

KARMANETICS:
WHEN BUDDHIST COSMOLOGY
AND CYBERNETIC CULTURE
RESEARCH UNITE¹

Milan Kroulík²

Abstract

This article proposes *karmanetics*, a speculative framework linking Buddhist cosmology and cybernetic theory. Putting together Nick Land's work and the ontological turn in anthropology with a general CCRU experimental framework, it reframes karma as a dynamic feedback process entangled with both the organic and non-organic. By Buddhist integrating concepts like dependent co-arising with cybernetics, it challenges Eurocentric ontologies and offers a method to recode the human without erasing subjectivity from cybernetics. Karmanetics invites a rethinking of the practical use of CCRU in a decolonial world.

Keywords: Buddhism. Decolonial. Cybernetics.

¹ This is an expansion and transformation of the “Karmanetics: A Media Theoretical Recoding of Buddhist Ontogenesis” chapter of the author’s doctoral thesis *Mediatizing Ritual, Ritualizing Media*.

² Independent Researcher (PhD in Philosophy, Université Toulouse – Jean Jaurès) working to bring media theory and decolonial anthropology into productive dialogue with an additional focus on thinking with Buddhist traditions and moving images.

Resumo

Este artigo propõe a karmanética, uma estrutura especulativa que liga a cosmologia budista e a teoria cibernética. Reunindo o trabalho de Nick Land e a virada ontológica na antropologia com uma estrutura experimental geral da CCRU, ele reformula o karma como um processo dinâmico de feedback entrelaçado com o orgânico e o não orgânico. Ao integrar conceitos budistas como o surgimento dependente com a cibernética, ele desafia as ontologias eurocêntricas e oferece um método para recodificar o humano sem apagar a subjetividade da cibernética. A karmanética convida a repensar o uso prático da CCRU em um mundo decolonial.

Palavras-Chave: Budismo. Decolonial. Cibernética.

There is no real option between a cybernetics of theory or a theory of cybernetics, because cybernetics is neither a theory nor its object. but an operation within anobjective partial circuits that reiterates 'itself in the real and machines theory through the unknown. – Nick Land

There are many ways to engage with the legacy of the CCRU. Here, I bring the experimental attitude in thinking and writing, as well as the titular cybernetics to rearticulate Buddhist principles within a cybernetic ontology, in short, karmanetics. Such transdisciplinary operations frame this work alongside decolonial futurisms and offers an alternative to the antihumanism and limits of the human debates in (post)humanities in general, which are also operating in CCRU and Nick Land's heritage above all. Because of this, discussions of subjectivity are generally of little to no interest in this legacy, in part because few that continue it look outside of European tradition. I believe that linking cybernetics and Buddhist cosmology enables the integration of the human position, which is important as it remains the position from which thought happens. Furthermore, cybernetics in the CCRU legacy, like much of accelerationism, appears not to take into account that the circuitries are still material and materiality is resistant. Cybernetics is thought from a somewhat idealist position, where it is assumed to be ideally smooth running without friction. If there is anything we as humans attentive to our surroundings know, it is that entities, whether organic or inorganic, biological or technological, must be upkeep, fixed, in order to keep functioning properly without breaking down and

becoming other types of bodies by virtue of that. Energy must go in, whether as food or work or whatever else is needed. Thinking happens from within Euro-Modern cosmology immediately posited as universal, with anthropological evidence that not only are there radically different conceptions of people, but people as biocultural entities actually are very different between worlds.³ So bringing the elements together that I do here, is about keeping the human without conceptually externalizing it, and instead decentralizing it while keeping it all related. Furthermore, I integrate the decolonial approach of the ontological turn in anthropology, concerned as it is with taking the ontological propositions of others at face value without immediately reducing them to untrue variants of an always already true Western cosmology, itself critiqued only secondarily (VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, 2014). The text is thus speculative and hyperstitious.⁴ It recognizes that the construction of Buddhism was happening at a time when universalist humanism and its heavily Christian legacy were taken as self-evident, but not necessary, and only in recent decades did other ways of constructing Buddhism appear as possibilities. Buddhist studies in general have yet to come into contact with cybernetic or non-representational ontologies, which is surprising, given how easily noticeable similarities are, once

³Reza Negarestani's (2008) work is the exception here, however what he plugs into Cyclonopedia does not operate on the philosophical planes I am concerned with here. He is very Euro-Modern in that.

⁴ "There is no difference in principle between a universe, a religion and a hoax. All involve manifestation engineering, or practical fiction, that is unbelievable. Nothing is true, because everything is in production. Because the future is a fiction, it has a more intense reality than the present or the past. The CCRU uses and is used by Hyperstition to colonize the future, traffic with the virtual and continually reinvent itself." (CCRU, 2015, p. 9)

put together.⁵ What I actualize here are recent debates in Buddhist studies as well as my own experience doing fieldwork and reading sutras that make the reductive humanist shackle apparent and that Buddhist teachings offer an alternative to conceiving the human beyond the human in our age without throwing the baby out with the bathwater as many accelerationisms do. It is most explicitly an alternative to Reza Negarestani's attempt to pose the questions of what it means to be human correctly (AVANESSIAN & MACKAY, p. 30). Crucially, the text is also meant to establish connections with decolonial philosophy and the anthropology of other worlds, not in the least the indispensable research done by Brazilian anthropologists that relativizes certainties of the colonial overdeveloped world that often continues its unquestioned primacy as the preconceptual substratum of research. This is not to say that I, the author raised in Europe, am not beholden to such implicit preconceptual practice, no matter how marginal my position might be and how hard I worked on making Buddhist principles part of my everyday thought and habits. However, I believe it at the very least gestures toward other possibilities by unapologetically integrating distinctly Buddhist principles and imaginaries immediately into the academic conceptual framework in a way that transforms the ground against which thought happens. It takes Buddhist teachings as a malleable, transformative cosmopractice that is in the actualization of certain principles which do not primarily include doctrinaire divisions, often naturalized in research as

⁵The definite exception is Christopher Vitale's blog *Networkologies*, particularly the posts on all things Buddhist, which are a foundational influence here. These writings have yet to be academically published. <https://networkologies.wordpress.com/>

foundational principles, and rather takes connective transformations and openness as crucial features of how Buddhists do worlds, which lead to situations where clearer boundaries must be discussed so the tradition won't disintegrate. Buddhist teachings being lost through time, because as time goes on, things change, including the teachings as carried by humans, was a historical concern for the tradition. This is not a human fallibility, or even specifically memory deteriorating because writing is used, as in Plato, but quite directly an ontological issue about the operations of the world based in change in general. In other words, entropy. "Let me explain entropy to you. It isn't difficult. It's the gradient of temporal irreversibility." (LAND 2014, p. 7) The thinking here takes inspiration less from doctrinaire disputes, though these are also there, whether Western academic or by different Buddhist schools, than from lives lived, art made and attitudes affected.

Cosmological Preliminaries

This is an experimental act of reframing and redescribing. It seeks out moments where logic seems to break down when Western native cosmology deals with Buddhist tradition, the former thus becoming ungrounded, and connects Buddhist teachings instead with Western derived relational and immanent framework to formulate a new ground. This I call karmanetics, as a linking of karma based cosmology and cybernetics. Where certainty breaks down, is where thought happens and what such fragmentation enables is to question common Western ontology within which

Buddhism⁶ is created. What is kept as stable as possible is the prospect of a Buddhist worlding. A central, traditionally acknowledged challenge when dealing with Buddhist potentialities as put into words is that words, much like the day to day experience of a grounding subject, seem to project a stable world, while Buddhist teachings affirm primary change. This means that Buddhist truths are ultimately ungraspable by language, the medium through which they are communicated.⁷ In a sense, they operate in between words, or to put it in the more common way, beyond words. This distinction is crucial to the innovation I introduce here, as the common way operationalizes a transcendent cosmology, which is something to avoid, while Buddhist traditions have wrestled with exactly how to deal with how to put something that is beyond world but also in the world. They thus offer a pre-conceptual scaffolding that bypasses many pitfalls afforded by the Western tradition. By making this problematic a ground for the theory developed, not something added on as it was mostly done hitherto, Buddhist cosmological concerns and Western theory are immediately combined. It is through the development of distinctly immanent philosophy, often drawing implicitly or explicitly on Gilles Deleuze's work, that new conceptual tools and literary styles are at disposal a more fluid world can be written. This is also distinctly a

⁶I use Buddhism as the Western study and occasionally practice of Buddhist teachings, and *Buddhadharma* for Buddhist teachings as lived and practiced in long-term Buddhist societies.

⁷ That is of course why mediation and other practices were developed. It is the logocentrism of research and the life one tends to live as a researcher that makes it harder to see, what would otherwise be easily evident. Namely, that traditions do not only exist in books and the cultural techniques developed are as important as the words used, and the former are not to be subordinated to the latter. Indeed, how parts get connected is itself a cultural technique and can differ, which is what informs this text.

preoccupation of the CCRU and its literary and conceptual experimentation.

What connects critical theories and Buddhist teachings is the challenge of putting into words and concepts something that eludes such stabilization. Which is something that doesn't fit typical academic writing, which is generally based in a style where thinking happens in the words and the in-between words reads as a common sense, analytical connection. Those who write with critical philosophy, not merely about it, know the struggle of balancing critical thought and acceptable style. This is what makes certain philosophies so challenging to engage for the untrained reader. Certain writing is hard to understand because it wants to force the breakdown of habitual connection of words and concepts. Practitioners of hegemonic Buddhist studies and their unconscious ontological projections might find themselves bewildered by what is written here.⁸ Countless elements of worlds are brought into contact with Buddhist thought that are outside of what is typically taken for granted (in what still effectively amounts to retaining Cartesian cosmology as the silent ground). This leads to a transformation of the infrastructure of Buddhist worlding or Buddhaverse, as well as the one derived from the contemporary theories that are actualized. Any reception, any thought occurs in situated conditions of complexity that concurrently make it possible and limit it. Nothing can be accessed from a position that wouldn't be historical, all research is necessarily situated.

⁸ To be clear: ontological assumptions always co-create and ground what is being read and thought. It is not so much that the cybernetic approach doesn't carry assumptions, as that the assumptions are for one, not essentialist, and two, such networkological assumptions actualize analogously to the Buddhist critical project. It is about leaving the critiqued position of the stable subject as ground and taking the networked and transforming subject-world, i.e. empty of essence, as ground instead.

Which means the position from which thought happens can also be transformed through encounters with other worlds. Complexity is such that things don't line up neatly and can't be fully grasped – the illusion thereof arises from the ontological practice that just assumes primary coherence which precludes any efforts to actually trace the conditions from which one thinks and acts. Such assumptions habitually operate before conscious thought properly, they are culture as cognitive habit in that sense. They are at the limit between thought and non-thought, and the point here is to plug in different cosmological assumptions for the conditions of thought. Once the position of a thinker is included in thought, once the conditions of research become part of research, all becomes more dynamic. The world (in general and as a body's affordances) is changing continuously, it is open. Multitudes of new things and beings and concepts and possibilities have appeared, few of them could have been predicted at a time before they came to be the way they did. The fact that Euro-Modernity is allegedly a culture where the concept of evolution is more or less foundational, yet only rarely is it assumed that the world actually continuously changes in its entirety, bespeaks of its Christian legacy where God made the earth and since then, nothing really new appeared. There are other worlds that might have it easier with integrating a truly evolutionary ontology, as the circuits between the appearance of the new and the conception of world itself is are not so thoroughly blocked. And new theories don't repeatedly pose themselves as the one true description of how things really are.

In Buddhist studies, as with many disciplines, once firmly established, many feedback circuits from their alleged

outsides are closed off or minimized. CCRU brings the necessary transdisciplinary ethos that is naturalized and when followed as a pre-conceptual habit, before impossible connections appear to the thus trained researcher. While anthropological engagement of Buddhist tradition with such worlds is more open in that way than related fields, because it often has to figure out how at least religious texts and life as lived connect, if not other elements of the world such as arts, intentional transformation of theory through Buddhist possibilities remains rare. Encounters between media theory or cybernetics, and Buddhist worlds are even rarer, despite indirect influence on Land through his proclivity for China. This is rooted in institutional divisions ontologized as essential divisions of the world. As institutions and definitions are mostly settled, once fluid and emerging categories and objects of thought and inquiry become heavy with world, they become real and appear as given or simply existing by themselves (in some parts of the world). Research that remains based in disciplinary divisions turns to be surface play of signifiers, scholastic debates that can't touch the reality of things, as that changes with the changing world. Critiques of categories that can run on endlessly, for critique produces itself, without leading to any material-semiotic reorganization of matters: critical approaches (not just in Buddhist and religious studies) demonstrate the contingency of foundational categories and finish at that.⁹ In other words, they remain idealist in practice even if they are based in materialist, situated analyses. This is so, because the theory and the very

⁹ This is not to deny the value such research has of course, even to what I do here. Rather it's about describing how it operates and introduce alternatives. Examples are basically any writing that combines the words critical and Buddhist or religious studies.

practice of research itself continue to be commonly actualized as transhistorical with each new iteration of a theory it is habitually posed as eternal, despite the empirical evidence of theory changing and being generated through complex causalities. Even within the general scheme of being only as thought, as contemplation, the encounters with otherness that are staged don't impinge on the infrastructure of thought, on the basic constituents of the Moderns such as projective universalism, a neutral ground or the human as individual preexisting any other reality. Critiques point out that such entities are not universal, but in order to actually change such matters, it is necessary to work out alternatives.¹⁰ It is precisely having learned to think intuitively with a wide set of Buddhist principles adapted to a scientific framework that such problems even appeared as possibilities. There is research (e.g. KLIMA, 2002) that is crucial for what I am doing here, and such works rarely, if ever have any followers that would develop the parts that have the most wide-ranging effects on research. Generally, even very innovative, transdisciplinary research gets read as primarily a source of empirical information. Fields in the vicinity of CCRU and their activities are among those emerging ones, still not stabilized, and thus afford a greater field of possibilities when followed as a practice and attitude. The ontological turn in anthropology (e.g. VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, 2014; HOLBRAAD & PEDERSEN, 2017) meanwhile has done crucial work to make it possible to transform Western thought based on encounters with other

¹⁰For example by taking the Buddha and some Buddhist propositions for thought as given (such as *dhmma*, ghosts, *deva*, *bidhikamma*), as existing, instead of inquiring into their reality (i.e. historicizing, relativizing them), I can build an alternative to the practice of taking the categories of Moderns as given (including entities such as society, culture, morality, universalism, nature vs. culture, the self-congratulatory image of scientificity and rationality, many of which are clearly Christianity-derived) thereby destabilizing their naturalization. In this I follow the ontological turn.

thought, without keeping the hierarchy between them. This is for one a decolonial practice, and of course speculative. In a way, much like Land's Sinofuturism, it is arriving from the future, as everything is in production, everything is practical fiction or fictionalization. Following such influences, the point is to reorient thought in such a way so as to cut habitual ties with the past (ties are there by virtue of complex webs of causalities) to what is taken to exist by virtue of repeating it in research practice (representational thought based in identity) and instead attempt to let future possibilities actively enter into what is being put together (creating causal links to what is not yet). That is, hyperstition. Past, present, future intermingle. The future becomes much more directly a cause for today. Those elements that are already established enter anyways, they have been made part of the world, their weight, their reality exhibits a pull on any speculation that arises from thorough critical engagement with what is – speculation that emerges from frictions and fragments, speculation propelled by resistances, speculation that is materialist in the sense that materials (however composed) are confronted in ways that makes new connections/combinations arise. A democratic research practice in that it aims to reveal its own naturalizing and unnaturalizing operations, its own propagation of some things in the world as given and others as subject to change.¹¹ This is a crucial component in CCRU practice, as it exceeds traditional academic venues of presentation, i.e. the materials as which thinking happens exceed (academic) writing.

¹¹This is precisely what decolonial framings lay bare: the modern constitution silently propagates itself through engagements with its others. On the surface it pretends to be open while the actual operations remain closed to the Other.

Karma and Cybernetics: Definitions

Karma has no equivalent in contemporary languages formed in the Greco-Christian tradition.¹² Indo-European onomastics is obviously not everything. Translating a concept from a different language into one's own, or just the dominant one used to practice research in, does take away something crucial (VIVEIROS DE CASTRO 2004). There is more to languages and worlds. Productive limitations left unacknowledged in universalist representational cosmology. Proper translations transform karma into action and its effect Or possibly also work or deed and consequence. There is no one word in the European tradition that would unequivocally grasp this. Already connections are multiplying. Continue pretending words of different worlds neatly map onto each other and cut off the networks of associations and philosophical uses they have. Other research practices are possible. Buddhist teachings add one more element into the mix, it's action-effect driven by *cetanā*, intention. Karma accumulates to yield fruits, that is have effects. Accumulative effects of internal causes (*hetu*) come to be expressed under according conditions, or rather external causes (*pratyaya*).

The word cybernetics is composed of two parts, with unsurprisingly attic linguistic origins, drawn from Platonic

¹²As this chapter is thought to speak most decidedly to a general discourse on things Buddhist, I will use the Sanskrit derived versions of words as they are commonized, while in other chapters, as mentioned in the preliminaries, I employ Pali derived versions so as to stress the connection to the Thai fields I have been intellectually cultivating.

dialogues, of parts that have had little influence on so-called Western thought until recently. Even seemingly dormant causes can come to operate again. Kybernētiké meaning all that pertains to governing, navigating, steering. Ancient Greeks were of course famous (for everyone but philosophers) for their seafaring capabilities and as merchants, and hence kept establishing transformative connections with others. However much that is ignored by the majoritarian edifice of philosophy and the image of Ancient Athens in favor of some culturally monolithic fantasy of patriarchal exclusionary democracy that still remains dominant in society at large.¹³ The science studies scholar Andrew Pickering (2011) points out how there were immediate connections in early cybernetics and cyberneticists' ideas of/influence by so-called 'Eastern traditions.' Research as active philosophical engagement of similarities and differences, connections and crosspollinations meanwhile has been rather meager (VARELA et al., 1991; MACY, 1991; VARELA & POERKSEN, 2006; GARLAND, 2007; SHEN & MIDGLEY, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c; MOUSSAVI, 2010; also PICKERING, 2017 gestures in this direction) – as expected given the division of labor infrastructured by the separation and consolidation of disciplines. As emphasized, this here is a speculative writing of connections between karmic operators and cybernetics, mediated by the concept of pratīyasamutpāda (dependent co-arising), a relational conception of how the world works. What is shared is a world as generated through connections, where humans are a mere

¹³For an alternative framing of the Ancient Greek world, one that is organized around openness and based on the Ionian coasts and islands of Anatolia, instead of the Attic lands, see Karatani (2017). It is crucial to have alternative framings for matters that otherwise seem settled, for all is connected and it is these allegedly settled things that keep pulling us back into the Euro-Modern orbit of the finished world.

subset, and what we see is brought about via a generative matrix of experience. Thus direct experience cannot serve as an independent, empirical verification for science, which for anthropological inquiry means that observation cannot directly be linked with theory or understanding. This is one of the points of the ontological turn, where observation including statements by informants that seem senseless or just plain wrong in the researcher's cosmology, are used to innovate the ontological framework so that the statements actually make sense, at least conceptually, even if one doesn't actually manage to live in such a world. Here, I am concerned with creating something that does at the very least not directly contradict a critical scientific understanding of the world, as well as Buddhist cosmologies as traditionally understood in the field.

Karmanetics

[[]] The world is never finished. Karma begets karma. Act(ion) begets act(ion). There is no clear division between objective world out there and subjective one in here. Imaging and imagining are and are not the same.¹⁴ Karma is always at work. The world has always existed. When all is connected nothing just begins and ends.

¹⁴"On a day-to-day basis, we, as human beings, often consider imaging as an operation of the consciousness, a process in which vision – our neurological system's bare cognition of a field of photons – is turned into recognition. Thus, the resulting image out there confirms our knowledge of reality, sense-certainty and subjectivity. The image, and the sentient body that images, are also believed to have their own existential values. Meanwhile, imagining is considered a mental process that relies on memories of previous perceptions and recognitions, seemingly without the aid of any external sensorial stimulations. The resulting imagination, or even the imagining mind, appears to be ungraspable, transient and non-existent. However, what makes us so certain that those sense data that we claim as being external to our body, which constitute the difference between imaging and imagining, are not part of our imagination?" (FAN, 2020, p. 364)

[[]] There is a speculative potential to be accessed in the way Buddhist dependent co-arising would describe the world. Propose a description of the world. Think with an ephemerally acentral networking continuously transforming imagination that offers no ultimate ground. One from which the One is not even thinkable, as all is immediately many. No tower of Babel in sight and neither the image of tracing the language-ethnicity complex to a single origin which so persistently keeps organizing much of modernity.¹⁵ One where localities are intensified interdependence enmeshed.¹⁶ One where perception is the effect of such ties of the past composing into the present future. The commonly operating translation when reworking the Buddhist cosmos is one where an image of reality as given and preexisting the human as a general, substantive category, is automatically connected to it. All the while, the two truths (*dvasatya/dvasacca*) state clearly that what is seen by a human body composed of the six senses is a karmic construction. Imagining and imaging are distinct and inseparable operators. A generative tension in Buddhist worlding as practical conundrum: one shouldn't cling, but only something relatively stable will enact the difference for controlled transformation. And, in a variation, how to use conventional pointers without making them into/treating

¹⁵By now, multiple origins, but the principle remains as well as the orientation of attention toward past linguistic commonality to the detriment of continuing creativity and interaction. Nowhere is this more strongly felt than in Indo-European linguistics. What world could be if linguistics and philology would start building their theories and implicit assumptions on indigenous languages instead of on a few dominant, colonial Indo-European ones?

¹⁶The complexity of interdependence in a node (body+location/internal+external cause) of *pratītyasamutpāda*, if viewed from there, increases (at least before the recent technological transformations of the world). While a body as *karmacode* in a distant location might be connected through pasts, bodies surrounding each other in the present necessarily co-create shared karma to much larger degrees than more distant ones.

them as independently stable ground. Change is relative to the position of a body. Absolute change, pure transformation, cannot be grasped by a common body. (DELEUZE & GUATTARI, 1994)

[[]] There are two truths.¹⁷ What is commonly described is what is seen, that is the conventional truth. Here, countless sentient beings reborn as humans make category mistakes: they project their own conditioned perception as a general one, the same for all the world (naive realism). They think: what I see is reality independent of my bodily constitution. Body, self and world are treated as disconnected. The second truth, called ultimate, says all reality is empty of inherent characteristics. In other words, it is non-perceptible, for perception by common sentient beings reifies and makes appear as stable, what is actually changing. Bodies are conditions and limits. As for what the Awakened perceive, it's impossible to access for the common body. So this here is a speculative proposition, a redescription of the world where all that appears conventionally takes on different operations when put in relation to dependent co-arising networks. Whatever appears to a perceiving body is not the ultimate reality.¹⁸ “However, Buddhists acknowledge that, because the ‘right’ view needs to be locally defined, different views of

¹⁷A distinction is made between the conventional, common sense language (*saṃvṛti/saṃmuti*) and ‘ultimate’ language (*paramārtha/paramattha*). Common language employs metaphors and doesn’t directly express higher truths. One might be aware of related uses of linguistic distinction in the uses of common language and philosophical or generally research conventions, as well as the unfortunate convention of many, even among researchers, mistaking the one for the other.

¹⁸*Anātman/anattā* commonly rendered as the doctrine of no-self or more precisely without self-existent essence, relates to all bodies, not just the human subject. An indicator, if anything, of an an-anthropocentric conception of the world. Any focus on subjectivity has practical reasons, as it is the position from which a common sentient being necessarily experiences world.

rightness will exist. Therefore, overcoming ignorance is an ongoing process requiring dialogue, not an end state that can be achieved once and for all.” (SHEN & MIDGLEY, 2007a, p. 179) Thus there is more (or less), there are no entities/objects/things/concepts in general, all are local occurrences secondarily subsumed into categories for practical reasons, namely communication.¹⁹

[[]] All is determined that is conditioned and hence empty of own-being (svabhāva/sabhāva): “For Buddhist scholars, all forms are initiated and extinguished, from one moment to another, from a layout of interdependent relationships. Hence, forms are by definition empty of existential values. The substrate-form divide is therefore a logical violation of this axiom.” (FAN, 2022, p. 7) The general law of dependent co-arising (pratītyasamutpāda) lays out a pure relationality as all emerges in an interconnected process of becoming. Causality here is complex and non-linear. Common sense causality, even in societies that operationalize karmic knowledge, is but a simplification of this complexity. Alternative translations of pratītyasamutpāda include interdependent origination or interbeing. Because everything arises interdependently, all that is depends on other parts and as such is impermanent (anicca, anitya). A mental experiment: if only one thing changes, as all is connected, indirectly all others will change as well. All things then are empty of essence or intrinsic nature (asvabhāva). Dharma is both “universal cosmic law [...] and corrective process [...] both the source of cosmic order and a means of liberation from the world.” (OLSON, 2006, p. 80)

¹⁹Innovators such as Nāgārjuna excelled at playing games with categories/concepts, at using language against itself, demonstrating their emptiness and their arbitrary relation to an outside of discourse. (WALDO, 1975)

Dharma as teaching is the corrective process, and when thought in this way, it becomes clear that Buddhadharma is about intervening into the constitution of the cosmos as well as employing an accurate description of some of its processes, so as to increase the intervention's effectivity. Meanwhile karma can be taken as a subset of the general law of causality and dependent arising. It is the one where *cetanā* or intention/volition/directionality combines with causes. Directionality is a potent image to think with. As acts including intentions appear continuously – a world on auto-pilot producing this complex connective tissue that binds – but only when the directions match, when there is an overlap, is karma specifically generated, otherwise it's just the regular entanglement in dependent arising. Here, the singular mind-body enters the scene. Causality is expanded by an element and at the same time somewhat reduced as intention must combine with a given action. If anything, it is an intra-action.²⁰ One must be cautious to not immediately insert the concept of a subject or individual, for this remains a world built on discreet but relational units of actions or acts combining in different ways, making the subject experience an effect. The experiment here is to reframe in such a way that the common experience of subjectivity will disappear. Karma as a sort of memory of the universe, as well as a personal trail, that is subset of the cosmic karma. An externalization or coding of

²⁰Unlike 'interaction' which postulates bodies existing before participation in mutual action and with that action as an inherent property of a body to be exercised, 'intra-action' conceives of agency as a dynamism of forces where all entities are constantly diffracting, mutually causing and inseparably operating. (BARAD, 2007, p. 141)

what remains of acts (past) that condition new acts (present/future).²¹ In short, karmacode.

[[]] All is determined and not determined. The anthropologist Alan Klima (2002) paints a picture, a differentiation between humans and animals. Sentient beings share an a priori relation by virtue of karmic operators. This does not have to be thought as primary connection and secondary (bodily) difference – if multiplicity is applied, then it becomes possible to conceive sentients as at the same time sharing a connection and being different. Commonly, humans remain determined by passions, yet there are those enacting correct practices to eventually escape that determination. In other words, enact a break with habit. So, first, the composed, composing, decomposing entity (always changing) that is a body with the emerging self-image (based on the interaction of the five senses and mind) has to be mostly determined (saṃsāra), otherwise what good is all that which the Buddha discovered? One would find oneself in a world where the concept of the subject is self-positing as in Euro-modernity. But no, Buddhist teachings show the relationality of all. Pratītyasamutpāda. Nets or webs that link past action to present in various degrees of complexity, indirectness and delay.²² Which is one of the many places doctrinal disputes

²¹This can be famously modulated and further entangled with contemporary practices such as merit generation and merit transference. It's like hacking into a local memory carrier (hard disk) connected to the vast and growing world wide web to change the information, which leads to a transformation of the whole web. Said hacking of course being conditioned by the web in the first place.

²²This are not unprecedented imageric connections. In Japanese Buddhist worldings, *pratyaya*, external causes, translated as *En*, and explicitly employ the imagery of webs: "More broadly, en connotes ties or relations (*enishi*), invisible orders beyond human knowledge, which form webs around all things in the universe. One can neither predict nor comprehend the design and work of en. However, though usually invisible, the threads that connect humans and nonhumans may be brought to attention through unexpected meetings. Actualized through chance and coincidence, en forms the reason (*kotowari*) behind all things in the universe." (JENSEN et al., 2016, p. 160) Though there has been no systematic

set in. "The actions we do, with our feet and hands as well as with our mouths and meanings, indeed, even with our thoughts and intentions, leave traces on the spirit, leave their imprints in the heart, and echo long after in the mind. Most people have some awareness of this causative relationship." (KLIMA, 2002, p. 270) The anthropologist draws on a scene an orange-robed monk once used to explain the operation. In this text it is recoded into a different kind of language than used in the reference and refracted, splitting into more versions as each thing is a multiplicity. It is here that different worlds are created, in the scenes that are used for thought and become common in a society's imaginary. It must be pointed out: which Greco-Abrahamic entity has ever thought with an example composed in this way? It is the scenes to think with, to do 'empirical philosophy' with that come to form different worlds, and the intuitive manners thought composes will differ. (MOL, 2002; 2021) A further unspecified human kicks a dog. This splits into two possibilities, two futures. The human feels bad, has some (refined) sense of consequences. Doesn't feel bad, goes on kicking, over time becomes increasingly less sensitive to *duḥkha* or intensified discontent, typically translated as suffering, an eminently Christian obsession and concept decidedly more negative than discontent. Thus unpleasant feelings stop arising when causing suffering to others, i.e. empathy diminishes, this insensitivity making it less likely to notice what is being done to the mind. Eventually, if enough repetitions occur one's character becomes changed in this direction and more and more such acts will be committed leading further down the insensitivity path and so on and so

study of cosmic net/web imagery in Buddhist traditions, there have appeared very popular image-concepts such as Indra's net already in the Indic tradition.

on.²³ Not a binary world of good or bad sentient beings then, but an automated and accumulative one. The either or binary is there on the level of actions, but as they accumulate and all is interdependent, at no moment is a situation much less the world binary. Acts beget acts and give rise to feelings and perceptions, all conditioned by the past. The past as actions already done coded according to the laws of karma, driven into the future. Acts of futures past. A different human feels bad about kicking the dog. Insight arises and next time human and dog meet, perhaps no such direct suffering is perpetuated as self-control is enacted. Other solutions to the annoyance of a barking dog sought. Which eventually accumulates to different habits and a different set of past actions comes coded as that which this human has come to be.²⁴ “In the Buddhist reckoning of kamma, thoughts piled one atop the other eventually spill over and become intentions. Intentions piled up become actions. Actions accumulated become habits; habits amassed become character, and a character sustained becomes a destiny. In this model, significantly, generosity is skillful: it gives you beneficial thoughts, beneficial intentions, and leads to beneficial actions, habits, to a beneficial character and, eventually, to a destiny.” (KLIMA, 2002, p. 270–1) These are ideal-type cases at each end of the spectrum of possibilities. In the flux of life, all kinds of action mix, and often whether it is wanted or not a habit will undermine good intentions. Karma is habit in a sense, though conceptualized

²³This is a principle that works regardless of how any individual act is classified.

²⁴“Habituation is when thoughts and actions become ingrained and automatic, while de-habituation involves the interruption and removal or replacement of habituated behaviors. Habituating forces come from action (karma) and its residues (*vasana*; *samskara*) while de-habituating forces come from analytical insight (*vipasyana*). Liberation comes from removing cognitive, perceptual and emotional limitations, which can be achieved by a process of contemplative exercises, including meditations.” (SHEN & MIDGEY, 2007a, p. 172)

more broadly than just pertaining to bodies. And the dog? A slight reframing of the focus in the scene yields a complex answer: karmacodes entangle, hitting and being hit connect (to) two different bodies. The canine too comes to be different by being hit, by which past bad actions are undone. The boundary between (non)self and other is muddled, as in complex feedback loops actions on others beget actions on future selves. It matters which scenes are used to think with. It matters which parts of the scene are used to think with. There are positive and negative feedback loops, as bad acts accumulate through iteration they occur more easily, while Buddhist teachings, or anything that seeks to turn this process around, act as negative feedback loops in this context in order to at the very least stabilize the entity, which would be the case for an average person living life. The goal of the teachings is to enter as a positive feedback loop in a way that effectively blocks the negative feedback from the habitual acts that hurt others and oneself, so that the entity qua accumulating and disaccumulating consequences can eventually attain a state where no more consequences are produced. A perfect feedback equivalence.

Non-human animals here have less options than humans, as they are more intuitive meaning directly influenced by stimuli, by their immediate surroundings. One could say, more in line with contemporary science and in a variation on von Uexküll and Bergson, that the higher the complexity of a sentient being, the more of a potential gap is there between input and output of action. This is the 'center of indetermination' articulated by Deleuze (1986, p. 62). "Free or indeterminate actions are ones delay re-action, meaning

that action is no longer restricted to a present one that is always beginning again.” (PEARSON, 2005, p. 1116) It is in this spacing that the transformation usually coded as learning occurs.²⁵ A dog learns too, even if different breeds learn differently, and might stop perpetrating the action that led to her being hit. An action, viewed from the middle, from within the action is not so clear. On its one end, it might be karmically bad, on the other good, as it is negating past bad karma. Media theoretical shifts in perspective, explorations of a scene informed by the CCRU ethos, enable new thought, such that is not contained in the Buddhist canon, yet remains Buddhist insofar as it explores manifestly Buddhist scenes, connections and concepts.

[[]] So there is determination, via repetition/accumulation as karmacode, but also something in outside of it, a sort of disengagement from karmic cycles. Where is such indeterminacy located? “And no one could survive very long without some ability to detach from cycles of kamma. They would just follow their first impulse and, who knows – splat – be hit by a car because they saw an ice cream stand across the road.” (KLIMA, 2002, p. 270) Animals and humans under the spell of their immediate desires and whims, or alcohol and other substances that take away the distance to surrounding conditions (social conventions can be included

²⁵Spacing here occurs as spacetime relative minimization of direct causation of some elements. It has nothing to do with an empty space of nothingness as conceived in Occidental tradition. It is however consistent with emptiness of Buddhist teachings as emptiness points to a dynamic made possible by everything having no essence, thereby being continuous change and the making and unmaking of connections. The conditions of such spacing can be thought as overdetermination, in the sense that because karma is so complex, there will necessarily be internal causes that in certain external causes contra-act each other, thereby enabling almost imperceptible changes that can eventually add up into a systematic redirecting.

here) afforded by a body as sense-mediation, will be more tightly bound by these cycles and with it immediate reactions to stimuli. The indeterminacy however is stochastic, it can appear anywhere – the difference would be in whether or not constantly appearing indeterminacies will eventually accumulate into a divergent path. Spacing between action (external) and reaction (internal). Generally local conditions and personal karmacode. All is entangled. The Buddha found ways out of this determination. These are encoded into the world as Buddhist teachings. As technically, part of the dharma is beyond language (for language reifies and cannot fully communicate the dharma, and as such, cannot ever be fully representational), all manner of practice is necessary.

[[]] As there is indetermination, paths are multiple. This much is obvious in the path of the Buddha and the different ways to achieving nirvana by humans, the pratyekabuddha/paccekabuddha, ‘a buddha on their own,’ being particularly intriguing to think with. Those that inadvertently walk the path of this ‘solitary Buddha’ or pratyekabuddhayāna, achieve liberation from the cycles of karma on their own without a teacher. Insight can be achieved because that is the way of the world, though this insight might be accidental (from the position of the practitioner) compared to doing so following Buddhadharma and connecting to the institutions that ought to support its transmission. There is something in the world that makes it unpredictable. Pratyekabuddhas have a crucial limitation – they cannot teach the dharma and usually are considered to appear only once the teachings have been lost. Only those that attained the omniscience and supreme compassion through complete

awakening (samyaksambodhi/sammā-sambodhi) may do so. Attaining nirvana by oneself doesn't generate supreme insight into the workings of the world in ways that can be shared. Correct dharmic knowledge, the one attained by the Buddha, increases certainty²⁶ and enhances the personal path far beyond the borders of the incessantly composing individual karmacoded body. Tradition, while also changing, is crucial, it is information tested and stabilized through time, and articulated in situation appropriate, i.e accessible, ways.

[[]] In a Buddhist world where all occurrences/events have a cause, condition and effect, the problem of how to relate these, especially given that past karmic conditions or pratītyasamutpāda networks aren't immediately cognitively accessible. (SHIH, 2000) A body must practice attention and attunement through repetition and thereby transform so as to improve the understanding of world and change one's relation to these known and unknown determinations. A localized body (only Buddhas and bodhisattvas achieve a sort of delocalization, similar to a certain singularity Land imagines for AI, only not really singular) needs to constantly update their image of the world of causes past, present and future, and the relation between all elements. Karma may be produced and work automatically, but gathering indeterminacies into a larger effect is anything but. "Cause is the 'inner' (or immediate) requirement, while

²⁶Even when guided, much more so when without a teacher, practices such as meditation (even more common ones) are dangerous for the body, after all, they aim at radical restructuration of all elements: "As I have explained in the incident of the crazed monk, I have witnessed people go into nervous breakdowns, for lack of better words, during the practice of Buddhist corpse meditation, including what clinicians might identify as psychotic hallucinations and fantasies. At the temple there is a short but significant history of the meditators whose 'minds cracked' (*sati taeg*), as they term it, at the sight of meditation imagery; most of them never recovered." (KLIMA, 2002, 203)

conditions are the 'outer' (or contextual) requirements for the effect. Therefore, in Buddhism, the cause is primary and the condition is the secondary requirement leading to the effect." (SHEN & MIDGLEY, 2007a, p. 177)

The two truths are always a messy affair from the position of the unawakened. Cause, condition, effect, while distinct, relate directly and are hence inseparable. In their daily lives humans perceive the limited causes afforded by conventional tradition and remain reluctant to explore further, to unearth greater complexities, including their own actively contributing position within the configuration. Tacitly separating one's own actions from an external situation, as if they were not connected, is all too common. The 'self' position remaining unmarked, conceptualized as neutral, invisible. Misapprehending the complexities of interbeing tends to shorten the time-spans within which the world is conceptualized, with only that which appears as most direct causes and conditions of the past are taken into account and projected onto the future. The arbitrary cuts a tradition or culture enacts between the elements that can be related in the world and those posited as outside of reach, as eternal, ahistorical, Natural, Other or simply too insignificant to heed (within a naturalist framework) are what guides attention and leads to illusory projections of what the world is like. In itself this is the condition of samsara and not an unsurmountable hurdle. It becomes a problem when it comes to be mistaken for the entire world that is reified, to use a popular critical term. When what a singular human perceives in the world is swapped for the world itself, when the ego projects its particular condition onto universality.

[[]] Actions make deliberate things happen when cause and condition are favorable. "If the cause and conditions are not propitious, no matter how hard one tries, nothing will happen through the simple exercise of choosing a particular path. It must be emphasized, however, that Buddhist thinking does not accept the idea of 'destiny,' because if all has been decided by destiny, nothing would exist that has not been foreordained, and there would be no purpose in evaluating actions as right or wrong." (SHEN & MIDGLE, 2007a, p. 180) If all were destined, there would be no indeterminacy. If all were destined the slow accumulation of a different path through small repetitions guided by correct teachings would be unfeasible. Indeterminacy is possible, because the world is not finite, not a closed set, and not happening in one timeline, but rather time as myriad rivers of whirls, rapids, forkings and reconnections. Causality as it operates here messes with time without contradicting entropy. Things fall apart, however this is modulated by unexpected causations that makes falling apart into something more unpredictable. The future would be closed, or at the very least if these were the teachings, sentient beings wouldn't be motivated to improve. Past actions have been completed and their effects will eventually come to fruition. The future however is ever so slightly open, with the relational conditions of the webs that bring about reality in general and a subject's in particular. All that is caused is itself cause. All that is caused is impermanent. Reality is an effect of past actions and perpetually transforming.

[[]] Reality in the Buddhism of Western worlds is often associated strictly with illusion and carries with it many

common associations that are not exactly Buddhist. Not all illusions are made the same or of the same stuff. Different cosmologies bring with them varied conceptions of illusion. Different worlds compose of varied elements and different mixtures of material and immaterial parts. The illusion here is not one created by a demi-urge to mislead humans on their road to God, operating a binary: all I perceive is either entirely true or entirely false. (AULINO, 2020) It is no world of idealist solipsism that starts with the human disconnected from the wider world and in the end arrives at nothing for it has already taken away all the creative powers of the earth and of the body, or rather the ability to perceive at least some of them in the making of one's body and reality. Once the a priori assumption of radical separation of self and world as infrastructured into the Christian realism of the Occident is learned to bracket, another Buddhist illusion-reality connection emerges. The world as such is not an illusion, rather what is experienced as immediate sense-impressions is. Or rather, mistaking the world as experienced, the one mediated by the senses, for the ultimate world is the illusion. As in the Matrix sequels (The Wachowskis 2003), what is seen by a human is a simulation, only not produced by allegedly malicious robots, but by the complex networks of causation. Whatever happens in the simulation continues to have effects, is connected to the 'real' world of the anthro-po-robotic war. It merely isn't the ultimate reality, and, as what happens in the simulation has impact on what happens outside of it, neither is the other. Though it may be composed in more heavily material ways. What different, but similarly composed bodies perceive in one location is for each conditioned by personal karmic history, yet will overlap as local conditions also enter

the process. None of this denies the reality of the illusion itself. So-called illusions though they may be, they still have effects, such as tying a body into samsaric cycles, but also in more simple everyday effects as bodies always do things. If one body perceives a ghost and the other doesn't, a difference is introduced between the two, as one is affected by the encounter and the other isn't. Both are effects of different but overlapping networks of effects. The reality of neither is truer, however much it will seem to each to be so. Disputes about what is or isn't more real in general are futile, more about the ego attachment and only cause division. The only 'neutral' ground is the non-action of achieving nirvana and the body naturally disappearing without producing further attachments, ceasing to have effects in the networks of causation. So, adapted to a scientific framework without Buddhist soteriology, there is no neutral, disconnected position. There are however techniques (and accompanying discourse) that create experiences that feed back into common life in a way that bodies and their realities radically transform. A regular sentient being in a Theravāda world can, through the practice of meditation, learn that what is perceived is constructed, learn to swap different images of the outside which naturally implies that what is seen, is constructed and can be changed. Such are the achievements possible if a body follows the legitimate teachings in appropriate places. Inappropriate practices remain a necessary option. Experiments with thought are as possible as those involving complex corporeal techniques: Replace the 'reality' image with an 'emergent webs' image. Reality as seen by an individual body is conditioned, can be different, and should not be extrapolated as a stable thing out there. Each body moves through and as

spacetime. What is seen is in a constant process of being composed through the activities of the world as described above. And, isn't doing critical theory, or in this case practicing what the CCRU developed, also a question of following sets of more or less legitimate practices and assumptions, only geared toward improving the world here instead of stopping karmic cycles?

[[]] This can be conceptualized as a surface/depth relation. The surface is conventional perception, as well as immediate reactions to stimuli taken. The depth is the past actions begetting today's, the complex causal networks. The world is depth and surface. Sentient beings are depth and surface, yet commonly mistake the surface for totality. For depth to feed back into surface consciousness takes work. Depth is complexity, connectivity and uncertainty; or at least awareness thereof, for a sentient can never grasp all of karmic causality: absolute depth is the lack of artificial cuts, relative depth (accessible to the unawakened) is the awareness of enacted cuts. Depth produces surface. Surface feeds into depth. Arising indeterminacies ripple through both. For all is connected. When all is connected, all is real. What is real, changes.

[[]] Buddhist teachings and practices (as if they were separable!) ensure that the most can be achieved of indeterminacies in the complex karmic causality.²⁷ These are Buddhist bodily techniques and the non-sentient infrastructures that support and enhance them. In a

²⁷The relevant framework the 'most' refers to here is leaving the cycles of rebirth and helping others to achieve the same. Directly through teaching, or indirectly through all other kinds of support.

conventional framework this can be rendered as systematizing instructions for leaving the determinations of the past into futures alternative than the ones projected through accumulated past actions. Indeterminacies in and of themselves don't add up to different paths. After all, they are random. Buddhadharmā, the teaching of the Buddha here becomes a tool that spaces out these (non)spaces that randomly appear between causes and effects. Being reborn as a human creates optimal conditions, as humans have a constitution that makes a relatively stronger unlinking of environmental cause and bodily action possible.²⁸ Gradually the tradition came to form other, more material spacings. The ancient saṃgha for example, a formation that carries the teachings and around which varied technologies were developed in order to store the teachings outside personal human memory (among them the community of monks itself and the rules and innovations to prevent strife and separation), as well as architectural knowledges that include implicit information that bodies can transfer by working next to each other but can't exactly be put into words, plans or manuals. And all the connected bodies that carry with the implicit knowledges of human/technological practices and techniques that enhance conditions for bodies to be open to teachings and temples, the small objects, gestures, intonations that create conducive atmospheres, that support the propagation of Buddhist virtues such as compassion and

²⁸Deities and other celestial beings live in worse conditions in relation to awakening, as their environment tends to be pleasant and thus the desire to leave the cycles is reduced. Bodies and environments evidently relate, even as bodies can be displaced into other environments and carry certain conditions with them (see above, point 9). Internal and external causes are never entirely separable – a 'good' rebirth relates to a correct body as much as environment.

equanimity.²⁹ They are conditioning surface spacings that enhance human activities in transforming stochastic indeterminacy into different paths, new karmacoding, and eventually perhaps nirvana.³⁰ Small changes must be sustained so as to systematize into larger ones, especially in an impermanent world this requires effort and complexity.³¹ Material networks in the conventional sense must be established so that bodies transforming through spacetime (it itself transforming) can do so in support systems that stabilize the gains, that reiterate the openings afforded by indeterminacy. In other words, Buddhist teachings, practices, temples introduce spaces into networking determinacies or stops into these flows. Networks are at the same time processes, are as constant motion. As continuous change, any thing is always more and less than one thing. Any act is always more than one act, as it connects different karmic pasts by embroiling more than one sentient being. All these Buddhist

²⁹Virtues always combine with acts, one does not want to reduce Buddhist worlding to a kind of contemplative virtue ethics focused at what is good at the expense of how to achieve a world where more beings will act accordingly to what is considered good. To paraphrase a typical attitude of the Buddha: one can debate what is and isn't good for all eternity without doing one act that would actually enhance goodness in the world. From such a Buddhist position with its ontological base in acts (*karmology*), talking and contemplating the 'good' in the end appears to be more about ego projection/protection than anything else.

³⁰For the inorganic is not karmically or otherwise conditioned for most of the Buddhaharmas that evolved on this earth for now. Only in medieval Japan did teachings appear, where everything in the world is karmic, dependent on arising. (RAMBELLI, 2001) Meanwhile, plants have always been considered borderline in Buddhist worldings. (FINDLY, 2009) This is to point out that the relative dearth, or general lack of awareness that Buddhist thought has tackled such problems, has more to do with Modern Western humanism/Christian realism than with anything integral to Buddhist teachings. Sharf (2013) analyzes how the always uncertain borders between sentience and insentience have been an issue for Chinese translators. Apparently unlike for translations into Western worlds, where the issue in general is sidelined. There is no neutral ground for translation and understanding.

³¹Locals, at least in Thailand, give many reasons for attending temples, or bringing parts of temple conditions through meditation apps. They attend temples to feel better, to be more determined in achieving goals, to calm the mind (playing games before sleeping seems to also do the trick for some), etc. Some for whom the Buddhist world is more present, there is also the possibility of more 'magical' activities to help with careers and love lives.

cultural techniques and paraphernalia are performative and impermanent. They perform the spacing, enhance conditions for accumulating indeterminacies into a new path. They are temporary spaces where change can be effected. An infrastructure through which bodies (in the most extensive sense) are connected, mixed, slowed down, sped up, reoriented. Temple spaces, meditation practices as experimental laboratories where other realities and corpotentialities are touched, learned, found, outside of conventional life. As all is effect, practices alone can even in less propitious conditions lead to large transformations, yet they work best when combining with the conditions created by temples. Their constitution being honed and fine-tuned through centuries of adaptation.

[[]] When all is impermanent, all is subjected to determined differentiation. There are various kinds of beings with more or less intensive affordances which can reshuffle the configurations within flowing networks. The Buddha is beyond these categories and all of them at once. But that body is not of concern here, as the aim is to construct connections with scientific practices by articulating Buddhist worldings as ontological discourse.

[[]] An important difference is made. There are karmic entities (organic entities with *cetanā*) and non-karmic entities. Sentient beings produce karmacode that is stored and conditions the future of this ever-changing composition of karma and six sense-organs constituted through acts. Non-karmic entities, roughly analogous to the non-organic, influence the karmacode of sentients but don't produce any

that would constitute their own. They have no 'internal' cause, they are all condition. Yet, the two mix in the webs of *pratītyasamutpāda* as all entities are effects. This is implicit in all teachings and made explicit in *Mahāyāna*: "That is, because all human (and non-human) actions are mutually influencing, we are connected in an 'intricate web' of karma, which is constantly changing. Recognizing this causes us to overcome a narrow, isolated view of the self and to then 'engage meaningfully with others and pursue collective happiness.'" (CLAYTON, 2021, p. 107) So to a certain extent karmacodes contain traces of asentients, most notably those of temples and ceremonial paraphernalia. Teachings and practices hover directly at the edges between sentients and asentients, the latter today include AI and robots, the status of which is debated (BAFELLI 2021, GOULD & WALTERS 2020, TRAVAGNIN 2020). Sentient beings differentiate through the complexity of karmic determinations or the affordances of indeterminacy. The world changes, new non-sentients appear, partly by mixing human things with non-human ones. Buddhist teachings and insights feed into the material-mediatic constitution of the world. Realities untouched by Buddhist teachings have different conditions. Realities touched by Buddhist teachings conceived idealistically, that is without them mingling with infrastructure, architecture, spatial and other organization, also differ, and in all but the smallest differences will in this regard be the same as the untouched ones. Nowhere can ever be fully Buddhist, as these are teachings of connection and transformation. And yet there are degrees of intensity. Buddha-fields one might say, reconceptualized onto things.

[[]] Insight arises from analysis, by applying 'correct' teachings. Insight transforms that entity composed of six senses and a mostly coherent karmacode. Insight, an action, conditioned by karmacode enacts changes that feed back into the code, as the path seemingly laid out for the future changes. Actions made possible by the spacings in determination and sustained by Buddho-technological infrastructure create circuits with the past/memory as karmacode.³² These circuits are non-linear and span times too vast for a common being to perceive. An individual life (as conventionally conceived) is but that what is between two cuts of a karmic life/stream in a world without beginning. A karmic life is one of which rebirth as different sentient beings are just instances or rather continual variations. A common life of an individuated body, the experience of the world from birth to death is the phase between two edits of a vastly more expansive stream. Rebirth is a cycle of expansion and contraction, the material parts dispersing (radical transformation), the karmic carrying on as less radical transformation, until they combine again, as a new mixture at the birth of a new body. Rebirth is often explained with the famous image of a flame and two candles. The flame from the first lights the second, it is and is not the same flame. Causes, conditions, and effects. Karma affects the next life, but disappears once the effect is caused. Karmacode is an infinite swarm of karmas happening. The flame carries over the energy, like an effect, but is not the same flame, it just appears

³²*Karmacode* here is used to make distinctions easier, as in Buddhist tradition proper, this is just called karma.

to be so. It is an effect of previous versions of the flame. Karma/code metamorphs continuously.³³

[[]] The way senses compose one's experience is through alternation too quick to be perceived without appropriate training so that it produces a continuous experience. "According to Buddhist meditation theory, the magic of being operates by the fast succession of sensory occurrences, making it possible for one to cling to a singular self-identity, in this case as a 'knower' of phenomena, when in fact all that has happened is that phenomena were there." (KLIMA, 2002, p. 213) Translated into the language operationalized here: there are spacings between sense-impressions. Alan Klima, referring to what a Theravāda monk told him, uses the imagery of an electric fan rotating so fast as to appear a continuous swoosh. It is unclear whether this is his example or shared by one of the monk interlocutors. It is through memory as habit that these gaps are being bridged to make for continuity out of fragments. "It may seem to be seamless when we inattentively reflect on our memory of 'experience' in life as it is lived, with relatively low awareness. But when one pays careful attention, under appropriate circumstances such as reclusive meditation, practitioners report that it is not too difficult to see, for instance, that phenomena change from seeing, hearing, touching, and thinking, back and forth in a most fragmentary and startling way." (Ibid.) Fragmentarity is primary, notably not a whole

³³The candle/flame image here operates analogously to film projection and even digital formats: what is experienced is the continuity of form via perception, yet underneath, that which carries and produces the form experienced continues to change. The form can travel so as to be carried by other material substrates made of the same components. The cinematic image or the computer interface are and are not the same. And there is always the subject that perceives all of this, that habitually creates continuity or mistakes one thing for the other.

broken into parts to be reconstituted again into a whole that preceded. Rather, bits and pieces ever-changing and composing into the experience of reality as experienced/perceived by a body composed of the parts that make for a human, a process at once active and passive. This is why Klima mobilizes the analogy of cinema, a seamless motion created as a succession of images too fast for common human perception to notice. It is not just analogical, but ontological. The primary sensory constitution of the world as succession of fragments drawn from different senses experienced as continuity. This is not so much a statement about a fragmentary world but about body-world interaction. The technological dispositif of the projection system as a condition for extended cognition. Where sentients and non-sentients mix. Meditation is a form of hacking the karmacode via material-habitual transformation. Training to make the world flexible. Teachings/practices mingle with bodies. Experience as well as dharma can never fully be put into words. Words used to describe meditation can be seen as more of a pointing toward the limits of everything, where disentangling from the endless cycles occurs. A common technique is the focus on breathing, where the borders of a body are traversed, on that activity, that mingling of elements that sustains life. Victor Fan, with a particular proclivity for the word 'gradually,' puts it this way:

When I pay attention to my breathing, I am gradually focusing on my biological mechanism of self-sustenance, thus allowing me to disengage myself from the immediate assemblage of causes and conditions that constitutes my state of anger. Gradually, the karmic impulses that initiate my process of becoming no longer operate on autopilot. Instead, I gradually engage myself in and know clearly the karmic impulses that are

responsible for my consciousness's initiation and extinction from one moment to another. By engaging myself in and knowing the generation and extinction of these impulses, I gradually become mindful of how each awareness functions as an assemblage of causes and conditions, which will inevitably produce consequences. I can then begin to take agency to ensure that these causes and conditions are initiated out of mindfulness, instead of letting my impulses run on autopilot. I can then make microperceptual choices between causes and conditions that would produce further mindful awarenesses and causes and conditions that would produce afflictions. (FAN, 2022, p. 248)

The interplay of dependent co-arising, karma and indeterminacy as continuously discontinuous operation, its expedience differentiated according to conditions without a universal projective-descriptive rule. Whether in a (temple) space, deep dark caves, the presence of a Buddha, different parts of the body or in *Mahāyāna* worlds, on the internet and with robotic sentients.

Conclusion

So this is what happens when two fields are brought together that in the established divisions of academia and general discourse would hardly touch. An innovative ontology can be articulated, one that updates Buddhist teachings into a cybernetic world, bypassing the typical humanism to which the tradition has been shackled in cultural translation. It is something that the CCRU enables, and here I above all experiment with and critically engage with Nick Land's Legacy. Much like the unit's members did with their activities, it makes connections appear that are wouldn't be

intuitive before but once noticed, one enters new realities and can wonder, how it is that such matters are not established yet. It's putting a certain set of concepts, imagery and pre-conceptual assumptions into immediate practice. Karmanetics enables to hold together the subject position and the wider world, including the machinic, in an innovative way, as the former is articulated as the result of the same complex non-teleological automated process. "The subject of theory can no longer affect to stand outside the process it describes: it is integrated as an immanent machine part in an open ended experimentation that is inextricable from capital's continuous scrambling of its own limits-which operates via the reprocessing of the actual through its virtual futures, dissolving all bulwarks that would preserve the past. In hooking itself up to this haywire time-machine, theory seeks to cast off its own inert obstacles." (AVANESSIAN & MACKAY, 2014, p. 17) What I hope for, is that experimentation with worlds outside of the Western tradition, to which CCRU mostly remains tied, might makes the immanent machine extricable from capital's continuous scrambling of its own limits. Karmentics is after all also a time machine operating on karmacode.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AVANESSIAN, Armen; MACKAY, Robin.** *#Accelerate: The Accelerationist Reader*. Falmouth: Urbanomic, 2014.
- BAFFELLI, Erica.** *Robots and Buddhist Practice in Contemporary Japan*. *Religions*, v. 12, n. 1, 2021, p. 1–16.
- CLAYTON, Bartholomew.** *Karma and Collective Happiness in East Asian Buddhism*. London: Routledge, 2021, p. 107.
- CCRU (Cybernetic Culture Research Unit).** *Writings 1997–2003*. Time Spiral Press, 2015. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/ccru-writings-1997-2003>. Accessed on: 30 July 2025.
- DELEUZE, Gilles.** *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.
- DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Félix.** *What is Philosophy?*. Translated by Graham Burchell and Hugh Tomlinson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.
- FAN, Victor.** *Cinema Illuminating Reality: Media Philosophy through Buddhism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2022, p. 7, 248.
- GOULD, Rebecca; WALTERS, Maria Alexandra L.** *On Robotic Monks and Algorithmic Compassion: Buddhism and AI*. *Journal of Religious Ethics*, v. 48, n. 2, 2020, p. 218–240.

HOLBRAAD, Martin; PEDERSEN, Morten Axel. *The Ontological Turn: An Anthropological Exposition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

KLIMA, Alan. *The Funeral Casino: Meditation, Massacre, and Exchange with the Dead in Thailand*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002, p. 213, 270–271.

LAND, Nick. *Templecity: Disordered Loops through Shanghai Time*. Falmouth: Urbanatomy Electronic, 2014, p. 7.

MACY, Joanna. *Mutual Causality in Buddhism and General Systems Theory: The Dharma of Natural Systems*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1991.

MOL, Annemarie. *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

MOL, Annemarie. *Eating in Theory*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2021.

MOUSSAVI, S. Farid. *Cybernetic Models in Buddhist Thought*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

OLSON, Carl. *Original Buddhist Sources: A Reader*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2006, p. 80.

PEARSON, Keith Ansell. *Germinal Life: The Difference and Repetition of Deleuze*. London: Routledge, 2005, p. 1116.

PICKERING, Andrew. *The Cybernetic Brain: Sketches of Another Future*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

- PICKERING, Andrew.** *New Ontologies*. In: **PICKERING, Andrew; GUZIK, Keith (orgs.).** *The Mangle in Practice: Science, Society, and Becoming*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2017, p. 1–28.
- SHEN, Yueh-Ting; MIDGLEY, Gerald.** *Philosophical Connections between Buddhism and Systems Thinking*. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, v. 20, n. 1, 2007b, p. 73–80.
- SHEN, Yueh-Ting; MIDGLEY, Gerald.** *Systemic Interventions and the Buddha's Middle Path: Toward a More Integrative Worldview*. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, v. 20, n. 2, 2007a, p. 175–182.
- SHIH, Huaiyu.** *Reconsidering Karma in Light of the Yogācāra Philosophy*. *Philosophy East and West*, v. 50, n. 2, 2000, p. 187–210.
- TRAVAGNIN, Stefania.** *Buddhist Robots, Cyborgs, and AI: Religious and Ethical Challenges*. *Journal of Contemporary Buddhism*, v. 21, n. 2, 2020, p. 145–160.
- VARELA, Francisco J.; THOMPSON, Evan; ROSCH, Eleanor.** *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991.
- VARELA, Francisco J.; POERKSEN, Bernhard.** *Truth is What Works: Francisco Varela on Cognitive Science, Buddhism, and the View from Somewhere*. Frankfurt: Carl-Auer Verlag, 2006.

VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, Eduardo. *Cannibal Metaphysics: For a Post-Structural Anthropology*. Translated by Peter Skafish. Minneapolis: Univocal Publishing, 2014.

VIVEIROS DE CASTRO, Eduardo. *Perspectival Anthropology and the Method of Controlled Equivocation*. *Tipití*, v. 2, n. 1, 2004, p. 3–20.