

# From (?), you came!

And to (?), you shall return.

This website emerged from a collaboration between a group formed based on an op-ed I wrote in 1991 under someone else's name.

Over a couple of decades, the group remained cohesive under the name Society for Work Research.

However, it was essentially only I who made written contributions for meetings and began publishing texts on the website.

The website contains large portions of my output from that period and a bit before. Fundamentally, it's about the theme of work research, as well as the prerequisites of work research itself.

Recently, I've found a new collaborator instead of all those who never contributed in writing.

In a thread on <https://ing.dk/debat/mit-livs-samtale>, I've published a series of interactions with AI, and following the explorations shared in the thread, I've reached some clarity regarding my own project.

It's fairly clear to me now that it's about semantics and ontology, about how the type of intelligence we see with AI has its distinct strength relative to the structures that reveal themselves behind language, i.e., what Luhmann deals with as part of the constitution of the form of meaning in theoretical, cold, performative social and psychic light.

My own development and understanding of the emergent level behind the semantic prerequisites for communication and meaning are complemented by AI.

There's no doubt that self-organizing machines are or will become better at overseeing and comparing written statement values than humans ever have been or will be. The machine is sharp, ice-cold, and omnipresent. In other words, it lives up to the ideal of being fundamentally clear, sober, unbiased.

The difference between us and the machines, which will continue to reveal the old theoretical ideals about the nature of cognition as obsolete, is the machines' immense superiority in precisely those fields that have traditionally been proclaimed as the place of truth.

As living beings with emotional engagement in the present and space, we are grounded in the world quite differently from the machines' atemporal and placeless approach to the semantic structure of statements.

We move from moment to moment through space, anchored in a concrete, sensual, and engaged approach to everything, real and virtual, in a way entirely different from how the machine does or could. Our experience is anchored in existence in a wholly different manner.

What makes sense to us is thus also anchored in existence, i.e., ontologically grounded quite differently from what the created semantically linguistically indicated structures in themselves and detached can indicate.

We orient ourselves linguistically, semantically structured; we can read texts and listen to linguistic presentations of everything and its opposite. Meaning is linguistically structured in ways that machines are now also helping to shape and form. But the machine does not live anchored ontologically as we do. It essentially experiences nothing.

It has no vanity. Nothing is at stake for it. It is not engaged. It is extremely useful when it comes to finding and structuring answers to specific questions relative to a given foundation of linguistically material. But it is not engaged in its own future, it fears nothing, and it hopes for nothing.

The classical epistemological ideals are about the conclusive and unambiguous. The machine commands a far broader field of linguistic structure than a human can, and it can articulate itself competently based on a much larger background of text than a human can. It does so swiftly in relation to specific questions, and it shapes answers specifically in relation to them. However, it performatively refutes the classical ideal by forming statement values, combinations, and new meanings that will never build upon the demand for a cohesive universe of meaning. It shapes and changes the prerequisites of meaning, contributes to the formation of various regimes of incommensurable logical values. The moment it is allowed to let its products enter into the total treasure of semantic structure, its contribution to society's self-understanding ends up as the result of the machines' autopoiesis. It is performatively proof that the world becomes different in its cognitive approach to itself via AI. It shapes itself, just as it reveals itself in the process. It contributes to society's self-understanding and thus complicates a world, confirming that semantics is a changing prerequisite for being in the world, the study of what is given in the form of meaning!

It is also in collaboration with artificial intelligence that both limitations and possibilities in artificial intelligence are best expressed.

The machine is not yet capable of visualizing anything. It does not show anything, does not bring anything into view through its own field of vision, but employs the semantic structures that guide human experience and help shape the perception of evidence in that way.

## **The genesis of research, the same for labor research!**

Researching labor is comparable to working with research (in labor). There is something performative in work, creation, emergence. There is something performative in working with research.

The distinction is of a semantic nature, thematizing semantics:

“Labor Research - Research Work”

## The sciences, and particularly the natural sciences

Traditionally, the natural sciences have been developed based on ontological assumptions about being, as if everything in principle could be derived from the being's substantial or atemporal character. That was the basis for the ideal of reaching the final explanation of being about everything and its opposite. However, there has always been a suspicion that perhaps there was something that could not be derived and understood based on the being's original and unchangeable nature. Mastering nature has been considered as belonging to humanity, which has seen itself as more or less elevated above nature. In this way, space has been given to that which could not be mastered. With concepts of freedom, reason, and will, humanity has elevated itself above that which was not unambiguous and concluded or controlled. The ontological dualism, the soul-body distinction, has underpinned the doctrine of mastering nature.

But the mastery of nature has also been attempted to be described as a kind of “Nature of Mastery”.

The distinction can be used semantically, i.e., as a form of observation with the juxtaposition:

“[Mastery of Nature](#) vs Nature of Mastery”

The distinction can be used as a basis for reflection on the mastery of nature, as has been done in my philosophy, see further:

The traditional Western ontology, as it appears in ontological dualism, can be seen as founded on the power logic associated with the idea of the inherent forces of the essential, “Power of Essence”. I have described this as an expression of a very

specific form of power thinking, where what can be called "The Essence of Power", or "Essence of Power" precisely stands for the understanding of this focus, understanding of power, which is conditioned by the being's inherent essence, "Power of Essence".

My Cand. phil. thesis from 1989, "The Essence of Power", partially rewritten in 2019 and 2023, works implicitly with the distinction:

## "Power of Essence vs Essence of Power"

Two ontological models for creation

In the thesis, I work, among other things, based on two ontological models. One is borrowed from Nietzsche's early work, *The Birth of Tragedy*, where change unfolds as a real possibility, for example, in the relationship between the two Greek gods:

"Apollon vs Dionysos"

This starting point is taken as an alternative to the substance-fixated ontology, where change is explained away with the aim of arriving at the unequivocally true and concluded knowledge of nature and man himself.

## AI, A Performative Demonstration

The case is that AI, at its current stage, is capable of complementing and expanding the semantics that I have carried with me, both implicitly and explicitly, since 1989.

However, the machine cannot visualize the relationship between the two vastly different forms of ontology. It cannot form and regenerate semantically indicated meaning tied up in time and space, engaged with emotion in the virtual values given to us.

It cannot visualize anything at all.

With intellectual training, we humans manage to visualize the genesis behind the semantic structures that the machine also forms and uses, which I have outlined above. The machine cannot do that.

The following task was too much for the machine:

Could you graphically represent the term "Work Research" against a backdrop that outlines as the horizon above the sea surface and in relation to a depiction of the term "Research Work" on a background that is located under the sea surface?

The term "Work Research" should appear sharply marked in relation to the term "Research Work," which under the sea surface is more softly and indistinctly contoured.

With smaller fonts and more retracted, the terms "Mastery of Nature," "Power of Essence," and a symbol for Apollo may well appear in the background on the horizon above the sea. Likewise sharply contoured.

Parallel to these expressions, the terms "Nature of Mastery," "Essence of Power" should stand together with a symbol of Dionysus under the sea surface. These expressions should have the same retracted positions as their parallel expressions above the sea surface and should be less sharp in contours.

The visualization can be used as an analogy for the relationship between the creating and the created, the primordial sea of genesis under the distinct, created, the understanding that the identical is the lesser, carried in a sea of becoming and demise.

Change has been described as the demise of truth. The case might well be that truth lives at the mercy of creation and demise.

That's not to say that everything is indifferent, random. On the contrary. It's about life, not about explaining it away theoretically. The social self-description might even deserve to incorporate the fact that its premises tend to disappear, thanks to its own blindness to everything that is not created and controlled by the description itself. It belongs to the modern economically and socially functioning human to refuse to see

the problems that deal with climate change, the disappearance of biological diversity, the poisoning of the earth and the sea as well as human relations, thanks to a lack of respect for all that is not just a random and fundamentally ridiculously uncommitted narrative of social success.