The Flexibility of Kripkenstein

Jason Wakefield, University of Cambridge.

The world vision of those who think contemporary French readings of German ontology is necessary to educational institutions has been severely undermined by Kit Fine, Saul Kripke and Robert Stalnaker. This tract is an address to conference panels on semantics and public lectures on logic in defence of Catherine Malabou’s French interpretation of the metamorphosis and migration of Dasein. This was originally very popular at the Laboratoire d’Anthropologie Sociale in Paris during 2004, however Malabou’s theory of ontico-ontological transformability was not deemed credible or serious at the State University of New York and the Library of Columbia University. This initial, limited uptake was because financial and professional services involved in mining, engineering, pharma and manufacturing found Malabou’s theory of ontological porosity very weak when applied to capitalism or technologically privileged beings. Fine, Kripke, and Stalnaker all abandoned Malabou’s crossing and folding of essences in the earth or sky because of its obscure, vague schematism that is more an imaginary way of being, rather than an actual ultra-metaphysical image of being.

In 2013’s technology – driven world, Malabou’s ontological transformability does help revolutionise the way we live our lives in the deconstruction of balance sheets we find in Benjamin Graham / David Dodd’s Security Analysis (1934). Fine, Kripke and Stalnaker have claimed that continental philosophy; as endorsed by Malabou – is cognitively meaningless, without legitimacy, unintelligible and incomprehensible bureaucratese containing ungrammatical hyperbole. Counter to this, is my quantified and semantical modal logic which expands Kripke’s Naming and Necessity (1980) with Malabou’s writing on change, metamorphosis and mobility in essence, beings and being. My first book The Question of Non-Being? A Pragmatic Methodology of Casino Contingency (2013) has all the methodological preliminaries in Kripke models for both normal propositional logic and first-order modal logic; Stalnaker’s mappings; Fine’s non-existence / internalism problematics and Malabou’s supple form of essences in harmony. This German ontology, its crossing and exchange of being has its origins in Aristotle’s thinking of movement, mobility and change through running; where we have a mobility of movement. This ontomorphic velocity and Malabou or Aristotle’s metamorphic understanding of form is compatible with Kripke’s nature of being and its logical relations with change. Kripke’s semantics permits the extension of an atomic predicate at a possible world to contain objects outside the domain of the quantified modal logic of that particular world’s formulas:

The variant [counterpart] semantics brings to the surface an assumption about the modal relations between the modal properties of an individual in different possible worlds (Stalnaker 2003: 153)

Support for the controversial Kripkenstein local non – cognitivism here comes from Stalnaker’s variation of possible worlds. Either the Kripke / Stalnaker charge of cognitive meaningless in Malabou’s Aristotelian ontotypological symptoms is inaccurate or Stalnaker and Kripke are both contradicting themselves from within. Fine, Kripke and Stalnaker form a complex nexus; however a synoptic review of their logical analysis of possible worlds and modal logic is not persuasive enough when we analyse their register, tone, diction, style and paracritical practices.
Noam Chomsky is another North American academic who has publicly dismissed continental philosophy and its implications as empty posturing based on irrationality, that does nothing more than play with fancy words (such as polysyllables) to create fancy jargon. Chomsky originally rejected in public debates Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida on this basis, as thinkers lacking empirically testable propositions; however in their wake, his attack has shifted to readers of Malabou’s ontico-ontological transformability, such as Slavoj Zizek. Chomsky’s most recent rejection of Zizek’s Lacanian – variety of Paris based philosophy is on the grounds of a lack of Empirical data and rational examination of facts. Contemporary French thought, according to Chomsky, lacked (and still lacks) resolutions by way of scientific, systematic logical theories validated by technical, quantified, scientific standards.

Jacques Lacan I actually knew. I kind of liked him. We had meetings every once in a while; but quite frankly I thought he was a total charlatan. (Chomsky Veterans Unplugged December 2012 interview)

The case against Chomsky, Zizek communicates through a disagreement with a significant portion of the two volumes of Chomsky’s Political Economy of Human Rights (1979) and forty-three pages concerning the silence in the media’s propaganda about the Indo-China wars in Chomsky & Herman’s Manufacturing Consent (1988). Thus it is the Chomsky of the decade circa 1977-1987 that Zizek finds muddling provocative data, rather than clarifying data, in a failure to remove distortions. Zizek finds both Chomsky and Herman failing to provide an accurate or precise quantification of political economy in East Timor or Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge. Zizek focuses his critique more significantly on Chomsky, rather than Herman, because of Chomsky’s earlier political book Two Essays on Cambodia (1970).

The ethical debate between Noam Chomsky and Slavoj Zizek is currently not as deep or complex as the ontological debate between Hubert Dreyfus and John McDowell about the non-conceptuality of social norms, thus no serious decoding is needed with any great application of technical resources of modal logic to provide structural cores for quantified theories; however a partial defence of Zizek is possible, not on the perhaps slightly predictable insurrections we find critically in Hegel and the Infinite: Religion, Politics and Dialectic (2011), but through the plasticity of a Fellow of King’s College, University of Cambridge:

‘let us write our Quantity Equation as follows: \( M'.V' = II.O \) where \( M' \) is the volume of the Industrial Circulation, \( O \) the volume of output, and \( II \) the price-level of output; then-so we have claimed – \( V' \) is a complex notion not identified with \( V \), the Velocity of Circulation. (John Maynard Keynes, A Treatise on Money, Volume II, The Applied Theory of Money 1934: 5).

This equation was found by me in the Faculty of History’s Seeley Library on the Sidgwick Site nearby to King’s College where Keynes originally formulated it. This is important for multiple reasons:

1. Monetary factors have fluctuations and a variability of velocity in business deposits.
2. The University of Cambridge, the quintessential epicentre of empirical data laboratories, bio-engineers plasticity through adding molecules to manipulate sequencing of DNA.

3. My analysis of the politico–economic futures of ontological mutability is from the source data itself in King’s College / Seeley Historical Library archives where Keynes himself conducted research; rather than Chomsky’s pseudo-field-work that mainly was analysed outside of Cambodia.

Chomsky sometimes failed to adequately check the original sources of his data that was available to him in the 1970’s. My personal critique of Chomsky on the Khymer Rouge, in partial support of Zizek, is on Keynesian terms, as he fails to articulate mathematically testable propositions in tabular rows and columns; trees with sets of nodes containing parent-children relationships or graph structures with measurements visualised in images. The equation that one cites from Keynes can be applied to the data we have on the fluctuations in the Khymer Rouge’s liquid capital during their genocidal grasp of Cambodia. The Khymer Rouge’s financial data is very important to a clear understanding of their economic movement in Cambodia. To clarify, the word data is the plural of datum, which is Latin for something given; which Tim Crane discussed in terms of the Dreyfus / McDowell debate to the phenomenology reading group in Cambridge during the Easter Term, on the 3rd May 2013. Malabou’s contribution to Zizek’s deconstructions of migration and exchange within the Khymer Rouge’s terrorism has a solid rational clarity in the following equation relating price fluctuations to carrying stock costs per annum: ‘pq=xy’ (Keynes 1934: 140).

If Chomsky wishes to analyse the linearity and consistency of Keynesian politico-economics, then he may wish to ‘analyse further validations of contemporary French thought in Chapter 15: The Psychological and Business Incentives to Liquidity of The General Theory of Employment Interest and Money: ‘because it is particularly important in transmitting the effects of change in the quantity of money’ (Keynes 1936: 196). Earlier in this book in the preface he cites A Treatise on Money:

‘This book, on the other hand, has evolved into what primarily a study of the forces which determine changes in the scale of output and employment as a whole […] a monetary economy, we shall find, is essentially one in which changing views about the future are capable of influencing the quantity of employment and not merely its direction’ (Keynes 1936: VII)

Thus it is crystal clear that Malabou’s radical theory of ontico – transformability that has influenced books similar to Zizek’s Welcome to the Desert of the Real (2002) do contain empirically testable propositions that allow for a rational examination of factual data. The Keynesian support for readers of Malabou (such as Zizek) will interest scholars such as Paul Smoke of New York University. Smoke advocates books such as The New Fiscal Sociology: Taxation in Comparative and Historical Perspective edited by Isaac William Martin, Ajay K. Mehrotra and Monica Prasad. This stretches to 313 pages of text, containing Andrea Campbell’s empirical analysis of the relationship between elitist rhetoric and the attitudes of average citizen’s about taxes in chapter 3; as well as; Fred Block’s deconstruction of the factors underlying the tax cuts of President George W. Bush from 2001 to 2003, showing how the political right manipulated individualistic ideology in chapter 4. Flexibility and plasticity should perhaps be taken a little more seriously by Chomsky, as leaders of economies in G8 countries are currently turning to Malabou for jargon-free guidance, as over 1 billion women enter the...
global work force and economy over the next decade. The flexibility of Kripkenstein and the mobility of data is crucial for removing the barriers women face over the next decade and beyond. The question of how the metamorphosis and migration of Dasein in its feminist form can be incorporated into the global economy, can serve to inspire and empower women further than France or Germany. The political struggles that working people embarked on to create welfare states in Europe, as well as, Keynesian arrangements in the US and UK is not the result of Derridean or Lacanian empty posturing; the London riots in August 2011 made vividly clear that there is a present force of French theorists who ignore both Chomsky’s and Zizek’s ideological restraints to radical change. Malabou’s friends, readers and colleagues have had a pragmatic approach to abolishing ‘capitalistic resistances to change through demonstrations, occupations, revolutions, strikes and uprisings at the conclusion of the first decade of the twenty-first century. This has seen the ontological transformability of Malabou’s pragmatism allow those who are teaching political theory in upstate New York to unshackle the communist ideal from the Soviet Union with a theoretical stringency that culminated in September 2011 with the financial heart of Lower Manhattan, New York City being ruptured with barricades. Wall Street was occupied by a collective counterforce inspired by the Paris Commune and the armed robbery of the Securitas Cash Depot in Tonbridge, Kent executed in February 2006.

Malabou currently teaches neurobiology, sociopathy and philosophy at the CRMEP (Centre for Research in Modern European Philosophy) at Kingston University near Bermondsey, South London - where Lee Murray, one of the organisers of the Securitas Cash Depot robbery family is from. Capitalism put Lee Murray at a disadvantage from an early age, leading to his incarceration at the Feltham Young Offenders Institution: however Murray later refused to be dispossessed of his future and plotted, then executed a robbery on the Securitas Cash Depot which provided him alongside his colleagues a modest £53,116,760 million out of the £199,500,000 million that was stored in its vaults. Approximately £37 million is circulating daily in the UK’s economy in paper currency, thus Murray felt outraged about the incompatibility between capitalism and ordinary, working people. Murray and his friends who helped him with the heist in Tonbridge, Kent felt exploited by the capitalist expropriation of their lives and futures, thus they organised a collective oppositional protest (in the form of the world’s biggest cash robbery) to challenge capitalist state power. A similar event occurred in the Paris Commune, where individuals who were almost inexistent, were brought into a politically communist maximal existence of self – inclusion.

The Securitas Cash Depot robbery in 2006 was not a revolutionary event in the perhaps more romantic vein of the Northern Bank Robbery in Belfast the previous December. The £26.4 million robbery in Belfast had a radically different context, where hostility to the International Finance Corporation – the World Bank’s private lending arm – was because of underground media figures unanimous opposition to the British presence in Northern Ireland. The £26.4 million robbery in Belfast was part of neighbours and sympathisers for some members of the IRA recognising the causes of poverty – stricken Catholics. The Provisional IRA have had a significant trade agreement with the Richardson family and others based in South London (since they detached themselves from the official IRA) however the Irish nationalists and folk heros of the Northern Bank Robbery, nor the Richardson family had any involvement in the heroic Securitas Cash Management Ltd Depot robbery in Tonbridge; which was organised as a protest towards the Chancellor of the Exchequer’s circle of Andrew Bailey, Gordon Brown and Mervyn King. Zizekian’s might be tempted to draw a parallel between the two events, in terms of former HMP Parkhurst inmate James McCann throwing Molotov cocktails for the IRA at Belfast’s Queen’s University, however it might be wiser to analyse how relevant Chomsky’s comments on Cambodia in the 1970’s are today. McCann escaped from Belfast’s
Crumlin Road Prison in 1971 whilst on trial for this petrol – bombing, let us see if Chomsky escapes Zizek’s critique.

The Monday 13th May 2013 issue of The Guardian newspaper had a short column with the title ‘Top bank accused of bankrolling land invasion for rubber’ co-written by Kate Hodal in Bangkok and Chris Kelly in Phnom Penh:

Two Vietnamese firms bankrolled by Deutsche Bank and the International Finance Corporation – the World Bank’s private lending arm – are leading a wave of land grabs in Cambodia and Laos, causing widespread evictions, illegal logging and food insecurity […] Land was often sold without villagers’ consent or knowledge and without compensation. […] In Cambodia private property was wiped out by the Khmer Rouge, while in Laos all land technically belongs to the State. (Hodal & Kelly 2013: 14)

The Deutsche Bank has officially denied providing finance to HAGL (Huang Anh Gia Lia) the privately owned Vietnamese company or VRG (Vietnam Rubber Group) which is State – owned directly. The factual data remains that families have been forced off land or are expected to work for the rubber plantation companies. These invasions of rice fields in the villages of Laos and Cambodia have brought back bad memories of Khmer Rouge threats of violence that Chomsky initially did not exclaim as unethical exploitation. The contentious financial data the media is reporting today, consists of the IFC investing ‘$14.95 million in a Vietnamese fund that holds 5% equity in HAGL, while Deutsche Bank own some $4.5 million – worth of HAGL shares’ (Hodal & Kelly 2013: 14). Thus we see that today the IFC seems to be secretly involved in bulldozing ordinary villagers’ rice fields and the atrocity of the legacy of the Khmer Rouge in a current environmental threat, on top of a food scandal. The lack of legal recourse and accountability of these particular bankers, as well as, Nobel Prize Winners who profess microfinance, has catalysed the armed robberies in Belfast and Tonbridge. Major vaults elsewhere, such as in the Zenith Bank of Nigeria, the largest Nigerian bank listed on the London Stock Exchange, have not been targeted by revolutionary armed robbers, because they have shown great integrity, as opposed to the endemic corruption and economic inequality sustained by banking sector entrepreneurs in Belfast and Kent. The exploitation of villagers in Cambodia and Laos has largely been silenced in favour of media coverage focusing on the entrenched corruption of Xi Jinping’s Chinese economy which is on a par with the bribery, embezzlement and statistical falsification of bankers in Trinidad and Tobago.

Further in to the 13.05.13 issue of the Guardian newspaper is an article written by Hugh Muir whom one met during Cornel West’s short residency in the Ryland’s Room, Old Lodge, King’s College. The room was named after Dadie Rylands, the English literary scholar educated at King’s and a Fellow up until his death in 1999; John Maynard Keynes (with Dadie Rylands) often lunched and discussed Shakespeare with Virginia Woolf in the room. It was a pleasure finally meeting both Muir and West in person during this brief visit, as West is currently focusing his time on eradicating poverty and protesting against Wall Street at the Union Theological Seminary in New York. His non-Marxist socialist Christianity has catalysed a bitter dispute with Lawrence Summers, President Obama’s Head of the US National Economic Council and other Managing Directors attached to Wall Street. Chomsky and Zizek should both support West’s respect for Martin Luther King’s fight against carpet-bombing in Vietnam and his plight to help dismantle or terminate the prison industrial complex.
created by unjust policies. West himself was arrested once during a protest against policing methods in Harlem in 2011.

Before Kripke, the operators in Malabou’s modal logic was taken seriously in New York and usually read as expressing logical necessity and possibility. Zizek discusses how necessity arises out of contingency on pages 126-132 of *For They Know What They Do* (1991); however the best starting point for a coherent defence of Malabou, is probably not in the pragmatic ontologies of West or Zizek, but in Carnap’s semantics. Atomic sentences and negations thereof as a logical constant have simplicity in Carnap’s approach that is also transparent, distinct and clear in Malabou’s logical modality of the plasticity of love (which is currently popular with Fordham University Press clinical neurophysiology editors in New York). This plasticity of love has closure under uniform substitution, which is mandatory for a logical system according to most experts in propositional modal logic.

Malabou’s plasticity, one must concede, is directly shaped by Derrida’s *Without Alibi* (2002) and Lacan’s *Ecrits* (1970); however Malabou shares with Carnap a difference for individual variables. The distinct variables x and y can be mapped to the same individual concept, so $x = y$, is true at all state-descriptions, however first-order modal logic in Carnap’s or Turing’s semantics cannot be completely axiomatized in a formal system. The Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Cambridge hosted a programme during 2012 called ‘Semantics and Syntax: The Legacy of Alan Turing’ which brought together researchers from across the syntax-semantics divide; thus the conclusion was plasticity in Malabou, enhances the technical problems in Carnap, by providing an alternative to the fatal flaw of unaxiomatizability in semantically presented logic. Further support for Malabou’s arithmetic applications can be found in Hans Hahn who wondered if the truth itself is unaxiomatisable. Kripke’s model – theoretic semantics solved some of Carnap’s problems in his short paper *Semantical Considerations on Modal Logic* (1963). Kripke’s non-modal guides to modal logic, may still be considered the best technical models for the relative possibilities between worlds, however the need to be flexible, is important, as Kripke’s semantics allow a range of possibility to vary while the logic remains fixed. Sets of worlds may differ in both Kripke’s and Malabou’s models of logic. The sets of worlds and the relation of relative possibilities leaves open a wide range of options that we can explore with Malabou’s plasticity that is compatible with Kripke models for normal propositional modal logic. The cohesion and compatibility between Kripke and Malabou, does not mean that, Kripke is a stranger to processing analytic data. A formula is valid on a model only if it is true in every model of its structure. The logic of Kripke’s model structures is the set of all the formulas and each theorem on it, which are valid in the class. Kripke’s formulas are only valid if and only if they are true in every model in that frame. When Malabou’s Hegelian concept of plasticity is applied to Kripke’s model structures, this does not mean that the clarity and precision of Kripke’s analytic project is diminished, on the contrary, new variables are expressed. Chomsky should have treated his raw or primary data in this flexible Kripkenstein form.

A sustained analysis of Kripke’s model structures is perhaps not necessary, as a long comparison or juxtaposition between his studies in semantics, modal logic, empiricism, ontology, meaning and necessity – perhaps seems slightly trivial as Carnap’s deflationism in 1950 combined metaphysics with pragmatic functional pluralism many years before Kripke’s linguistic framework asked us for validations which are empirical, as in science; or logical; as in mathematics. This Carnapian *deflationistic* perspective towards human epistemology would please Chomskyan empiricist philosophers, as it extracts knowledge from observation. What has loosely been termed Kripkensteinian semantics was already negotiated previously by Carnap’s reading of Wittgenstein as a rejection of the Vienna Circle’s classification as nominalist. In 1950, Carnap, combined pluralism about ontology with a deflationary critique of metaphysics in general. Carnap survived (with ease)
Quine’s counter-attack on Carnap’s ontology later in 1966, thus Kripke’s *Wittgenstein on Rules and Private Language* (1982) does not cover substantially dispositionalist approaches to rule-following nor how dispositions can give rise to norms. Malabou’s Hegelian approach to plasticity through Lacanian dialectics, gives Kripke’s explanation of phenomenology to explain normative notions of truth and falsity a fresh analysis of Wittgenstein that is distinctly deflationary, as when we deconstruct and reconstruct Carnap or Ramsey.

To Clarify, 1929 marked a major contradictory, semi-dialectical shift in Wittgenstein’s philosophy. Wittgenstein had returned to Cambridge to have his Ph.D thesis examined by Moore and Russell at Trinity College; whilst Ramsey was teaching mathematics and rule-following considerations at King’s College, before Wittgenstein started lecturing on the material that later appeared in his *Philosophical Investigations*. Wittgenstein discussed at length with Ramsey what many readers of what Kripke has termed Wittgenstein’s paradox have misread as Kripkensteinian conclusions. Ramsey would not recommend to Wittgenstein a sceptical local non-cognitivism.

My critical analysis of the Kripkenstein legacy lays elsewhere fundamentally, as Kripke objects to a dispositional account of rule-following where addition involves numbers too large for us to grasp in a finite time. The simple counter-argument is to apply reduction sentences where we can grasp the arithmetic despite blind followers of Kripke in New York who seem to be misled by Kripke. In conclusion, we find Chomsky’s political ontology no superior to Zizek’s: however when we juxtapose their respective oeuvres from a Kripkensteinian or semantic deflationist perspective. Chomsky’s use of language in an analytic or (psychoanalytic sense) is far superior:

As for semantics, insofar as we understand language use, the argument for a reference-based semantics apart from an internalist syntactic version) seems to me weak. It is possible that natural language has only syntax and pragamatics; it has a “semantics” only in the sense of “the study of how this instrument, whose formal structure and potentialities of expression are the subject of syntactic investigation, is actually put to use in a speech community,” to quote the earliest formulation in generative grammar 40 years ago, influenced by Wittgenstein, Austin, and others. (Chomsky *Logical Structure of Linguistic Theory* 1975: 102-3).

There is no useful semantic external notion that a word or sentence bears to the external world, only networks that are either causal-functional, inferential or computational. It is in this analysis of syntactic structures that Chomsky is clearer than even Hegel’s *The Science of Logic* (1816) or *Philosophy of Right* (1820) logic of purification when a subject puts all of its libidinal investment into a contingent fragment of being. In Zizek’s preferred Lacanese – this object is a metonymy of lack – the Lacanian objet petit a – an operator of purification from all content. The object is a contingent ontic filler of this void, in a synthesis of Hegelian logic with Lacanian objet a contingent singularity.

The denoument of this debate between Chomsky’s Anglo – Saxon empirically verifiable evidence and Zizek’s Hegelio-Lacanian corollary takes place within the same proto-anarchist, political Left-Wing. Despite Chomsky’s superiority in transformational grammar, over Zizek’s challenges to structural linguistics, Chomskyan linguistic excellence might have the same devastating nullification that Gottlob Frege’s *Grundgesetze der Arithmetik* (1893) had at the hands of Russell’s paradox, which undermined Frege’s proofs. Richard Heck Jr.’s *Reading Frege’s Grundgesetze* (2013) has attempted to avoid Russell’s paradox, thus it is only a very short matter of time until we see editors (such as Peter Momtchiloff at Oxford University Press) receiving letters showing that the axioms Chomsky is using to formalise his logic is inconsistent. Heck Jr.’s earliest encounter with Frege’s *Grundgesetze* was when he was a B. Phil student at Oxford, where Micheal Dummet had been teaching its logic. Without
the flexibility of Malabou’s Kripkenstein – friendly ontology of change, Chomsky’s thought cannot evolve with a new paradigm shift.

Malabou’s quantified modal logic (as constrained by Kripke’s semantics) permits the extension of an atomic predicate at a possible world to contain objects of it. The counterfactual intervention of the Chomsky / Zizek debate is perhaps a political irrelevancy to this serious constraint to being that we find in my Kripkensteinian analysis of Malabou’s philosophy of change. The trivial Chomsky/ Zizek debate only threatens the flexibility of Kripkenstein on a narrowly partial survey of data from Wittgenstein’s or Frege’s natural language. Despite the attempts of Fine’s *Modality and Tense: Philosophical Papers* (2005) core argumentation (that many contingentist’s defend) to make distinct truth regardless or however the truth turns out – it still remains very obscure. Stalnaker attempted to improve on the clarity of Kripke’s semantics with model-theoretic semantics for first-order logic into a language for quantified modal logic with identity. Following Stalnaker’s combined language, we now need a clearer exposition Kripkenstein’s orthodox semantics combined with Malabou’s ontological mutability, in a realm where the creation of possible worlds in which *ressentiment* in empirical data collection politics no longer hold sway. Malabou and I, look forward to the future of new symptomatologies established by the flexibility of Kripkensteinian analytics.
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