

The illusion of singularity of mind must be dispelled. While convenient for the justification of the moralist when applying the principle of change, it as a method of extrapolation and prediction to quote nic hex, falls fucking flat. Now let us see what we mean by all of this talk. Examine lyrics from a ballad written by Nickelback.

Never made it as a wise man
I couldn't cut it as a poor man stealing
Tired of living like a blind man
I'm sick of sight without a sense of feeling
And this is how you remind me
This is how you remind me
Of what I really am
This is how you remind me
Of what I really am

It's not like you to say sorry
I was waiting on a different story
This time I'm mistaken
for handing you a heart worth breaking
and I've been wrong, I've been down,
to the bottom of every bottle
these five words in my head
scream "are we having fun yet?"

yet, yet, yet, no, no
yet, yet, yet, no, no

it's not like you didn't know that
I said I love you and I swear I still do
And it must have been so bad
Cause living with me must have damn near
killed you

And this is how, you remind me
Of what I really am
This is how, you remind me
Of what I really am

It's not like you to say sorry
I was waiting on a different story
This time I'm mistaken
for handing you a heart worth breaking
and I've been wrong, I've been down,
to the bottom of every bottle
these five words in my head
scream "are we having fun yet?"

yet, yet, yet, no, no
yet, yet, yet, no, no
yet, yet, yet, no, no
yet, yet, yet, no, no

Never made it as a wise man
I couldn't cut it as a poor man stealing
And this is how you remind me
This is how you remind me
This is how you remind me
Of what I really am
This is how you remind me
Of what I really am

It's not like you to say sorry
I was waiting on a different story
This time I'm mistaken
for handing you a heart worth breaking
and I've been wrong, I've been down,
to the bottom of every bottle
these five words in my head
scream "are we having fun yet?"
yet, yet
are we having fun yet [3x]

Bob₁: "This useless drivel is the same song that's been rehashed and played over and over again. Its like taking all of the used porridge from an orphanage mashing it together and then claiming it as a new recipe for porridge. Pop music is vacuous and without feeling, its intended to sell records and make money for the record companies."

Bob₂: "I can really understand the pain and anguish that this troubled singer has endured. He expresses himself uniquely and effectively and it allows me access to his pain and in this way I do not feel so alone. He is a talented musician working on the edge to bring truth to the eternal sorrows of mankind"

Disabusive Sophist: "I hate people for Bob₁ and Bob₂ are not two separate entities, (whatever that means) in fact, Bob₁ and Bob₂ are the same entity. Bob is a hypocrite, at one point rejecting the song, and in the next moment he accepts the song "

What is really at stake here is model construction. I suppose humans, and moralist for sure, have gotten into the habit of believing models maintain a certain degree of consistency. Case in

point, that rock in your hand, always seems to fall to the ground when you drop it, in fact the very term 'drop' implies that something will fall. But the point is that the model, in this case gravity, consistently sends the rock to the floor. For this gravity as a model is seen to be consistent and predictable.

Such accountability would be nice if applicable to humans, and so as it stands such accountability in fact is applied to humans. In the example given, about Bob depending on the model we like of Bob, we call that the 'true' Bob. Appearance of the other Bob causes a denouncement and proclamation that the current Bob is not the legitimate Bob. This can also be applied moralistically, when one behaves consistent with the model the priest prefers, that is the 'true' self, they are a 'good' 'moral' person. However, when one acts contrary to the priest, they are 'bad' and 'evil'. We already know from Nietzsche that applying moral edicts of evilness to a human only reveals that one declared as such, behaves contrary to the preferences of those delivering the edict. The priest wants Bob₁, but gets Bob₂ and so to explain this deviation in behavior, Bob must be evil.

The problem with such a setup is the implication that such a true self exists within each person. How many times has one found themselves¹ drawn and quartered by differing internal drives? If singularity of consciousness were to exist then why should there be deviations and argument within the singular entity about what the entity should do. Perhaps one may argue that indeed an entity may have multiple drives, but that entity is marked by what selects those drives. The entity resides in drives that are expressed. Those making such an argument error in failing to realize that expression in behaviour of a drive already implies that one drive over the other demanding expression has succeeded in 'a will to power' over the other drives. Hence they have not proven a singular entity but have shown the consequence of when one drive succeeds over another when demanding expression. To talk in previous terminology the priest attempts to pull out the drive, or model he prefers, in the entity he is currently working with. Again we return to the problem of viewing a human as a singular entity.

Humans sure as hell aren't singular entities. To state what may be my most important thesis, human beings are a collection of drives that vary as a function of their environment. Drive expression depends on the both transient and state affects that power one drive over another. This is obviously the case in instances of hunger, some type of physiological affect powers the drive to consume, such that behaviour and thought express such a drive. One imagines the puppet master capable of pulling certain strings bringing out certain drives in an entity causing a transformation in behaviour and thought. We are victims of our drives.

Complicating the fact that a human is not a singular entity is that, a human is not a singular entity. Let me explain. Humans vary as a function of the drives that control them, but now a human attempting to understand another human being is restricted in the same way. Hence, model construction of one human, whose behavior varies as a function of drive expression, also is modified by the drive expression of the human constructing the model. Explaining the behaviour of another requires understanding both the drive of the person emitting the behaviour and understanding the drive that is attempting to explain that behaviour.

In administering punishment, it is convenient to believe in a singular entity, for the simple matter that you want the punishment to affect the drive that behaved deviantly. Commonly, punishing an entity for its deviant behaviour places the retribution on the wrong drive. Assuming the drive came to fruition, then it satiated what its desire, if this is the case then its power base has been depleted, and as such is no longer the expressed drive. Punishment is placed on another drive, one that shares no direct relationship with the drive. If this is the case, then we would no longer be able to justify the administration of punishment. Instead we demand singularity from our entities to maintain justification of punishment. To certain extent such a belief is justified given

the fact that a severe enough punishment will give enough power to a drive such that it has a certain degree of staying power over the 'deviant' drive.

But now what about our friend Bob and his contradictory feelings of Nickelback? Explanation seems pretty clear at this point, Bob₂ or should we say Drive₂ express itself in behavior and thought that is consistent with what is expressed in Nickelback's How You Remind Me. In this way, he can sympathize and understand Nickelback's position and from it comes admiration. On the other hand, Bob₁ operates within a cynical social circle. Drive to cynicism is more easily expressed for this reason mockery of Nickelback occurs.

1. Language itself betrays me here forcing me to refer to a singularity entity when it hardly seems appropriate.