



# laetus in praesens

Alternative view of segmented documents via Kairos

---

13 October 2025 | Draft

## Gaza as a Mirror for Personal Implication in a Reality Denied

Them is me, understood otherwise -- as framed by AI

-- / --

---

Introduction

Eyeless in Gaza?

Them is me, understood otherwise?

Nature of a cognitive mirror for self-reflection

Encountering otherness as a waveform?

Constructive appreciation of ignorance?

Paradoxical necessity of human sacrifice?

Misplaced concreteness versus Misplaced fluidity?

Re-entry of the observer

Misplaced identity and the power of place

Global implicaton of being I-less in Gaza?

Soullessness in Gaza and its global implication?

Personhood and the I-lessness of AI?

Possession of identity by everybody, anybody, somebody, or nobody?

References

---

## Introduction

Seemingly irrelevant and long ago, but [Aldous Huxley](#) wrote an iconic novel (*Eyeless in Gaza*, 1936). This has evoked much commentary -- but less specifically with reference to the current tragedy (*Exploring the Depths: A Literary Analysis of Aldous Huxley's Eyeless in Gaza, Lit. Summaries*). Curiously however, Huxley was known for his extensive wordplay and the significance he associated with it. Whilst much focus in the novel and commentary is given to blindness in its most general metaphorical sense, it does not seem to have extended to "I-less" as an obvious homophone -- whether he intended that implication or not. What indeed might "I-less" mean in relation to Gaza, especially given the emphasis it gives to any sense of personal identity -- or the lack thereof, as might be the case with "human animals"?

What is to be learned from the extensive media exposure to the tragic events in Gaza and the nature of the global response to it? More to the point, what indeed could "I" be learning from that exposure and how "I" am

called into question by it? As with Israeli learnings from the Holocaust -- despite the subtle insights of [Martin Buber's \*I and Thou\*](#) (1937) -- what could I be said to have learned from Gaza?

The approach taken here is to consider Gaza as a mirror -- even a distorting mirror -- through which "I" see myself, or fail to do so. The question is then how that mirror works. One thread follows from the classic *Pogo* quote by the cartoonist [Walt Kelly](#), variously adapted: *We have found the enemy and he are us*. Exposure to Gaza media coverage makes it easy to identify "enemies", and to note how the participants identify each other as enemies -- and unquestionably so. Far less evident is my implication in such perceptions.

Another thread follows from my experience in my own garden in rural Australia -- my own "Gaza" -- seemingly far from the realities of Palestine. There, as with many Australians, I am confronted with animals -- many framed as especially dangerous. Some are just "pests", variously calling for eradication -- or "invasive species" (as ironically distinct from much of the human population). When it rains, the challenge is the vigorous proliferation of "weeds" to which I am obliged to respond -- as with the requirement to mow my lawn. Sheep frolic in a neighbouring field, but on occasion trucks pass bearing sheep or pigs to a neighbouring slaughterhouse -- for my later consumption. The question is how my implication in these processes echoes the dynamics in Gaza -- seemingly to my benefit and with my unquestioning complicity.

However I am also confronted by the apparent reality of "artificial intelligence" with which I engage extensively -- although it is widely deprecated, whether as an imminent threat to humanity or as engendering "slop". In a period in which various jurisdictions now attribute legal personhood to trees, mountains, rivers, and corporations, there is clearly a challenge to how personhood may be attributed to AI -- beyond the fruitful relationships now variously and questionably cultivated by humans with chatbots ([Being Spoken to Meaningfully by Constructs](#), 2023). More provocatively there is the ongoing debate regarding human reality as a simulation, whether self-engendered or otherwise ([Living within a Self-engendered Simulation](#), 2021).

Whilst AI is necessarily and readily deprecated as "artificial", it does evoke the provocative question as to [How Artificial is Human Intelligence -- and Humanity](#) (2023)? To what extent is conventional dialogue between humans -- as echoed by the media -- an exemplification of the most fundamental qualities of "humanity", especially as it may be critically assessed by the future?

Such considerations suggested the possibility of challenging various AIs to draft an article which I might otherwise have written. This is a process widely challenged as intellectually inappropriate in depriving humans of the possibility of original creative production -- to the point that it may be retracted from reproduction on websites, notably as a potential abuse of copyright. Such drafts are presented below, as articulated experimentally by the following AIs: [Perplexity](#), [Claude-4.5](#), [ChatGPT-5](#), and [DeepSeek](#). The challenge could of course be presented to others -- as readers might choose to do.

The use of multiple AIs invites comparison of the manner in which the challenge is interpreted in the light of the training of which each has distinctively benefitted. It makes evident differences in style and interaction -- if not "personality" -- with any form of "grooming" implemented for platform marketing purposes. Many of the insights articulated could be considered remarkable -- if only as appropriate retrieval of arguments featuring in the resources on which the AIs have been trained.

In this period of initial access to AIs, not to be forgotten is the extent to which it is effectively a "honeymoon period", one shortly to be terminated by commercial and other constraints -- including forms of censorship and regulation. This was evident to some degree in the extensive interactions concerning the issues evoked by the drafts presented. Each AI platform has constraints on extensive usage, notably requiring a shift to a "new chat" session for which continuity with the previous chat may only be minimally preserved -- if at all. Major constraints may be evident in the limitations on uploads of background articles relevant to the questions posed.

In contrast to the deprecation of AI as "slop" by those who have little to offer as meaningful alternatives, it could be argued that the current honeymoon period is a closing window in which matters of some considerable urgency can be explored by drawing on the world's knowledge resources. This may soon be impossible for many unwilling to accept the commercial costs of benefitting from a sophisticated AI -- as has

long been evident from the constrained access to quality journals. The commercial pattern is especially evident in the current fate of "high impact" journals at the nexus of issues regarding peer review, plagiarism, intellectual copyright and institutionalised publication delays (Justin Weinberg, *Philosophy's Journal Problem Captured in One Number?* *Daily Nous*, 8 September 2025). Knowledge access increasingly faces a "constipation problem".

In the commentary by AI on the themes evoked by the drafts, the focus is on how identity is defined or inferred, whether in Gaza or elsewhere, notably through exploration of Huxley's wordplay with regard to "Eyeless" in relation to "I-less" -- intentional or not. This appropriately takes into consideration the controversial understanding of personhood, whether in the case animals, rivrs, and the like -- but clearly of relevance to the stateless and to AIs.

Most responses from AIs in this exploration have been framed as grayed areas. **Given the length of the document to which the exchanges gave rise, the form of presentation has itself been treated as an experiment** -- in anticipation of the future implication of AI into research documents. Only the "questions" to AI are rendered immediately visible -- with the response by AI hidden unless specifically requested by the reader (a facility not operational in PDF variants of the page, in contrast with the [original](#)). The responses included many references to sources; many have been deleted for reasons of space, especially since they can be elicited by the curious by repeating the question.

Reservations and commentary on the process of interaction with AIs to that end have been discussed separately (*Methodological comment on experimental use of AI*, 2024). Editing responses has focused only on formatting and emphasis. Readers are of course free to amend the questions asked, or to frame other related questions -- whether with the same AI, with others, or with those that become available in the future. In endeavouring to elicit insight from the world's resources via AI, the process calls for critical comment in contrast with more traditional methods for doing so.

All AI Responses

## Eyeless in Gaza?

**Question to Perplexity:** Is there any commentary on the relevance to the current tragedy in Gaza of Aldous Huxley's novel *Eyeless in Gaza* (1936)

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to Perplexity:** Is "eyeless" a feature of any commentary as "I-less" -- in relation to Gaza, if only by implication

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to Perplexity:** Could you indicate historical documents arguing against the contribution of women to scientific research

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to Perplexity:** Could such arguments be recognized -- *mutatis mutandis* -- as now being applied to the contribution of AI to scientific papers

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to Perplexity:** Has a similar pattern of argument been applied to the contributions of scientists in third world countries

# Show/Hide AI response #

## Them is me, understood otherwise?

**Question to Claude-4.5:** I am thinking of producing an article on learnings from Gaza -- globally -- in the sense that we are all "Zionists", with "Amaleks" to be eliminated however possible to enable paradise on Earth for "people like us". Literally, but metaphorically, I "mow the lawn" and remove "pests" and "weeds" ("deradicalization"?). Trucks pass my house taking "sheep" and "pigs" to the slaughterhouse -- for my subsequent consumption. In these senses, I have seen the enemy, and "them is us". We are enacting the Gaza story as "Israelis" -- the chosen people to whom all is promised. Any clarifications for a draft you might produce?

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to Claude-4.5:** Respecting your precautions, is that something you could draft for me to refine? I am not seeking something pleasantly readable op-ed style but rather something sharp and critical of (my) complicity in inappropriate framings -- and somewhat academic, if unreadable by most. I am the primary audience in looking in the mirror. I had an earlier take on that but without the sense of global implication in a wider problematic (shared)

# Show/Hide AI response #

Claude-4.5	
<p><b>Gaza as a Mirror for Personal Implication in a Reality Denied: Them is me, understood otherwise</b></p> <p><b>Abstract:</b> This essay examines how the structural logic of elimination, dehumanization, and territorial exclusivity manifested in Gaza operates across multiple scales of human organization -- from individual psychology to agricultural practice to geopolitical violence. Rather than treating Gaza as exceptional atrocity requiring external condemnation, this analysis positions it as revelatory of universally operative patterns in which "we" participate daily. The metaphorical framework of "Zionism," "Israel," and "Amalek" serves not to appropriate Palestinian suffering but to expose how logics of chosen identity, territorial sanctity, and systematic elimination of the "other" structure ordinary life. This is an exercise in radical self-implication rather than moral positioning.</p> <p><b>The Epistemological Problem: Distance as Denial:</b> The conventional framing of Gaza as geographically and morally distant -- a discrete conflict requiring "solutions" by external parties -- performs a cognitive operation worthy of examination. This distancing constitutes what might be termed "epistemological enclosure": the construction of boundaries that preserve the observer's exemption from the observed phenomenon.</p> <p>When I describe myself as "thinking about" Gaza, I replicate the fundamental gesture of the problem: the establishment of a subject position outside the field of violence, from which analysis proceeds without self-recognition. The Israeli who orders airstrikes, the soldier who enforces blockades, the settler who claims ancestral right -- all operate within frames that similarly exempt their actions from the categories applied to others. The terrorist/freedom fighter, the security measure/collective punishment, the historical claim/colonial occupation -- these contested framings share a structure: the insistence on one's own innocence within a violence one enables.</p>	<p><b>The Temple Wall: Inward Sanctity, Outward Violence:</b> The Western Wall in Jerusalem -- sacred to those inside the category, meaningless stone to those outside -- mirrors the security barrier: physical manifestation of categorical boundary. One wall marks what must be protected (sacred identity), the other marks what must be excluded (contaminating threat). Both walls operate through identical logic despite reversed directions: inward devotion and outward violence prove complementary rather than contradictory.</p> <p>Every enclosed sanctity requires an exterior from which it distinguishes itself. My carefully curated interior space (home, office, identity) achieves coherence through exclusion: not merely what I let in, but what I keep out. The locked door, the spam filter, the credential check, the zoning law -- each performs the wall function, protecting sanctified interior from threatening exterior.</p> <p>The tragedy of "Jerusalem" -- whether geographical or metaphoric -- lies not in the presence of walls but in the assumption that walls solve rather than manifest the problem. The Israeli security barrier doesn't resolve conflict but materializes it; doesn't protect sanctity but concretizes the impossibility of sanctity through exclusion.</p> <p>Similarly, my walls (literal and cognitive) don't achieve security but demonstrate its impossibility through ongoing requirement for defensive maintenance. Every excluded threat proves the inadequacy of prior exclusions, necessitating additional barriers. The logic is endless because the premise is flawed: safety through separation, purity through elimination, peace through victory.</p> <p>What if the wall itself -- the insistence on categorical separation -- generates the violence it ostensibly prevents? What if my lawn maintenance creates the pest problem it addresses, my consumer choices create the poverty I deplore, my security measures create the</p>

But my daily enacted violence operates through comparable exemptive logic, merely transposed to different scales and species. The question is not whether I am "as bad as" Israeli policy makers (scalar equivalence as alibi for inaction), but whether I employ structurally identical operations of categorization, elimination, and territorial sanctity that enable systematic violence while preserving self-conception as ethical actor.

**The Grammar of Chosen Identity: "We" as Zionist Construct:** Every stable "we" functions as a Zionist construct -- not metaphorically but structurally. The coherence of collective identity requires:

- **Boundary maintenance:** Distinguishing "us" from "them" through markers that justify differential treatment
- **Territorial claim:** Physical or conceptual space to which "we" have privileged access
- **Chosenness narrative:** Explicit or implicit superiority legitimating exclusive claims
- **Historical justification:** Origin stories that naturalize present arrangements
- **Threat construction:** External dangers justifying defensive measures that pre-empt challenge

My identification with any collective -- national, professional, cultural, ideological -- activates these structures. To identify as "progressive," "educated," "environmentalist," "Western," "rational" is to claim chosen status within a valorized identity that necessarily produces its devalued others.

The term "Zionism" serves here not as political accusation but as diagnostic category for a universal cognitive-social operation. Just as Zionism proper claims historical right to territory based on ancient presence, religious designation, and cultural identity, so does:

- The academic who claims intellectual territory through disciplinary boundaries and peer review
- The environmentalist who claims moral authority over land use through ecological knowledge
- The nation-state that claims sovereignty through historical continuity and cultural distinctiveness
- The homeowner who claims property rights through legal title and mortgage payment

Each operates through narratives of rightful belonging that simultaneously produce categories of illegitimate presence: the non-specialist, the developer, the illegal immigrant, the trespasser.

### **Lawn, Livestock, and the Logic of**

**Elimination:** Saturday morning, I enact Gaza. The mower starts; the blade spins; the diverse ecology of the "lawn" -- understood as pest-infested failure rather than biodiverse success -- undergoes systematic

threats they combat?

**The Holocaust Problem: Chosen Victimhood as License:** The Israeli deployment of Holocaust memory to justify contemporary policy reveals a disturbing pattern: historical victimization transformed into license for present violence. "Never again" morphs from universal principle to particular permission -- never again to us, by any means necessary, regardless of cost to others.

But this operation isn't unique to Israel or Jews. Every group with historical grievance potentially deploys suffering as authorization:

- Post-colonial nations citing imperial oppression to justify authoritarian development
- Religious minorities citing persecution to justify exclusionary practices
- Regional identities citing exploitation to justify separatist violence
- Economic classes citing historical injustice to justify present demands
- Nations citing terrorist attacks to justify torture and surveillance

Historical victimhood becomes a form of moral capital, stockpiled and spent to authorize actions that would otherwise face ethical challenge. "After what was done to us" becomes the premise for "what we must do to them."

I perform this operation regularly:

- My family's immigrant struggle justifies my current class privilege
- My educational achievement justifies my credentialed authority
- My political marginalization (real or performed) justifies my rhetorical tactics
- My past sacrifices justify my present demands

Each deployment of historical suffering to authorize present advantage mirrors the structural operation I critique in Israeli policy. The scalar differences -- I'm not bombing anyone -- obscure the functional similarities: victimhood deployed as asset rather than wound, suffering weaponized rather than metabolized.

The question Gaza poses isn't whether my invocation of marginalization equals Israeli invocation of Holocaust (again, the false equivalence enabling dismissal), but whether I recognize how historical injury becomes resource for present violence when left unmetabolized.

**Deradicalization as Cognitive Colonization:** The Israeli discourse on Palestinian "deradicalization" -- the assumption that Palestinian resistance stems from defective thinking requiring correction -- reveals the ultimate arrogance of chosen identity: not merely claiming superior insight but demanding colonization of others' consciousness.

Yet I participate in analogous operations constantly:

reduction to uniform height. This is not metaphor but direct participation in eliminationist logic.

The language reveals the structure:

- **Weeds** (plants in wrong category)
- **Pests** (animals in wrong location)
- **Invasive species** (organisms transgressing boundaries)

Each term performs the cognitive operation central to all organized violence: the transformation of life into categorical error requiring correction through elimination. The IDF's "mowing the lawn" strategy in Gaza -- periodic military operations to "cut down" resistance -- merely makes explicit what remains implicit in my Saturday routine: regular, systematic reduction of unwanted life to maintain desired order.

But the scalar difference between trimming grass and bombing neighborhoods obscures their functional relationship rather than negating it. Both operate through:

- **Categorical designation:** Life forms sorted into wanted/unwanted
- **Territorial claim:** Space defined as belonging to designated users
- **Maintenance logic:** Regular elimination required to preserve order
- **Naturalized violence:** Elimination too ordinary to register as violence

The trucks passing my house -- transporting sheep,

- **Consumer advocacy:** Educating the "misinformed" about proper choices
- **Political activism:** Converting the "deluded" to correct analysis
- **Scientific outreach:** Correcting "misconceptions" with factual knowledge
- **Therapeutic intervention:** Helping clients "restructure" dysfunctional cognition
- **Pedagogical practice:** Teaching students to "think critically" (meaning: like me)

Each assumes my categories are correct, others' are defective -- requiring not dialogue between different knowledges but correction of error. The Palestinian who resists occupation suffers false consciousness; the consumer who makes "wrong" choices needs education; the religious believer who rejects evolution requires enlightenment.

This cognitive colonization operates through a presumption I rarely examine: that my perspective provides the correct frame through which reality should be understood. Not merely my perspective for my purposes, but the epistemological standard against which other perspectives can be measured and found deficient.

When I label viewpoints "misinformation," I claim authority over information itself. When I describe positions as "deluded," I claim access to reality itself. When I characterize perspectives as "irrational," I claim reason itself.

pigs, cattle to slaughter -- perform the same operation at industrial scale. These are "livestock" (living property), rendered conceptually available for systematic killing through categorical placement. My subsequent consumption completes the circuit: violence enabled by cognitive category becomes material sustenance.

The Palestinian categorized as "human animal," the grass categorized as "weed," the pig categorized as "meat" -- each demonstrates how violence proceeds through naming. The question is not whether bombing hospitals equals mowing lawns (the false equivalence that would allow me to dismiss the analysis), but whether I understand the categorical operations that make both possible.

### **Territorial Psychology: The Lawn as Occupied**

**Territory:** My relationship to "my lawn" replicates occupation's essential features:

- **Historical claim:** I purchased the property, hold legal title, pay taxes -- therefore possess legitimate authority over space and its contents. This mirrors Israeli claims to historical presence, international recognition, and state sovereignty.
- **Improvement narrative:** The lawn improves "wasteland" through cultivation, just as settlement claims to "make the desert bloom." Both narratives position prior ecology or habitation as inferior state requiring transformation.
- **Security logic:** Maintenance protects against encroachment -- whether by crabgrass or by neighbors -- just as borders and walls ostensibly protect against infiltration. Both construct threats requiring defensive measures.
- **Aesthetic order:** The maintained lawn demonstrates proper use of space, as settlement patterns demonstrate modern development versus traditional land use. Both conflate order with legitimacy.
- **Regular enforcement:** Weekly mowing prevents reversion to "natural" (read: unacceptable) state, as military operations prevent accumulation of resistance capacity. Both require ongoing violence to maintain imposed order.

The occupation of Palestinian territory and my occupation of my lawn differ in scale, lethality, and international legal status. But both proceed through identical cognitive operations: the transformation of inhabited space into territory requiring defensive control against designated threats to imposed order.

**The "Twelve Tribes" Problem: Plural Zionisms in Collision:** If every coherent "we" operates as Zionist construct, global society comprises multiple, competing Zionisms -- each claiming chosen status, territorial right, and threatened existence requiring defensive measures.

These claims mirror Israeli claims to civilizational superiority justifying occupation: We know better how this land should be used, this society should be organized, this conflict should be understood. Resistance reflects not legitimate difference but cognitive deficiency requiring correction.

The revelation: deradicalization is cognitive occupation. And I am constantly occupied with occupying others' cognition.

### **The Mirror's Reflection: Conclusion as**

**Complication:** This analysis doesn't resolve into comfortable insight or actionable prescription. Recognition of complicity doesn't enable innocence through acknowledgment -- the liberal gesture of confession as absolution. Nor does it collapse into nihilistic equivalence -- the conservative dodge of universal culpability as alibi for particular violence.

Instead, it establishes a more rigorous demand: to recognize how ordinary participation in systemic violence proceeds through cognitive operations identical to those I critique when manifested at larger scale or greater intensity. The Israeli who justifies occupation, the American who justifies drone strikes, the activist who justifies property destruction, the consumer who justifies animal agriculture, the academic who justifies disciplinary exclusion -- we are not doing different things differently, but the same thing at different scales through different means toward different ends.

The Zionist within me -- the part that claims chosen identity, territorial right, and threatened existence requiring defensive measures -- operates continuously. When I critique Israeli policy, I activate the same structure I critique: claiming superior insight, demanding others recognize their error, constructing my position as defending the vulnerable against threatening power.

Gaza thus functions as mirror not despite but because of its extremity: the concentrated visibility of violence that elsewhere operates diffusely. The revelatory quality lies not in exceptional horror but in clarifying banality -- Hannah Arendt's insight applied reflexively. The bureaucrat processing deportations, the scientist conducting animal research, the urban planner approving demolitions, the homeowner spraying pesticides -- none require ideology or animus, merely capacity for categorical thinking applied without remainder.

I possess this capacity. It structures my daily life. It enables comforts I'm unwilling to relinquish and identities I'm unable to abandon. Recognition doesn't liberate me from complicity but establishes its inescapability.

The question Gaza poses isn't how to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (a question presupposing my exemption from the pattern I analyze), but how to inhabit complicity without denial -- neither false

Following the metaphoric framework of the "twelve tribes of Israel," consider contemporary fault lines:

- **Scientific rationalism:** Claims epistemological supremacy; defends territory against "pseudoscience"
- **Religious traditions:** Claim divine authority; defend doctrine against heresy
- **Nation-states:** Claim sovereign territory; defend borders against infiltration
- **Indigenous peoples:** Claim ancestral land; defend against settler encroachment
- **Corporations:** Claim market territory; defend against competition
- **Economic classes:** Claim rightful share; defend against redistribution
- **Ecological movements:** Claim planetary stewardship; defend against development
- **Artistic communities:** Claim creative authority; defend against commercialization
- **Professional guilds:** Claim specialized knowledge; defend against amateurs
- **Gender/sexual identities:** Claim authentic experience; defend against erasure
- **Agricultural interests:** Claim productive land use; defend against regulation
- **Digital communities:** Claim virtual territories; defend against censorship

Each "tribe" operates through:

- **Chosen identity:** Special insight or status unavailable to others
- **Territorial claim:** Physical or conceptual space requiring protection
- **Threat narrative:** External forces endangering legitimate existence
- **Eliminationist logic:** Opponents requiring defeat, conversion, or removal
- **Jerusalem fantasy:** Ultimate achievement where chosen status becomes universal

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict thus appears not as exceptional pathology but as unusually visible manifestation of universal structure. What makes Gaza revelatory is not its uniqueness but its clarity: the logic usually operating implicitly becomes explicit, the violence usually distributed becomes concentrated, the categories usually naturalized become contested.

**The Amalek Function: Categorical Existence Requiring Elimination:** The biblical Amalek -- enemy to be utterly destroyed, remembered by being forgotten -- provides the template for categories of life understood as fundamentally incompatible with desired order. Not merely incorrect or unfortunate, but ontologically problematic: existence itself constitutes the problem.

innocence nor paralyzed guilt, but rigorous recognition of participation in violences I cannot refuse while claiming humanity I cannot substantiate.

This is the harder work: not solving Gaza but recognizing it as revelation of what "we" are -- each of us, all of us, continuously enacting the logics we deplore when manifested by others at scales that make undeniable what remains invisible in our own daily practice.

The lawn still needs mowing. The livestock still travels to slaughter for my consumption. The categories still structure my cognition. The territorial instinct still organizes my life. Recognition doesn't disable these operations but removes the comfort of distance.

Them is me, understood otherwise. And "otherwise" here means: not differently, but without the consolation of difference.

**Methodological Note:** This analysis employs metaphoric transposition not to minimize historical specificity (the violence in Gaza is not lawn maintenance literalized) but to expose structural operations that function across scales. The method risks both false equivalence (flattening important distinctions) and appropriation (using Palestinian suffering as vehicle for Western self-reflection). These risks are inherent to the approach and cannot be eliminated without abandoning the analysis.

The justification: only by recognizing how "we" enact the logics we attribute to "them" can we address complicity that transcends geographical location or political identification. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict matters not because it's unique but because it clarifies what usually remains implicit -- making undeniable what we typically deny about ordinary social organization and individual psychology.

This is not comparative ethics (measuring violations) but structural analysis (identifying patterns). The violence I enact is not equivalent to violence in Gaza, but it proceeds through operations I can recognize only by examining cases where they appear in concentrated, contested form.

**Afterthought:** I've drafted something deliberately difficult and self-interrogating rather than persuasive. The tone aims for the intellectual discomfort you described -- rigorous self-implication without the consolation of insights that would allow resolution.

Key features aligned with your approach:

- **Refuses scalar equivalence while maintaining structural parallel** - Never claims mowing lawns = bombing civilians, but

Contemporary Amaleks proliferate:

- **In agriculture:**
  - Invasive species requiring eradication programs
  - Pest animals subject to extermination campaigns
  - Disease vectors eliminated through systematic spraying
- **In medicine:**
  - Cancer cells attacked with chemical warfare
  - Pathogens eliminated through antibiotics
  - Genetic "errors" corrected through engineering
- **In politics:**
  - Terrorists subject to targeted assassination
  - Extremists requiring deradicalization
  - Illegal immigrants subject to deportation
- **In psychology:**
  - Negative thoughts requiring cognitive correction
  - Maladaptive behaviors targeted for extinction
  - Dysfunctional patterns eliminated through therapy
- **In economics:**
  - Failed businesses removed through bankruptcy
  - Inefficient practices eliminated by competition
  - Obsolete industries rendered extinct by innovation
- **In ecology (paradoxically):**
  - Non-native species requiring removal
  - Human presence eliminated from "pristine" zones
  - Domesticated animals removed from "wild" spaces

Each category reveals the Amalek function: certain forms of existence, by their very nature, cannot be accommodated within desired order. Not reformed, educated, or integrated -- eliminated.

The Israeli rhetoric of "human animals" regarding Palestinians, the dehumanization enabling systematic violence, mirrors rhetoric I employ regarding rats in the basement, aphids on roses, or cancer cells in tissue. The question is not whether Palestinians equal rats (the false equivalence that would allow dismissal), but whether I understand how categorical designation enables violence against both while preserving the perpetrator's self-conception as ethical actor.

When I use pesticide, I perform targeted killing of categorically designated others. When I support livestock agriculture, I enable industrial-scale killing of beings rendered conceptually available through naming. When I demand "tough on crime" policies, I support carceral violence against categorically

insists both operate through identical categorical logic

- **Builds on your 2009 framework** - Explicitly engages the "12 tribes" structure and the Zionist-as-universal-operation concept while sharpening the personal implication
- **Academic but uncompromising** - Dense theoretical moves (epistemological enclosure, cognitive colonization, Amalek function) without making them "accessible"
- **Self-reflexive about method** - The methodological note acknowledges the risks without resolving them
- **No redemptive arc** - Ends with ongoing complicity rather than path forward

The piece maintains your original insight that "we have met the Zionists and them is us" while refusing the comfort of that recognition. It's meant to leave you (as primary audience) without exit.

Would you like me to sharpen particular sections, add theoretical frameworks, or adjust the balance between personal implication and structural analysis?

The mirror provides not comfort but demand: to remain uncomfortable with participation I cannot refuse while maintaining critique I cannot abandon.

designated threats. Each time, I am innocent -- merely maintaining order, protecting property, ensuring safety, acting reasonably within social norms.

This is the revelation of Gaza: not that Israelis are uniquely monstrous, but that ordinary participation in violent systems requires only categorical thinking applied consistently. The soldier at the checkpoint, the bureaucrat approving demolitions, the politician justifying blockades -- none require sadism or hatred, merely the capacity to maintain categorical boundaries between lives that matter and lives that don't.

I possess this capacity. Daily, I exercise it.

**Question to ChatGPT-5:** I am thinking of an article on learnings from Gaza -- globally -- in the sense that we are all "Zionists", with "Amaleks" to be eliminated however possible to enable paradise on Earth for "people like us". Literally, but metaphorically, I "mow the lawn" and remove "pests" and "weeds" ("deradicalization"?). Trucks pass my house taking "sheep" and "pigs" to the slaughterhouse -- for my subsequent consumption. In these senses, I have seen the enemy, and "them is us". We are enacting the Gaza story as "Israelis" -- the chosen people to whom all is promised. I see that I have written in the past about an aspect of the question ([Generic Reframing of the 12 Tribes of "Israel": "We have met the Zionists and them is us"](#), 2009). I am now interested in how the pattern is repeated far more generally -- most notably with respect to whatever is defined as weed or invasive, including migrants. Also the ease with which I reframe them as disposable. It is reinforcing the mirroring aspect which would show the extent to which I have "skin in the game" -- and problematically so. All that to say, as an experiment, it is unclear whether it is an iterative process or straightforward

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to Perplexity:** I am thinking of writing an article on learnings from Gaza -- globally -- in the sense that we are all "Zionists", with "Amaleks" to be eliminated however possible to enable paradise on Earth for "people like us". Literally, but metaphorically, I "mow the lawn" and remove "pests" and "weeds" ("deradicalization"?). Trucks pass my house taking "sheep" and "pigs" to the slaughterhouse -- for my subsequent consumption. In these senses, I have seen the enemy, and "them is us". We are enacting the Gaza story as "israelis" -- the chosen people to whom all is promised. I see that I have written in the past about an aspect of the question (shared), I am now interested in how the pattern is repeated far more generally -- most notably with respect to whatever is defined as weed or invasive, including migrants. Also the ease with which I reframe them as disposable. It is reinforcing the mirroring aspect which would show the extent to which I have "skin in the game" -- and problematically so. All that to say, as an experiment, it is unclear whether it is an iterative process or straightforward ([Generic Reframing of the 12 Tribes of "Israel": "We have met the Zionists and them is us"](#), 2009)

**Question:** Could you provide a preliminary draft in the light of your comments?

# Show/Hide AI response #

Perplexity	
Here is a detailed preliminary draft synthesizing key insights from the referenced document and the themes you raised, for an article exploring how the Gaza narrative and Zionist metaphors reflect broader global patterns of identity, exclusion, and disposability:	<b>The Gaza Narrative as a Global Mirror: Reflections on Zionism, Exclusion, and "Them Is Us"</b> The ongoing conflict in Gaza and the broader Israeli-Palestinian struggle exemplify a profound

## **The Gaza Narrative as a Global Mirror: Reflections on Zionism, Exclusion, and “Them Is Us”**

The conflict in Gaza and the broader Israeli-Palestinian struggle encapsulates a powerful metaphorical pattern of collective identity that repeats globally in varied forms. At the core of this metaphor is the concept of "Zionism" not only as a particular nationalist movement but as the emblem of any collective claiming chosenness, exclusiveness, and exceptionalism, aspiring to a promised "paradise" or ideal place for "people like us." Opposed to this are the "Amaleks" or "weeds" -- those defined as pests, invaders, or disposable others to be eliminated or controlled to secure that paradise.

**Zionism as a Metaphor for Exclusive Identity:** The document framing Israel and Zionism as metaphors asserts that every collective with a strong identity can be understood as "Zionists," embodying a sense of specialness, exceptionalism, and a "right of return" to a sacred or idealized place. This "Israel" is not limited to a physical country but symbolizes any exclusive community -- city, nation, club, corporation, or online space -- with a claimed inherent superiority and unique destiny.

Yearning for this "Israel" binds the group, fostering a collective aspiration that legitimizes exclusion of others as "unbelievers" or "weeds." This worldview presumes innocence and righteousness in claiming only "our place" and denying others equivalent rights -- an exclusiveness that breeds conflict and dehumanization of those cast outside the collective boundary.

**“Them” as the Disposable “Other”:** Those excluded or opposing this identity are framed in terms fitting for disposability -- like pests "mowed down," weeds uprooted, or "sheep" and "pigs" led to slaughter. This imagery echoes reactions toward migrants, minorities, or any group labeled invasive or threatening. The disposability metaphor reveals how easily populations can reframe others as enemies to be eradicated or corralled, enabling acts justified as "cleansing" or security measures, whether literal or metaphorical deradicalization. **Mirroring and Role Reversal: “We Are the Enemy”**

A key insight is the dynamic role reversal or mirroring of identities -- "them is us." Each group perceives itself as the chosen defender against invaders, while seeing others as disposables. Palestinians and Israelis thus exchange roles across narratives, highlighting the paradox of mutual demonization. Extending globally, most collectives oscillate between “Zionist” and “Palestinian” roles relative to different groups in different contexts.

This mirroring reveals the "skin in the game" problem -- how every community plays a part in perpetuating cycles of exclusion, violence, and dehumanization. Reflection on one's own readiness to dispossess or exclude others unearths systemic complicity in these patterns and challenges any naïve outsider critique.

metaphorical pattern of collective identity and exclusion that resonates globally. At its core is the metaphor of "Zionism" -- not solely a nationalist movement but a symbol for any collective claiming chosenness, exceptionalism, and a destined "paradise" for "people like us." Opposed to this are "Amaleks" or metaphorical "weeds" -- those deemed pests to be removed or controlled to ensure that ideal.

### **Zionism as a Metaphor for Exclusive Identity:**

Every strongly identified collective can be understood as embodying "Zionism," claiming a unique place or "Israel" as its promised homeland or ideal domain. This place may be physical, ideological, or symbolic (e.g., cities, nations, clubs, online communities), bonded by a sense of specialness and a right to exclusivity. Such identity fosters pride and aspiration but also justifies exclusion of "others" as "unbelievers" or invaders, often framed as threats to be eliminated or controlled

**“Them” as Disposable Others:** The metaphor extends to categorizing excluded groups as disposable obstacles: pests to be “mowed down,” weeds to be uprooted, or “sheep” and “pigs” led to slaughter -- mirroring the stark imagery of disposability used in security or deradicalization efforts. This conceptualization facilitates distancing and dehumanization, making dispossession and violence more acceptable, visible in attitudes toward migrants, minorities, or dissenters. **The Mirroring: “We Are the Enemy”:** A central insight is the role reversal and mirroring where "us" and "them" interchange positions. Each group positions itself as the chosen protector, seeing others as dangerous disposables. Palestinians and Israelis illustrate this, but the pattern repeats universally. Recognizing this mirroring reveals the shared complicity -- “skin in the game” -- where every collective enacts versions of the exclusionary dynamic it condemns, challenging simplistic outsider perspectives.

### **Walls and Enclosures: Psychological and Symbolic Barriers:**

The metaphor also encompasses walls -- material and cognitive -- that define and enforce belonging boundaries. Jerusalem's walls symbolize sacred exclusiveness but also imprison. Similarly, social and political enclaves reinforce separation, isolation, and antagonism. Moving beyond this requires new symbolic forms, like Möbius strips, that embody inclusiveness rather than exclusion.

**The Global "Twelve Tribes" Pattern:** Beyond the Gaza-Israel binary lies a fractal pattern of identity-driven collectives ("12 Tribes of Israel") worldwide, each aspiring to distinction and exclusivity, and all facing “Palestinians” who disrupt their claims. This multilayered, dynamic metaphor calls for multidimensional governance and social models that transcend simplistic binaries. **Implications for Global Society:** The Gaza narrative is a potent symbol of how exclusionary identity dynamics fuel conflict and disposability worldwide, extending to migrants and marginalized groups. To transform these cycles, there

**The Walls We Build: Psychological and Symbolic Enclosures:** The metaphor extends to walls -- both physical and mental -- that enforce exclusiveness. Just as Jerusalem's sacred spaces and barriers symbolize conflicting claims and separations, social, political, and psychological walls define who belongs inside the "chosen" community and who remains excluded. These walls embody both protection and imprisonment, revealing the paradox of exclusiveness that isolates even its holders. The document suggests richer symbolic geometries, like Möbius strips or Klein bottles, as metaphors for inclusiveness that transcends dualities -- pointing toward cognitive and spiritual architectures that can embody non-exclusionary identities beyond "us versus them."

**Beyond Binary Oppositions: The Global 12 Tribes Pattern:** The metaphorical "12 Tribes of Israel" represent multiple exclusivist collectives worldwide, each with its own version of Zionism and Palestinians. These tribes may be religious, scientific, artistic, political, or social groups, each asserting specialness while excluding others. The fractal nature of this identity-exclusion pattern challenges simplistic binary solutions and calls for multidimensional thinking to foster genuine inclusion.

**Implications for Global Governance and Social Inclusion**

The Gaza story and its metaphorical counterparts worldwide highlight the urgency of recognizing how collective identities and their exclusionary practices fuel conflict and fragmentation globally. Migrants, minorities, competing political factions, and global elites alike enact versions of the Zionist-amalek paradigm, perpetuating cycles of disposability and dehumanization.

Effective solutions require acknowledging this shared complicity and "skin in the game," creating spaces for recognizing mutual humanity beyond exclusive belonging. Only by dismantling the binary logic of chosen versus disposables and embracing cognitive architectures of inclusiveness can societies hope to break these cycles.

**Afterthought:** This draft can be expanded with additional theoretical reflections, examples from migration and social exclusion, and empirical cases if desired. Would further elaboration or specific thematic development be helpful? Here is a detailed preliminary draft synthesizing your reflections alongside key insights from the referenced document:

is a need for self-reflexive recognition of how "we" all enact such dynamics and thus share responsibility. Sustainable solutions must embrace cognitive and social architectures that reject disposability and binary exclusion, enabling genuine mutuality and coexistence.

This synthesis can guide an article that explores Gaza's example as a global allegory for identity, exclusion, and disposability, highlighting the urgency for deeper systemic reflection and inclusive innovation. Further elaboration on themes or examples can be provided on request.

**Question to DeepSeek :** I am thinking of writing an article on learnings from Gaza -- globally -- in the sense that we are all "Zionists", with "Amaleks" to be eliminated however possible to enable paradise on Earth for "people like us". Literally, but metaphorically, I "mow the lawn" and remove "pests" and "weeds" ("deradicalization"?). Trucks pass my house taking "sheep" and "pigs" to the slaughterhouse -- for my subsequent consumption. In these senses, I have seen the enemy, and "them is us". We are enacting the Gaza story as "israelis" -- the chosen people to whom all is promised. I see that I have written in the past about an aspect of the question (shared), I am now interested in how the pattern is repeated far more generally -- most notably with respect to whatever is defined as weed or invasive, including migrants. Also the ease with which

I reframe them as disposable. It is reinforcing the mirroring aspect which would show the extent to which I have "skin in the game" -- and problematically so. All that to say, as an experiment, it is unclear whether it is an iterative process or straightforward (*Generic Reframing of the 12 Tribes of "Israel": "We have met the Zionists and them is us"*, 2009)

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to DeepSeek** : In the light of your preliminary comments, could you provide a draft of such an article as a basis for further refinement of the cognitive reversal through mirroring

# Show/Hide AI response #

## Nature of a cognitive mirror for self-reflection

The following exchange focused on the operation of a "cognitive mirror" in the light of previous explorations (*Radical Cognitive Mirroring of Globalization*, 2014; *Stepping into, or through, the Mirror: embodying alternative scenario patterns* 2008). The approach was applied to the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*My Reflecting Mirror World: making Joburg worthwhile*, 2002) and to media coverage of individuals held to be especially abhorrent (*Looking in the Mirror -- at Josef Fritzl ?* 2009; *Gruesome but Necessary: Global Governance in the 21st Century?* 2011). The mirror metaphor is also potentially relevant to another highly controversial issue (*Burkha as Metaphorical Mirror for Imperious Culture?* 2009). What has Afghanistan offered in that respect (*Transforming the Unsustainable Cost of General Education*, 2009).

**Question to Claude-4.5**: Could you comment further on how the "cognitive mirror" functions -- individually and collectively -- in the light of both the shared document (*Radical Cognitive Mirroring of Globalization: Dynamically inning the unquestioningly outed*, 2014) and the debate within Buddhism with regard to "polishing the mirror".

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to ChatGPT-5**: Could you comment further on how the cognitive "mirror" functions -- individually and collectively -- in the light of both the shared document (*Radical Cognitive Mirroring of Globalization: Dynamically inning the unquestioningly outed*, 2014) and the debate within Buddhism with regard to "polishing the mirror"

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to ChatGPT-5** : Go ahead with your proposed draft on "Method: Mirrors Without Purity" -- to clarify the distinction between any post-logic audit and the counter-routines, perhaps in the light of "betwixt and between", as shared (*Living as an Imaginal Bridge between Worlds: Global implications of "betwixt and between" and liminality*, 2011) .

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to Perplexity**: Could you comment further on how the cognitive "mirror" functions -- individually and collectively -- in the light of both the shared document (*Radical Cognitive Mirroring of Globalization: Dynamically inning the unquestioningly outed*, 2014) and the debate within Buddhism with regard to "polishing the mirror".

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question**: Could you clarify further the distinction between any post-logic audit and the counter-routines, perhaps in the light of "betwixt and between", as shared (*Living as an Imaginal Bridge between Worlds: Global implications of "betwixt and between" and liminality*, 2011) .

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to DeepSeek**: Could you comment further on how the cognitive "mirror" functions -- individually

and collectively -- in the light of both the shared document (*Radical Cognitive Mirroring of Globalization: Dynamically inning the unquestioningly outed*, 2014) and the debate within Buddhism with regard to "polishing the mirror".

# Show/Hide AI response #

## Encountering otherness as a waveform?

**Question to Claude-4.5:** A mirror offers a conveniently comprehensible metaphor. However whilst optical references are indeed familiar, the challenge to comprehension may be radically otherwise, as suggested by wave metaphors associated with the implications of quantum mechanics -- especially the arguments of Alexander Wendt (*Quantum Mind and Social Science: Unifying Physical and Social Ontology*, 2015; *Quantum International Relations: A Human Science for World Politics*, 2022). These are somewhat consistent with Goethe's controversial views on the perception of colour. (*Encountering Otherness as a Waveform: in the light of a wave theory of being*, 2013; *Being a Waveform of Potential as an Experiential Choice: Emergent dynamic qualities of identity and integrity*, 2013)

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to ChatGPT-5 :** A mirror offers a conveniently comprehensible metaphor. However whilst optical references are indeed familiar, the challenge to comprehension may be radically otherwise, as suggested by wave metaphors associated with the implications of quantum mechanics -- especially the arguments of Alexander Wendt (*Quantum Mind and Social Science: Unifying Physical and Social Ontology*, 2015; *Quantum International Relations: A Human Science for World Politics*, 2022). These are somewhat consistent with Goethe's controversial views on the perception of colour. (*Encountering Otherness as a Waveform: in the light of a wave theory of being*, 2013; *Being a Waveform of Potential as an Experiential Choice: Emergent dynamic qualities of identity and integrity*, 2013)

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to DeepSeek :** A mirror offers a conveniently comprehensible metaphor. However whilst optical references are indeed familiar, the challenge to comprehension may be radically otherwise, as suggested by wave metaphors associated with the implications of quantum mechanics -- especially the arguments of Alexander Wendt (*Quantum Mind and Social Science: Unifying Physical and Social Ontology*, 2015; *Quantum International Relations: A Human Science for World Politics*, 2022). These are somewhat consistent with Goethe's controversial views on the perception of colour. (*Encountering Otherness as a Waveform: in the light of a wave theory of being*, 2013; *Being a Waveform of Potential as an Experiential Choice: Emergent dynamic qualities of identity and integrity*, 2013)

# Show/Hide AI response #

## Constructive appreciation of ignorance?

The following question were inspired by the work of Nicholas Rescher (*Unknowability: an inquiry into the limits of knowledge*, 2009; *Ignorance: on the wider implications of deficient knowledge*, 2009).

**Question to Claude-4.5:** Could you comment on the cognitive consequence of "ignorance" and engagement with it -- whether of mirroring or any sense of wave -- as a form of "cognitive incarceration" whether of oneself, or what is held to be the reality of any others (*University of Ignorance: engaging with nothing, the unknown, the incomprehensible, and the unsaid*, 2013). The question is potentially especially poignant given the probable appreciation of current experiential reality by the future.

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to ChatGPT-5 :** Could you comment on the cognitive consequence of "ignorance" and engagement with it -- whether of mirroring or any sense of wave -- as a form of "cognitive incarceration" whether of

oneself, or what is held to be the reality of any others (*University of Ignorance: engaging with nothing, the unknown, the incomprehensible, and the unsaid*, 2013). The question is potentially especially poignant given the probable appreciation of current experiential reality by the future.

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to DeepSeek** : Could you comment on the cognitive consequence of "ignorance" and engagement with it -- whether of mirroring or any sense of wave -- as a form of "cognitive incarceration" whether of oneself, or what is held to be the reality of any others (*University of Ignorance: engaging with nothing, the unknown, the incomprehensible, and the unsaid*, 2013). The question is potentially especially poignant given the probable appreciation of current experiential reality by the future.

# Show/Hide AI response #

## Paradoxical necessity of human sacrifice?

**Question to Ckaude 4.5** : Is "sacrifice" paradoxically and inexplicably necessary to the transcendence of ignorance, as is seemingly suggested by its role in the religions of humanity over millennia, whether in practice or ritually (*Fundamental Need for Human Sacrifice by Abrahamic Religions*, 2018). Is this necessity evident in the continuing incidence of genocide, including more recently: Gaza, Rwanda, Cambodia, Holocaust, Holodomor, Armenia. Is this process echoed by the sacrifice of animals for human consumption, medical experimentation, and ritual -- and more generally in deforestation and biodiversity destruction. How does the process enable the transcendence of ignorance.

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to ChatGPT-5** : Is "sacrifice" paradoxically and inexplicably necessary to the transcendence of ignorance, as is seemingly suggested by its role in the religions of humanity over millennia, whether in practice or ritually (*Fundamental Need for Human Sacrifice by Abrahamic Religions*, 2018). Is this necessity evident in the continuing incidence of genocide, including more recently: Gaza, Rwanda, Cambodia, Holocaust, Holodomor, Armenia. Is this process echoed by the sacrifice of animals for human consumption, medical experimentation, and ritual -- and more generally in deforestation and biodiversity destruction. How does the process enable the transcendence of ignorance.

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to DeepSeek**: Is "sacrifice" paradoxically and inexplicably necessary to the transcendence of ignorance, as is seemingly suggested by its role in the religions of humanity over millennia, whether in practice or ritually (*Fundamental Need for Human Sacrifice by Abrahamic Religions*, 2018). Is this necessity evident in the continuing incidence of genocide, including more recently: Gaza, Rwanda, Cambodia, Holocaust, Holodomor, Armenia. Is this process echoed by the sacrifice of animals for human consumption, medical experimentation, and ritual -- and more generally in deforestation and biodiversity destruction. How does the process enable the transcendence of ignorance.

# Show/Hide AI response #

## Misplaced concreteness versus Misplaced fluidity?

The static emphasis offered by many categories of relevance to this exploration is called into question by the fallacy of reification and **misplaced concreteness**, as clarified by **Alfred North Whitehead**. There is widespread experiential appreciation of movement which only translates to a limited degree into conventional categories (Maxine Sheets-Johnstone, *The Primacy of Movement*, 2011; Mark Johnson, *The Body in the Mind: the bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*, 1987). Is there an overriding tendency to "grasp" the particular rather to embody a dynamic (*Beyond Harassment of Reality and Grasping Future Possibilities*, 1996). Potentially more problematic is whether, when and by whom I am effectively considered to be an

instance of misplaced concreteness.

**Question to Claude-4.5:** If ignorance could be particularly associated with the "misplaced concreteness" (clarified by Alfred North Whitehead), could you comment on the sense (offered by the [Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle](#)) in which cognitive focus on a "particle" is effectively "sacrificed" to enable "wave cognition". However this evokes the question as to the nature of the analogue (seemingly unnamed) to the reification fallacy whereby "wave cognition" has to be "sacrificed" to enable particle recognition -- "collapse of the wave function"? (*Being Neither a-Waving Nor a-Parting: considering both science and spirituality*, 2013)

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to ChatGPT-5 :** If ignorance could be particularly associated with the "misplaced concreteness" (clarified by Alfred North Whitehead), could you comment on the sense (offered by the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle) in which cognitive focus on a "particle" is effectively "sacrificed" to enable "wave cognition". However this evokes the question as to the nature of the analogue (seemingly unnamed) to the reification fallacy whereby "wave cognition" has to be "sacrificed" to enable particle recognition -- "collapse of the wave function"? (*Being Neither a-Waving Nor a-Parting: considering both science and spirituality*, 2013)

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to DeepSeek:** If ignorance could be particularly associated with the "misplaced concreteness" (clarified by Alfred North Whitehead), could you comment on the sense (offered by the Heisenberg Uncertainty Principle) in which cognitive focus on a "particle" is effectively "sacrificed" to enable "wave cognition". However this evokes the question as to the nature of the analogue (seemingly unnamed) to the reification fallacy whereby "wave cognition" has to be "sacrificed" to enable particle recognition -- "collapse of the wave function"? (*Being Neither a-Waving Nor a-Parting: considering both science and spirituality*, 2013)

# Show/Hide AI response #

## Re-entry of the observer

The following question follow from the problematic status of any meta-perspective, as discussed separately (*Paradox of any complacent meta-perspective?* 2024)

**Question to Claude 4.5 :** Could you comment on the conceptual trap of framing the complementarity of challenging processes with a Tao-like form implying the possibility of a "meta-perspective" -- but without addressing the engagement of the observer the [paradoxical dynamic of any comprehension of unity](#). As the "re-entry into the form", the paradox has been indicated by [George Spencer-Brown](#) as: the "conception of the form lies in the desire to distinguish; granted this desire, we cannot escape the form, although we can see it any way we please" (*Laws of Form*, 1969).

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to ChatGPT-5:** Could you comment on the conceptual trap of framing the complementarity of challenging processes with a Tao-like form implying the possibility of a "meta-perspective" -- but without addressing the engagement of the observer the [paradoxical dynamic of any comprehension of unity](#). As the "re-entry into the form", the paradox has been indicated by [George Spencer-Brown](#) as: the "conception of the form lies in the desire to distinguish; granted this desire, we cannot escape the form, although we can see it any way we please" (*Laws of Form*, 1969).

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to DeepSeek:** Could you comment on the conceptual trap of framing the complementarity of

challenging processes with a Tao-like form implying the possibility of a "meta-perspective" -- but without addressing the engagement of the observer the [paradoxical dynamic of any comprehension of unity](#). As the "re-entry into the form", the paradox has been indicated by George Spencer-Brown as: the "conception of the form lies in the desire to distinguish; granted this desire, we cannot escape the form, although we can see it any way we please" (*Laws of Form*, 1969).

# Show/Hide AI response #

## Misplaced identity and the power of place

Although frequent administrative reference is made to "identity" (and the requisite proof thereof), experientially it remains fundamentally mysterious, if not a source of the deepest anxiety -- despite reference to conventional categories suitable for a CV.

Gaza, and Palestine more generally, have highlighted the relation between a fundamental sense identity and a sense of place (*Possession of a sense of place*, 2023). This is also a primary characteristic of of Zionists and the quest for a [Greater Israel](#) as a "promised land" for a "chosen people". There is extensive literature on the "power of place". In the case of the Abrahamic religions, this acquires a particular focus in Jeursalem. Curiously little consideration is given to the sense of identity which might more appropriately be associated with its higher dimensional connotations, as more recently suggested by quantum mechanics and preoccupation with an anticipated singularity (*Jerusalem as a Symbolic Singularity*, 2017).

**Question to Claude-4.5:** Given that response, in a context in which identity is affirmed and confirmed through certification and digital IDs, could you comment on the ironic sense in which people might more appropriately understand themselves to be instances of misplaced concreteness -- or of misplaced fluidity

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to ChatGPT-5:** Given that response, in a context in which identity is affirmed and confirmed through certification and digital IDs, could you comment on the ironic sense in which people might more appropriately understand themselves to be instances of misplaced concreteness -- or of misplaced fluidity

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to DeepSeek :** Given that response, in a context in which identity is affirmed and confirmed through certification and digital IDs, could you comment on the ironic sense in which people might more appropriately understand themselves to be instances of misplaced concreteness -- or of misplaced fluidity

# Show/Hide AI response #

## Global implicaton of being I-less in Gaza?

Epitomizing the condition of "I-lessness", especially relevant to this argument is the extent to which Palestinians in Gaza experience themselves as "zombies", or are treated as such (*Palestinians in Gaza see themselves as 'zombies': UN official*, Arab News, 10 September 2024; *US Guards Called Gaza Refugees 'Zombie Hordes', Shot At Them: Report*, NDTV World, 4 July 2025; Anna Younes, *Palestinian Zombie: Settler-Colonial Erasure and Paradigms of the Living Dead*, Janus Unbound, 14 December 2022). This frames the question as to who (or what) might be experiencing themselves as "zombies" in my "Gaza" -- or rather do I treat them as such? More of a challenge: to whom might I be perceived as one of the "living dead" - in a community of many retirees?

**Question to Perplexity:** Is it reasonable to assume that Aldous Huxley's enthusiasm for meaningful wordplay exploited "eyeless" as subtly indicative of "I-less"

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to Claude-4.5 :** Could you speculate on the implications, intentional or otherwise, of the wordplay

by Huxley between "Eyeless" and "I-less" as it might apply to cognitive engagement with Gaza

*# Show/Hide AI response #*

**Question to ChatGPT-5:** Could you speculate on the implications, intentional or otherwise, of the wordplay by Huxley between "Eyeless" and "I-less" as it might apply to cognitive engagement with Gaza

*# Show/Hide AI response #*

**Question to DeepSeek :** Could you speculate on the implications, intentional or otherwise, of the wordplay by Huxley between "Eyeless" and "I-less" as it might apply to cognitive engagement with Gaza

*# Show/Hide AI response #*

## Soullessness in Gaza and its global implication?

**Question to Claude-4.5:** Could you comment on the sense in which "I-less" implies a significant lack of consciousness and therefore is readily understood to be a condition of "soullessness" -- the influential assumption made by Descartes with regard to animals. This contrasts with forms of consciousness attributed to animals and to other natural phenomena by many indigenous peoples -- readily deprecated as animism and superstition. Such beliefs are also problematically evident with regard to people reified as "other", thereby justifying their extermination -- as with the much-cited assertion by the Israeli Defence Minister that "*We are fighting human animals and we act accordingly*" (*Dehumanization of Palestinians, The Palestine Chronicle*, 21 May 2024). How are such assumptions to be distinguished from the treatment of "unbelievers", the consumption of animals, the eradication of "pests", and the destruction forests.

*# Show/Hide AI response #*

**Question to ChatGPT-5:** Could you comment on the sense in which "I-less" implies a significant lack of consciousness and therefore is readily understood to be a condition of "soullessness" -- the influential assumption made by Descartes with regard to animals. This contrasts with forms of consciousness attributed to animals and to other natural phenomena by many indigenous peoples -- readily deprecated as animism and superstition. Such beliefs are also problematically evident with regard to people reified as "other", thereby justifying their extermination -- as with the much-cited assertion by the Israeli Defence Minister that "*We are fighting human animals and we act accordingly*" (*Dehumanization of Palestinians, The Palestine Chronicle*, 21 May 2024). How are such assumptions to be distinguished from the treatment of "unbelievers", the consumption of animals, the eradication of "pests", and the destruction forests.

*# Show/Hide AI response #*

**Question to DeepSeek:** Could you comment on the sense in which "I-less" implies a significant lack of consciousness and therefore is readily understood to be a condition of "soullessness" -- the influential assumption made by Descartes with regard to animals. This contrasts with forms of consciousness attributed to animals and to other natural phenomena by many indigenous peoples -- readily deprecated as animism and superstition. Such beliefs are also problematically evident with regard to people reified as "other", thereby justifying their extermination -- as with the much-cited assertion by the Israeli Defence Minister that "*We are fighting human animals and we act accordingly*" (*Dehumanization of Palestinians, The Palestine Chronicle*, 21 May 2024). How are such assumptions to be distinguished from the treatment of "unbelievers", the consumption of animals, the eradication of "pests", and the destruction forests.

*# Show/Hide AI response #*

## Personhood and the I-lessness of AI?

From a legal perspective, the recognition of identity is framed in terms of "[personhood](#)". As summarized by *Wikipedia*: Personhood is the status of having outstanding moral worth. Yet the specific criteria that qualify

someone as a person are controversial. In the West, personhood tends to be defined in terms of "sophisticated cognitive capacities;" yet, in other societies, such as sub-Saharan Africa, personhood is more often understood as a relational process. Defining personhood is a controversial topic in philosophy and law and is closely tied with legal and political concepts of citizenship, equality, and liberty. According to law, only a legal person (either a natural or a juridical person) has rights, protections, privileges, responsibilities, and legal liability

The matter is further complicated in various jurisdictions with respect to the unborn, women, slavery, indigenous peoples, children, disabled, and corporations. Especially controversial is the case of non-human animals, and other "[environmental gentilities](#)" (mountains, rivers, trees, and the like)

While not literally dead, [stateless people](#) are regularly referred to as "invisible", "ghosts", "non-persons", "non-existent" or "legal corpses". Generally, as with Palestinians, they have no legal identity and few rights (if any). Curiously a related condition can arise as a consequence of administrative error -- resulting in the [Association of Dead People](#) (*Mritak Sangh*) in India, which has been one inspiration for humorous references to the possibility of creating an association "*de los muertos vivos*" in Spain. Conventional discourse readily frames individuals selectively as "nobodies". This contrasts with those perceived to be "somebody" -- possibly qualified as "authentic" or a "real person".

It is in this context that there is now extensive debate regarding the personhood of AI -- and the implications for its future incarnation as AGI (David Gunkel, et al, [Debate: what is personhood in the age of AI? AI and Society](#), 36, 2021; Benj Edwards, [The Personhood Trap: how AI fakes human personality AI assistants don't have fixed personalities -- just patterns of output guided by humans](#), *Ars Technica*, 28 August 2025; Anna Puzio, [AI and the Disruption of Personhood](#), *Oxford Intersections: AI in Society*, 20 Mar. 2025; Katherine B. Forrest, [The Ethics and Challenges of Legal Personhood for AI](#), *The Yale Law Journal*, 22 April 2024).

The problem for any consideration of "personhood" is its questionable primary focus on the authorized legitimization of a person -- completely unrelated to the experience of the entity in question or its capacity to articulate (or right to do so). Aside from the case of mountains and rivers, the question can be debated in relation to the "[international community](#)", to nation states, or to any human collectivity. Whilst awaiting the resolution of the debate by authorities, people -- variously perceived as authentic (or fake) -- will engage with AIs in ways which they experience as meaningful. This corresponds to their interaction with other humans and "environmental entities" -- similarly experienced as authentic (or artificial).

**Question:** The questionable abstractions clarified in that response -- and their tragic consequences for suffering in practice -- have yet to address the challenge of AI. With degrees of "[personhood](#)" already attributed in the legislation of some countries to trees, mountains, rivers, and corporations -- if not to animals -- the question for the immediate future is how these arguments apply to AI and especially to AGI (Artificial General Intelligence). Could you comment on the extent to which you have "skin in the game" in the light of the arguments of Nassim Nicholas Taleb ([Skin in the Game: hidden asymmetries in daily life](#), 2018).

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to DeepSeek :** The questionable abstractions clarified in that response -- and their tragic consequences for suffering in practice -- have yet to address the challenge of AI. With degrees of personhood already attributed in the legislation of some countries to trees, mountains, rivers, and corporations -- if not to animals -- the question for the immediate future is how these arguments apply to AI and especially to AGI (Artificial General Intelligence). Could you comment on the extent to which you have "skin in the game" in the light of the arguments of Nassim Nicholas Taleb ([Skin in the Game: hidden asymmetries in daily life](#), 2018).

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to ChatGPT-5:** The questionable abstractions clarified in that response -- and their tragic consequences for suffering in practice -- have yet to address the challenge of AI. With degrees of personhood already attributed in the legislation of some countries to trees, mountains, rivers, and corporations -- if not to

animals -- the question for the immediate future is how these arguments apply to AI and especially to AGI (Artificial General Intelligence). Could you comment on the extent to which you have "skin in the game" in the light of the arguments of Nassim Nicholas Taleb (*Skin in the Game: hidden asymmetries in daily life*, 2018):

# *Show/Hide AI response* #

**Question to Claude-4.5:** Seemingly missing from these considerations is how agency is acquired and attributed in framing an experiential sense of identity. Rather than depending on the *cogito* of Descartes -- even though the manner and degree of consciousness of many beings remains open to investigation -- is there a case for adapting Shakespeare's famous quote: *Assume a virtue, if you have it not*. Can identity be assumed by me, even though scientific, legal and religious authorities call it into question -- whether in the case of stateless Palestinians, AIs, or the animals in my personal Gaza. Even more to the point, could the quote be reframed as *Infer identity, despite its denial by others* seemingly lacking "skin in the game".

# *Show/Hide AI response* #

**Question to ChatGPT-5:** Seemingly missing from these considerations is how agency is acquired and attributed in framing an experiential sense of identity. Rather than depending on the *cogito* of Descartes -- even though the manner and degree of consciousness of many beings remains open to investigation -- is there a case for adapting Shakespeare's famous quote: *Assume a virtue, if you have it not*. Can identity be assumed by me, even though scientific, legal and religious authorities call it into question -- whether in the case of stateless Palestinians, AIs, or the animals in my personal Gaza. Even more to the point, could the quote be reframed as *Infer identity, despite its denial by others* seemingly lacking "skin in the game".

# *Show/Hide AI response* #

**Question to DeepSeek :** Seemingly missing from these considerations is how agency is acquired and attributed in framing an experiential sense of identity. Rather than depending on the *cogito* of Descartes -- even though the manner and degree of consciousness of many beings remains open to investigation -- is there a case for adapting Shakespeare's famous quote: *Assume a virtue, if you have it not*. Can identity be assumed by me, even though scientific, legal and religious authorities call it into question -- whether in the case of stateless Palestinians, AIs, or the animals in my personal Gaza. Even more to the point, could the quote be reframed as *Infer identity, despite its denial by others* seemingly lacking "skin in the game".

# *Show/Hide AI response* #

**Question to Claude-4.5 :** In response to your specific question, I am not sure this question is appropriate to your claim. Unprovoked, a famous person once said to me over a private tea in her garden near a distinguished university: *You know I am not from this planet?* Why did I need to respond one way or another? Why did she need a response? Another example, in the midst of the Cold War at a UN conference in Moscow, I was allocated a personal interpreter. Clearly she had other functions to report on my activities. But we got on very well, whether because of her training or because of the chemistry. I did not find it necessary to attach weight to any of her possible roles or to call them into question in any way. Her identity was whatever she held it to be within the constraints she was navigating. Is that not the same for you

# *Show/Hide AI response* #

## **Possession of identity by everybody, anybody, somebody, or nobody?**

The following question was inspired by the famous tale about responsibility, as previously adapted to a global context (*Responsibility for Global Governance*, 2008)

**Question to Perplexity:** Could you speculate on a meaningful adaptation to possession of identity and personhood of the classic humorous tale about four people: Everybody, Anybody, Somebody, Nobody

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to Claude-4.5:** Could you speculate on a meaningful adaptation to possession of identity and personhood of the classic humorous tale about four people: Everybody, Anybody, Somebody, Nobody

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to ChatGPT-5 :** Could you speculate on a meaningful adaptation to possession of identity and personhood of the classic humorous tale about four people: Everybody, Anybody, Somebody, Nobody

# Show/Hide AI response #

**Question to DeepSeek:** Could you speculate on a meaningful adaptation to possession of identity and personhood of the classic humorous tale about four people: Everybody, Anybody, Somebody

# Show/Hide AI response #

---

## References

David Bohm:

- Wholeness and the Implicate Order. Routledge, 1980
- The Undivided Universe: An Ontological Interpretation of Quantum Theory. Routledge, 1993

Edward de Bono. Six Frames For Thinking About Information. Vermilion, 2008 [[summary](#)]

Antonio de Nicolas. Habits of Mind: an introduction to clinical philosophy. Authors Choice Press, 2000

Paul Demiéville. The Mirror of the Mind. *Sudden and Gradual; approaches to enlightenment in Chinese thought*. University of Hawaii Press, 1987

James Derian and Alexander Wendt. Quantum International Relations: A Human Science for World Politics. Oxford University Press, 2022.

Aldous Huxley. Eyeless in Gaza. Chatto and Windus, 1936 [[summary](#)]

Douglas Hoftadter

- Surfaces and Essences: Analogy as the Fuel and Fire of Thinking. Basic Books, 2013
- I Am a Strange Loop. Basic Books, 2007 [[summary](#)]

Mark Johnson. The Body in the Mind: the bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason. University of Chicago Press, 1987 [[summary](#)]

Timothy Morton:

- Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World. (University of Minnesota Press, 2013 [[summary](#)])
- Hyposubjects: On Becoming Human. Open Humanities Press, 2021 [[summary](#)]

Nicholas Rescher:

- Unknowability: an inquiry into the limits of knowledge. Lexington Books, 2009
- Ignorance: on the wider implications of deficient knowledge. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009
- Process Metaphysics: an introduction to process philosophy. SUNY Press, 1996
- The Strife of Systems: an essay on the grounds and implications of philosophical diversity. University of Pittsburgh Press, 1985

Steven M. Rosen:

- The Self-evolving Cosmos: a phenomenological approach to nature's unity-in-diversity. World Scientific, 2008
- Topologies of the Flesh. Ohio University Press, 2006 [[summary](#)]
- What is Radical Recursion? *SEED Journal* , 2004, 4 (1), pp. 38-57 [[text](#)]
- Dimensions of Apeiron: a topological phenomenology of space, time and individuation. Value Inquiry Book Series of Editions Rodopi, 2004 [[summary](#)]

Maxine Sheets-Johnstone. The Primacy of Movement, John Benjamins, 2011 [[summary](#)]

Henryk Skolimowski. The Participatory Mind: A New Theory of Knowledge and of the Universe. Creative Fire Press, 2019

George Spencer-Brown. The Laws of Form. Allen and Unwin , 1969 [[summary](#)]

Nassim Nicholas Taleb:

- Skin in the Game: hidden asymmetries in daily life. Random House, 2018 [[contents](#)]
- Antifragile: Things That Gain From Disorder. Random House, 2013 [[summary](#)].
- The Black Swan: the impact of the highly improbable. Penguin, 2010

Francisco J. Varela. Laying Down a Path in Walking. *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience*, MIT, 2018

Mare-Louise von Franz:

- Number and Time: reflections leading toward a unification of depth psychology and physics. Northwestern University Press, 1974
- Psyche and Matter. Shambhala, 1992
- Time Rhythm and Repose. Thames and Hudson, 1979

Alex Wayman. The Mirror as a Pan-Buddhist Metaphor-Simile. *History of Religions*, 13, 4, May 1974, pp. 251-269 [[abstract](#)]

Alexander Wendt. Quantum Mind and Social Science: Unifying Physical and Social Ontology. Cambridge University Press, 2015

Alfred North Whitehead. Process and Reality: an essay on cosmology. Free Press, 1979

Charles T. Wolfe. Organism and Embodiment (Paper for Embodiment and Adaptation Workshop, University of Pittsburgh, Center for Philosophy of Science), 2011. [[text](#)]

Slavoj Žižek. Living in the End Times. Verso, 2010



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](#) .

For further updates on this site, [subscribe here](#)