

The verbal agreement: The intrinsic meaninglessness of words and how they are agreed upon to bolster the “I”.

On being asked “What is your aim in Philosophy?”, Ludwig Wittgenstein said:
“To show the fly the way out of the fly-bottle”.

Of course whether he did this or not is another question, however the metaphor of the fly in the fly bottle which was Wittgenstein’s example of the condition of the state of western philosophy, is a key expression which can relate to any of us in the world today, philosopher or not. There is a context or base-layer premise of the way we communicate that is constantly implied and overlooked (the fly bottle). This assumption is at the root/background of all our interactions and expressions between one another and in every way is assumed to be truly real, and that the fly-bottle, the “I”, is the only, albeit unsatisfying and limited, reality.

When we engage with language and are expressing what is felt or experienced it is very often expressed as an “I” to a “you”... or what we can call a subject/object duality. This fundamental duality is set within the confines of language and is basically the context in which language is assumed to be based. Just as in science there is the assumption that the observer is basically not part of the experiment, it is considered an “objective” view, yet science is deeply subjective as it is based on the ideals of those people doing the experiment and their often deeply skewed picture of investigating this fly-bottle “reality”.

The point is that unless the fundamental basis of language, and so culture in general, is considered and investigated to the extent that it can be, how is it possible to express any sentence with “sureness” of what is being expressed? Does what we say really have the meaning we assume it does? Language has meaning because of the fundamental basis that “I” and “you” are very much real and absolute, this means a separate “you” and a separate “me”. Without these concepts in place and there being a subject/object duality, all words would in fact lose their intrinsic value completely and thereby their meaning as there is no “me” to find meaning from the words. Words then become simplified to mere signposts or outer indicators of pure-energy which is impersonal and yet utterly intimate. Words only have meaning because of the value placed upon them by the original idea that they are expressions of a separate “me”. Without this “centric self” words are simply conventions of expression that have no value or meaning to them whatsoever.

Of course this sounds crazy... if words don't have meaning how can we communicate with one another and understand what we mean? This is due to the general unspoken “agreement” of the reality of a “separate-self”. If we consider the child’s way of hearing words, to begin with they are sounds, which is also how animals and plants “communicate”, in fact this is not a “communication” as there is no separation. In fact it is just interplay of energy, meaning that similar to the way a wave of sound is expressed or like a ripple, it has a domino-effect to each member of a group. It is only when there is a “me” or “self” that these sounds take on meaning for a “me” and become what we might call “language”. As a form of “communication” and the idea that “I” need to communicate to “you”, language is fundamentally based on the “self”. We know that if we go to a foreign country where you cannot speak the language it is hard to be “understood” if we want to talk about abstract concepts and have a

“conversation”. But actual communication of all that might be called basic-human expressions *are* understood in any culture anywhere and are completely clear. However, those who are unable to make themselves understood conceptually in another culture are often ostracized because they cannot engage with concepts, they are seen as an “infant” by that culture and therefore often relegated to the bottom rung of that society’s power base.

Communication is seen as intrinsic to life, yet when you need to live, actually how important are words? Before the “me” is formed in the child during the years after about the age of 3, the child will say sounds and express things that an adult attaches meaning to, but the child does not. This is the hilarious experience of hearing a very young child using what an adult would call “swear words” in a way that is utterly innocent of meaning. In the same way concepts associated with “love” or “hate” don't come into the child’s notion, there is simply a process called speaking which has sounds and these sounds have no “value” attached to them. A child may very well go around expressing that he or she “loves” or “hates” everyone, but neither word will mean anything to the child. He or she may well jump into your arms with a smile and softly say “I hate you, you bastard” because they heard it on the TV. When a child wants to feel close to their mother or father, they just go towards this, it is only when they are told that the wanting to do this is called “love” in adult terms that they then call it this. Later of course they are also told when and to whom it is appropriate to express this “love” to and to whom it isn’t, what this “love” means and why it needs to be a “special” word that is meant for “special” people.

All of this however is the separatism and dualism of the adult with the sense of “I” which is the basis of all his or her expressions. In a sense everything has to be qualified by an “I” otherwise it loses meaning. It can’t be that people just say “Love” which by itself is considered “meaningless”, it has to be “I love you”. This is because there is value added to the expression when it is qualified by an “I” and a “you”, it seemingly gives it a concrete foundation, except that this “I” or “you” has never been investigated or challenged, it has always been assumed from very young age to be what is there... but is it?

The whole of society agrees on these concepts, they also agree on the nature of interaction involved in human affairs, or else wars are instigated and those who don’t agree with the basis of what a “I” and a “you” is are killed. This agreement/enforcement can be altered. In Nazi Germany there was a convincing of the population that the Jews were actually not human at all, so as a concept “Jew” meant something that was no longer a brother or sister but actually toxic and lowly...hence there is a changing of attitude towards this group. The same is true of the black slaves of colonial America, there is a way of suggesting that difference in skin colour actually again lowly and lesser. Basically because the “I” sees things as more or less, good or bad, higher or lower, right or wrong, so a value system is set up by the subjectivity of the “I”... And what is this “I” based on? Absolutely nothing...there has never been any evidence whatsoever for the existence of a thing called a “self” that has ever come into the world, it is merely only an agreed-upon concept.

As an adult, without the “self” words no longer have meaning in dualistic terms, which means they lose all their power. They are expressed as mere conventions in that “I” or “me” has no value to it, so the whole of language is more a expression which is

superficial and the feeling with which they are expressed conveys the expression, not the words themselves. This mustn't be confused but the phrase "it's not what you say but how you say it". Actually it is neither what "you" say or how "you" say it but the fact that there is no "you". This then points out that when words are expressed without intention but are just spontaneous, then there is no importance in the words as they are used by nature not by a "you". The words are expressed *through the body* not by "you" and very often they then take on a poetic or musical quality which is difficult to understand in "conventional" terms because all the parameters of "I" have been dropped away. This doesn't mean that "I" is not used, but it has no reference to what someone else may consider "I" to "mean". Hence what is truly meant is very easily overlooked and believed to be something that isn't. This is something that can often be seen in Tony Parsons meetings (see <http://www.theopensecret.com>) where an expression of clarity is delivered but it is rarely possible to actually hear it.

When words change their meaning do to the duality dropping out of them, there are many phrases and expressions that no longer seem to have relevance so language often alters in the speaker. They may or may not be able to explain this and sometimes because of the conventions of society the subtle change that has occurred in the spontaneous expression of language may not seem very different externally. However because the whole illusion of "me" has dropped out there is very little point in expressing some things that are simply purely dualistic, it would be like standing on a busy highway and pretending a car is not moving towards you... when something is so obvious there is no reason to play the game of pretence and when "self" drops out, all game-playing ceases.

Therefore the nature of the child-state and of language that has no-meaning but is purely expressive of feeling, is deeply anarchic to society as society is based on language and on "I" and "you" politics. If we take out the "meaning" and "value" judgments from things and our thoughts and feeling do not belong to "me", then there is a totally different way of communicating that begins. In general people would say less, for there is far less to express when there is no process of "seeking" for meaning which takes up most of our time on earth as humans. At this time most of us don't realize that in the process of speaking and engaging with each other in the world, with every move and in most expressions, we are constantly upholding and re-confirming the status quo of the "individualization". However we are unable to "change" this state because it is something that naturally falls away as life happens, when there is a ripeness of the "me" to simply go into retirement and die, if not before then always at the moment of physical death.

Just to be clear, this is all a description, there is nothing good or bad about this whole expression, it is simply the nature of suffering of the human condition, there's nothing to be "done" about it because once again "you" would need to be involved in that, and it would therefore just be like chasing ones tail! The end of our use of language as centered on the "self" provides an exploration of words that few have really understood, which is that of conveying meaning without a basis of philosophy. Instead of restricting us to commonly used words which are verbal-agreements of dualism such as "I" and "you", this opens up the whole of language and more importantly *sound-spectrum* as a communication that goes beyond the stark and transactional structures of dualism and we begin to see that there is no requirement of "communication" as we know it, as there already is intrinsic Oneness.

Jabberwocky
by Lewis Carroll

'Twas brillig, and the slithy toves
Did gyre and gimble in the wabe:
All mimsy were the borogoves,
And the mome raths outgrabe.

'Beware the Jabberwock, my son!
The jaws that bite, the claws that catch!
Beware the Jubjub bird, and shun
The frumious Bandersnatch!'

He took his vorpal sword in hand:
Long time the manxome foe he sought --
So rested he by the Tumtum tree,
And stood a while in thought.

And, as in uffish thought he stood,
The Jabberwock, with eyes of flame,
Came whiffling through the tulgey wood,
And burbled as it came!

One two! One two! And through and through
The vorpal blade went snicker-snack!
He left it dead, and with its head
He went galumphing back.

'And hast thou slain the Jabberwock?
Come to my arms, my beamish boy!
Oh frabjous day! Callooh! Callay!'
He chortled in his joy.

'Twas brillig, and the slithy toves
Did gyre and gimble in the wabe:
All mimsy were the borogoves,
And the mome raths outgrabe.

David Nassim
19/11/12