Individual/person: a 'killer binary'

Fred Perez

Abstract: **Think of the man/woman distinction in** *Genesis***/chapter_3, the body/soul binary designed by Socrates/Plato/Aristotle, the East/West divide of Empire, the body/mind split of Descartes and the subject/object dichotomy of modern science, the bourgeoisie/proletariat opposition of Engels/Marx, and the friend/enemy distinction brought to life by Carl Schmitt via Schopenhauer-Nietzsche-Max_Weber in** *The Concept of the Political***. A lot of people have lost their lives because of these distinctions. So, forgetting how dangerous binary oppositional thinking can be, I have decided to add a new 'killer binary' to the above list. The 'individual/person' distinction is potentially as dangerous as other famous binaries that have come before it. Indeed, it can destroy the nation-state. And yet it can serve as a time/space template for the introduction and preparation of a new way of thinking about contemporary human beings.**

Keywords: **Binary oppositions, binarisation, Big Data, digital human, zombie, European Union, Napoleon, imperialism, Carl Schmitt, neutralisations, depoliticisations, Africa, Asia, Middle East, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, dangerousness, anarchism, liberalism, criminals, criminality, politicians, prisons, organised crime, terror, terrorism, Hannah Arendt, Eichmann, Benito Cereno, Melville, Slavoj Žižek, Less than Nothing, Lévi-strauss, Hobbes, Spinoza, Pufendorf, Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man, exoplanet, The Little Prince, Antoine de Saint-Exupery, Snowden, spy agencies, ID, number, age, gender, race, nationality, Kepler mission, NASA, space, telescope, star gazing, Mauna Kea, Kona Keahole.**

1. INTRODUCTION

Because of the uniqueness of 9/11 and the 'war on terror' that followed, it is possible to provide an exhaustive/general account of what terror is doing to people: 'Terror transforms individuals into persons.' By combining this belief in the transformative power of terror with my own personal conviction that the democratic/digital_human is turning into a zombie, I advance a simple criterion of social change. The new movement of dreams, ideas, people, practices, and visions brought in by Big Data seems to tempt the odd concept of 'person' into religious transcendence by giving it the timeless attributes of the soul. One of the great scandals of the moral code, in my opinion, is the gulf it sets between the way things appear to 'us' through psychotic binarisation and the way they are in themselves.

For example, being perceived as 'the dead person in a funeral' is a feature that cannot be left out of the conception of the 'individual': the zombie can neither abstract from nor prescind of the thought of being perceived as a 'person' by some*one*/some*thing* post-mortem, after death. Yes, we can empathise/sympathise more with the dead than with the living. That awful futurity which awaits the dead can be reversed as a transcendental gap which influences the happiness of the living. The present 'zombie' situation is characterised by the fact that the process of democratisation started by the French Revolution, extended and expanded by Napoleon through war and imperialism, and consolidated thereafter by the European powers that defeated him; that process of substitution of blood-based social ties and treaties for one based on individual merit has reached its end. The mass conversion of oppressed-caste Hindus, particularly to Islam, sits uncomfortably near the mass conversion of Napoleon-conquered peoples to a reformed legal system known as the Code Napoleon that remains the basis of much of European law to this day.

What Napoleon had done with the rules of war and the Code de Napoleon by giving equal rights to all men, the Muslims had done many centuries earlier with their swords and their religion. Napoleon's legacy dwells on a cruel and rotten age of feudalism that was brought to naught by the cruelty and vandalism exerted on conquered peoples in the name of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. After Napoleon, modern Western governance involved the question of the nation-state,

and its security and independence from other states similarly constituted. It also involved addressing the volatile question of the right to representation: Who had the right to represent the people that constituted each nation-state? Who would decide on the exception? Who would be sovereign? Suddenly, a people who belonged to an impossibly diverse range of countries, classes, castes, tribes, languages, customs, traditions and religions, decided to adopt a similar system of government that moved in the direction of the judicial; that is, the Rule of Law.

Although it passes through the separation of powers (legislature, executive, judiciary), this 'directionalism' (teleology) of governance towards the judicial ends with the disappearance of the political through the process of neutralisation and depoliticisation described by Carl Schmitt at a conference in Barcelona in 1929. His lecture was on the topic of 'The Age of Neutralisations and Depoliticisations'. The lecture was published in 1930 and was added to the edition of *The Concept of the Political* when it appeared in 1932. One could argue that the end result of the process of depolitisations and neutralisations is the constitution of the European Union as a judiciary body of governance that mediates inequalities and disputes between member states in order to prevent wars. The great success of the European Union hasn't been economical but judicial. A legislative body standing above those of the member states seems to have been quite effective in preventing another major war in Europe. At the same time, it has caused massive instability in the rest of the world, by cutting off Africa, Asia and the Middle East from European commerce and industry. Now the question is whether to carry on with the project of extension of the judicial to the rest of the world and, based on its success in Europe – which is no other than the judicial project of the abolition of all wars by supra-international Law; or whether we follow in the direction of the psychotic, which has already started in the US and the UK, towards a disintegration of the 'moral code' of these societies and the creation of a new kind of human being, mentally incapable of creating binary oppositional moral codes which could be headed by the friend/enemy distinction.

It is not violence but non-violent coercive control by zombie-like individuals that concerns me. These 'zombies' act the same in war or in peace, automatically and in fear of the exception which they desire vicariously as they desire or fantasise about being celebrities – which, ultimately queries or questions the state of peace 'we' are at the moment in Europe as a possible state of war or, at least, civil war. This might not be a military war except for the firing weapons and the noise of cannons and explosions, but it is nevertheless a war normalised as peace in terms of logistics, industry, food rationing in supermarkets, commerce, communications, housing, work, engineering, and so on. This argument around the possibility of 'war being [normalised] peace' turns the main achievement of the European Union (achieving lasting 'peace' in Europe) into a project of masking a prolonged war as a permanent magical peace. And the possibility of extending the European Union to the whole world, that project of extension of the judicial, becomes a rather poor alternative to the 'mutation' project headed by the introduction of the 'individual/person' distinction into the 'moral code' of psychotic societies such as Usuk[1].

Is this conclusion on war really correct? In Usuk, for example, war happens to Others, outside their territory; perhaps, because it happened Once and it was so terrible that it must never be repeated. To me, this argument falls under the psychopathy of One [2] and thus nobody can quarrel against it, for [being psychotic] any logical objections against it remain powerless[3]. The pacifist ideal cannot be rejected on the grounds that it has no meaning in the present situation and for the

---

[1] Usuk stands for the United States of America and the United Kingdom as if they were united into a single transatlantic country. Of course, no such country exists!

[2] The psychopathy of One can be expressed as: One/One is to a(=)a as One/Many is to exception/rule. a(=)a can be defined as the relationship '(=)' between 'a' and 'a', where 'a' can be either 'a' or the delusional 'a' which is more like a 'b' and where '(=)' being variable can be anything from 'wanting to be'/ 'more or less equal to' / 'not completely being' to anything that can be similarly and randomly thought. '(=)' implies that two things cannot be exactly the same unless there is an observer imagining that they are the same. The first [qualitative, a(=)a=One/One] relationship is related to the 'identity' component of the psychotic desire, mania or obsession for total equality as read from the I/eye. The second [quantitative, exception/rule=One/Many] relationship is related to the extreme/borderline 'value' of the psychotic experience. It is about the rarity, uniqueness, exceptionality, oddity, scarcity, and life-changing potential of the psycho/semio experience. The I/eye is the site of sovereignty in a psychotic society; an imaginary point from which the moral code is read/shared and the binarised decision is taken.

[3] 'Each portion which returns from oblivion asserts itself with peculiar force, exercises an incomparably powerful influence on people in the mass, and raises an irresistible claim to truth against which logical objections remain powerless [...] This remarkable feature can only be understood on the pattern of the delusions of the psychotics.' Sigmund Freud, 'Moses and Monotheism: Three Essays', in *The Standard Edition*, vol. XXIII (1939), p. 85.

understanding of the situation. In Carl Schmitt, one finds a recognition of the possibility of world peace incarnated in a wholly apolitical partnership in consumption and production of humanity united. To me, on the other hand, the world 'united' is symptomatic of One and the psychopathy of binarisation [4]. Today the 'global' tends to tomorrow's TOTAL[5]. Following Baudrillard, I theorise the TOTAL as the coming world of hegemony. This is a state where everyone is devalued and government is totally superfluous, because men and women have become zombies. Societies are no longer 'political' societies but herds of individual units of the social mass, zombies are industrially farmed, commercially exploited, manufactured as products, formed or shaped rather like sheep or cattle. Zombies are non-dangerous and by this I mean that they don't require a government. What they require is a shepherd who pinpoints feeding places for them and helps with the delivery of a new generation of zombies; that is, reproduction. Yet, zombies become dangerous when faced with the exception of 'horror' or 'terror'. The danger is, that they may become 'persons' – that is, they might acquire a 'soul' by exposure to 'terror'. In the 'conclusion', I argue that an act of terror/terrorism can awake the dormant soul of zombies and turn them into persons.

2. THE CAPSULE AND THE POWDER

There's a precedent to the kind of children story I'm going to tell you: *The Little Prince* by Antoine de Saint-Exupery. Hard philosophical concepts are diluted and made available for the little ones. My story is called 'The Capsule and the Powder' because it develops the difference between 'individual' (capsule) and 'person' (powder). Those who understand the capsule can understand how encapsulated and isolated individuals feel in contemporary society, and those who understand the powder can understand why some people kill themselves as the only way to achieve some kind of freedom. The capsule is the ID manufactured and managed by the state: number, age, gender, race, nationality, height, and eye colour. The powder is the person, so curved, porous and indefinable that it becomes indestructible. The person is not constructed inside the capsule provided by the state and its apparatuses. Unlike the individual, the person is constructed from the periphery, from Big Data, from bits and pieces of information, images, memories, recordings, imaginary apparitions, and readings of that person held by the various human/animal agents and machines that had interacted or being in contact with her during her life. It would be made by, for example, the memories of her mother when she was a baby – those memorable moments that still now and then come to someone else's mind – plus the memories of friends and colleagues, enemies and lovers, and any other person who knew her. So the person is a huge database or databases with information held by several servers and accessible from various points. The person is alive as long as the information on/about/around her is 'live'. Today the closest you come to my notion of 'person' is at a funeral when friends and family talk and remember the defunct. So the easiest way to understand the notion of person is to start thinking 'back-to-front' or 'in reverse', from the point of death. The main advantage of changing individuals into persons is that physical death is no longer 'ultimate' nor can be used by the state as a threat. Killing someone would be as stupid as trying to empty the sea with a bucket.

Even today, in the Age of Psychosis, when people kill people they are acting under the delusion that a 'person' is just an 'individual'; that is, a certain, untransferable, unique, single unit of the social mass. If the person can exist in a cloud of information hosted by a multitude of 'servers', it would be almost indestructible. In this sense, a person is internet-like. Interestingly, the larger the network of servers and connections a person has the closer it would be to possessing an

---

[4] Binarisation is the process by which the human mind can imagine only one side of a binary opposition; that is, the process of gradation, repression, consistency, transparency and value that gives mass to the moral code of a psychotic society. A vital component in the process of binarisation is the reader I/eye. This is an imaginary point from which the moral code made of binary oppositions is read. For example, in a simple code made of binary oppositions headed by good/bad, sun/moon, reason/passion, and white/black, the reader I/eye returns 'good, sun, reason, white' completely ignoring the existence of the other side; so 'bad, good, passion, black' is masked, repressed, downgraded, under-valued, and ignored. For the concept of 'binarisation' see Fred Perez, 'Psychotic Society: An Introduction with a Glossary' in *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 5:1, pp. 403-418.

[5] Following Baudrillard, TOTAL is a new hegemony which is totally 'evil'. Baudrillard says that 'this absolute Evil comes from an excess of Good, an unchecked proliferation of Good, of technological development, of infinite progress, of totalitarian morality, of a radical will to do good without opposition.' Jean Baudrillard, 'The Roots of Evil' in *The Agony of Power* (Los Angeles: Semotext (e) Intervention Series, 2011), p. 109. TOTAL is the maelstrom that sucks everything and everyone; the integral reality we are in – which cannot be challenged with or resisted by conventional means such as revolution, revolt, civil disobedience, street demonstrations, strikes, rioting, and so on.

indestructible 'soul'. In a religious sense, the person has an accessible soul and that soul is made of bits of information held by so many agents and in so many locations that total destruction is almost impossible. Even if a person suffers a malicious attack (similar to those viral attacks that constantly threaten computers) there would be always enough info left somewhere else to re-compose or reinvent that person. The graphic possibilities of the capsule and the powder are infinite, so are their transformations into other things, say, the capsule into a car, truck, a train, or spacecraft. The concepts are simple but full of subversive potential. I would like to take the capsule into space and visit exoplanets. I don't know if any of you has seen a genuine exoplanet, but I once saw one, and it struck me as so divine, so glorious, so gorgeous and wonderful that I feel I should start my story there.

When I was a little boy, I had a twin sister called Martha, and we did everything together, including looking at the stars. One night, Martha told me that she had seen a planet that wasn't really there in the heavenly sky but was inside her mind. I dismissed her vision as totally ludicrous, and invited her to rethink again and try to make sense. After all, she was a 'girl' and everyone knows that girls are unreliable. I was the older of the two by 15 minutes, and I was a 'boy'. So the responsibility for being in control always fell on me. Between us, we had masses of star gazing experience, having spent many nights together looking through a large roof-window that was just above our beds. Star gazing was our attempt to destroy established codes, especially with regard to gender. When my sister was hospitalised at the age of thirteen, the psychiatrist asked me if I was seeing exoplanets too. I thought how he had the nerve of asking me that, since I was the man and, until that moment, I'd been utterly reliable. He insisted on asking me if I was afraid of being a girl; of growing a pussy like my sister? He said that I had such lovely eyes. I didn't understand a thing he was talking about while he was touching me. Did he think he looked sexy, in that boring white gown? As star gazers, we had to reinvent femininity because it went with staying up all night looking at stars that had neither sex nor gender. The whole point of star gazing is not doing what you're told to do and not seeing what you're supposed to see. It's the closest thing to being a punk.

This might seem very obvious to you, but the problem with stars is that they're very bright. They are so full of light that they don't let you see anything around them. Their glare subsumes the reflected light of any other little object around. So one must find indirect ways of finding such objects. We have to remember that we never actually see a planet. We're doing everything through inference, by indirect means. One of the most interesting developments regarding exoplanets is our ability to study their atmosphere. Who could have predicted this could be possible 20 years ago? Similarly, one of the most interesting developments regarding the spy agencies is our ability to predict what they are up to without hacking into their systems. Most of the information we have about spy agencies comes from transit observations. So when a person like Snowden passes through a spy agency, we can measure how important or relevant this event appears to be. Similarly, when the planet passes in front of the star we can measure how larger it appears to be by how much of the light from the star it occults. If you can make this measurement in different colours, then you can basically see the altitude at which the atmosphere becomes transparent. And if there are gases in the atmosphere or clouds, they would alter the colour spectrum, because different gases absorb light of different colours. So using this method, known as the transmission method, we are able to infer the presence of clouds and certain molecular components in the atmosphere. There are other types of measurements which probably would take too long to describe in detail. But my general question here is that if we are now starting to have quite a precise picture of objects that are billions of light years away and which we cannot see with the most potent telescopes, how much easier it would be to have a total and complete picture of the spy agencies and their 'secrets'.

What is one looking for? The key moment in my story comes when one is not just finding exoplanets: one is characterising them and understanding their properties, finding out their differences and their similarities. One is looking for something that is very small, very cold, and very dim. It's really taken us many centuries to get sophisticated enough instruments to detect these hidden worlds. Because the idea that there can be undiscovered worlds out there is not new. There's been speculation about other worlds for many centuries. But it's only in the last 20 years that we have moved to this new theoretical/technical stage where we can find anything, no matter how small, how hidden or how dim. Detecting the light that a planet reflects, for example, wouldn't be a problem if it wasn't for the fact that it's totally swamped by the glare of the star. (You can detect the light of a single fire-fly but not if that fire-fly is next to a car lamp.) So just by pointing your telescope at a star and taking a picture of it, you won't discover the planet around it – anymore than by directly targeting a specific spy agency, you will discover its secrets. It is by measuring the tiniest reaction by the government and its agencies to an external event that one can reveal some of their secrets. Out of that measurement, for that tiny amount of time, one can build all sorts of facts about it. The transit method is also very effective because if you

have an orientation of an orbit so that the planet moves across the face of the star, then the star would get slightly dimmer. If you remember, a couple of years ago Venus moved in front of the sun, and people could observe black discs on the face of the sun as Venus moved across. Well, the same thing happens with stars; although we can't see the disc, we can measure the change in brightness. At the time of the Snowden bluff, the flicker of a doubt caught my imagination. The bigger the doubt the more the spy agencies were obscured by this passing event. But having preconceived ideas is dangerous in this field. If detecting exoplanets requires 'resolution' or the ability to separate the light of one object from another, detecting spy secrets requires 'distinction' or the ability to separate one concept or idea from another. One of the most useful things to understand how the spy agencies operate is not to think that all societies look very much like our own. The US and the UK are psychotic societies, quite different from the rest. People have for many years assumed that Western societies would look very much the same. As the opposite of 'Eastern', the umbrella term 'Western' acquires meaning through the typical distinctions and depoliticalisations characteristic of the liberal nineteenth century, antitheses such as religious/political, cultural/natural, economic/social, legal/moral, scientific/superstitious, and so on. Democracy is a doctrine that feeds on thousands of binary oppositions, each one helping to bring some sense of order and hierarchy into a system of equality that blends castes and classes and blurs the boundaries between state and society.

The psychotic is thus a reaction to 'democratisation' whereby a stringent moral code, a basic and compressed structure is invented by the collective mind of a society (the I/eye) to decode the chaotic cryptography of everyday life. Yet a doctrine like democracy that is nourished by so many springs not only creates a state which demands, pursues and aspires to totally control the individual but also creates a majority of people who looks to the state for the things they will most likely refuse to do. There is no question here of whether the binary oppositions produced by the I/eye are a reflex of evolution and sociological reality, or whether social reality and evolution are conceived as a result of a particular kind of thinking (psychotic thinking) and therefore also of acting in the world. Rather this set of psycho-concepts is conceived as the result of a psychotic leap, an impossible jump that betrays the creation of another system – crunched, limited, illusory, projected from the I/eye: a moral code made of binary oppositions whose propriety of application defines the 'good' psychotic and whose impropriety of application betrays the 'bad' psychotic as an outcast.

The friend/enemy distinction provides a criterion or conceptual unit measurement that serves to separate Usuk from the other nations of the world. Since 9/11, both the US and the UK have defined their identity through their 'war on terror'. The equation 'enemy=terrorism' denotes the utmost degree of intensity of a union between the US and the UK. In any event, they are independent, not in the sense of being unlike the rest with fundamentally different institutions and laws, but in that Usuk can neither be based on any one nation or combination of other nation-states, nor can it be traced to these. So to find a couple of societies like Usuk in the West, where things move at such an amazing speed that no one can stop and think, is like finding a Jupiter-mass object with a period of four days (remember Mercury has a period of 88 days and Jupiter a period of 12 years). It is inconceivable! One assumes that solar systems would look very much like our own. But they don't.

Now I can go back to the point in my story when the psychiatrist asked me if I'd seen exoplanets, as if I was imagining things – like my sister. If I take an idea of what I'm looking for out into the psychiatrist's observation, he couldn't be more wrong. He was biasing his observations about me on what my sister was imagining, just because we were twins. With the psychiatrist it was the same as with the police – in custody, a kind policeman once said to me: 'Your eyes are prettier than you realise, why don't you give me a kiss?' Although I'm not even complaining in the first place, my sister already had a tiny tumour in her brain which wasn't detected by the psychiatrist at the hospital and which had plenty of time to grow, reaching the size of a Cantaloupe melon by the time she was twenty years old. Three cutting-edge operations extended her lifespan another ten years. On the last year of her life, seeing that she was about to die, I proposed to her a magic journey. 'Let's go to Hawaii. On the summit of Mauna Kea there's a wonderful telescope,' I said to her. 'You can hold my hand while we look at the stars in dark skies above the clouds.' I will never forget how her eyes lit up when I mentioned the Mauna Kea mountain and its telescope. She couldn't be happier. It was a great idea.

So I booked the flights for the 25th of March 2010 with United Airlines from London Heathrow to Kona Keahole Airport. The duration of the flight was 21h 38min. Martha was apprehensive that she wasn't going to make it, so I constantly tried to remind her how strong she was. If she had managed to live for 20 years with a tumour in her brain, how could she not survive one day inside an airplane. But it wasn't meant to be. The typical call 'Is there a doctor on board?' was heard through the speakers halfway into our flight. Martha had fainted. Apparently, the tumour reduced the blood flow to her brain and the cabin pressure did the rest. The doctor told the pilot to reduce altitude and a yellow, soft, silicone oxygen

cup with elastic bands was adjusted to her head. When we arrived at the Kona airport, an ambulance was waiting on the tarmac to take her to Kona Community Hospital. She had a fantastic care by the nurses and doctor Kuma. I was grateful she received the necessary care and even more grateful that she did not receive excessive care. After all, we didn't want compassion. It was a sure thing. She was going to die.

With Martha stuck between sleep and consciousness, there was little time left to achieve the dream-death I had planned for her, holding hands, looking at the stars in dark skies above the clouds. Fortunately, I had brought my laptop. The best way to approach this crisis was to look at it from the bad guy's perspective. When it comes to hacking, I am one of the best. So I was naturally tempted to hack into the Kepler mission's computers, the NASA space telescope, which had been launched the previous year. If Martha couldn't climb up the mountain to see the stars, the stars had to be brought down to Martha's bedside. Kepler was designed to look for planets close to the order of earth's mass using the transit method and monitoring star brightness with a photometer. When I asked Martha if she minded that we were going to be looking at exoplanets instead of stars, she said that she felt that looking at exoplanets seemed more exceptional and appropriate to her end-of-life disappearing circumstance, for she had spent all her life looking at the stars, and they'd always seemed to her a bit 'macho' – big show-offs: far too bright, too alive and too obvious.

Now that she was going to travel to a place from where nobody has returned, she could prepare herself by imagining life in a dim and hidden planet. Don't get me wrong, stars are friendships on fire, love companions or sex buddies, but exoplanets are long-lasting friends under $a(=)a$ [6] – or the hope of finding a planet similar to our own. They are sites of hope and transcendence. Earth, Kepler-62 e, Gliese 581 g*, Kepler-62 f, Gliese 667C c, Kepler-22 b, Tau Ceti e*, Gliese 163 c, Kepler-37 c, Kepler-438b, Kepler-442b, Kepler-440 b; if I've given you a list of habitable exoplanets, it's on account of the grown-ups and their ways. Grown-ups love figures. They never say to you, for example, I saw a beautiful planet made of rosy brick, with two volcanoes and one flower. Looking at my sister's dying eyes, I soon learned to appreciate this flower better. 'All women love flowers,' said my sister, 'but they're not the same for different women. For some, who are in love, flowers are tokens of love and lust. For others they are no more than a waste of space. To my dog, for instance, what's a rose? Unless it has been urinated upon by another dog, it is insignificant. For others, who are scholars, they present problems of categorisation. For the businessman they are wealth. Apparently, in the seventeenth century, the Dutch run their economy on tulip bulbs. But all these flowers are silent. Death – you alone – will have the flowers as no one else has them. For Martha, however, one flower was more important than all the hundreds of other flowers, because it was the flower I gave to her; because it was the one she watered; because it was the one she sheltered behind the screen; because it was the one for whom she killed the caterpillars; the one she listened to when she was sad; the one she loved.

'Grown-ups are like that,' I said to my sister who was becoming increasingly agitated. 'One must not hold it against them. But certainly, for us who don't understand grown-ups, figures are a matter of indifference, like flowers without urine for your dog. So I'm going to skip the numerical data I'm getting from the Kepler mission's computers and draw you a planet on the screen of my laptop you can add things to with the click of this mouse.' So I handed my laptop over to her and placed the mouse under her right hand and waited to see if she could manage on her own. I was pleasantly surprised to see how well she could move her index finger and how well she could click on the icons with the mouse. Unfortunately, she clicked on planet earth, which was the first drawing on my list of exoplanets, and I didn't have the heart to tell her that it was the wrong planet to draw upon. Next, she chose the picture of a 'capsule' from the picture menu, and started clicking on the continents. In no time, Africa, Europe, Asia, Australia, America, New Zealand, and other masses of land were completely covered in capsules of the same size and shape. I didn't know where she was heading, nor I had the heart to stop her. Next she picked up an image of 'powder', like a square of dust, from the picture menu and started clicking on all the masses of water she could see. Soon she had her fake exoplanet totally full with capsules covering the land and powder covering the seas.

We had arrived at a standstill in our process of creation. My sister had stop drawing and I had started thinking what to do next with the powder and the capsules. 'Are the capsules empty?' Asked my sister. 'Of course, they are,' I replied. 'Then we could fill the capsules with powder and uncover the seas.' So the process of filling in capsules with powder began in

---

[6] $a(=)a$ is the relationship '(=)' between 'a' and 'a', where 'a' can be either 'a' or the delusional 'a' which is more like a 'b' and where '(=)' being variable can be anything from 'wanting to be'/ 'more or less equal to' / 'not completely being' to anything that can be similarly and randomly thought.

earnest and it took us a couple of days to clean up the seas of powder. We were so tired that we slept for a whole day after finishing this job. And we heard a voice in our dreams that said, 'Let the land produce living creatures according to their kind: the livestock, the creatures that move along the ground, and the wild animals, each according to their kind.'

When we woke up, I handed the mouse over to my sister and she managed to draw four legs and one head on each capsule and she called them 'animals'. Then the voice said, 'Let us make mankind in our image, in our likeness, so that they may rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky, over the livestock and all the wild animals, and over all the creatures that move along the ground.' So my sister draw two legs and two arms and one head on some of the capsules and we called them 'humans'. The voice blessed them and said to them, 'Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky and over every living creature that moves on the ground.' So we left my sister's creation in God's hands and waited a couple of days to see the results. The first thing we noticed is that there were very few animals left. And that the seas were teeming with excrement. The sky had become poisonous. And humans were killing each other.

My sister saw all that she had made, and it was very bad. And she asked me for help: 'How can I stop this mess?' What had started as a godly game of creation had become a total nightmare. 'I don't want to die having spoiled our exoplanet,' she said. So I came up with a solution that she did find acceptable. 'You can open each human capsule and empty it of powder.' 'Killing all humans?' she asked. 'Not exactly; just separating their souls from their bodies,' I said to make it look less final. So she emptied every single little human of their powder and saw how the land became covered with green grass and how the animals were happy. God saw all that my sister had made, and it was very good. And there was evening, and there was morning – the sixth day. [7]

Dangerousness:

In the story of 'The Capsule and the Powder', humans are pests that deserve extinction. Yet 'killing' is so stupid that the individual killer is the stupidest of animals; that is, 'individuals' should kill themselves rather than kill others; as killing others for something that is not hunger or food is idiotic. Most people would profoundly disagree with me on this point. Many political activists consider that killing others is an act of purification and a necessary revolutionary act. Killing the enemy is good and not stupid according to them. For they consider man the highest of God's creation and a being superior to animals. To me, on the other hand, man is inferior to animals, less intelligent, less capable of survival, and made psychotic by 'language'. Thus humans are less beneficial than other animals to the environment and the rest of the world. Planet earth would be a much better place for animals and plants without humans. Getting rid of the human pestilence is a worthy task. But killing humans in their thousands or millions won't achieve the desired results. On the contrary, killing a swarm or mass of humans doesn't lead to a decrease in the human population but it leads to reproduction. For humans are like rats, they cannot be exterminated unless you kill them all at the same time everywhere. Humans, like rats, develop resistances over time (this is what's happening with antibiotics), so they are very difficult to eliminate. In some way, humans are just vessels of very lively forms that want to survive. So they are carriers of much more clever forms that use them parasitically or as a medium to thrive and reproduce. If humans disappear from the face of the earth, they certainly won't be missed. Unlike insects, for example, humans are neither necessary nor fundamental for life in the planet to survive. Remember Dawkins' book *The Selfish Gene*, meaning life forms – of which humans are made being selfish or very clever – much more clever than humans and better at survival.

From the idea that humans are boring, mediocre, and mentally psychotic comes the idea that most of them don't have the capacity to disobey nor have the talent to be free. Therefore, they don't need a government. All they need a shepherd to exploit them for meat, milk and wool. I must admit that in 'real' societies there are difficult individuals that disobey and don't submit to authority. But the 5 per cent or so of dangerous individuals a society produces (who are already occupying polarised positions in Western societies both as government/leader actors and as criminal/creative actors in prisons) does

---

[7] In the beginning God had created the heavens and the earth. The earth was formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the spirit of God was hovering over the waters. And God said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light. God saw that the light was good, and he separated the light from the darkness. God called the light 'day', and the darkness he called 'night'. And there was evening, and there was morning – the first day. And God created the sky on the second day. 'Let the water under the sky be gathered to one place, and let dry ground appear.' And it was so. God called the dry ground 'land', and the gathered waters he called 'seas.' And God saw that it was good. This must have been the situation before my sister covered the seas with powder and the land with capsules.

not explain prison or government. The majority of people are so 'good' that don't require to be governed because they can live in peace with each other as sheep do. As I have already said, they may require a shepherd, but even a shepherd can be made redundant if the animals are not exploited for milk or wool or meat. Left to their own devices, the sheep would be subjected to predation and other hazards. Yet some may survive in a natural environment that is ecologically viable. Here we have the link between ecology and government. Get rid of government and you will improve the environment. A lack of government might bring death to the majority of people who rely on its protection to thrive and reproduce.

If politicians have a desire for power it is because they share a certain kind of mentality with the criminal who doesn't like to obey, so they choose to do the opposite which is to give orders. The fact that criminals are indistinguishable from politicians may explain why the latter create laws to put the former in prison, so they can be distinguished psychotically by asking the question 'Where?' Where is s/he? If s/he is in parliament, s/he is a politician. If s/he is in prison, s/he is a criminal. Prisons are packed with people who don't like to obey, but who don't have the skills to get into government (which is a higher form of organised crime), so they end up in prison. Both criminals and politicians rely on the existence of a flock of sheep to thrive – the former need the flock to satisfy their need for money and the latter to satisfy their need for power. Both criminals and politicians tend to be talented people, slightly cleverer than the majority who relies on them for ideas and guidance – basically, to get ripped off.

'Unthinkingness'[8] is the intellectual euphemism that I use to refer to the 'good' majority of people. 'Mental rape' is another term I frequently use (this time more affirmatively ideologically) to indicate the persistent, routinely and repetitive abuse exercised by the organised criminal minority in power to manipulate the 'good' majority for their own personal gain/pleasure/satisfaction. In psychotic societies like US/UK, for example, the majority is so (mentally and physically) vulnerable that they are oblivious to being raped; mass-commercialisation has been achieved by BD (Big Data) analysis and mass surveillance to the extent that everyone is equally valued/de-valued as a unit of the social mass. Individual tagging enables the criminal minority now in power to exploit and manipulate the 'unthinking' majority more effectively. Like previous scientific revolutions, the Big Data revolution started with measuring: the 'individual' is the unit of measurement of the nation-state's social mass. Going back to the flock metaphor, the sheep is industrially farmed, individually tagged and exploited to the maximum so that little is wasted. Each sheep gives its shepherd its milk, its wool, and its meat; an individual's milk is its labour rewarded with a wage; its wool is its entertainment consuming capacity; and its meat is its reproductive capacity or its contribution to making the flock bigger and its shepherd richer. Democracy is the manipulation of the flock by a criminal minority who takes the role of shepherd. The con of democracy is to make the sheep believe that the shepherd is needed, that the shepherd is necessary and, above all, that the shepherd is 'good'. An ethics of benevolence is at work in all liberal institutions from human rights to charity, from universal education to pensions, from 'free' national health services to unemployment benefits, from taxation to advisory services. All democratic institutions are founded on the 'unthinkingness' of the sheep and the cunning of the shepherd.

Dangerousness in a psychotic society is found both at the top and at the bottom, in the criminal minority that governs and gives orders and in the common/political prisoners who lie in cells for dis-obeying. What becomes clear is that dis-obeying becomes the engine of progress when the world 'evil' is used in a positive sense. Following Spinoza, 'evil' can be understood either as human inferiority (corruption, weakness, cowardice, stupidity) or as animal power (instinctual drive-ness, vitality, irrationality). Lévi-strauss noticed that the philosophers of statecraft of the seventeenth century

---

[8] I use the word 'unthinkingness' to refer to US/UK retro-feudality, to the atmosphere of 'ignorance' and 'fear' created by these countries' reaction to 9/11. This atmosphere of 'unthinkingness' predicates infantilisation, that is, there is a boogie man (Saddam, Gaddafi, bin Laden, Assad, al-Bagdadi, Kim Jong-un), and mental retardation, meaning that there are 'no-go areas' in the world of ideas and the human imagination; places where you cannot possibly be, things you cannot possibly say, ideas you cannot possibly think. I've also coined the term 'unthinkingness' to refer to mental responses that are profoundly 'avoidant of thoughts, feelings, and places' which have become the norm in affluent democracies. Citizens' discourse often appears fragmented, full of gaps and contradictions; yet it is subjected to a ferocious polarisation caused by the gravity of One (the new hegemonic 'mental' black hole). Thus the adult population suffer from a 'lack of rigour', 'cognitive flaws' and 'mental vulnerabilities' that can be exploited by the elite to bring people into submission. Perhaps I go too far by theorising 'hurry' as a symptom of unthinkingness and also as an indicator of violence. I argue that 'hurry' is institutionalised in Usuk. Modern time as a negative function of money and violence coexists when haste and expediency become an excuse for 'states of emergency' that allow extremes of behaviour towards minorities that are hated. We have all heard the expression: 'time is money'. Today, hurry informs and shapes most democratic and capitalist processes, from voting day and the factory production line to the super-fast transactions of the money markets.

(Hobbes, Spinoza, Pufendorf) described man in the state of nature as 'evil'; that is, evil like beasts that are moved by their drives (hunger, cupidity, fear, callousness). The fundamental political fact of government in a psychotic society is its capacity for evil like the beasts. This, in my language, means a lack of capacity to manipulate and to harm others knowingly and willingly, like the flock of sheep which has no capacity for evil. Here the argument follows the line first drawn by Hannah Arendt in *Eichmann*, the Nazi whose banality was shockingly at odds with the monstrous imputation of being the brain behind the systematic killing of Jews in Nazi Germany. One can stretch Eichmann's banality to the extreme where it breaks – the generic Eichmann is everyone who belongs to the majority that doesn't think and obeys orders of the criminal majority in power. And yet, the calm persister is a mediocrity, a 'slave', or a 'generic Eichmann', depending on the degree of dramatism you want add to the concept. [9] Rather than being a moron or imbecile bureaucratic criminal who commits unimaginable atrocities within a genocidal system devoid of human personality, the generic Eichmann lives in the suburbs, goes to work every day from 9am to 5pm, pays his taxes, gets on with his neighbours, is amicable enough with his co-workers though exhibits a shorter temper at home, drives on broad roads but shows a narrower view point. Like the real Eichmann, he is a criminal, a serial killer, a genocider, but he is not aware of having done evil.

The Eichmann dilemma can also be approached from another angle. Carl Schmitt was very fond of *Benito Cereno*, a story by Melville about a passenger in a slave ship who survives an insurrection by the slaves where most of the white crew is killed. Cereno is forced to play the role of captain so as not to arouse suspicion from other ships. Eventually, after a prolonged encounter with the frigate of the American Captain Delano, the truth comes out: the slaves are recaptured and imprisoned, some are executed. The story was understood in Germany as an allegory or symbol for the situation of persons of intelligence caught in the brutal Nazi mass-murder system. Arendt is quick to assume that Eichmann is banal, mediocre, superficial, and even a bit 'thick'. Her intention is to prove that evil can be caused by idiots. One doesn't need to be a master criminal to participate in genocide. In terms of the Cereno story, this is about asking questions around what being a genocide criminal is, how one is to recognise one, and the mistakes that can be made when one doesn't. Eichmann might be an 'idiot' and, therefore, supremely intelligent. When equated to 'stupidity', 'idiocy' can be the trait of the hyper-intelligent subject who just doesn't 'get it', who understands a situation logically but simply misses its hidden contextual rules. Slavoj Žižek makes this point in his introduction to *Less than Nothing*: 'When I first visited New York, a waiter at a café asked me: "How was your day?" Mistaking the phrase for a genuine question, I answered to him truthfully ("I am dead tired, jet-lagged, stressed out . . ."), and he looked at me as if I were a complete idiot . . . and he was right: this kind of stupidity is precisely that of an idiot.' [10]

One can stretch Žižek's point to its limit by turning all politicians not only into 'terrorists' but also into 'persons' of extraordinary intelligence; that is, they are proto-psychotics unable to process the implicit contextual rule that the building where they are holding their parliamentary debates is closer to the castle and the monastery than to the Greek Parthenon. Insisting on the Greek origins of our democracy is like insisting on Adam and Eve and the creation of the world by God in seven days. It is an entertaining lie for younger kids. Similarly, it can be argued that Eichmann simply didn't 'get it'. If the accused couldn't understand what he did wrong, then how could he have had 'intention'. To have 'intention' is to think reflectively about one's own action as a political being whose own life and thinking is bound to the life/thinking of others. So, in this first instance, what had become 'banal' was non-thinking itself, like the life and thought of waiter at the NY café who automatically asks all customers: 'How was your day?' The idiot is in fact the person who 'thinks'. The idiot is quite simply 'stupid' but, unlike the waiter, not 'banal'. So I would object to Žižek's treatment as a scapegoat for the banality of the waiter; and also to how the automatic question ('How was your day') served both to establish the café's legal authority and to legitimate the waiter's slave-wage by association with the general unthinkingness of the state.

In Western democracies, the evilness of government is best characterised by mental rape and coercive control; that is, by the banality/brutality of standardisation, automatisms, repetitions and regular events imposed on the general population, whether they are special occasions or 9-to-5 daily working routines. For example, 'voting' is the clearest symptom of irrational automatic standardisation by democratic governments. Voting is irrational but consistently regular and repetitive. In the final analysis, voting is an irrational rejection of every intellectually conscious decision. To coerce

---

[9] 'Generic Eichmann' is concept which I developed from Hannah Arendt's *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (1963).

[10] Slavoj Žižek, 'Introduction' to *Less than Nothing* (NY & London: Verso, 2012), page 1.

people into voting is a form of mental rape. Yet the people are so vulnerable and so accustomed to being mentally abused that they don't question voting and don't see it as 'odd' or irrational. They flock happily to the urns to place their vote every four or five years when they are required to do so, even thanking the government for giving them an opportunity to have their say in how they want to be governed. An opportunity and an honour many people in the world don't have. Yes, voters should be grateful to their leaders because that would distinguish them from sheep.

The criminal minority who compete for their votes show boundless energy and vitality during electoral campaigning and display instinctual drives (hunger, cupidity, fear, callousness). But they also show sensitivity/sensibility towards audiences, for they know what to say to whom in order to capture their attention and obtain their votes. In psychotic societies like US/UK a single 'meme' can win you an election. The paradigmatic example, repeated many times, is Obama's 'yes, we can'. [11] Now, great thinkers are not concerned with the 'content' of an expression. Its meaning is irrelevant. What they care about is whether they can establish a commonality of form, pattern or idea with other expressions, and from those links they can draw inferences. For example, artists belong to the criminal category, not as individuals but as persons reflected backwards through the patterns they create which, unlike them, might be beautiful, interesting, and compelling. Their extreme traditionalism actually means, as in voting, the rejection of every intellectually conscious decision and the adoption of the moment as the ultimate source of inspiration.

The individual: 'banal' or 'scum'?

Liberalism is the unavoidable consequence of the Hobbesian dream of a state. Extreme liberalism, or traditional anarchism, would be human rights' rule – without the state, not against it: Man is capable of infinite progress under the right of influence and education. He is a tabula rasa, neutral, clean, and free from bias. From this point of neutrality, depolitisation ensues, and the opposition between good and evil loses its edge; for everyone is born free and innocent, until a bad government, the oppressive state and its corrupt institutions make one wicked. Hobbes' disquisitions on evil are not fundamentally different from those of Spinoza and Pufendorf. One has to wait three centuries for this conception of evil to be turned-upside-down by Hannah Arendt in 1961 with her report on the Eichmann trial in Jerusalem. This was the turning point Ethics was waiting for to launch a new philosophy of evil. The 'banality of evil' is pregnant with anti-liberal, anti-democratic, and anti-capitalist possibilities. The baby, the child, the well-behaved young person, the nine-to-five wage slave worker, the responsible taxpayer, the obedient civil servant, the good and responsible citizens, and so forth, all could be potential foci of the most dangerous kind: banal, superficial, repetitive, familiar, benevolent evil.

In order to make Hobbes' notion of evil compatible with that of Arendt, one can make the evil of criminals innocent like the beasts': 'Criminals are those who can make or break laws indistinctively.' So law-makers are criminals too. If they are seen as different by the people it is because their minds/brains are suffering from the 'good' psychosis of binarisation. This is why judges put criminals in prison, and law-givers count on law-breakers to give a reason/motive for their existence. The majority of people (for example, up to 95 per cent of the population in the UK, according to statistics) don't have capacity either to make or to break the law. So let's give them all the freedom in the world, for example, by allowing 'murder', and they won't know what to do with it. They won't have it in them to kill anyone. When the people break the law it is through ignorance or accident or negligence or lack of understanding of the law. Sorry, we have found a double way of nullifying evil: One, following Arendt, the evil of the majority is nullified as 'banal'; Two, following my parliament-as-monastery argument, the evil of the minority in power is nullified as 'innocent'. Like the beats, they are moved by their drives: hunger, cupidity, fear, jealousy, greed. Regarding positioning, criminals, both in government and in prison, occupy the extreme, the border, the crust, the skin of the social body while, the majority occupy the widest possible middle.

This middle is an arid region that was theorised by Marcuse in *One-Dimensional Man*. It is occupied by a majority of zombie-like individuals who have pornography but not libido, because they are the products of standardisation and repetition, encouraged to reproduce and work effectively to maintain economic growth. They are One-dimensional because they are products themselves, not distinct from the product they are born to make and destined to consume. Thus the legs of lamb on the supermarket shelves are not different from the human legs not on display on supermarket shelves. The non-presence of human meat for sale in meat markets and supermarkets confirms the Law of One, raising questions

---

[11] For more complex memes in the Obama election see Erhardt Graeff, 'Binders Full of Election Memes: Participatory Culture Invades the 2012 U.S. Election', in Civic Media Project. http://civicmediaproject.org/works/civic-media-project/binders-full-of-election-memes-participatory-culture-invades-the-2012-us-election

of presence/absence and inconsistency in a One-dimensional space. Yet in the connection I made between Hobbes' view of evil and Arendt's, I failed to mask my sympathy for the criminals at the top, the politicians and members of the government. This admiration and sympathy, however, is nothing other than admiration for animal power, not distinct from some people's admiration for serial killers, genocides, suicides, and other violent criminals. Above all, what I'm seeking is consistency within a particular system of philosophy by equating criminals at the top with criminals at the bottom – not finding any difference between, say, the president of the government and a serial killer.

At the same time, this consistency extends to the attempt to be 'normal'; that is, to live in thrall of the exception. Thus to take an interest in both the criminals who form the government and the criminals who form the prison population is a symptom of normality. The 'bad' psychotic doesn't find the 'exception' interesting at all. He doesn't differentiate between the rule and the exception, both are 'irrational'. A celebrity giving a speech on TV is as interesting to him as a flower without urine is to a dog. The inappropriateness of the 'normal' sympathy for celebrities and criminals immediately becomes clear when we discover that what is admired is not the criminal himself but his difference from the zombie-like majority on which he feeds. The individual is 'scum'. He is not even a 'person' but a slave, a zombie, an automaton, a sheep, a piece of 'shit'. The criminal's dangerousness, revealed as a need for domination of a flock of sheep can be understood only as moral baseness and a lack of ambition. 'Why bother with scum?' Plato would ask of Socrates' insistent questioning of ignorant people in order to show them that they knew nothing. Leaving people to their own devices; to rot in their own boredom and to thrive in their own self-sufficiency would be the apolitical ideal. To resist the desire for domination, to resist the desire to rule over a flock of sheep: this is the ultimate meaning of the affirmation of the apolitical.

3. CONCLUSION

If dangerousness means 'need for domination', the ultimate quarrel is not between pacifist and bellicose but between anarchists and authoritarians. At the centre of this quarrel is the question of whether man is presupposed to be 'good' or 'bad'. Carl Schmitt laughs at anarchism when it reveals an ingenuous belief in the natural goodness of man which is closely tied to the radical denial of state and government. For liberalism, which is a very mild form of anarchism (with a relation of mildness equivalent to that of mozzarella to stilton), the goodness of man backs up the argument for a benevolent state that helps people (through universal education, financial credit, unemployment benefits, and government grants) to achieve their full potential. Schmitt laughs at this mild conception of man's goodness too. But the person/individual distinction of 'man' (which is heavily influenced by medieval notions of death and decay) would probably be shocking even for Schmitt. I don't think that he would laugh at the kind of fundamentalist anarchism that sees the 'individual' as 'scum' or as very limited and mentally retarded, being suitable for voluntary death or killing. And I say 'voluntary' because mass-suicide would be expected after anti-psychotic remedies are applied to a society and an awareness of how limited, un-free, and boring human beings really are.

Mohamed Emwazi (known as 'Jihadi John'), for example, is neither boring nor un-free because he falls under the romantic doctrine of the autonomous, isolated, and solitary super-hero, whose absolute stance towards himself gives a world in which nothing is connecting to anything else. Dressed like a super-hero, Jihadi John goes on about his business like Batman, Spider-man, Iron-man; they all wear balaclavas and have superpowers that draw the attention of the authorities. What's happening now that's different from previous non-psychotic eras is that the authorities are very interested in defining who this 'person' is, why he did it, going into detail about his life; that is, the terror actor is no longer an 'individual', he has become a 'person'. The person/individual binary opposition theorises this magic transformation, because the common denominator of the 'individual' from the point of view of the state was: 'I don't care who you are.' Basically, everyone is equal before the law.

However, in psychotic societies like Usuk, the principle of equality before the law no longer applies. By transforming terrorists into 'persons', the democratic state might be doing killers a favour. What if the dead are simply transformed from being 'individuals' to becoming 'persons'? What if the 'person' under consideration cannot be killed, and will repeatedly take another body after the death of the current one? The essential aspect of a human being is thus reconceptualised. The unit of measurement of the social mass is no longer an 'individual', whose life is short and whose body/mind is constantly raped by the state and its apparatuses. Death gives both terror actors and their victims a life they previously didn't have. Imagine the London underground, supposedly one of the least friendly places on earth, a place where people rarely make eye contact, let alone speak to each other. Yet on the 7th of July 2005, when a bomb was

detonated at Edgware Road, there were passengers who risked their own lives to save strangers. The heroic and uplifting stories of the passengers and passers-by who stayed behind risking injury and death trying to save complete strangers do speak of the transformative power of terror. A tragedy can be, paradoxically, a way of enhancing or enlightening their lives. The proliferation of charities and non-profit organisations testifies to this.

But killing people can also be, at best, a waste of time (because death comes to everyone, sooner or later) and, at worst, a recipe for manufacturing persons/celebrities. It can be argued that 'individuals' are not 'persons' but abstract representations or 'ideas'. Therefore, killing an 'individual', which is a single unit of measurement of the social mass of the state, standardised through categories such as sex, age, profession, nationality, address, and ID number, cannot be considered 'murder'. If it is 'murder', is because the law says so. And the law, like democracy, relies heavily on individualism, freedom of speech, modernity, and other delusions, for its wide appeal. Instead of killing people, why terrorists don't kill ideas? The public is dead scared of weapons and violence. But, for the same psychological reason that they love the exceptional event, they love a good argument. An opinion expressed very strongly in an argument, with clarity of mind and clarity of purpose, is so rare these days that it tends to cause an impact on those who listen to it. What the public desires and appreciates most is that which they generally lack: the capacity to reason. This explains why freedom of speech is such a safe bet in democratic societies where people have lost the capacity to stop and think in systematic and effective ways. Very few people, a tiny minority, are still capable of saying something with such persuasive authority so as to render everyone susceptible to their influence. Only in prisons, where talented individuals have time to push the boundaries of their thoughts, can a thinking revolution take place. Jail is where some of the finest people I know are these days. Outside prisons, no one seems to be capable of saying anything dangerous anymore.

<div align="center">

REFERENCES

</div>

[1] Arendt, Hannah. *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* , Intr. Amos Elon (New York & London: Penguin Books, 2007).

[2] Baudrillard, Jean . *The Agony of Power* (Los Angeles: Semotext (e) Intervention Series, 2011).

[3] Dawkins, Richard. *The Selfish Gene* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

[4] Freud, Sigmund. 'Moses and Monotheism: Three Essays', in *The Standard Edition*, vol. XXIII (1939).

[5] Marcuse, Herbert. *One-Dimensional Man*(Oxford & new York: Routledge Classics, 2002).

[6] Melville, Herman. *Benito Cereno* (Boston, MA: Squid Ink Classics, 2015).

[7] Saint-Exupery, Antoine de. *The Little Prince* (London: Mammoth, 2001).

[8] Schmitt, Carl. *The Concept of the Political* (Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 2007).

[9] Žižek, Slavoj. *Less than Nothing* (NY & London: Verso, 2012).