

DRAFT

FUII!, A visual artist's unsuccessful attempt to make a reasonable hypothesis of the notion that covertly there exists in Civilization a potentially effectually manageable pathological perceptual behavior: Functionless Unaware Imitative Indifference (FUII). GVB2730

Copyright 2002 by Thomas C. Custer

First some definitions:

1. Civilization: the complex, largely urban, technologically advanced societies.
2. Behavior: all manifestations originating from our species that can motivate imitation.
3. Ground Valuing Behavior: behavior that values the unimportant (along an open ended range of definitions) without sacrificing that unimportance in the process of valuing it.
4. Ground Perceptual Behavior (GPB): perceptual behavior whose task is to make unimportant to various degrees that which it is directed at.
5. Figural Perceptual Behavior (FPB): perceptual behavior that makes important to various degrees that which it is directed at.
6. Indifference: that which can be observed of perceptual behavior when GPB is the dominant perceptual behavior in a given social environment.

FUII!

7. IMN: a variably distributed need to imitate the dominant behaviors in various categories to be observed in the various social environments of Civilization.

8. SN1: a variably distributed need to influence one's social environment.

9. SN2: a variably distributed need to be influenced by one's social environment.

10. SMN (AKA Ego): a variably distributed need to manage other needs.

It goes without saying that virtually everything on this list is of a debatable nature. Let me now tell the story of how I became interested in FUII.

Over a period of many years, first in Architecture but dominantly in painting, I gradually became convinced that what gratified me most in both was when I felt that I was valuing in the act of design or painting that which is least figurally or otherwise competitive. This sense began with plan in architecture and exploded in a diversity of directions in painting. I came to call this work Ground Valuing Behavior (GVB)

FUII!, A visual artist's notions of the possible covert existence in Civilization (the complex, largely urban, technologically advanced societies) of a potentially manageable pathological perceptual behavior: Functionless Unaware Indifference Imitation, FUII.

GVB2731

Copyright 2002 by Thomas C. Custer

Say one spent far too much time wondering if the specialization so characteristic of Civilization and so instrumental in our species success has any downsides, negative side effects, and some stumbled how on the concept of perceptual behavior (behavior being defined for use here to be any manifestation linked to our species that can motivate imitation of itself) and how it might relate to specialization. It occurred to me that it would not be unreasonable that use of perceptual behaviors that facilitated the the formation of the narrow but rich realities appropriate to differing areas of specialization must exist. I quasi invented two such possible behaviors. The first is Ground Perceptual Behavior, GPB, which has the task of making unimportant to various degrees all that it is directed at and has the function of supporting the second, Figural Perceptual Behavior, FPB, which has the task of making important to various degrees that which it is directed at. GPB and FPB are simply a primitive application of behavior to the classic figure/ground notion of Gestalt Psychology.

Now to relate how GPB in the service of specialization could lead to a quite deadly side effect of specialization. If GPB could best serve a given specialization by making unimportant even unreal all both without and within the individual that specialization which was irrelevant to or interfered with that specialization; then this would much benefit the individual practicing that specialization. I propose that observation of this sort of internal external application of GPB would take the form of unaware indifference (indifference being here defined to be the results of observation of externally directed GPB where such GPB is the dominant perceptual behavior to be observed). The unaware aspect of indifference is defined as observation of internally directed GPB directed at indifference when this internally directed behavior, GPB, is the dominant perceptual behavior so directed (at indifference).

There is a further wrinkle to unaware indifference. Unawareness of indifference behavior and indifference are dominantly unassociated in the observer's mind. I feel that this is because the indifference so observable (and so unimportant) in member's of civilization has undeniable negative affect that renders it of a very different nature from observed unawareness of indifference which I feel has no emotional baggage and is thus much more easily made ground (ignored). It can still be observed if viewers should choose to direct their FPB at this unawareness thus restoring its' relationship to indifference.

Perhaps the above is of some interest, but what has it to do with any sort of side effect of specialization? Well, this perceptual policeman thinks that since our species does definitely have an imitative dimension however unpopular it might be (it is so very destructive of self

DRAFT 8/17/02 FUII!

esteem, identity, and pretensions of originality etc.) a dimension I casually transformed into IMN, a variably distributed need to imitate dominant behaviors in various categories to be observed in the various social environments we inhabit; then there exists the possibility that ubiquitously though variably distributed imitation of unaware indifference, UI, could be taking place, an imitation impossible to directly detect (observe) since imitation of the unaware aspect of UI would render the imitation intangible as the imitation would include GPB directed at itself.

Isn't this fun? There are far too many "unprovens" for me to make even a reasonable hypothesis let alone a theory (FUII Theory) of FUII, Functionless Unaware Indifference Imitation, which is, of course, what I call this putative imitation of UI, unaware indifference. Incidentally, the Functionless aspect of FUII comes from the notion that this imitation serves no function as GPB's function (supporting FPB) is not observable. This functionlessness together with the unawareness part of FUII open the door to the discovery of the FUII's role as a side effect of specialization. Must not FUII implicitly interfere with reality formation and in so doing frustrate and generate threat in and from all human needs that make use of reality? Must not these frustrated needs also include IMN since they must be capable of motivating reality formation which in turn must implicitly interfere with FUII and so with IMN?

So, Here we "have" an intangible and hence unapproachable behavior, FUII, a variable multiplicity of frustration and threat (all needs being both variably distributed and survival oriented which implies that their frustration must generate threat), and this further wrinkle: It

seems useful to me to divide FUII in two thusly: FUII1 being imitation of UI directed at the imitator and FUII2 being imitation of such unaware in-difference directed elsewhere. Some consequences of FUII1 and FUII2 will be touched on later. Does the reader not sense, not smell, the "emergence" as it were of a side effect of such magnitude, potency, and diversity of "application" as to threaten even specialization, the seat of our success, itself? And to think that I can't make FUII! anything more than a speculative jaunt. FUII! indeed! I have no worthy grounds to "bust" FUII. just my suspicious and exceedingly hungry nature.

Let me now reach for material that supports the existence of FUII though in a most imperfect way. I'll begin in this way: I feel that there are many institutions and practices in Civilization that at least in part unwarily act to limit FUII. In so doing they become quantitatively large but also qualitatively small indirect evidence of the existence of FUII. It should also noted here that those with most access to these aspects of Civilization tend to ~~least~~ exhibit quite unpleasant evidence of FUII that will presently appear. Still, this tendency also must somewhat support FUII.

The first of these institutions (I will only touch on a few) is the monstrously large and costly yet taken for granted (ground) investment in and reality of privacy arrangements (homes etc.) that characterizes Civilization. Particularly among the affluent, these arrangements can do a great deal to limit their inhabitants exposure to UI and in so doing lessen it's potential for dominance in the category of perceptual behavior and so ability to motivate FUII. These arrangements involve much more than bricks and mortar. They have to do with locational choice, neighborhoods etc.. These privacy arrangements extend to places of specialization (offices etc.). They extend to environments of likeminded

associates who are much less likely to view other inhabitants of such environments with indifference as here defined and, of course, such environments also most often exclude or dominantly exclude those who would more likely exhibit such indifference.

Consider the also monstrously sized and equally taken for granted (made ground by GPB) mass media industry. One has but to redefine exposure to products of this industry and a mind boggling amount of such exposure there is, thusly: One is overwhelmingly exposed to social environments ranging from violent sporting events to sensitive domestic dramas where FPB (think of actors reacting to other actors or the action on a football field) is the dominant perceptual behavior to be observed, not GPB as in the "real" world as I contend. Must not so much exposure at such cost in time not do something to diminish UI/GPB dominance and so lessen motivation to do FUII? Such costs are willingly borne and this also supports the existence of FUII as does a similiar situation with respect to privacy arrangements.

Finally, consider the institution of the increasingly popular fine arts or at least the sort of painting that I and many others (the impressionists for one) mostly unawarely do or did. I came to define the the work I do or rather the result of the work I do in painting and earlier in architecture to be Ground Valuing Behavior (GVB). This is behavior as defined above that values the unimportant (along an openended range of definitions) without in the process sacrificing that unimportance. This definition led eventually to FUII when I concluded that viewer exposure to GVB as the dominant, indeed, the only behavior in it's category could possibly motivate imitation that would conflict with and so diminish FUII. Such a conclusion, of course, gives a grand function,

of course, to all GVB work in whatever media, but aside from the self esteem issues etc., the existence of this unsubstantiated GVB work would also support the existence of FUII. As to any possible validity of GVB, I would ask the readers to think back and see if they recall any enrichment of their perceptions of ordinary physical environments following immersion in art exhibits. Such enrichment however transitory, I feel could indicate a lessening of FUII because of exposure to GVB.

I'm sure that GVB exists in many areas of human behavior even though I'm not aware of them. I'm also convinced that I've barely scratched the surface of how civilized societies, particularly those that are long established, unwarily act to lessen FUII but here also I am ignorant of them.

Now to material more directly linkable to FUII though still very inadequately so (the linkage has no quality of exclusivity). I'm referring to all the objectless/very dubiously caused psychological and other difficulties endemic in Civilization. The linkage at one level is that the objectlessness of these difficulties resonates so sweetly with, indeed, shares an identity with the putative intangibility of FUII and frustration, threat, and internal conflict so easily if undemonstrably associated with FUII. This sense of an identity equation (objectlessness equals intangibility) makes it acceptable to me to cursorily discuss this diversity of difficulties in relation to FUII.

Let me begin with clinical depression. Do not symptoms of this malady make a great deal of sense if individuals cannot cope with intangibly caused frustration, conflict, and threat? Similarly, the anxiety (objectless fear) strongly associated with depression makes perfect sense in such circumstances. Objectless free floating hostility/aggression and

objectless flight/withdrawal/concealment behavior similiarly makes sense. Objectless NMN (need to manage needs)/EGO weakness also makes sense if intangibility makes it impossible to manage this situation (frustration, conflict, and threat). Objectless alienation makes sense if FUII sufficiently reduces reality formation of others so as to produce a sense of separation of distance from others while simultaneously their norms and values meaningless. Painful loneliness I consider to be a suitable response of SN2, a variably distributed need to be influenced by others, frustrated by FUII2 caused diminishment of other's reality, perhaps compounded by a flight response to all the threat etc. initiated by FUII in general. Objectless painful difficulties with self esteem and identity issues seem a likely result of FUII1 which must act to diminish the reality and value of the self and all else of an internal nature that is important to survival. SN1, a variably distributed need to influence others, must be frustrated/threatened by such diminishment of self reality. Objectless rejection of human imitateness (see above) could also be a consequence of this threat to self esteem etc.. Endemic painful boredom/ennui seems an obvious consequence of FUII. Neglect of physical environments could also in part be a function of FUII2. Psychoses that feature difficulties with reality could indicate extreme manifestations of FUII in those with relatively (to their other needs) more powerful IMNs. Objectless animosities between those exhibiting inimitable or very difficultly imitable differences such as age, gender, racial characteristics, class, income, religious, and cultural; could indicate IMN frustration associated with internal conflict initially caused by FUII. Objectless animosities in sexual, familial, educational, economic, and specialization environments (offices workplaces etc.) could indicate the involvement of FUII.

That those, the variously and/or multiply disadvantaged, have

generally also less access to the institutions touched on above, exhibit so much of these objectless difficulties and also exhibit much short term thinking, need for immediate gratification, and other indications of reality formation inadequacies in those most needful of reality adequacy also supports FUII. Too common problems in education (short attention spans, dumbed down content, too many teachers able to make only a small minority of their students important and thus unleashing a cloud of FUII encouraging GPB on the rest), the surprising incursions of incompetence and poor judgement into various specializations (pilot errors, medical malpractice, excessive accounting creativity, investment inadvertances, Private sector and governmental imbecilities) may have FUII as a silent partner and so be indicative of both the existence of and the significance of FUII.

Finally in this effort to find support for FUII, consider this: Exposure to popular events which includes being part of a physically present audience could expose one to a great deal of FPB both from on the "field" and from the audience. Such massive and desired exposure to FPB could then be seen to diminish motivation to do FUII and therefore be supportive of FUII's existence.

I'm convinced that there is much more of this unfortunately nonexclusive evidence of the significant existence of FUII, however much it might be diminished by the "actions" of other needs and by other factors touched on above. Alas, I am ignorant of them. Only scientific investigation of FUII could possibly lead to exclusive evidence that would make probable it's existence. This truthful banality and the sense that FUII is potentially manageable (the institutions touched on above led to that sense) makes it painful to me that I cannot make what I would consider to be a decent hypothesis of FUII. That is to say, I cannot create

a device that would both motivate and facilitate an emperical incur-
sion into FUII. Assuming a FUII favorable outcome to such ruthlessness,
I alose assume that such an effort would lead to ways that would effect-
ually manage FUII.