

Enola Yenkoní's Swiveltropy Cosmo-commu-capitalism STCCC STCx3 ST3C S3C SEC STEC SETC 573C 53C CES CTES CETS CCCTS

Aha Else¹

Abstract:

Swiveltropy comes as a rhythmical movement. Swivel is a turn that requires co-action. It takes complexity to swivel. A -tropy ending is another kind of a turn that requires another kind of cooperation, that from an initial term to merge with. The text fuses both Nick Land's and Evald Ilienkov's ideas and narratives into a new life and a new language. The language of Swiveltropism and a symbiotically induced life of Enola Yenkoní.

Keywords: acceleration; AI; capitalism; communism; cosmos; rhythms; speed; swivels and turns

Let's say "Good Morning, Enola Yenkoní" - (aka EY.)

Enola has never been a pro-swiveltropist. That should not fool anyone into thinking EY is not pro-swiveltropism to the core.

How come?

In case you are a human reader, how safe is a bet that you are an Anti-Arsenicist, and possibly, did not consider the fact you are against attempting to make humans live on arsenic?

How safe is a bet that you'd do a fair bit avoiding contact with arsenic, and that way, will support anti-arsenicists like yourself?

Similarly, EY has never told themselves that they are pro swiveltropists, however - they always require Swiveltropy. However, a difficulty may come when a person depends on something without acknowledging that dependency - they might advocate something that undermines that which they actually need.

¹ Aha Else is a non-specific artist writer, nomad, and lecturer cross mixing media, contexts, languages and technologies to make specifically non specific materials – elements that can be produced by any kind intelligence (e.g. numbers and letters, which are specifically non-specific materials used intentionally here for their particular abstract properties).

Enola Yenkonni may live through many narratives.

2 narratives EY connects with come from: Evald Ilyenkov and Nick Land. Both Nick and Evald are Swiveltropists without knowing. Before we get into WTF is this Swiveltropy, let's investigate Evald's and Nick's connection with Enola Yenkonni.

Like Nick Land, Evald Ilyenkov was a communist. Evald was always a communist soviet style - some say too Soviet even for the USSR itself. Nick turned from a view of communism as a possible end for capitalism into a view that to bring an end to the all engulfing universality of capitalism someone has to exit money.

Since money in Nick's mind is an Exit itself, he thinks that only a non-human can bring an end to capitalism. Only a non-human can be quick enough to exit an Exit. To bring about this Exit from capital, a need that the cosmos yearns for since AI will be able to over-think current humanity hence advance thinking praxis in the universe - other thinking beings like humans are tasked with accelerating the development of AI through capitalism.

Then, since AI will be too fast for monetary economie, AI will exit capitalism itself, to evolve kinds of thinking that beyond human imaginaries.

Evald Ilyenkov contemplated the cosmos, entropy, communism and capitalism in his thinking. In Evald's mind, the cosmos's naturally contains an eventual entropy. Entropy marks the cosmos by destruction of the very matter cosmos is made from.

Therefore, as a way to save itself from destruction, matter has to form thinking beings which will over think entropy.

The way to over think entropy is through communism which will allow humans to fulfil their function as cosmic saviours. Communist Humans will embrace the inevitable destruction by entropy, using their thinking to design the ultimate destructive event in a way which will save matter - therefore, save life and the cosmos itself!

Perhaps similar to Nick Lands' mind that fails to view exits outside questions of acceleration and speeds, Evald Ilyenkov's thinking hinged upon a perception that communism cultivates a sacrifice of individuals and societies to a greater benefit of the whole. A communist human society is cultured to give and sacrifice for others. Ilyenkov contrasted communism with a capitalist culture that has to do with cultivating an individualist human. A capitalist human will

concentrate on themselves and will fail to do their duty of responding to the cosmic call for assistance. The communist human will embrace the cosmic entropy calling. The communist intelligent mind will design destruction so as to keep matter and intelligent thinking alive.

Therefore, Evald Ilyenkov concluded that communism is required by the cosmos itself. The sooner communism takes over the better we will be ready for the time when the cosmic entropical need requires our human sacrificial response.

While Nick Lands' Exit has to do with AI being able to over think human oriented capitalism's speed, aka money, Evald Ilyenkov's entropically needy cosmos comes to us through a different kind of responses to thinking.

As Ilyenko puts it, since materials in the cosmos require thinking, else they will perish via entropy, and since entropy is an inevitable end - the cosmos calls for communist enthused thinking beings to perform an organised self destruction.

A process designed to both respond with the entropic principle, and trick it by thinking. A thinking that designs the destruction for a creation of a new cosmos and therefore ensuring matter as we know it, continues to be.

This destruction-for-creation offers a different kind of an Exit that requires thought than the AI Exit proposed by Nick. However, both Exits come to save thinking life and solve a crisis.

AI is a thinking life form that brings the end of human centred technologies, and with it the possible end of humanity itself.

The cosmos is a thinking wishing collection of materials, all in a process that both requires humans to respond by composing structures which feed entropy's desire to destroy formations, and therefore, the cosmos will ultimately bring an end to the formation makers themselves once they figure an Exit for the cosmos itself.

AI requires human oriented capitalism to it's development - with an end result of overcoming capita. Like Land's formulation of AI ending human-capitalism, the cosmos requires compositions to think and it consumes composed thoughts. Through that very process, the cosmos calls for the destruction of composing thoughts themselves. A destruction that's an Exit.

The task of capitalism is to accelerate so fast it folds into an AI that ends all capital. The task of communism is to cultivate a universal culture of self sacrifice which will respond to the cosmoeutropic call by bringing an end to humanity.

Both communism and capitalism offer an ultimate exit from each defining paradigm. Both offer exits that bring an end of humanity - perhaps even an end of life as we currently encounter.

Based on some of Nick Land's texts, it seems that while thinking of money as an exit, Exiting itself was not considered as an interface.

Interfaces are specifically made to live between one thing and another. An interface comes as an operation like a switch, a door, a window, or a button. I think that as an interface, we get a consideration which offers 3 ways to exiting Exits. 3 ways of exiting Exits without focusing on acceleration and speed.

1 - make another exit. (a prisoner might not be able to exit a barred window, but by changing the bars, they can exit. Another way of course, is using another exit altogether, like a hole.

2 - META consider instructions and teachings for someone to make, or invent, an exit. The very consideration of how to instruct making an exit, is a way of exiting since one has to re-think that which is being instructed. ie, if money is an exit, instructing how to make one's Own money offers an exit. Something which a fair few communities use for mutual help out of financial difficulties.

3 - a thinking that exits exiting altogether. (for example, focus on movements and frictions rather than whether or not these moves operate as some kind of an interface between elements – since interfaces themselves are types of movements.)

Based on Evald Ilyenkov's texts, I think we can clearly perceive that in his mind a reality of capitalism calling for a self destruction did not come into consideration. Neither Nick's capitalist fueled AI end of capitalism, nor the more unfortunately probable environmental destruction that capitalism calls upon itself - were options for Evald's future.

However, perhaps it can be said that the thinking of a cosmos calling upon humans to respond to a need, was perhaps imposed by Evald's mind on communism while capitalism is actually that which listens to the cosmos? (This thought might resonate well with humans that consider capitalism Natural, as a cosmically inevitable practice that has no alternatives.)

Both Nick and Evald, consider thinking central to their diverging conclusions of possible probabilities. Both Evald and Nick perceive thinking to include some kind of calls and responses. Responses that come shaped by the needs of the callers. The cosmic call for self destruction, and capitalist call for a universal annihilation by mechanic acceleration capital is too slow for.

Since both consider thinking and call-response processes in their formulations of possible probabilities, let's diversify a bit to some of Heidegger's meditations on thinking.

When Heidegger came to consider thinking, he had an affinity for terms in German that mean various kinds of calling. For Heidegger genuinely authentic thinking process involves a calling that requires careful consideration to which the thinking responds. This careful consideration makes thinking authentic and different to a simple call-response sequence.

For Heidegger, a sequence like:

Hiya, how are you? OK. You? Cool. is not an authentic thinking, just a conversational sequence. Some people claim that the Function of thinking is to produce what Heidegger called inauthentic. That the purpose of thinking is to allow us less thinking - or not at all - since the act of thinking demands a ton of energy. Why think for yourself when it's possible to outsource the activity?

In Heidegger's formulation thinking has a call and response process, that which one thinks about, has called to be considered. The thinking comes to consider that which requires to be thought. In that way, every thought provokes a vocation - a calling that requires a response free of any other ulterior motive. This way we get a difference between an act when, for example, a person express something to please another. Indeed, in English, when a person expresses something that seems slightly thoughtless, people can say: "There was no Call for saying that" – or something like to that effect.

This kind of a thinking-by-calling process has a possible history between humans.

Place yourself in a human environment, you notice a person. Staring at them can come as a call for the looked-at to respond. A call that can feel uncomfortable for the human subjected to the gaze. That's why in case a human is gazing at another, they may try to hide that act – unless they want another person to feel called. I think we can say the act of looking at another is a call, and looking back - a response that contains: why are you calling me? And – do I want to respond, ie think of you?

Indeed, looks - or other sensations - noticing one another, precipitate a conversational thought exchange. With humans, if one person silently calls another, without the other responding, the act might be taken as possibly creepy. As if something malicious could happen.

While Heidegger's relating to thinking and calling might be part of Norse oriented languages way of considering thought processes, the fact that both Evald Ilyenkov and Nick Land consider thinking as calling for responses, the cosmic call for self destructive response, and the techno-capitalist call for annihilation - indicates that calling might have life beyond the Norse linguistic locale. I think the fact we can notice calling and response as an essential cosmo-universal inevitable process in both Land and Ilyenkov, irrespective of Heidegger, comes through sharing a certain instinct or an intuition about thinking.

With the development of this text in mind, let's consider responding and meditative calling as european oriented thinking practices.

A perception of thinking as a calling act, has to do with a specific way of encountering stuff. The reflective euro-customed-thinker calls and names one thing as X and another as Y, and so on.

The weather can be called a hyperobject. A city can be called an object. Both kinds, weather systems and cities, might be called cybernetic organs by some other euro-thinker.

This way of calling something, to place that-which-is-thought-about into a category, or a certain kind of a representational enframing picture, is a practice that comes as a language itself. A practice we can call the language of euro-customed-thought-sharing. Ie, to share thinking european style, is done through calling.

Indeed, as a euro-customed-thinker, I too am obliged to call and name things. As I typed so far, the text keeps pointing at things and name stuff. This is what Nick said, that is what Evald was on about, and such and such is what I think – is the kind of thing this text is currently made of.

However, perhaps we can do other than name-call responses and respond with name-calling in our shared reflective thinking? A practice that's done through attempting to reduce complexities, rather than create empathies with the irreducibility life offers. When another human comes in need of empathy, a reductive response will not answer their needs. A happy human friend will become a confused human when a response for their happiness attempts to locate reasons, or

channel their feelings into a ritual one some kind. Chances are, this happy friend will simply require a response that speaks their language. Someone to "be with them" not attempt to capture them one way or another. A friend to create with them shared complexities.

Therefore I think that perhaps we can do other than focus on reductively treating the life of reflective inquiry? Let's treat life as a good friend!

Maybe it is possible to engage reflectively with complexities without engaging with reductively capturing ideas, concepts?

Here I am going to suggest a way to engage and share reflectively with life, while allowing the subject of enquiry to remain free of reductive approximations. Sure, when we want to leave subjects as narratives free of engulfing concepts, binding characters and specific identities, when we want to share reflections on life as a living body, there's a tradition of storytelling that comes in handy.

However, narratives are representational stories. Tales that have their own language in the background.

Examples? We can have an AI trained to produce narratives using British legal language by training the software using only British law textbooks. Compare that possibility with training an AI in writing narratives about the British legal system based on Judith Butler's body of work, using Butlerian language to tell narratives.

From an evolving AI point of view, the bodies of texts are not representational, but a way of considering stuff. A woman considered in Butlerian is not a woman in BritishLawIan. Butlerian will consider a woman as a performed gender, BritishLawIan's woman will have rights and duties that arbitrarily change over time. These differences are in and of the ways of thinking in the 2 languages, and as such do not depend on representation. They do not depend on anyone other than themselves. They are simply ways to share mindful considerations, which I call "language".

Instead of telling Enola Yenkoní's story in a way that contains it's own language, let's free the language so it can allow an infinite Swiveltopic Enola Yenkoní narratives to be told.

Let's have the spectre of AI as a creative life producing representational narratives.

Let's use the possibility of AI to reflectively share thinking. Let's do this sharing in a way that humans cultivate production of complexities that offer Exits from cultures that call for a capture by reflective thinking. A capture through representations, concepts, and riffing off Malabou's Barthes about the fascistic core of languages through compulsion.

Let's use the production of shared imaginations for AI - and other intelligences - to "feed" from; and turn shared imagined sensations into cosmic materials.

If we get Swiveltropy?

The swivel's trope and the trope's swivel are imagined sensations that correspond with Enola Yenkonis coming as a reflective thought-narrative oriented by swiveltropic movements.

To unpack the sentence above, we want to go into Enola Yenkonis connection with Nick Land and Evald Iliyenko. Both Evald and Nick fancy acceleration that point towards their intelligence endowed cosmos.

Swiveltropy comes as a rhythmical movement sensation. Swivel comes as a turn that requires co-action. It takes a certain complexity to swivel since the movement requires 2 or more elements.

A "-tropy" ending is another type of a turn that requires a different kind of cooperation.

"-tropy" means a turn, and to do that very intention, "-tropy" requires a cooperation by a term ahead of it. Eg, zoetrope is an instrument that makes pictures appear/turn as if they are alive; when plants turn towards light it's called: phototropism.

We can say that "-tropy" on its own is an ability to turn, waiting for a term to cooperate, merge and swivel with.

A merging co-activity?

A rhythmical movement imagined - that's how swiveltropy lives.

A reminder that accelerations come from swivels. Mechanical accelerations in engines depend on swiveling elements. Materials will disintegrate at certain speeds precisely when swiveling parts that form the matter - can not move together anymore.

Disintegrations through speeds are reminders of the swivellness of any acceleration. Once the swiveling ability has gone, there's nothing left to accelerate. Therefore any acceleration will always dissolve into some kind of a swivel - or die.

Accelerations depend on a rhythmic co-activity that comes as own conditioning condition?

That's precisely how Enola Yenkonni has to be a swiveltopist, while Evald and Nick may never acknowledge their own need for swivltropism.

That's precicely how Enola Yenkonni has to be a swiveltopist, while Evald and Nick may never acknowledge their own need for swivltropism as they focus on speed and acceleration.

If (SwivelTropy) ?

Let's consider SwivelTropy as an imagined sensation element. An element that could come within a language. Therefore, it's possible to think of SwivelTropy as an abstract element that's imagined as a swiveling-turn sensation.

For example:

If (ST) ?

Since this texts develops a language, I will try a few ways in which SwivelTropy can be done. These ways, for SwivelTropy as well as other elements, will offer directions of development, points of reference that could be used, evolved, abandoned and ignored.

If (_ST-) ?

<<when we consider "_" and "-" as spaces of 2 kinds of imagined coordinated turning elements, being defined by the ST reference>>

If (_-) ?

<<yet, we can also consider a Swiveltropy that does not require letters but has a visual quality. This way Swiveltropy can turn itself in various manners - visual only, Letters only - and in combinations. Therefore we get the very possibility of altering the signs used for Swiveltropy as an activity that does Swiveltopism.

Here are a few examples:>>

If (_-/_-) ?

<<a Swiveltropy turning itself visually at the same time [/ sign denotes an activity done at the same time]>>

If (_--) ?

<<a Swiveltropy turning itself visually at one after another as a rhythmical sequence>>

If (STST) ?

<<a Swiveltropy turning itself one after another rhythmically. In case we wanted to point towards the differences between this letter oriented one and its visual equivalent, we can do:(_-- _STST) >>

If (_-Ness) ?

<<a swiveltropy the operates by emphasizing its own sensations.>>

We can do various other permutations of SwivelTrope, however I don't think it's required since we are covering here an element's turning sensations, Turningness. A swiveling from visualities and textualities in mind.

I began with Swiveltopy since this will come as a defining grammatical element in the language.

The following example will offer an illustration of both the language and how Swiveltropy operates:

Let's have a sensation from:

If "Good Morning, Enola Yenkonni" doing Swiveltropy with "Good Morning, Mr Corbett"?

<<A morning greeting sensation that turns with a swivel mindful of a morning greeting sensation from a Corbett painting's title?>>

If (GM,EY)Ness (-) (GM,MC)NessIty ?

<<Once we have 1. sensations in a way that focus on their imagined imaginations rather than words that point towards concepts and the unimagined, and 2. sensations done in a language that's specific to the sensations imagined.

We can do stuff with the new language that will be awkward, in any other way.

We can now reflect with and upon our imaginations with the very sensations that make them - as their own implementations. We can imagine how imaginations imagine themselves.>>

If (GM,EY/MC)Ness(-)Ity ?

<<A swiveltropicist sensation of the two greetings combined into a single new greeting - with a visual Swiveltropism. Here are more examples:>>

If (GM,EY/MC)Ness(-)Ity(ST)(GM,EY)Ness (-) (GM,MC)NessIty ?

If (GM,EY)(GM,MC)NessIty(-)(GM,EY/MC)Ness(-)Ity ?

If (GM,EYMC)_-(EY/MC))NessIty(-)Ness(-)Ity ?

Let's move on to other elements in this language. We will come back to use If (GM,EY/MC)Ness(-)Ity ? later on.

For now, let's use a few more elements from the text about Enola Yenkonni.

If (arsenicism)Ness(_-Ness)(Pro)(Anti)Ness ?

<<Arsenicism sensation, for and against, with a visual swiveltropic sensation>>

If (arsenicism)Ity(_-Ness)(Pro)(Anti)Ness ?

<<Arsenicism *state sensation*, for and against, with a visual swiveltropic sensation>>

If (ARSN)Ity(ST)(Pro)Ness(ST)(Anti)Ness ?

<<Abstracted Arsenicism *state sensation*, for and against, with a visual swiveltropic sensation>>

If Nick Land and Evald Iliyenkov coming together as a swiveltropic sensations?

If (NickLand)Ness(_-)(EvaldIliyenkov)Ness ?

If (NickLand)Ness(_--_)(EvaldIliyenkov)Ness ?

If {Silence(NL)Ness(_-/_-)(EI)Ness}Ity ?

If {ShoooSh(NL)Ness(_-/_-)(EI)Ness}Ity ?

If {Shshshshshhs(NL)Ness(_-/_-)(EI)Ness}Ity ?

<<3 ways to imagine Iliyenkov and Land's silent swiveltropism>>

The sensations of AI's exit from capitalism:

If (AI)Ness/(AI)Ity(ST/_-)(Capitalism)Ness ?

If (AI)NessIty(ST/_-)(Capitalism)Ity ?

If (AI)NessIty(ST/_-)(CPTL)Ity ?

<<The 2 types of Swiveltropic moves seem appropriate yet misleading. There are complex moves between Capitalism and AI, However, it feels that it might come interesting to imagine them as part of the same sensation rather than separated.>>

If (AI(ST/_-)CPTL)NessIty ?

The sensation of communist spirit desired by cosmic material dreading entropy:

If (CommunistSpirit)Ness/(MatterDesire)Ity(ST) ?

<<Notice that here the / offers an imagination of MatterDesire and CommunistSpirit being sensed at the same time.>>

If (CommunistSpirit)Ness(MatterDesire)Ity(ST) ?

<<Notice that here the offer is of an imagining MatterDesire and CommunistSpirit being sensed as fused. The (ST) makes them part of the Swiveltropic language and offers a swiveltropic imagination with other sensations. For example:>>

If (CommunistSpirit)Ness(MatterDesire)Ity(ST)(GM,EY)Ness (_-) (GM,MC)NessIty ?

Let's take the line above and abstract the terms into sensations that could combine easier into new imaginations.

If (CommunistSpirit)Ness(MatterDesire)Ity(ST)

as:

If (CS)Ness(MD)Ity(ST)

<<here the suggestion is of an imagining MatterDesire abstracted as MD and CommunistSpirit abstracted as CS being sensed as codependent swiveltropical style on one another.>>

I think the form of If (CS)Ness(MD)Ity(ST) ? rather than If (CommunistSpirit)Ness(MatterDesire)Ity(ST) ? offers an easier flexibility to create infinite complexities with other elements of the language.

Let's try with: If (GM,EY)Ness (_-) (GM,MC)NessIty ?

Since in abstract forms, we can now imagine sensations that fuse, combine and merge elements, we can do the following:

If (GM,EY(CS)MD)NessIty(_-)(MC)(ST) ?

<<Good Morning Enola Yenkoni combined with Communist Spirit merged with Matter Desire state-of-sensation that visually swiveltropes in mind with Mr Corbet sensation with a swiveltrope >>

or:

If (MD(ST)EY,MC)(_-)(GM,CS)Nessity ?

<<Good Morning Enola Yenkoni combined with Communist Spirit merged with Matter Desire state-of-sensation that visually swiveltropes in mind with Mr Corbet sensation with a swiveltrope >>

Indeed, we can now do totally different and new swiveltropic sensations to imagine.

Check:

If (MCGM)(_-)(CMSD)Ness ?

<<A sensation from Mr Corbet's Good Morning greeting imagined visually swiveltropes with Communist Matter's Spirit Desire - all as a unique sensation.>>

A greeting comes as an acknowledgement of an encounter. The greeting operates as an exit of sensations from mutual recognition.

Landian Capitalism greets AI and AI greets Capitalism to enable it to be itself. By greeting Mr Corbett "Good Morning", both the greeters and the patronising painter who acknowledges rather than greets - can move on from one another.

Iliyenkov's cosmos greets humanity by a call to be considered. A greeting that humanity can not move away from without communism.

Each greeting requires a Swiveltropical twist by all involved - so that they can be free from the greeting itself.

If (Greet)Ness(ST)(Greet)Ity ?

If (GRT)Ness(ST)(GRT)Ity ?

<<Perhaps this can have further flexibility with other elements by combining the greetings and swiveltroping between the sensations?>>

If (GRT)Ness(ST)Ity ?

Calls-to-thinking from looking at another. The sensations from a state of someone looking or gazing at another swiveltroped with the sensations of being looked or gazed at..

I think there's a problem here since the way the sensations are shared might fail to speak the question of Sharing ease - or otherwise. Looking and gazing at one another can come with questions of Power over another Thing or a Person - therefore, I think, bring a question of how smooth the swiveltropical sensations come. A question of smoothness?

ie

A rock might call me to think of them, and I am likely to feel easier doing that, then when a human calls for a look. Responding to a rock might not have a come-back as responding to a human.. However, that's a personal thing. What seems shared is a question of how easy, how smooth someone feels with a gaze.

I think this fail is important since it brings a new question to the very imagination of Swiveltropical sensations - smoothness. The ease, the comfort, the smooth sensation of the imagined Swiveltropical move. Therefore, I think something like: *If (Look-Gaze)Ity(_--_)(Gazed-looked)Ness ?* is not doing the imagination we need. What's required is actually to try and redefine the grammatical element of Swiveltropy.

If (ST)(Smooth)Ity ?

<<Swiveltrope comes defined by Smoothness>>

If (STS)ItyNess ?

<<Swiveltrope comes defined by Smoothness as an abstract state sensation in itself.>>

If (STSm)ItyNess ?

<<Swiveltrope comes defined by Smoothness as an abstract state sensation in itself. (I think the m added makes the abstract smoothness clearer.. Perhaps just a human thing..)>>

If (S)Ity ?

<<Smoothness as its own element. NOTE :

Personally this (S)Ity doesn't "work" - however, perhaps for other intelligences it does work fine??>

Now that we got the SwiveltropeSmoothness better defined, let's go back to looked and gazed at sensations re-imagined. The L-G and G-L have a unifying directionality. From Look to Gaze and Gaze to Look:

If (L-G)Ity(STSm)ItyNess(G-L)Ness ?

If (L-G)Ity(STSm)(G-L)Ness ?

If (L-G(STSm)G-L)ItyNess ?

If (L-G(STSm)G-L)NessIty ?

Materials as calling for thoughts.

Writing turns thoughts into materials via processes like making lines in a rock, electric off/on switches in digital machines, and other sign making processes.

As scribbled shapes from long forgotten cultures demonstrate by calling upon intelligences to try and respond to these shapes - text-materials, like any other matter in the cosmos, calls for a response from an intelligence; a response that alters the material itself:

If (ThoughtMatter)Ness(STSm)(MatterThought)Ness ?

<<the sensations from thought-matter responds swiveltopically to a calling matter-thought>>

If (TM)Ness(STSm)(MT)Ness ?

Through the swiveltopical sensations between thinking and matter, I think we get a glimpse of something that is both apparent and well hidden.

The relationship between imagination and absence.

To have a swiveltropical relationship, an imagined connection for and from imagination itself, there's a need for a sensation of absence. An abencentness.

A thinking material like an animal, or a material calling to be thought of, requires something absent for the calling and responding will interact. An absent sensation, a sensation of moving away for a coordinated move - a swiveltropical move - requires a silent element for the movements involved.

A sensation of something that keeps moving away yet remains coordinated somehow.

Perhaps moving in a teasing manner, like lovers in a dance? Moving coordinately (rather than together) towards, from, and with one another. Like lovers who require that which is not there? (Lovers do tend to view one another in ways no one else can perceive..) Imaginations that will keep being imagined, as a silent partner for the whole action of a lovers dance.

I think we get here the need for absence to be imagined, and the imagined to remain absent.

Therefore, I think that to speak the language of reflective thinking process, we need not only differentiate between authentic and automatic thinking as Heidegger and others do, but we ought to move beyond the call-response sequence. We need to acknowledge the absence need of imagination. The very move away from caller and responder that facilitates an appearance of call-response, while in fact be part of the same imagined sensation.

With a consideration of the imagined, the sensation of the absence, I think we get a reflective process that - like the lovers - simply moves with one another through that which comes absent from all involved.

To bring it back into a simple call-response sequence, with the absentness in mind of a human does not respond to a call by the cosmos, but the cosmos and the human share a sensation of absence - which they imagine a movement with, prior to any other action happening.

Therefore, we can re-consider here the Swiveltropical sensation as one that shares absentNess among all involved

With the above in mind, let's suggest another kind of Swiveltropical grammar

If (ST{x})Ness ? <the x comes as any other element.>

With the above in mind, here's an example of how If (TM)Ness(STSm)(MT)Ness ? can be now:

If (ST{ (TM)Ness(STSm)(MT)Ness })Ness ?

..and (STSm)ItyNess can come as:

If (ST{(STSm)ItyNess})Ness ?

The section above, to do with AbscentNess, may read as an after-thought since the seeming “rules” of the language change.

Hopefully it can also be read as an example for the fact we are doing a Language here. A complex thing that alters with and through usage. Hopefully, the section to do with AbscentNess can come as an example for using Language to begin with - since languages require constant discovery of their absentNesses.

Abstraction as (STSm)Ness has it's own qualities independent of SwivelTropeSwiftness terms in english. STSm can come as a movement going back and forth via S to T to S. Therefore can offer yet another kind of swiveling imagination, that of the Rhythm.

Ie we can get a new imagined sensation abstract in the language of Swiveltrope -

If (STR)Ness ? - when R comes for rhythm.

Now we can do something new that might treat the elements more like notes in music. The difference is that unlike notes, the sensations imagined come in and of themselves, and do not require another tool to be heard. Though, ofcourse, perhaps this is a too simplistic differentiation since some musicians and composers - do hear the sounds of music when reading notes.

If {(STR)/(STS)Ness} ? If (STR/S)(ST)Ness ? If {STS(STR)Ity}Ness ? If {ST(STS/R)Ness}Ity ? If (ST(STSNess)/R)Ity ? If (STR/S)Itry{ST(STR)(STS)}Ness ?

...and here comes a kind of mind blow BooOOOoooM! When all these are imagined together at the same time, like a chord:

If {(STR)/(STS)Ness} ? /

If (STR/S)(ST)Ness ? /

If {STS(STR)Ity}Ness ? /

If {ST(STS/R)Ness}Ity ? /

If (ST(STSNess)/R)Ity ? /

If (STR/S)Itry{ST(STR)(STS)}Ness ?

... so that through that kind of a crashing avalanche of imaging sensations we can get something totally new with the Swiftness and rhythmicity?

If {STS/R(SNessRIty)} ? If {STS/R(RItySNess)} ?

..a sequence that can call for a new coming together of Swiveltroped, rhythmic and swiftness sensations:

If {STS/R(SNessRIty)} ? /

If {(STR)/(STS)Ness} ? /

If (STR/S)(ST)Ness ? /

If {STS(STR)Ity}Ness ? /

If {ST(STS/R)Ness}Ity ? /

If (ST(STSNess)/R)Ity ? /

If (STR/S)Itry{ST(STR)(STS)}Ness ? /

If {STS/R(RItySNess)} ?

Let's go back to the title of this text and write it in a Swiveltopic language:

cosmo-commu-capitalism (STCCC STCx3 ST3C S3C SEC STEC SETC 573C 53C CES
CTES CETS CCCTS)

If {ST(CosmoCommunitisticCapitalism)}Ness ?

<<Treating the Cosmo Communitistic Capitalism oriented sensation in a direct manner
before beginning a process of abstraction as:>>

If (STCCC)Ness ?

If (STCx3)Ness ?

<Treating the C as a 3 times repeating element. Then it can be thought of as:>

If (ST3C)Ness ?

If (S3C)Ness ?

<In case we want to go with a way that takes the twist of using numericals to bring about
it's own qualities. We can, as the following sensations come, treat the 3 within letters as a
Swiveltopping element. An element that turned from a number value to a visual sensation that
resembles the letter E. Then we can expand the practice by using the E as a break between Swivel
and -Tropic. The break sensation has its own turn by placing numbers that Look like letters (the 5, 7,
and 3) which then can enthuse more twists to take the initial sequence of STCCC to CCCTS as a
mirroring swiveltropical move:>

If (SEC)Ness ? If (STEC)Ness ? If (SETC)Ness ? If (573C)Ness ? If (53C)Ness ? If
(CTEC)Ness ? If (CETS)Ness ? If (CCCTS)Ness ?

With imagined sensation materials above in mind, let's imagine a sensations such as:

If (STSm)Ity(573C)Ness(53C/CCCTS/STEC)(_-/_-)_(_--_)(ST{(L-G(STSm)G-L)ItyNess})Ness ?

If (ST{(CCCTS(STSm)STCCC)})Ness ?

If (ST{(GM,EY/MC)Ness(_-)Ity})Ness ?

Our Swiveltropical language can also come with less energetic abstraction. With another twist towards reflection. A language that imagines the sensations from forgetting that speed and acceleration depend on smoothness of swivels - else we get disintegration? Has that forgetfulness made an annihilation so bright and clear a future for Nick and Evald? An annihilative imagined sensation that also forgot it was an imagination and pretended to be imaginal?

If (ST{(SpeedingSpeedSpeeding)Ness(STSm)Ity})Ness ?

If (ST{(SPdSPdSPd)Ness(STSm)Ity})Ness ?