

And in this moment do we come to the coincidence of coincidences. For all that we have glimpsed so far through that door held ajar by the artwork Widows and Bairns, is about how we are, how we see and how we speak. And the location of the disaster, the people crying beside the river, the sculpture that drew me (with my interests in art, language and quantum paradoxes) quite fortuitously, to live but six miles from the artwork?...

Eyemouth

Of linear language and singularity

It is not the linear notation of words which threatens the mass extinction of life on earth, nor indeed is it our linear com-prehending of singularity as 'time'. (Linearity is the very fact of com-prehending, as we hope to show.) The danger lies in how carelessly and willfully we use speech and writing to reduce, subjugate and commodify the infinite variety of otherness on this planet, into the service of our own ideal existence. If we com-prehend language as something like 'that which signifies', then that's what it will do, and *things* will always merely be the undefined, signposted *objects* of our dominion.

But as we have identified, the letters - the basic units of the text - are symbolic, which means that as well as indicating our dominion - our world, as the multiplicity of *real* objects, the words also, *actually*, constitute a singularity of understanding. The startling implication of this is that when we see and indicate other objects around us - they are not different from us; and that despite the apparent distance between us, they are [as] us : we are [as] them. The basic relationship between the signifier and the signified is one of under-standing - not difference. This is what is *actually* written in the text.

If the letters of the words that I am writing are symbols; if a symbol is symbolic of its own singularity; and if singularity is our *actual* state (as coincidence seems to insist that it is), then these words cannot actually be indicating some object that exists 'over there'. Although an object might appear to be¹ 'in that space over there', like us it is also the symbol of the singular thing, and we ourself must 'be there' too. With other objects do we constitute the *thing* for which we are all symbols; and because of that, we hereby object to any further usage of the word 'object' in the text, because it places itself as a paradox to our urgent need to understanding the symbolism of things. 'Object' is the symbol that has always already prevented its own ability to symbolize. Let us use the word 'environment' instead of 'object'.

¹ When describing our actual state of singularity - always already prior to spacetime - from our condition of being real inside spacetime, we cannot simply use tenses of the verb 'to be'. By doing that we would continue to affirm the apparent separation of objects in time and space. Therefore we must use the term '[as]' in place of any tense of 'to be'. This means that we will use tenses of 'to be' in the general flow of the text, and the term '[as]' when describing the singularity of things, (or modifying a word object [as] a symbol.)