What is the relation between *joinery* in furniture, *subjunctive* in language and *consequence* in ethics? The reach of this question may be the challenge of aesthetics in our time. To engage with logic of triads rather opposition. And in this drift understand the relation between writing, action and language.

That is, as a specific case of the more general problem of 'occasional cause' that may determine whether we manage to determine and make up our debt to reality. How objects that become *mobiliary* by virtue of moving *in* and *out* of language. And how language moves *in* and *out* of action.

If we accept that the project of ethics is to reach a 3rd level of knowledge (Spinoza)—or, *intuition*—how does the *sensorial* experience of making and using, and the *reasoned* articulation of grammar, come together in a way where aesthetic consistency extends into the ethical line of *consequence*?

Philosophically, the notion of 'hidden layer' used in *neural networks* features as a *third mover*. A concept within the Aristotelian lingo of causality that was never formulated by Aristotle. What happens with the idea of a hidden layer—between the input and output layers—is the invention of the *gap*.

That is, without claiming that the gap is a thing—in a broad sense—it is conceived as a material. A material for learning, which in neural network features as a leap that in a single gesture proceeds conjointly by *intra-polation* and *extrapolation*. It gauges the current by making it happen.

It features the leap between the epistemological (*how we can know that we know*) and the ontological (*how we can state that something is*). We can crowd this space with Moebius-strips, Escher staircases, Klein's bottles, tesseracts and other contraptions of this kind. But they are also confusing.

A more straightforward approach—and therefore consistent with Occam's razor—is to conceive the Black Box (cybernetics) as something else than a *mere* absence, and apply ourselves to develop a *dynamic* concept and practice (expression and experiment) of *zero*. That is, an *understanding*.

We have harvested from the *knowledges* that the invention of zero permits for quite a number of years now (3 b.c.e. in Mesopotamia). However, the *understanding* of zero has been project confined to the deep insights of some mystics (e.g. Sufis and Cabalists). It hasn't been broadly relevant.

The idea that adding zero to any real number n, you increase that number of by a multiple of **10**, is a *digital* idea: why **10** and not **11**? We have **10** *fingers* and **10** *toes*. Digits. The idea of **10**-fold multiplication starts with the *body*. More precisely, *hands* that take up a lion's share of our brain-cortex.

Of course, there have been *more than one* count-base. But we have adopted *one* where adding **0**—the symbol for *nothing*—increases any number **n**, but a multiple of **10**. Essentially, a placeholder for something that we have *decided* is a multiple of **10**. And *all the knowledges* implied by this.

The effect is that the world has been *up for grabs*, and that it is up to humanity to *set* or *push* the limits. At the present juncture, however, we may be in a situation where we, by setting off and postponing our understanding of **0**, are making ourselves *indebted* to the real. Perhaps beyond retrieve.

If objects—as Giorgio Agamben seems to suggest—are the equivalent to *zero* in natural language, may we anticipate that the category of objects that perforate—go in and out of language—are artefacts of a special mobile de-finition: *mobiliary*. And that language, correspondingly, goes in/out of action.

It would mean that we can partake of our *three* categories of *movers*—**(1)** emotion, **(2)** operations and **(3)** mobiliary—in terms that makes the notion of 'occasional cause' perfectly clear. And include these ideas into the pre-cincts of the common, rather than the esoteric. A *mirror*: **(1):(2)** :: **(2):(3)**.