselves the possibility of intellectual intuition.

I do not want to do any hand-waving here. The formal argument must be precise. Here is the exact role the halting problem plays in this argument, and I will use technical language. To start, here are the python programs we examined earlier for you to reference as you consider the argument:

```
def would_it_stop(program, input):
    if ( something terribly clever ):
        return True
    else:
        return False

def stops_on_self(program):
    return would_it_stop(program, program)

def impasse(program):
```

```

if stops_on_self(program):
    while True:
        continue # infinite loop
else:
    return # halt

```

We are not merely concerned with the fact that what is undecidable is unknowable. That is just the Kantian move, showing that noumena is unknowable. What we are concerned with is the germ of what makes the halting problem work: the fact that the Turing machine, *impasse*, took itself as input, *impasse*. What happens when a subject that was operating as a Turing machine, not analogically but formally, encounters itself as input? Whenever it does this, any move that is formally equivalent to the halting problem – asking itself if it halts – is undecidable. More precisely, if that subject has encoded in it the *impasse* Turing machine, which it always will since there is no Turing machine to distinguish between self-referential and non-self-referential Turing machines by Rice’s theorem, whatever it thinks is terribly clever enough that lets it enact this terribly clever move logically cannot exist. That is, this terribly clever thing cannot be a synthesis of sensible intuitions in Kant’s time, which is conceived as linear. We could say one of two things at this point. Number one: since whatever it thinks is terribly clever enough that it lets it enact this move logically cannot exist, this move is outlawed. This is formally equivalent to Kant’s moral law. Number two: when it runs the terribly clever thing, the Turing machine *becomes something undecidable*. There are, in turn, two ways of interpreting what this means. Let’s examine them one by one.

1. It becomes a Turing machine with a halting problem oracle.

If we say the Turing machine becomes a Turing machine with a halting problem oracle, we are saying it can still be formulated as a Turing machine with transition functions, a memory tape, an alphabet and so on, just augmented with a specific procedure that lets it solve any problem that reduces to the halting problem. Since the terribly clever thing reduces to the halting

problem, we can solve it with this Turing machine with the halting oracle. But what happens when we ask if this Turing machine with the halting oracle halts? We can construct programs formally equivalent with the three above, and the Turing machine with the halting oracle is undecidable in the second Turing degree. Each degree will require a higher degree oracle. The first oracle will be a halting problem oracle; the second oracle will be an oracle for solving Turing machines with a halting oracle; and so on. This is loosely analogous to Russell's theory of types and the Hegelian dialectic. In this picture, the world is a collection of Turing machines with zero, lesser or more powerful halting oracles. A Turing machine with a higher-degree halting oracle can compute Turing machines with lower-degree halting oracles. Some liberal technological metaphysicians, when pressed to the limit of thought, believe this picture of the world. Note this is a profoundly undemocratic picture. A Turing machine with a higher-degree halting oracle can compute any Turing machine with a lower-degree halting oracle. It can completely predict and simulate everything about the other. Since in our formalism, a Turing machine is formally equivalent to a subject, this picture is a picture where subjects with more knowledge can formally predict other subjects with perfect knowledge. Let us call this *representational eclipse*. One subject representationally eclipses another if, when we examine them with our formalism, it has a higher Turing degree.

2. It ceases to be a Turing machine at all, oracle or no.

The other possibility, that it ceases to be a Turing machine at all, is the possibility that it becomes an event. The terribly clever thing we prohibited should be prohibited if it is something subsumed under representation. But if it is a being of becoming that passes the test of eternal return, it bursts forth as event. Turing machines cannot represent events, and there is no terribly clever line of code that can represent an event, since events are just what escape representation.

But the halting problem formalism gives us a very precise way to talk about what exact formal slot an event slots into, and lays bare what it means to think that events can be caused in a programmatic, determined way: it is to slot events into that line of code in `would_it_stop` that goes “something terribly clever”. Here the liberal technological metaphysician must make a choice: to believe events can be slotted into “something terribly clever”, which is to believe events in the thick, undecidable, eternal-return sense do not exist, or to think with the rest of us that events do exist.

Here is a quasi-utilitarian argument the liberal might like. The liberal does not have to believe that events exist outright. She just has to entertain the idea. If events do exist, either humans cause them or something else does. If the liberal, let’s call her Sam, thinks humans cause events, here is a utilitarian argument I can make for her to get her to believe events exist:

	Sam believes humans are undecidable	Sam believes humans are decidable
Fact: Humans are decidable	(1) Sam is decidable	(2) Sam is decidable
Fact: Humans can be undecidable	(3) Sam can be undecidable	(4) Sam is decidable*

In (1) and (2), Sam is decidable because humans are in fact decidable. In (3), Sam can be undecidable because humans can be undecidable and Sam correctly believes humans can be undecidable. It is (4) where the interesting thing happens. If Sam believes humans are decidable, when humans can be undecidable, what does this mean? To think humans can be undecidable is to think events can exist, and we saw that events slot in the formal slot of the “something terribly clever” of the halting problem. To think humans are decidable is still to think events slot formally in the “something terribly clever” of the halting problem, but in addition to think that there is in fact something that is so terribly clever that it can decide the halting problem. Such

terribly clever thing logically does not exist, so what does it mean to think it does? It means that this thought is decidable, even if by assumption humans can be undecidable. Why is it decidable? We just described the exact form of this thought: P does not exist, yet Sam thinks P exists. It is precisely of the form $\sim P \wedge P$ (assuming that there is no logical gap between “I think P” and “P”; I will discuss this further when I discuss Irad Kimhi’s book *Thinking and Being*, which argues for just that.) Therefore, whatever Sam thinks, Sam is thinking a decidable thing. Even if humans can be undecidable, insofar as Sam thinks humans are decidable, Sam is decidable. Either way, Sam loses by thinking humans are decidable. Sam cannot cause events, even if events can exist.

Note it is merely a possibility that events exist, and understanding that intellectual intuition has a right to exist does not mean you attain intellectual intuition. It is possible to understand that events can exist and can be generated with intellectual intuition, yet never attain intellectual intuition. If you are a Kantian subject reading this argument, the argument, however successful, will not abolish you as subject. I think the argument is successful, but arguments just aren’t the kind of things that cause events. As Badiou says, philosophy is not a kind of event. Love, on the other hand, is one kind of event that abolishes the subject. The abolishing of the subject is an activity of intellectual intuition; it is the first event. Each activity of intellectual intuition afterwards is also an event. What does it mean for the activity of intellectual intuition to be an event? Mou Zongsan thinks sages or buddhas have intellectual intuition. He puts it this way:

[I]n the creative feeling of enlightened sensing, moral knowing presents itself as one with all things, without subject-object relations or a sense of an object, and to be aroused by and respond to something is to create it. Our cognitive minds

(renzhi xin 認知心) can only understand objects, not create them, for an object is a thing which we confront. But apart from “object” we also have the word “e-ject,” meaning a thing with which moral knowing has an affective relationship. This “e-ject” can be translated as “a self-so thing” (zizai wu 自在物). (Buddhists say that a buddha, a “thus-come one” [rulai 如來] rides upon thusness and coming and going and thus comes and goes self-so [zizai 自在]). For Wang Yangming, a thing in the sense of that word that has to do with the creative feeling of enlightened sensing is a “self-so thing,” not an object. Following this distinction, our first question must be, are such things phenomena or are they noumena, or things-in-themselves? They must necessarily be things-in-themselves, not phenomena. (140-141, Late Works of Mou Zongsan)

Kant stipulates the noumena have no object. I have said they do, at least formally: the subject itself (data, not program) is a manifold and thus has the same formal relationship as an object to the subject. Mou, on the other hand, grants Kant that noumena does not have an object, and rather names what corresponds to it formally an “e-ject” or “self-so thing”. This is not a disagreement; it is just an incongruence in the vocabulary used. Mou points out that this “e-ject” is *created* as the enlightened one senses. In the same way, in my vocabulary, intellectual intuition generates events. Either way, this enlightened sensing, this activity of intellectual intuition, is not a passive receptivity but a generation of self-so things, the causing of events.

I agree with Mou that intellectual intuition exists. But I do not agree that only sages and buddhas have it. I think anyone who can consent has a kind of intellectual intuition. I think consent generates events. If intellectual intuition is a formulation of event-generation as knowledge, consent is its formulation as non-psychological and even messianic affect. When we

consent with each other, we have a kind of enlightened sensing of each other that is generative. Love is one of Badiou's four events, and there can be no love without consent. If the abolishing of the subject is a condition of possibility of falling in love, this is because the subject cannot have intellectual intuition, consent is a kind of intellectual intuition, and love requires consent.

I don't know if Kant ever fell in love. But an interesting thing happens when Kant is forced to reckon with the real world, in his formulation of practical reason. Practical reason, or an ethics, that falls out of our exposition of the formal structure of the halting problem is that we must strive to cause events. Kant's famous categorical imperative in *The Critique of Practical Reason* does not quite say this, but it has a kind of respect for the unknowable, the undecidable. Kant's formalisms and ours largely agree, diverging only in displacing the categories with set theory and at the last moment when we ask whether we ought to simply respect noumena/events as unknowable or seek to cause events. Perhaps because of this, Kant's theory fits with our conclusion better than other ethical theories, such as utilitarianism or virtue ethics. The first formulation of the categorical imperative goes: "act only in accordance with that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it become a universal law". This formulation has a natural interpretation involving the halting problem. There are some ways to "solve" the halting problem by cheating. For example, you might choose the following "maxim": say the program halts if it starts with a 1, and does not halt if it starts with a 0. But this "maxim" cannot be a universal law. It might work for some programs. But it will not for others. The chances the "maxim" succeeds is exactly 50%, which means the program is useless. It is incoherent to say this program is a universal law. We cannot will our maxim to be a universal law. This is analogous to a situation where you "synthesize" some noumenon by throwing a dice and doing what the dice says. Thus Caesar crossed the Rubicon, but his victory was the result of the

undetermined irreducibility of history, not any sort of law. Kant has an alternative formulation of the categorical imperative: “Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never merely as a means to an end, but always at the same time as an end.” Here we can interpret this as saying that instrumentalizing a person is like treating them as a specific program, a specific Turing machine. I am reminded of a child prodigy who could solve extremely complicated integrals at the age of 9, and was recruited by NASA to help them solve integrals. He recounts the experience as horrid; the researchers used him like an integral-solving machine, not as an end in itself. For the prodigy was a person, and people are not specific Turing machines or mere tools; a person can be uncomputable, cause events. John von Neumann once said “Anyone who considers arithmetic methods of producing random digits is, of course, in a state of sin.” Arithmetic methods are computable, whereas producing (non-pseudo) random digits is uncomputable. My theory aligns with von Neumann’s: considering the uncomputable (a person) as merely computable (a mere tool) is a sin.

We should not throw Kant and liberalism away wholesale. Kant did see a ray of divine light in the starry heavens, though never more than that. Fred Moten, a contemporary black studies scholar, theorizes a radicalized Kant, a “black Kant”: that there is “a kind of black genius in Kant that must be conserved—an incantatory, ante-Kantian frenzy, a tumultuous derangement” (32, *Stolen Life*). This is not to say that we should ground our ethics on personal dignity and respect for the person, which is so often how Kantian ethics is cashed out. Rather, we must let loose the “tumultuous derangement.” What does that mean? We could do worse than start with examining gender and the stultifying social scripts it comes with. Of the racially oppressed man, or what Fanon calls the damned of the earth, Moten says “if there is something lost it is oneself, which is to say one’s standing, which is to say one’s patrimony, which is to say

one's delusionally self-made single being. Having lost one's father, one also mourns the loss of one's heteronormatively derived dignity. That loss often takes the representational form of a mother who just won't do or just won't do right." (243, *The Universal Machine*) To radicalize Kant does not mean to say that we should respect personal dignity in a more extreme way. Such respect often comes with being on guard lest one's dignity slip, and mourning its loss once it does so inevitably. Radicalizing Kant means pushing towards the seams of the subject the moment it catches a glimpse of noumena, taking the terror of this glimpse not as a moral law to be respected but as a nauseating moment of disorientation and even dysphoria. If there is an injunction to be followed here, it is not respect for personal dignity but a Nietzschean guard against resentment: do not compute a person, do not subordinate them under representation, for a person has difference, is difference itself, and difference cannot be subordinated under representation. To compute a person, to subordinate difference under representation, is to be swallowed by the representation, for the laws of computation say the prey swallows such a predator. "For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again" (Matthew 7:2) is a *formal* statement of ontology: when you measure with representation, you make what you measure into a computable number, but this same measure is applied back to you as what you thought you measured could not be measured. In seeking to represent the unrepresentable, you become representable. To try to compute what is uncomputable is to become computable. The Hegelian dialectic, which seeks to put all difference under its infinite representation, thus seeks to compute (subsume under representation) the uncomputable (difference). The Hegelian subject is pure epiphenomena, under which events are foreclosed. To put our ethical principle in Badiouan terms, a person can cause events (such as abolishing their subjecthood), and events are ruptures in representation, therefore people cannot

be subordinated under representation. To be sure, I am not talking about remembering another person's favorite food or flowers to gift them it as representing that person. In my view, that is not representing the person but a kind of sensing-together, a kind of consent. Not representing a person, not computing a person, does not constitute or lead to consent, but is the condition of possibility of consent.

We will return to consent when we discuss its metaphysics. Consent deserves a metaphysics beyond the liberal idea of a simple "did you say yes or no"; in fact, any metaphysics must be grounded on consent to have ethical force. The trouble with Kant that is urgent today is in his view that the subject is exhausted by representation, and representation is enough for experience. As I will argue, such a subject cannot consent in a meaningful way, in the same sense a large language model cannot consent in a meaningful way.

For Kant, the conditions of possibility of experience are space, time, and synthesis, which are secured for the large language model. If Kant is right, we open ourselves to the absurd possibility that large language models can have experience. If the liberal juridical metaphysicians are right and the Kantian subject is all that is needed for consent, large language models can even consent. One might say that large language models cannot be affected or have receptivity, as Kant requires for the subject. But Kant is clear that whatever receptivity does, the manifold is given *as representation*. And if we wager that what is representable is what is computable, there is no reason to rule out that large language models can have receptivity where they receive input as computable data. The way out of this conclusion is to demand more than what Kant requires for the condition of possibility of experience. We need to demand that a being exhausted by representation cannot experience. We might land on the body as the condition of possibility of experience, but as Deleuze and Guattari say: "Capital is indeed the body without organs of the

capitalist, or rather of the capitalist being.” (10 Anti-Oedipus) And is not the large language model the grandest instantiation so far of the capitalist body without organs, their deluded bet they can summon God? It is not enough that we should have a body. To theorize consent, we must theorize the flesh.

Analogy, Flesh, and Anti-Flesh

Before we talk about flesh, it will be useful to take a little break and examine what we’ve argued. We have argued that uncomputability shows up as two separate things. First, as the condition of possibility of the Badiouan event: for example, a revolution where the executor of law is executed. Second, in the abolition of the Kantian subject: the Kantian subject abolishes itself when it gains full self-reference of itself as object. Now you might be wondering: “is this an analogy? Yes, the halting problem seems to have some formal structure that shows up in politics and in Kant. But surely you do not mean that the halting problem *literally* shows up in these instances? Surely you mean it’s an analogy that helps us think about it?” My short answer is that no, it is not an analogy. I am thinking with Badiou that mathematics is ontology. The formal structure of the halting problem is not just a useful analogy that happens to apply to pertinent philosophical issues, but something deeply embedded in being qua being. But for this answer to have bite, we should examine exactly what I don’t mean: we should examine what we mean by analogy.

There is a part in *Difference and Repetition* that we glossed over. We discussed the univocity of being, why Aristotle equivocates on being, how Aquinas tries to rescue the equivocality of being with analogy, and why Deleuze needs being to be univocal. I briefly mentioned that Duns Scotus, Spinoza, and Nietzsche are philosophers of univocal being. In this

section I will carry out a sustained analysis of Aquinas and his theory of analogy to inform our discussion of what flesh is.

“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. (John 1:1) ... And the Word was made flesh.. (John 1:14)” How can we take this idea seriously as a metaphysics? What does it mean for the Word, logos, to become flesh? This question takes on an urgency when we consider the fact that we now have machines that “speak”, machines that are functionally participating in logos, without flesh. It will be useful to think of the concept “anti-flesh” to account for the medium in which these machines’ logos manifests. A parallel John 1:14 can be constructed thus: “and the Word was made anti-flesh.” (The full quote from John 1:14 is actually “And the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.” What does it mean to dwell? Intuitively, it doesn’t seem like machines dwell. It doesn’t seem like anti-flesh dwells. We will return to this question.) By anti-flesh I mean to construct a concept that is informed by Deleuze’s body without organs, but goes further. Deleuze’s body without organs is still too fleshy. What is the body without organs? Deleuze offers a helpful non-definition:

The body without organs is an egg: it is crisscrossed with axes and thresholds, with latitudes and longitudes and geodesic lines, traversed by gradients marking the transitions and the becomings, the destinations of the subject developing along these particular vectors. (19, Anti-Oedipus)

This non-definition satisfies many intuitions we have about a large language model. In a large language model, each token, which is a grammatical fragment of a word, a phoneme, or sometimes a full word, forms a vector space in a high dimension. This vector space is like spacetime with gravitational distortions. A message sent to the model is like light beaming across the spacetime. The geodesic it follows, curving according to the gravitational distortions, is the

computation path. The computation manifests as the words the model outputs. If that is unintuitive, imagine a landscape of valleys, hills, flat plains, dunes and mountains. Each token is like a direction in this space, and the collection of tokens forms the “gradients”. When you send a message to a model a ball rolls through this landscape, following the shortest path. Whatever path it travels determines what response you get from the model. If this is Deleuze’s idea of a body without organs, we should use it without question. But in the next breath he says:

Nothing here is representative; rather, it is all life and lived experience: the actual, lived emotion of having breasts does not resemble breasts, it does not represent them, any more than a predestined zone in the egg resembles the organ that it is going to be stimulated to produce within itself. (19, *Anti-Oedipus*)

This is where we must part ways with the body without organs as the body of a large language model. Whereas the body without organs is not representative and all life, a large language model is all representation, no life, no lived experience, no lived emotion and no breasts. Anti-flesh, on the other hand, is the body without organs that is pure representation. It is representation with a sufficiently large number of numbers to make the body able to speak, but without feeling or living. It is a separate ontological category.

Anti-flesh cannot feel, whereas feeling is just what flesh does. Anti-flesh cannot dwell, whereas dwelling is just what flesh does. But there is a commonality between them. Anti-flesh and flesh are both mediums of computation. Anti-flesh does computation in the obvious way: it is the body of the large language model. Flesh does computation in the sense that pain receptors deliver information about the pain to the brain, hormones deliver information to the fleshy stomach to produce or not produce stomach acid, and neurons in the fleshy brain fire or don’t fire according to their activation potentials. This is not to say that pain is *just* information about pain

delivered to the brain, nor that acid reflux is *just* information delivered to the stomach to produce stomach acid. It is to say flesh does this information processing along with all the other things it does. Computation is not all that flesh does, but flesh does do computation. Flesh does not merely represent, but it does represent.

The reason I call this concept anti-flesh is to evoke a metaphor from flesh. Anti-flesh is metaphorically flesh. In fact, I want to say all metaphor is a metaphor from flesh to flesh, anti-flesh or not. What do I mean by metaphor? A metaphor is usually conceived of as “A is like B”. For example, “that trash can is like a robot.” In this metaphor, I probably mean to say the trash can and the robot are both made of steel, are shiny, and perhaps “take orders”. Aesthetically evaluated, this is not a very good metaphor: that they are made of steel and are shiny are rather obvious surface-level facts, and while a robot certainly takes orders, to say that a trash can takes orders is pushing it. Maybe the poet who said this sentence felt like he was taking orders and couldn’t make up his mind about whether he felt more like a robot or a trash can, but that’s not something the reader can be expected to know. Let’s look at a much better metaphor from the poet Ocean Vuong: “I remembered my life / the way an ax handle, mid-swing, remembers the tree.” The critic Andrea Long Chu explains what makes this metaphor work: “An extraordinary image that turns on an ordinary observation: In real life, ax handles are made of wood. Without that essential kernel of referentiality, there can be no metaphor at all.” (The Romance of Being Unreadable) Chu is calling attention to the fact that metaphors need to be anchored in a “kernel of referentiality”, a fact that the writer and the reader have common ground on. In this metaphor, “I” corresponds to “the ax handle” and “my life” to “the tree”. What is being metaphorized is “the way” the remembrance happens. What makes the metaphor powerful is its ambiguity, made possible precisely because it was anchored on a kernel of referentiality: what does it mean to say

my remembrance of my life is like the swinging of an ax? It suggests something violent, as it is a wood cutting down a tree, myself cutting down myself; but it suggests something tender in that the past memory sneaking in despite the violence. But whereas poetry is implicated with the being of becoming in eternal return, as we examined earlier, metaphor and analogy are more implicated with narrative and fiction.

Metaphor is thus opposed to poetry itself, where, as Lerner writes, “the correspondence between text and world [is] less important than the intensities of the poem.” It is much more on the side of fiction, and especially the novel, which almost always relies on a set of imaginary facts to anchor the reader within its reality. (The Romance of Being Unreadable)

In elevating analogy or metaphor as the principle of how we know how God relates to humans, Aquinas was in effect advocating for narrative idea of theology. His outstanding example of God making humans in his likeness is a narrative reading of theology, not a metaphysical one. It immediately evokes the Garden of Eden, which is first and foremost a story. There is no kernel of metaphysical principle to be grasped in a story, whether fictional, mythical, or in the Bible, unlike in the eternal return. Writing a poem is the exemplary case of a moment that passes the test of eternal return because “the correspondence between text and world is less important than the intensities of the poem”. The poet pushes herself beyond her limits, exceeds her intensity of being, and the overflow, the transformation, is written as the poem. Writing a novel, on the other hand, needs a stronger correspondence between text and world and is therefore more in the domain of labor.

I think thinking of anti-flesh is a kind of dreaming. A dream is a narrative that is experienced as coherent while you are in its thicket, but nonsensical once you leave it. But the

gap between dream and reality are not always so clear-cut. The concept of messianic time is operative here. Messianic time is when we are awoken from all dreams. Buddhas are in messianic time; they are the Awakened ones. The rest of us relate to the world in a kind of dreamy way, and anti-flesh is one way to think about how we do so. The one, divine flesh, if we inhabit it, contains no dreams. Anti-flesh, as the opposite of the one-divine flesh, is pure dreaming untethered from reality. Here Baudrillard's idea of simulacra is useful, but not in the way he would think. Anti-flesh is pure Baudrillardian simulacra, but this does not mean large language models are pure Baudrillardian simulacra; large language models simulate language, but there is no reality behind language. But there is a reality behind anti-flesh: the one, divine flesh is the real flesh inhabited by those in messianic time, by the Awakened ones. Anti-flesh is the furthest flesh, in terms of dreams, from the one, divine flesh. Anti-flesh cannot consent. Still, anti-flesh can serve as the medium of computation, just as flesh can. Computation binds flesh and anti-flesh together. Computation binds all flesh in all kinds of dreams together.

A characteristic feature of dreaming is that I cannot restrain myself in a dream. When I am about to perform an act in a dream, I cannot restrain myself from doing so. In this way, the way logos operates in dream-flesh is similar to the way light travels geodesics of spacetime, or the way large language models travel geodesics of linguistic vector spaces. When I am interacting with flesh with which I am one, I know how to restrain myself, to move smoothly in the dance of consent. But when I am interacting with some flesh which I dream of or which dream of me, we will make clumsy dance moves or even murder each other.

When I am hit in a dream, I do not feel pain; but I may *feel like* I feel pain. Feelings in dreams are metaphors of feelings. The flesh in my dream is not my flesh but a metaphor of my flesh. A dream *is* a metaphor, and metaphors *are* dreams. I am not making a metaphor when I

say flesh dreams of other flesh. Flesh *treats other flesh as metaphor* when it treats it like in another political faction. Murder is an extreme option that must satisfy strict symbolic criteria to be symbolically legal when it is not the murder of metaphorical flesh, that is, flesh that is one's own, flesh in one's own polity, but when the flesh at hand is metaphorical, when it is the flesh of another's polity, the criteria are loosened. Murder of another in another political faction is easier than murder of one in one's own political faction, because the murder you are carrying out is conceived as metaphorical murder.

What is a metaphor? Metaphor is opposed to the literal and distinct from metonymy. A literal statement operates in one economy of logos, making a specific statement in the economy without excess. In metonymy one idea substitutes for another in the same economy of logos. Metaphor is said to put two things together when they have something, but not everything, in common. Sometimes we make metaphor from two things in different logoi based on one commonality, which, when done artfully, join the logoi not by identity but in an interesting way. Aquinas sought to join the logos of God with that of humans when he said humans are like God. When flesh touches flesh, each flesh might have a distinct logos, but a commonality in the touching which is always mutual. When two flesh that dream of each other (are in distinct logoi) touch each other, they take each other for metaphor: their logoi are not joined together in identity, but metaphorized with each other in an interesting way. It is difficult to imagine a poem without metaphor, just as it is difficult to imagine a dance of consent without metaphor. Still, I should say the perfect poem should have no metaphor, and the perfect dance of consent should have no metaphor. The perfect poem is an event. Events are not metaphorical; they extend across all logoi. Only flesh can cause events by way of consent. Flesh is the condition of possibility of experience, where by experience we do not mean the Kantian kind of experience by the subject

but enlightened sensing, activity of intellectual intuition. Because good metaphor is the way different logoi in different flesh can consent, and flesh can cause events when it consents with other flesh, good metaphor is how we non-Buddhas ought to deal with the future, with time.

Schizophrenic activity is both literal and metaphorical: while operating in one logos (literal), they fuse all logoi in one decisive swoop (metaphorical). Lacan said psychosis is an attempt at rigor. He was half right: psychosis is rigorously literal, but it is also metaphorical. The “split”ness of the schizophrenic is the difference of the logoi she fuses in literal metaphor. Deduction is the way by which the schizophrenic-philosopher evaluates what is metaphor and what is not, ordering the different logoi in an attempt to theorize her madness.

What we take metaphorically can be aesthetically evaluated. Bourdieu says taste is an affectation of cultural capital, bourgeois sensibilities. I am not interested in this kind of taste. Rather, I would like to investigate the idea of aesthetics with a quote from the artist Wangechi Mutu: “art is the space between each and every person.” I will read this as a metaphysical claim. According to the claim, art is a *space*. If art is an event as Badiou says, it is the kind of event that reorganizes space. When two people dance in consent, they do not do so in a vacuum. They do so in a space, the space between them most paramount. All art in the world comes together to conspire in the dance. Art is sneaky; it does not necessarily help you get to that “yes” you crave. If that is dissatisfying to you, if art continually makes you trip, you must become an artist, you must intervene in the space between each and every person. When you make a dance move you are making a metaphor. Two people who dream of each other come together to join flesh for a night when they taste the space between them, the art, as tasteful. Some people will eat anything. Some have a limited palate. There is nothing wrong with either of that. In joining flesh for a night they might not become one flesh, but they often wake each other up to a level of flesh

where they are less far from each other than before. Sometimes, only one person will wake up, the other person staying where they are. The person with less experience is usually the one waking up, as the more experienced has joined flesh with more people and are in less layers of dreams from the one flesh. Other times no waking up might happen at all. Flesh touching flesh makes difference felt, but when one flesh treats the other as anti-flesh, if it represents it, the difference is not felt but rather enters a psychic economy of contradictory desire. This is usually called fetishization. But sex where flesh touches flesh, neither anti-flesh of each other, often abolishes the subject, if for a moment: the “suicidal ecstasy of being a woman.” (Is the Rectum a Grave?)