

Architettura Vera

*Dedicated to Vera,
who believes herself to be postmodern...*

Permanent changes in defense of freedom can arise only from the action of people willing to embrace a radical, dangerous, and unpredictable alteration of the entire system. In other words, it is the revolutionaries who change the face of History, not the reformists.

—
We shall all die one day, and we believe it far preferable to draw one's last breath fighting for survival or for a cause, rather than dragging on an empty and purposeless existence.

—
An ideology, in order truly to win enthusiastic adherence, must however accompany a positive ideal with a negative one; it must show itself for something as well as against something.¹

Architecture is Power

Architecture is power—it always has been and always will be.

The architect is a person, that is, a sensitive individual who lives within the world and is acted upon by it. The architect is an artist—an individual particularly receptive to social inputs who re-elaborates them and returns them through the works of his or her craft.

The architect forges the future through the personal surplus of interpretation invested in their works. In this sense—and whenever this happens—architecture, like every other form of “communication, has the function of being diaphanous (from the Greek to pass through, to be transparent), that is, to transmit the message, not to render it opaque like an impenetrable screen.”²

Artists may paint canvases that rest in museums; they may write books found in libraries, or sing songs we hear on Spotify... Architects, however, design architectures that stand in our cities—open to sight and use by everyone. “Open-air museums,” as they are often called.

Every era has its power. Every power has its Architecture—and vice versa.³

Metaphorically

It is possible to crystallize the characteristics of these Architectures in representations that are particularly revealing on a metaphorical level.

Two eras ago, as described by Foucault in *Discipline and Punish*, Bentham’s Panopticon was the paradigmatic architecture of its age—and of its power. A power that gradually transformed itself in accordance with the interests of a society changing with technology, the Industrial Revolution, and the resulting capitalist social manifestation.

The necessary metamorphosis was that from the discontinuous power of the sovereign—who alternated excesses (public punishments) as expressions of absolute authority with illegalities broadly tolerated because socially and culturally accepted—to a continuous, uniform power, less spectacular and less ostentatious, but with the explicit aim of reaching everyone, leaving no shadowed zones where the law could not penetrate.

With the shift of economic activity from agrarian to capitalist, the bourgeoisie could no longer tolerate the range of tolerated illegalities that previously served a functional purpose but now threatened property, that is, capital. Thus, the bourgeoisie reserved for itself the fertile domain of the “illegality of rights,” while constructing, at the same time, a structure of power intended to impose a discipline of goods.

This new discipline required embodiment in laws, rules, customs, and technological devices. The Panopticon was, in fact, its metaphorical representation through an architectural device—a machine of infinite surveillance designed to impose an infinite discipline throughout the stages of life.

“First the family, then the school (‘you are no longer at home’), then the barracks (‘you are no longer at school’), then the factory—occasionally the hospital, and eventually the prison, the environment of confinement par excellence.”⁴

From these premises emerges an accelerating process—still ongoing—of progressive subtraction of free life, that life not subject to any ban, from the dominion of the individual in favor of a system whose very essence lies in appropriating that possibility.

“For millennia man remained what he was for Aristotle: a living animal capable of political existence; modern man is an animal whose politics puts his life as a living being at stake.”⁵

Life itself (zoe), having fallen into the political (bios) realm of forces, now required a specific field of inquiry—and Foucault was the first to organize this shift. Thus was born biopolitics as a distinct field of knowledge:

“Within an adequate theoretical and philosophical framework aimed at a systematic inquiry into the apparatuses of power exercised through concrete and local forms of subjection, referred particularly, though not exclusively, to space and to the body.”⁶

Yet Foucault also grasped another process contiguous with this loss of freedom: power is no longer something possessed and exercised, as in the case of the sovereign, but rather something

that circulates, functioning like a chain—passing through individuals and thus activating leveling processes of subjectivation. Such infra-power can therefore only be administered, never possessed.

The refinement of this controlling power, alongside the emergence of new technologies—first radio waves, then computers and the internet, and later the pharmaceutical industry—produced an organic evolution whose sharpest architectural representation is Rem Koolhaas's Exodus. The “interior” environments of confinement fell into crisis, giving way to new forms of open-air control. It is crucial to understand, however, that these new methods of control do not belong purely to the positive, open realm opposed to the closed negativity of disciplinary spaces, but rather to a hybrid equilibrium between the new—the computer (ephemeral states, immateriality, dematerialization and re-materialization)—and the inherited bureaucratic-scientific apparatus of the disciplinary society.

The disciplinary society, though it had eliminated the despotic figure of the sovereign, retained within the system—the bourgeois order—the capacity to decide over the life of the citizen, no longer subject. In the late-capitalist society, this process has split into two simultaneous dimensions: the inherited and the new.

It is no longer a matter of imposing discipline from the outside but of communicating an aesthetic to which individuals must conform. Discipline is now both exercised through pre-established technological devices and self-imposed as a condition for survival within this techno-bio-political context—the natural evolution of Foucault's premises.

It is possible to imagine a mirror image of this terrifying architecture, a force as intense and devastating but used instead in the **service of positive intentions**. Division, isolation, inequality, aggression, destruction, all the negative aspects of the Wall, could be the ingredients of a new phenomenon: **architectural warfare against undesirable conditions**, in this case London. This would be an immodest architecture committed not too timid improvements but to the provision of totally desirable alternatives. *The inhabitants of this architecture, those strong enough to Love it, would become its Voluntary Prisoners, ecstatic in the freedom of their architectural confines.*

Contrary to modern architecture and its desperate afterbirths, this new architecture is neither authoritarian nor hysterical: **it is the hedonistic science of designing collective facilities that fully accommodate individual desires**. From the outside this architecture is a sequence of serene monuments; the **Life inside produces a continuous state of ornamental frenzy and decorative delirium, an overdose of symbols**. This will be an architecture that generates its own successors, miraculously curing architects of their masochism and self-hatred.¹

Exodus is the graphic representation—through an architectural technical device—of the insuring technical apparatus that becomes global through the computer and the Internet.

Its capacity lies in the ephemeral and digital organization of states that are definable yet variable; Deleuze defines it as a “modulation in perpetual metastability.”

And from these states, made artificially desirable, it extracts value.

This metaphorical representation is composed of three constitutive spaces: the Interior, the Edge, and the Exterior.

The Interior

The interior is an anthropological literary discourse of power, a construction of “truth.” In more specific terms, it is the semiotic-technical model imposed through the authority of bigness, through the mediatic capacity of the global technical apparatus, and through the specialized knowledge of design.

It is, in effect, a reduced, specialized, pragmatic, and technically-derived truth, around which the system can conveniently and deliberately coagulate an aesthetic—one that, pertaining to bios, takes the name techno-bio-aesthetics.¹²

The type of control exercised by the Interior through this techno-bio-aesthetic logic is pharmaco-pornographic:

¹ <https://socks-studio.com/2011/03/19/exodus-or-the-voluntary-prisoners-of-architecture/>

“The biomediatric management of subjectivity, through its molecular control and the production of virtual audiovisual connections.”¹³

The raw materials of the current productive process are:

excitation,
erection,
ejaculation,

pleasure,
the sense of self-gratification,
omnipotent control, and total destruction.

From these raw materials the products to be extracted are serotonin, techno-blood and its derivatives, testosterone, antacids, cortisone, antibiotics, estradiol, alcohol and tobacco, morphine, insulin, cocaine, sildenafil citrate (Viagra), and all that vast material and virtual complex which participates in the production of altered mental and psychosomatic states—the “raw materials” above.¹⁴

The pre-biopolitical human becomes the corpus pornographicus (human or animal, real or virtual, female or male, of flesh or of silicone—it makes no difference).¹⁵ In such a context, the body can exist only as a body fully exploited in its bio-excitatory dimension, stripped of every civic requirement. Its life lacks rights of citizenship, authorship, and labor; it is constructed through biotechnology and exposed—through pornographic communication—to apparatuses of self-surveillance, publication, and global mediatization for the sole purpose of extracting value.

The space of the Interior thus assumes the qualities of smooth space:

“Marked only by ‘traces’ that vanish and shift along the path [...]. Smooth space is precisely that of the minimal gap; it has no homogeneity except within infinitely proximate points, and the connection among proximities is made independently of any predetermined route [...]. Variability, polyvalence of directions, is an essential characteristic of smooth spaces.”

The body inhabiting such spaces is therefore polyvocal.

The stylistic cipher of the Interior—and of this biopolitics—is therefore smoothness.

A smooth body is thus a symbol simultaneously evoking bio-techno-capitalist potentialities and the rewards obtainable through their achievement, capable of generating visibility capital through the rekindling of orgasmic force—i.e., the body’s potentiality and its labor capacity within this context.¹⁶

What characterizes the Interior is the constant renunciation of contingency: life becomes anesthetized and “insured” through ever-increasing specialization. Following the model of epigenetics, such a system would fade within a generation—were it not for the continuous production of peculiar “feelings” in the common sense, capable of channeling perception toward hyper-invested forms useful to the system. Without continually producing these metastable, desirable forms—acting bio-culturally—it would lose its reproductive capacity and cease to exist. The continual attempt of its technological component to encroach upon genetics and species reproduction does not contradict this. Control of birth—whether through managing conception, modes of childbirth, or directly intervening on the genetic makeup of the unborn—serves, on one hand, to force those who experience such intrusions to pass increasingly through the spirals of the system, adapting and subjecting them to its dictates;¹⁸ on the other, it reveals the system’s ambition to detach reproduction from human biological functions and relegate it entirely to the technical apparatus.^{19,20}

For “coming into the world” remains the most contingent act that exists; its absorption into the domain of technique would thus condemn humanity to a totally apathetic existence, immersed in a surplus of symbols and specialized techniques, deprived of all distraction from a non-coded reality—from the outside: the pharmaco-pornographic biopolitics at its highest potency.

The Edge

The Edge is the technical apparatus generating both the Interior and, therefore, the Exterior. When the modulating module, the modeling model, becomes concretized—coalescing into a socio-constructed equilibrium—it simultaneously appears to regulate access. Without it, no desirable Interior or corresponding Exterior could exist.

“Sedentary space is striated by walls, enclosures, and paths between enclosures.”²¹

The positional distinction that this apparatus enforces upon the individual determines the conditions and modalities under which life (bios) unfolds. Even disciplines themselves, as we shall see, are desirable states generated by this distinction.

This distinction pertains to techno-bio-power, not as a power of decision transiting through a technical device—planetary in scale, as evoked by Donna Haraway and later Preciado²²—but as a matter of quality. It is the adherence to, and application of, the previously described semiotic-technical model that earns it the adjective techno.

As is clear from Koolhaas’s reinterpretation:

“The camp, not the city, is today the biopolitical paradigm of the West.”²³

In Exodus, it is the juxtaposition of two boundaries that generates that particular state of exception—the model—in which the pharmaco-pornographic ban reigns within a city. Not by chance, Koolhaas speaks of voluntary prisoners strong enough to love it: only they can endure the exception to which they subject themselves.

The body, passing through such apparatuses, assumes their characteristics—it becomes *dividual*.²⁴ Its becoming digit, wave, electron defines it within this realm. In computer language, the digit is both access code and ephemeral state—indeterminate, probabilistic, heir to the characteristics of the electron. Only through the metastable materialization of the model does the Edge concretize, exercising control over the *dividual*, identified as cipher. This mechanism decides access or refusal to more desirable states (or retrocession).

It is the body’s reduction to cipher—as in Nazi concentration camps—that allows the control of bios according to pharmaco-pornographic dictates.

The Edge is where the smooth space of the model thickens; it administers the “truths” emanating from it, applying their idiosyncrasies through two main apparatuses: the bureaucratic and the scientific.

Bureaucracy is the opaque mask behind which the administration of centralized aesthetics and desirable states hides—an impersonal application of the model through rules, regulations, and algorithms: prescriptive languages. It is the technical device that devours contingency wherever it appears, subjecting humanity to the anesthetizing, culturally constructed techno-bio ban.

Moving across Edges implies a transformation of the *dividual* to meet socio-produced requirements. The scientific disciplines on which the contemporary working world is based—architects, doctors, lawyers, psychologists, academics—and all the certifications achievable through lifelong training, seals, signatures, attestations, and bureaucratic documentation, constitute the paper fortress that administers enabling thresholds.

Thus, in bureaucracy lies that ensemble of attestations and languages whose attainment does not necessarily correlate with the actual capacity to perform the given work, but rather with the fulfillment of metastable, socio-produced requirements necessary to determine the *dividual*’s position.

Inverting the phrase: it is not the capacity to perform that enables the work, but the bureaucratically validated certificate.

Science, too, bends to contemporary *infra-power*, becoming the primary producer of justifications for decrees issued by centralized organs and administered through bureaucracy. In this condition, Science becomes *scienzah*: folded to the pharmaco-pornographic interests of the model, a mere justificatory instrument—a generator, on demand, of “truths.”

Its authority no longer depends on Truth but on bigness and design: the more elite and desirable the metastable state from which the study, research, or admonition originates, the greater the aura and the orgasmic force it displays, and thus the more credible it appears to the masses.

The Exterior

Within the Exterior arises the distinction between raw and bio-tech.²⁵

One is raw whenever one has not yet modulated to the semiotic-technical dictates of the Interior. This condition is a becoming, a process constantly renewed—not a final state.

We are always Interior and Exterior simultaneously. We possess desirable traits while desiring others.

In the zero state of raw, there exists both the absence of biopolitics and the possibility, for the system, to begin to “make itself felt” through the mechanisms proper to the Interior. In this state, one does not exist as corpus pornographicus, for one is not exploitable for orgasmic force; yet simultaneously one exists as *dividual*.

One exits the raw state only when beginning to feel and to experience what, at a certain point, are perceived as the benefits of the model—entering the global technical apparatus. Control, at this stage, is self-induced; it does not belong to the Edge but, operating in the open air, to the free initiative of those who wish to modulate.

It is absence itself that becomes force—like gravity in a depression, or like a magnet attracting prisoners strong enough to approach.

The raw state is the necessary counterpart of the bio-tech state, just as the Exterior is to the Interior. Orgasmic force can arise only through the duality of the one who is watched and the one who watches.

Given this entire structure of control—in the synchronous unfolding of the Interior (the Model), the Edge (popularity reward), and the Exterior (responsible autonomy)—it becomes clear that both Byung-Chul Han, on one side, and Arendt, Esposito, Agamben, and others on the other, were simultaneously right and wrong.

Though they accurately described parts of the system, they missed the whole.

They did not grasp that the performance subject, positive in excess, must correspond to a model to which one modulates, and that—even if metastable—such a model requires negativity, a threshold, and therefore an immunitary paradigm.

Positive and negative paradigms must necessarily coexist, as two faces of the same coin.

It is not a matter of determining which is hegemonic—quantitatively or qualitatively—but of recognizing their complementarity within the current mode of control, whose strength lies precisely in this collaboration.

For those within their metastable state, those outside—unable to access it due to the Edge—represent the negative to be immunized.

Conversely, those who, from raw, wish to become bio-tech, or who already bio-tech wish to continue conforming and specializing to the metastable model of the Interior, will experience the excess of positivity:

“The rejection originating from an excess of positivity represents not an immunological reaction but a digestive-neuronal abreaction and refusal.”²⁸

Neuronal pathologies such as depression, ADHD, and borderline personality disorder—conditions closer to infarction than to infection—characterize the modes and spaces of excessive positivity.

The Freudian knowledge—power upon which disciplinary power was founded—and of which, as a field of knowledge, it was itself the product—is recycled within the current system.

The positive subject in excess does not listen to itself, in the sense intended by Han; rather, it is “free” to decide the degree of modelling to which it wishes to subject itself. This transition is, most of the time, unconscious: desire always appears as self-produced.

The reason lies in the reuse of Freudian techniques within the constitution of the Model. We look at the Model—but the Model is ourselves. The reference to the other, to contingency, is missing, because what we look at and desire is the version of ourselves that has acquired those traits we consider positive.

“[Pharmaco-pornographic semiotic-technical symbols are] a mirror. Not the Stendhalian mirror that reflects the blue sky and the muddy puddles [contingency]. But something more akin to the bathroom mirror with the light above it, before which fifteen-year-olds inspect their biceps and decide which is their best profile. This kind of window onto the neurotic perception of the self... has a simply inestimable value for ... [the survival of the system and the emotional control of the body]. ... There's a lot of money at stake, after all.”

The excess of positivity characterizing both the Interior and the Exterior—with all its accompanying illnesses and modes derived from the purposeless narcissist, the amorphous, apathetic, flexible, unbound and enfeebled depressive subject, worn out by the constant demand for initiative—was born from the voluntary cession of privacy carried out by the one who has become dividual (which, as we have seen, is its necessary condition).

The dividual pertains to the Edge, to a negative and immunizing cut. Therefore, the excess of positivity always arises from the negativity operated by the limit.

Moreover, even within the utmost self-exploitation culminating in burnout and then in the depression of the positive subject, Freudian frustrating anxiety remains an educational tool at the service of the Edge and the Model whenever the required modulating characteristics are not met.

The plural of dividual is Big Data.

Artificial Intelligences, based on immense data banks, are the best instruments yet created for the unconscious Freudian repetition: of desire, of the production of orgasmic force, of the renunciation of contingency, of specialization, and of anesthetization.

Money is at once an abstract psychotropic signifier and an instrument of dividual control. We shall explore this further later on.

Practically

As already stated, the disciplinary society was based on a succession of enclosed spaces through which the individual moved during the various phases of life: family, school, factory, hospital, prison.

In the current configuration of power, the Nazi concentration camps were the first concrete implementation of a new form of control. From there, Las Vegas and New York were extensively studied by architects on a theoretical level and entered the collective imagination as references for a new spatial paradigm—later termed Junkspace.

If, metaphorically, the concentration camp is the archetype, while Exodus is the paradigm, then, practically:

“The deadly and ‘silent’ face of biopower not only bears the aspect of horror but manifests wherever ‘insured life’ circulates through specific forms of self-representation and technical devices that guarantee its concealed flow and increase.”

And naked life:

“...is at the center of our post-industrial democracies, part of a global multimedia brothel-laboratory where control of flows and affections is realized through the pop form of excitation–frustration.”

In this context, architecture acquires the role of a techno-bio-cratic agent. As Montani paraphrases:

First, as a technical apparatus, it must be felt—it must circumscribe and produce a common sense of feeling, and only subsequently crystallize this shared sentiment into particular macro-social transformations (the Bilbao effect), into particular aesthetics—auratic ones—destined to administer the process of leveling, contraction, and canalization through forms endowed with prestige and desirability, and through figures of architects or artists delegated to conceive and produce them.

At the macro level:

“‘Masterpiece’ has become a definitive sanction, a semantic space that shields the object from critique, leaving its qualities unproven, its performance unmeasured, its reasons undiscussed. The masterpiece is no longer an inexplicable stroke of luck, a throw of dice, but a coherent typology: its mission is to intimidate...”

Museums and cultural centers play a crucial role, as there occurs a transfer from container to content: the authority of the “masterpiece” legitimizes, in the eyes of the paying public, the socially produced and modulatory message it presents. This is equally true for exhibitions and events, whose purpose is the construction of consensus and the rekindling of orgasmic force.

At the micro level:

Just as disciplinary architecture adapted to surveillance and individualization, pharmaco-pornographic architecture has invented spatial devices that promote immersivity and anesthetization. As Jameson notes, late-capitalist spatiality is both immersive and flat.

The spatiality of power once visible in barracks and hospitals is now reproduced in cinemas, hotels, and private spaces that aestheticize exposure. The transparent glass shower boxes and bathrooms of modern hotels symbolize this shift: modesty has become a counterproductive value in the pharmaco-pornographic era, where ostentation, rhetoric, and mediatization—even, and perhaps especially, of sexuality—form the microphysics of contemporary power.

These architectural devices induce behavioral effects that can be grouped into two macro-categories: isolation and social sharing. Exactly the dynamics envisioned by Koolhaas for the monumental sequences of the Exodus Strip. The typical space of the pharmaco-pornographic era thus becomes “one that facilitates an intense cycle of metropolitan life, alternating mystical retreat with participation in social life.”

Curiously, these same traits coincide with what Bifo identifies as the modern plague of suicides: isolation and hyper-stimulation. Isolation occurs amid company, and sharing in moments of solitude—an evident social dysfunction.

These twin dynamics—spaces of isolation and spaces of sharing—compose the spatio-temporal sequence on which power rests: what Debord called the spectacle.

Three Problems

In the postmodern world, we live detached from the ground—from ourselves, from our roots, from our biology, and from the contingent truth of nature. From this emerge three principal axes of power:

- Bioaesthetics: the transit of the body through the global technical device produces a constant process of insurance, specialization, and anesthetization.
- Pharmaco-pornography: control through altered states of consciousness; bodies induced to create orgasmic surplus value while abandoning every civic and ethical retention.
- Access to power of the second type: technological development and consumerism lead to the annihilation of needs achievable only through real effort.

The first needs (too easily satisfied) and the third (impossible to satisfy) dominate, while the second—requiring effort—are replaced by artificially created needs, induced through the previous two pillars: substitute activities.

The renunciation of the self-affirmative process of power is the renunciation of freedom. Freedom, therefore, pertains to the self-affirmative process of power.

Adjacent to these axioms, we may add to our reflection a rather peculiar aspect of the contemporary Model—one that pertains, in its very construction, to the biopolitical and pharmaco-pornographic dimensions previously examined.

This vision is described by Harari in his *Homo Sapiens: From Animals to Gods*, and I like to define it as evolutionary positionality.

This way of seeing ourselves as a species belongs more to an existential eventuality than to any sense of our sacrality or preservation.

If we are nothing more than animals who have accidentally reached the cockpit of the ecosystem—nothing special—then a whole range of invasive genetic, biological, and chemical scenarios opens up (precisely what was happening in the Nazi concentration camps).

The fall of Homo into Corpus renders the human being subject to modification, experimentation, and intrusions guided solely by the Model; thus, the creation of a new species through genetic experimentation may supplant us; thus, cyborgs—humans enhanced by digital interfaces and altered by pharmaco-industrial substances—may replace us; thus, the entire species will soon find itself facing crises that may place its very existence in doubt and, perhaps, in the face of a culturally produced ecological crisis, may even choose its own castration and consequent extinction.

As I have attempted to describe in the preceding paragraphs, all this is already underway as the modus operandi of the system:

we are lending ourselves to ever greater levels of sub-humanity, along the path of dangerous bio- and thanato-political drifts.

We have already become cyborgs—no longer human—and we have not even realized it.

Overcoming

This is not liberation from the system but its modification—a beneficial one, we believe.

This Manifesto of Architecture stands in the will to reclaim the Human. Not out of vanity, but through sensitive observation of the power that shapes us.

From the fall of the Berlin Wall and the anti-communist struggle, to the rise of the Cypherpunk movement and Anarcho-capitalism, to 9/11 and the search for money free from state power; from Wikipedia and GitHub to Anonymous, from the Greek debt crisis to the “society of fatigue,” from Chiara Ferragni to the Vertical Forest—the relations among philosophy, physics, and society have always been marked by discoveries that redefined each epoch.

The relationships between philosophy, physics, and society have, throughout history, been marked by great discoveries: in the modern era, physics—as defined by Galileo—was deterministic;

whereas the probabilistic indeterminacy of quantum matter contributed to the birth of the postmodern.

The discovery of Bitcoin lays the foundations for a new epoch.

Bitcoin

As Antonopoulos already noted, Bitcoin is a disruptive innovation, not an incremental one.

For this reason, it remains difficult to provide a comprehensive definition: its multidisciplinary nature refracts like a diamond—you can examine it closely, yet some reflection will always escape you. Let us nonetheless attempt a definition, sufficient for the purpose of this treatise.

Bitcoin is a peer-to-peer network composed of an open network of hardware—specialized or not—that runs open-source software. Anyone may propose modifications to the software; they are implemented if consensus is achieved. Anyone may modify the software on their own machine, and if those changes do not affect the consensus rules, they remain part of the network; if they do, they are automatically excluded.

Some nodes also perform the so-called mining operation through additional specialized hardware. This specialized hardware, known as a miner, carries out continuous mathematical attempts (brute force) in order to find a predefined number that varies according to the total computational power made available to the system.

The more of these specialized devices participate in the search for the number, the greater the total computing power of the system—and the higher the probability that the number will be found quickly.

To keep the discovery time of this number constant, the software automatically measures, approximately every two weeks (after a given number of discoveries), the total computing power

of the network and, through a mechanism known as difficulty adjustment, increases or decreases it accordingly.

The lower the number to be found, the harder it is to find.

Each time this number is discovered by a miner, a set of transactions is validated and broadcast to the rest of the nodes so that they may acknowledge it, and the miners immediately begin a new search.

Simultaneously with the discovery of the number, the software issues a certain quantity of new bitcoins, variable according to the epoch in which the network finds itself—that is, according to the number of reward halvings that have occurred.

These newly issued bitcoins are automatically assigned to the miner who found the number, as a reward for the time and energy expended in the physical world. Indeed, the resources (for example, time and electrical energy) that the miner consumes in the real world to perform the digital calculations necessary to find the number constitute the so-called proof of work.

From what has been said in the previous two paragraphs, the importance of the difficulty adjustment becomes clear:

on the one hand, maintaining a constant discovery rate directly affects the issuance of new bitcoins—that is, Bitcoin's inflationary policy.

Bitcoin's inflationary policy is predetermined and administered by the software itself through this very mechanism of difficulty adjustment.

It is written, in fact, that upon each discovery of the number a quantity of bitcoins equal to $50 / 2^i$ is issued, where i is the number of halvings that have taken place.

The halving event occurs every 210,000 discoveries.

Summing all these rewards yields approximately 21 million bitcoins.

No more than this amount can ever exist within the current consensus of the Bitcoin network.

On the other hand, the difficulty adjustment indirectly concerns the ability of nodes to converge around a shared history of transactions in a decentralized context, thereby preventing double spending—a problem that humanity had never solved before Bitcoin.

The Bitcoin software running on each node participating in the network simultaneously validates transactions—that is, it verifies their conformity to the protocol's rules.

We speak of “transactions,” but in reality these are pieces of information, numbers, zeros and ones—bits.

Everything that occurs within Bitcoin's code operates at the level of bits.

At a certain level, therefore, Bitcoin may be interpreted as an exchange of valid information between nodes.

The peculiarity of this information allows us to interpret it as money and to denominate it bitcoin.

After all, the Bitcoin software was created with a monetary purpose.

Ownership within this environment—interpretable as the ability to spend a certain amount of bitcoin—therefore corresponds to the ability to provide the software with a subset of valid information that authorizes spending.

This set of information is encoded and translated into human language as a list of 12–24 words.

The mere possession of this information (together with access to the network)—and no other socio-produced imposition—determines and enables action.

Money is nothing more than a means of storing the time and energy spent in work, to be later exchanged for goods and services.

To facilitate the meeting of supply and demand, it is desirable that it also possess good divisibility and transmissibility properties.

It is a shifter of time and energy expended, a thermodynamic container of the resources employed.

It follows that—aside from socio-cultural contingencies—a good form of money will possess adequate thermodynamic, divisible, and transmissible characteristics.

The Biopolitics of Bitcoin

Bitcoin is not biopolitical.

This does not mean, however, that it produces no effects on life.

Its founding characteristic is that of distinguishing bios from zoe, returning the body to an extra-biopolitical condition. This new power no longer needs to make itself felt in order to act upon the

body through aesthetic or political techniques, but rather leaves the body constitutionally free to experience the contingency of the world—thus allowing, ultimately, for a shared ethical accord to emerge. True not through anthropological egocentrism, but through a state of consensus attained around the highest degree of contingency experienced. The highest degree of contingency experienced coincides with the search for convenience—it is contextual to incentive.

What has just been said—that is, the relationship between Bitcoin and human action—must be understood within the framework of the principle whereby every technological invention in history acts constitutively upon the horizon of human possibilities, and therefore upon the ethical interpretation of life. Bitcoin acts upon the human ethical horizon.

In accordance with the effects produced by this new Bitcoin instrument upon the body, we are experiencing a new form of power.

We no longer witness an aesthetic imposition of subjectivation; the three axes of contemporary power collapse, giving way to an autonomous empirical ethical inquiry. This must be understood not as a quantitative substitution of power, but as a qualitative one. A form of power becomes dominant when it exerts a decisive influence upon all other forms of production—even if, quantitatively, it remains in the minority.

The so-called cultural industry—passing through the first and second axes of power—which, as a natural consequence of its very being, produced the annihilation of personal desire in favor of a hyper-mediatization of synthetic desire imposed through Freudian methods, is no longer the hegemonic power of transformation. Pharmaco-pornographic methods lose their organizing incisiveness, and in accordance with the new ethical horizon induced by the discovery of Bitcoin, we witness a rediscovery of natural contingency.

No longer subjected to external pharmaco-pornographic interventions, the body itself becomes the primary field of natural rediscovery. The knowledge of human biochemistry is no longer mystified by instrumental scientific assertions; it thus regains a correct relationship with what is.

Biochemistry, nutrition, circadian rhythms, hormones, self-awareness, posture, illness—no longer fall within the socio-produced sphere of influence, leaving the human being free to experiment with their own potential.

This means that the new body will be free to experiment with practices that today are considered unscientific by the contemporary pharmaco-industrial apparatus.

The natural consequence is a realignment between the body and human aspirations.

Processes of second-order power—the self-affirmative, creative ones—reappear instantaneously within the human field of possibilities opened by Bitcoin, once pharmaco-pornographic intrusions are excluded.

By the same principle, Nature itself will benefit. Freed from the contemporary hypocrisies that can be summarized as follows:

- a real misalignment between man and nature caused by the pharmaco-industrial complex and the resulting consumerist way of life;
- a genuine problem mystified by a socio-produced environmental crisis serving purposes of control through altered states of consciousness;
- to which a false remedy is sought through the constant reduction of personal freedoms, and ESG methodologies that, at best, are mere devices to perpetuate the consumerist circus as it stands—and, at worst, to pollute and exploit new ecological niches that were once relatively untouched.

“The old mole was the animal of confinement environments, while the serpent is that of societies of control. We have moved from one animal to another—from the mole to the serpent—in the regime we inhabit, but also in our very way of living and relating to others.”

The Bitcoiner's animal is the honey badger! 🦡

Having become aware of the anesthetic state in which we found ourselves, our natural and human inner inclination has set us back on the path.

We will grow in wisdom, awareness, and collaborative capacity until the subtracted corpus becomes plenipotentiary.

The body will no longer have to endure the polyvocality induced by an imposed aesthetic condition—one that deprives it of the natural process of ambition → affirmation → power—but by reaffirming itself, it will unlock its full potential.

Truth and Freedom

What is there to say when everything has already been said?

What is there to say when God is dead, when one turns endlessly in circles, when the utmost degree of desecration has been achieved, and every “new” thing is invalidated by bioaesthetic themes? Truth, instead of “truth,” assumes subversive and extremist characteristics. Only Truth, within a context constructed dialogically and anthropologically, is constitutionally provocative; whereas contemporary artistic forms that “kill God” once again in a thousand different ways are nothing but the weary reiteration of the effectiveness of artistic models in building a capital of visibility.

What is Truth?

If truth is God—and it is—then man cannot have full experience of it.

God, by definition, is constitutively other with respect to man; this renders Him not fully knowable. Indeed, man cannot experience the very attributes that define God: eternity, immutability, ubiquity... At the same time, our own constitutive essence is the measure of judgment and of the degree of knowledge we can aspire to in our relation with God. To be God therefore does not concern us—except perhaps as a matter of faith, which is not the subject here. If we cannot know Him fully, He assumes a state of constitutive indeterminacy.

What should concern us, instead, is the definition—that is, the search—for our own measure of knowledge. Only in this way may we aspire to ever more advanced states of Truth.

For this reason, we are aware that reality and truth do not necessarily coincide—except through an act of faith. Hence our calm willingness to align ourselves upon a shared truth.

Bitcoin coagulates the uncertain into the certain, chaos into intelligible order. It turns future probability into past determinacy. Just as time crystallizes future indeterminacy into the certainty of experienced, shared, and objective reality—the past—through the succession of events and measurements—the present—so too does Bitcoin act as a builder of Truth.

The technical means by which it accomplishes this is mining. Mining transmutes the probabilistic uncertainty of finding the number into its discovery; the multiplicity of simultaneous future transactions in the mempool into a sequential order.

The crucial thing to understand is that, thanks to the mechanism of difficulty adjustment:

In Bitcoin, the map is the territory.

The truth constructed by Bitcoin is not a representation (a map) but the territory itself. It is not an idea, an image referring to something else, thereby falling again into the postmodern characteristics that Montani attributes to the image of current power. Bitcoin is, rather, a real object within the virtual world.

To introduce the theme of freedom, we must speak of money and FIAT currencies.

Money in the era just past is a tool of control, subordinated to the socio-cultural requirements previously described. Current currencies are called FIAT money—from the Latin fiat, “let it be made from nothing.” Having lost their gold backing, they entered the digital age; inheriting the traits of the computer age, they became infinitely duplicable and enabled double spending. The right to double spend—that is, to inflate, to create money from nothing, to dilute the labor and time stored within it—has been reserved by the system to globalist banking elites.

The connection of such currencies to centralized servers of large corporations and state organizations denies the possibility of ownership to the individual individual, making money an instrument of control. The possibility of spending, and therefore of freedom of disposition, is permitted only if one conforms to the signs of the Model and remains compliant with the demands

of the Edge. The individual must ask permission—through the cipher, the password by which they are identified—in order to dispose of their own money within this context.

It becomes clear that the most fertile form of illegalism in the waning epoch concerns the ability to defy the enabling cutoff of the Edge: to intervene at will upon the semitechnical rules derived from and administered by the Edge; to reserve for oneself, therefore, the power to modify the code of the global technical apparatus.

All this, however, is not possible within the consensus of Bitcoin. Any modification of the code either falls outside consensus or is automatically excluded from the system—thereby directly inhibiting the principal illegalism of the old order, which for this very reason becomes obsolete.

In parallel, the rehabilitation of ownership according to the mechanisms described above—within a decentralized network—belongs to freedom: freedom understood as freedom of expression, the freedom to let an action follow a thought without asking permission, regardless of adherence to the Model.

To dispose freely of the time and energy stored in money, in order to pursue second-order powers, finally pertains to individual freedom.

Infinite inflation generates infinite slavery—through the imposed impossibility of efficiently storing one's resources, and through the consequent reduction of purchasing power and of the freedom to dispose of them. A constant reduction in purchasing power undermines individual freedoms of the second type. Conversely, to use a form of money that is not infinitely inflatable enables financial freedom, and therefore, Freedom itself.

Bitcoin is True and Free money.

Through the reintegration of these concepts—Truth and Freedom—within the horizon of human possibility, we witness the rebirth of Man.

Ethics and Aesthetics

It is not a free-for-all. We are not speaking, in fact, of an absolute and maximally atomized relativism, but rather of an ETHICAL convergence toward the most convenient state. ETHICS presupposes free adherence; if imposed, it becomes Aesthetics.

A centralized entity, in order to survive, will always require an Aesthetic imposition. A decentralized organism, by contrast, reaches agreement around an Ethical state, experienced first and foremost individually.

From here, individual rebirth will always, as a logical consequence and premise, begin from one's own talents, with the goal of ETHICAL convergence, even through excellence in the arts and sciences, so as to produce an improvement of the shared Status Quo.

Centralized aesthetic imposition creates ethical residues at the margins of the apparatus.

We must return to the essence of technique. By saying this, it is implicit that the inquiry will no longer be directed toward the pursuit of the most refined aesthetic techniques of centralized control, but toward individual ethical efficiency. No longer a technical inquiry into the anesthetization of the senses through their chemical–emotional manipulation, but one oriented toward incentive, efficiency, frugality, the laws of economy and sustainability: to achieve globally diffused consensus through being, not appearing; through ethics, not aesthetics; through technique, not form.

In Bitcoin, anesthetized humanity is forcibly lifted—because of its evident incapacity—from the possibility of performing punctual ethical choices. Such incapacity derives from the habit of living within an environment in which market laws are constantly distorted by the disincentivizing intervention of central authority, imposing the paths of the Model.

Every element of ethical indeterminacy is predetermined, pre-coded, and delegated to the algorithmic mechanism of consensus. Foundational and vital (bios) will be the choice of which techno-bio-ethical ecosystem one wishes to adhere to—if such a choice remains operable. Should it be so, the body's resistance will be required: a resistance not defined merely by absence

or withdrawal from subjectivizing, seductive, bio-culturally desirable mechanisms, but also by nature, logic, and contingency. Something new now exists to which one may adhere.

Parallel to the monetary sphere—which was the most difficult and important to rectify—similar protocols may emerge in other domains.

To achieve this, a global meeting platform is required on which consensus may be reached.

This, in turn, will require a global database for the sharing, commentary, and revision of projects in which this research may take place—a process rather than a product.

This implies open source, and the abolition of industrial secrecy and copyright.

In the new epoch, participation in this global process of consensus will by no means be mandatory. Each individual will be free to seek—or not to seek—ethics on their own.

It will be up to everyone to determine their degree of abstention from the global technical apparatus: not only from that devoted to the transmission of images and bioaesthetics, but also from that of ethics itself. In both cases, one will no longer be subjected to the flattening mechanism of mass communication, but rather left free to express oneself and to create peculiarity—not in order to emerge, to look and be looked at, but in order to be oneself.

It follows naturally that sharing will be ethically preferred. If it is not, it will not be for greed or jealousy, but for asceticism.

Decentralized devices organized in this sense impose a new, other techno-bio-ethic.

Every legislative superstructure will be unable to act constructively within the field of actions pertaining to Bitcoin, and will thus be redundant and superfluous by definition.

Every bureaucratic structure that places itself in competition with these techno-bio-ethical protocols and devices will be likewise obsolete.

States, in their current sense, will be unable to compete with these devices and will have to adapt.

It is probable that states-as-a-service will emerge: market entities offering their services while leaving freedom of adherence and withdrawal.

In general, there will be a reduction of biopolitical control by states—although some may even increase it, and those who wish will be free to purchase their services.

In this context, it will therefore not be the socio-produced certificate administered by the Edge that enables one to work, but rather the capacity for work itself.

It is the demonstration of knowing how to perform a task—through the task itself, without any bureaucratic enabling threshold—that authorizes one to perform it.

The raw material will be value, derived from experienced contingency—an authentic value, ethically recognized.

Since recognition is not its constitutive feature (it is only a potentiality), such value can exist autonomously. When recognition occurs, the exchange of value takes place.

Preferring a centralized system to a decentralized one cannot be determined a priori; it depends solely on historical positionality—that is, on context and on human tendencies.

It is not that we are incapable of pursuing long-term ethical choices.

In general terms, short-term preference is not necessarily more seductive than long-term preference. Rather, in this historical phase, we are in need of the Bitcoin medicine—the right tool at the right time, born not by chance but by causality.

Necessity is the mother of invention. Accustomed as we are to the aesthetics imposed upon us, and to the instruments made available to us—such as FIAT money—a very powerful tool was needed to make us change course.

The conflict now outlined is that between imposed investment, through the devaluation of currency (whose feasibility grows with wealth), and the right to save.

The right to save means the right to preserve the value generated through one's labor, time, and energy, and to employ it freely at a later moment. Consequently, it concerns the opposition between two human horizons of possibility. The praxis and experience of this inflationary system have shown that it favors the rich, the powerful, the oligarchs—those who already possess economic power.

This is not only true on the social scale of individuals, but also between States and populations, between the First and the Third World. Let us not forget that the paradigm of this system is infinite growth, infinite pollution, infinite and institutionalized generational slavery—a total control based on the totality of data surrendered by force, through the complete renunciation of privacy.

Architettura Vera

Architettura Vera is the architecture invested with this new power. Architettura Vera is the architecture invested with the power of Bitcoin.

An architecture of human ambitions.

Architettura Vera is both a symbol and an essence, referring to the qualities of an individual search for Truth.

As explained, though Bitcoin is a digital instrument—and has often been criticized for this very reason—it shifts the focus from digital life back to real life. No longer an imposed renunciation of contingency in order to specialize within the pharmaco-pornographic biopolitical order, but rather a necessary opening to contingency and to reality, in the ethical pursuit of incentive.

Not value of the commodity, but value of life. An architecture at the service of True Life.

Produce true houses, true clothes, true food, true art, true science. A True Architecture, for example, is an architecture that is lasting, useful, functional, beautiful. A healthy and respectful subjectivism—not a dark and nihilistic relativism—will underlie the discourse on beauty and utility.

Since every form of inquiry, as written, begins first and foremost on an individual level, it remains that convergence will necessarily occur on ethical grounds; thus, Beauty and Utility will tend to reconcile. This will not be an aesthetic imposition required by the system to survive, but rather a natural individual tendency—freely and locally disregarded when desired—arising from the incentives of efficiency.

The rhythms and modes of life will change in accordance with the new horizon of possibilities, and architecture will consequently reflect this transformation. Quality, beauty, comfort.. will no longer be hedonistic whims, but ethical demands for the well-being of the body, in harmony with human nature.

We will realize, for instance, the need to rethink the relationship between spaces of work and spaces of celebration. Work will once again become the production of value, no longer a substitute activity—or worse, an anesthetizing imposition functional to institutionalized slavery. The two spaces may thus merge, or remain separate, but they will lose their present-day duality.

By withdrawing the body from the pharmaco-pornographic domain, the social dysfunctionality that today characterizes spaces of aggregation and isolation will be able to cease.

Spaces for encounter and conviviality will follow one another in sequence with spaces for privacy and intimate life.

Thus, digital conviviality—no longer an instrument of power—will cease its organizing function and be relegated to the role of a tool.

Architecture will be reborn in harmony with the rediscovery of contingency.. and it will be beautiful.

*“We can forgive a child who is afraid of the dark.
The real tragedy of life is when men are afraid of the light.”
(Plato)*