JUST MATHS

LAVENDER OF THE IDEAL

TOMMI KAUPPINEN

Just maths

Lavender of the ideal

To my mother

My sincere thanks to Rebecca Mills for her valuable comments.

© Tommi Kauppinen 2023 Publisher: Haaras (Heinola, Finland; www.haaras.art) ISBN 978-952-69991-3-5 (softcover) ISBN 978-952-69991-4-2 (PDF, www.haaras.art/justmaths)

Just Maths Lavender of the ideal

Tommi Kauppinen

HAARAS A T

1 = 1

Everything is perfect in itself; only through others does one become imperfect.

$A \cup B$

I exist in a flux of contradictions of hermit life and jet set. The monastery of thought and materiality of

pleasure,

combining into a single perspective. How can I build a tower for the mind without succeeding, how not to succeed, when dark hands join hands, tier after tier, raising me up to the top of the supply chain pyramid? How I envy those who do not understand, while thinking they hold the truth.

I exist in a flux of contradiction of the empire built on empiricism and the distant calls of what once was, I hope, a union with Nature. It is an impossible mission to herd these flocks of goats-who spend their days knowing they are right —into the same pasture, to find a plausible solution to their differences. I know I am not the only one caught in the flux. What are we waiting for?

1 + 1 = 2

When a person walks a gravelled path, they feel nothing but stones.

These foundations, however, shift and shake underfoot, shoulder to shoulder.

When a swan swims in a lake, it does not feel the mud below.

However, the lake bed knows the swan is there, from the tug and pull of the unknown.

"We can only observe": the truth split into two lies. "No man is an island": a well-rehearsed line. There is an interaction; the neighbour is not always the one closest to the eye or the ear or the mouth.

It speaks no words, but we can still listen. We do not observe;

the object perceives us, becoming a subject. How does it feel? How can we understand it? No object is an island, not even an island.

$A \cap B$

A solitary individualist does not enlighten.

There needs to be
a significant other for a common law.

2 - 1 = 1

Everybody must choose, repeatedly,
day after day,
year after year
to believe and remember
or to forfeit and forget.

Even if everything was written by Fate, would it be, in the world of quarks and fractals, impossible to find anything more beautiful?

1 - 1 = 0

Every word you speak is the reality; thoughts you think are the truth.

If they remain in the objective world, your subject is an artist.

0 - 1 = -1

Summer in the ruins of a mansion:
by a wall, I grow and bleed
yellowish sap, not caring for
anything except the truth of my own.

 $f: 1 \rightarrow 0$

When my boat was destroyed I half sank, half dove to the ocean floor. Half-dead, half-unconscious, I searched my way to the surface, drinking the air afterwards.

Now I reside in shallow water, staying hidden, keeping safe, not trusting the gods.
They have not mapped this abyss like a thing called I has.

$$2^{-1} = \frac{1}{2}$$

Flinger of light yellow eye the crown imperial proud an open palm does not deny a spruce by moss endowed

$f^{-1}: 0 \to 1$

Live your life, they say,

with all the lies they muster.

Rather: do not lie to;

rather,

lie down, lie with

lie in

between

the lines,

converse with the abyss

of no meaning

or

words.

Without money to burn their lies die down to ash and new

life!

(with soft f, without hard v,)

adding

truth, like water,

is born.

0 = 0

It lies in the

back

of our minds,

lying in all the language games known.

Tread softly,

for the burden is heavy, the knowledge better left untapped.

Better not look too closely

into the

darkness.

Do not

bring light.

Tread lightly, to not to awaken

– Oh, the conquest, the glory! –

the beast in the dark.

Look what you have done.

The act of love is treason.

Bearing a child is selfishness.

Tread lightly to not awaken.

We are all beyond good and evil.

$$i = \sqrt{-1}$$

Whales eat plankton, I too live like that although I miss the sea.

Stars of the Milky Way, they are as far away as her absolution, as the water's caress on my shore, her breath, her eyes.

How could I know her depths?

 $i^{5} = i$

The juxtaposed against a, a subject with the object, a humanity and the nature. Becoming against eternity, for with longing, betrayal, community beast and culture. Liminal and dead, birth without direction. How easy, how hard; enten eller, this and that.

While alive:

There is a light in the darkness and a darkness in the light

$$P(A \cup B) = P(A) + P(B) - P(A \cap B)$$

I sit on a bench, my face still ingénue, but I am impatient while impatiens grow and I fly, like a wind-up bird to times long past, where quicksilver, not the dog's mercury, was a life potion, and understand the sorrow I still need to hate the world. It is the same sorrow that created calculus.

$$P(A|B) = \frac{P(A \cap B)}{P(B)}$$

(i) Mind striving for escape velocity. The escapee tied by social injustice, polite lies, and uncertainty ad infinitum. I want my child to learn my past, staring into her eyes, in the safety of summer.

(ii)
There is so much that is invisible.
Inequality.
Climate change.
The beast in the dark.
Your nature.
The world.

(iii)
Fire pushes acrid smoke
out of coal power plants, fluttering
somewhere distant, while
a sparrow flies across my window.
I take no notice. I am about to log out
of countless social media.
Soon we shall take off.

(iv)
My cry grew wild
in the Tropic of Capricorn.
Will you now hear me,
my child?
There I learned pride in humility,
and humility in pride.

(v)
Gravelled suburban landscape
gives no clues to the memory path
from my childhood
to where I stand, to the competing
narratives, fool's gold, flux of contradictions
of western life
all fade into the background.
The summer is over, we have returned, again.

(vi)
I walk the autumn street with my child, we see leaves drop to the ground, fluttering first this way, then the other.
Are we like them? The choice eludes me. The chance eludes me.

Convict B	cooperate	defect
Convict A		
cooperate	-1,-1	-5,0
defect	0,-5	-2,-2

I do not remember our first kiss.
There was a desk, blue,
and an uneasy feeling that I was staring;
you in your bed,
I on a stool, the sky the hues of dawn.

There was a question in the air: should I come down to lie with you or go home to get some sleep, (not an hour too soon)?

I left you there on your bed, but called in a day or two, to ask you if I could come by for a while to stare at you some more.

Just us, sitting on your balcony, deciding how our world should be, smoking cigarettes.

I do not remember our first kiss. I always forget it, but not you.

$U: x \to z$

There are at least two ways of viewing the world:
First, you can view everything with the certainty that it is homogeneous, everything is alive and alike.
Second, you can view everything with the certainty that you do not know what it is: it is strange and unlike anything you have seen before.

When taking the first approach, one must discover love towards everything, for everything is similar and in unison. One seeks to learn the mystery of love by reaching out and finding oneself by giving up one's individuality.

One loses one's self but finds love.

When taking the second approach, one must study everything meticulously, for no reason can grant complete certainty on the exact nature of things foreign.

One seeks to learn of the world outside, with rigorous analysis of the world and the self. One finds fear as one finds knowledge.

The first approach is called Faith, the second approach is called Science. All you need is fear, not love. But the fear of stupidity brings the love of wisdom, and with love of life comes fear of dying. Fear from love from fear from love, etc. Could they be the same?

U as utility

You offered a group of economists a lift. You gave them a place to hop on, and the time of departure. Then you gave them a place where they can hop off, and an ETA.

They decided to reallocate the resources, making your vehicle (which you borrowed from a friend) a common asset, to be maximally utilised for optimal capital use.

You were politely asked to drive to three different destinations to collect the economists when it suited them best, and to do the same with the drop off. Therefore, you were supplied alongside the vehicle, as it is convenient to have a driver in a car.

I admit, transportation is a scarce resource and therefore, you too can be allocated more effectively for the common good.

Shared utility

The forest is a common good, the consumer a selfish unit, devoid of other than rational choice. I choose to be like the forest.

But I cannot, for the forest knows how to create oxygen. As does the sea, where the coral reefs abide.

I would like to share my utility; it grows greater than arithmetic allows, for the cinema for two is worth three cinemas alone, and a bar with nobody else is a torture chamber with beer on tap.

If there is somebody who needs a blanket, or shelter in a refugee camp, what is my need for a euro or two?

We live together, the forest and me.

Utility of Convict A can contain a part of utility of Convict B or vice versa

Enlightenment is abysmal: there will be no other End of the world.

Effciency = max {output} s. t. input conditions are met.

They came.

no ammo left

treads of

fear

wrath of the righteous

the enemies we make

just just gust

blowing the icy alleys

no one left to stand upright why what was done was wrong

religious doctrine

invading army

high shrieks, sick sea gulls gladioli a charade of justice.

They came. Wave after wave for an instant

we stood our

ground,

painted red by the crimson families

howling

blood-broidered

highways

my city true to the world,

now to a priest

true god of hate.

They

sentenced me to

civilian confinement

there were others

I am

sure.

$$\lim_{x\to p}U(x)=L$$

I ran for cover,

seeds

in

my pocket.

Would you now think of a sunflower,

name it after me?

For there is beauty in death,

and in truth.

One of them bears my name.

29

$$|U(x) - L| < \varepsilon$$
; $0 < |x - p| < \delta$.

What else would justify righteousness and moralism than knowing what is the truth?

O apple from the tree of good and evil.

We could, instead, live like monkeys on a rock, deciding what is the truth on a daily basis.

Would it now be, maybe,
a little self-righteous and immoral
to claim
that mathematics
does not belong in this equation?

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x}U(\mathrm{a}) = \lim_{x \to \mathrm{a}} \frac{U(x) - U(\mathrm{a})}{x - \mathrm{a}}$$

Love is.
Wisdom is.
Regarding Power I am an agnostic
(because "I" holds The Power).

Suffciency = min {input} s.t. output conditions are met.

And there it goes, the free jetset life, thrown from a window of a soon-to-be demolished cabriolet, because some fool communist hippie decided for me that it does not belong to my quota.

Nowadays we live in a society, at the same time *where* and *nowhere*, for the maps are distributed only for hiking trips, and some idiot decides whether I need to fly at all.

For generations we have done whatever we want, for I have suckled on the nipple of privilege from birth, knowing I know, because Power is knowledge. Stupid hippies! Come and give it a shot, you failed in 1917, you won't succeed this time either!

The Cold War was because of you, and Putin.

Ett brew från afar, Yours, The shadow of Le Roi Soleil

$$V_s = \frac{4}{3}\pi r^3$$

The chance for us to survive was initially quite small,

but I sprayed the violet lilac's bloom into blue. Epeius approved the solution.

In every coherence, there is pain.

$\vec{e}, \vec{t}, \vec{d} \in \mathbf{R}^n$

String theory demands twelve dimensions, divide et impera, a group of more than a dozen needs at least thirteen to settle their disputes.

I sometimes walk home with a coffee bought from the train station. Frivolously, I always drop the empty cup into the same rubbish bin, regardless of the time of day or season.

\vec{e} and \vec{t} define future trends

Economic growth demands innovation. Technological development supports welfare. Therefore, we need development and growth.

Green growth will be sustainable.

The way Covid-19 was handled is not suitable for tackling climate change.

By changing the type of technology, we consciously decouple

from our need for more energy.

Mining for metals can be done ethically,
but it is not necessary.

The more resources, the more pirates.

\vec{e} is projected development of economy

Familiar form from ancient Babylon: the big eat the small,

weeds suffocate the lavender of the ideal, academics complaining about teaching already two and a half millennia ago.

All the same, only the scale has changed. The Hanseatic traders knew it in medieval times, the mega corporations know it now: the big eat the small, only the scale matters.

When their homeland is far behind them, the lost are always eager to reach their destination.

The found know there is nowhere to get to.

\vec{t} is projected development of technology

To augur a metastructure, where somehow decisions are results, not beginnings, and "new" is as old as the first techne.

The last four hundred years have been a triumph and a cancer.

Scientists must read the horrible end in the stars, but they prefer to continue building a terminator.

Who would throw a spear at the mouth of the ravaging Dame of Northland?

\vec{d} is degrowth

There is a need for low-tech tools,

e.g. the shovel. There is a need to

stop,

but the only pedal is that of a taffodil, a taisy to remember me by.

I want more, you want more, we all want more. Such a simple, vicious problem with no solution.

(but what is more?)

It is better to make people unhappy than it is to make them suffer.

I begin to understand Power but turn my head; I do not fight.

Search a glade

as far away as possible beyond the stars.

$$\vec{d} = \vec{e} \times \vec{t}$$

To push through to the unimaginable, one needs to leave the plane of the rational and mundane.

Like a normal vector with a cross product, one grows to soaring heights and all of it takes on a new dimension.

Uprooted, falling from the sky, like Icarus, or a fly hitting the light bulb, stunned and bewildered, trembling in a vision of the beast in the dark, having a conversation with the lord of the flies.

There is nothing more solid than the plan(e) to catch you when you fall.

Wittgenstein

It is elementary to view by only one truth's possibility any fresh mathematical dew with all of beauty's fragility.

A language can be a game of chess against nature, and/or theft, creating oh what a lovely mesh babbling about what in the world is left.

The language the world surrounds like an intellectual troop assembly. Can you hear music, or sounds? There are multiple points of entry.

There is more than one possible mathematics

As there is an interaction with a fantasy of reality, epiphany becomes mudded, impure with references from outside it.

Application takes a pure idea and mangles it into the works of the world.

I feel amazed that a thought can even survive!

It is only possible via the theory of Ideas.

However, a machine still works even if it never has worked justly, and after four hundred years of externalities the destruction floods our doors into perception.

I am confident that there is another miracle, another ideal, than a machine to employ. Lavender will not do well because of the mud, but maybe they will teach us what we need.

I still believe we have hope to survive.

Metaxyphysics

Beginning from ethics and eternity, we slowly ascend into empiricism and relativism, but if the ascension is a spiral staircase, we are going to return to eternity.

Everything is relative, including mathematics. Empirical thinking has its merits, and downsides in abundance.

Defining the problem results in the answer.

The solution is both immanent and transcendent, both here and nowhere.

For every object to have a perspective and relations, and a shared unconscious to feel these relations.

There is hope and there is faith. Realise how imperfect every interaction is.

Gödel

There cannot be anything because "I" destroys anything that is.

Take the truth of temporality, then, rather than an axiomatized proof of continuity.