

Social
Epistemology

“poetic language has from our ordinary language’s rigid predication, the almost perspicuous feeling of language, the absolute exchange values of words, and the conventional use value of language. indeed, if poetic language had not fallen it would not exist, there would only be our ordinary literal language.”

By Francis Raven

A
Naturalized
Subject
For Epistemology¹

To the extent that the assumption of the existence of scientists is built into a scientific inquiry itself the assumption of a fully rational knower is also built into that inquiry. Life, on the other hand, does not require that people are fully (or ideally) rational. This shouldn't be that surprising, but problems arise when the subject of particular science is man himself (that is, any of the social sciences). These sciences usually begin by attempting to study man qua scientist when they should actually be studying man qua *man as he is* (since that is the way that he is). The clearest example of this is in the field of economics. I will outline these issues

“okay, but we still don't know what you're excluding”

can thus be reduced to questions of what constitutes a representation

modern ethical theories are all attempting to deal with the epistemic crisis which created both mistrust in the senses (cannot be circumscribed by philosophy at all times)

and a subjective self

[the epistemology of capitalism - the filter filtering itself (spectacular life)]

Profiling, Torture & Knowledge

Both profiling and torture are techniques used to prevent crime. However, both methods are often overprovided by the state. Therefore, the use of both procedures needs to be bounded by robust ethical standards. The roots of these ethical standards might be found in a study of how both torture and profiling relate to knowledge. That is, it is possible that in this case the ethical might helpfully intersect with the epistemic. In this essay, I will explore the relationship between knowledge and torture, between knowledge and profiling, and between these two types of knowledge. In so doing, I will distinguish between the use and acquisition of knowledge and between particular and generalized (or scientific) knowledge. However, most of the questions raised by this essay end up being outside of its scope and perhaps all that it has to offer are a few distinctions and few new refined questions.

To begin, the first difference between torture and profiling with regard to knowledge is that to profile effectively we *need* knowledge, whereas if

and show how the work of economist, Richard Thaler, in what could be called “naturalized economics,” has helped solve part of the problem of what should be the subject of economics.

Asking what the subject of a given field should be is a descriptive project for it allows the scientist (the economist in this case) to assess the current state of affairs in a given field. However, there are two aspects in the naturalization of a field of inquiry: the descriptive and the meliorative. The meliorative project attempts to say in which direction a given field should be moving. In the case of economics this means asking how we can make people better utility maximizers.

...Both deductive and inductive science require an inference to be made. In the case of inductive science, the inference made is from evidence to hypotheses and then

for, example at the wrong dosage or for the wrong duration and cooking devices used improperly for heating

to consider and not know

standing up to the text =
{non-violence = agnostic. . .}

do not find it easy to investigate

ground
hinge
appellation

argued that there are situations in which a belief may be justified and true, and yet not count as knowledge

sunken knowledge
decision vectors

but the offer of the tree doesn't even know any leaves

torture is ever justified it *supplies* us (that is, the state) with knowledge. That is, successful torture will *obtain* knowledge whereas successful profiling will *use* knowledge. The knowledge *of* and the knowledge *needed* intersect in the state's knowledge regime.

The asymmetry between the acquisition and the use of knowledge alters the ethical requirements placed on torture and profiling. This is because, to generalize, the ethical standards for use are stricter when the substance (or activity) being used affects more people than just the user; whereas, the ethical standards for acquisition (or production) are stricter when use only affects the user (that is, when the use of the substance constitutes a “victimless crime”). The question remains: should the ethical standards for using knowledge be more or less strict than the ethical standards for acquiring knowledge? I will not answer this question, for its answer lies outside the scope of this short paper.

Presently, I will turn to the state's twin tasks regarding knowledge: torture and profiling. Torture is

to theories, and the case of deductive science (as opposed to deductive reasoning), an inference is made the other way, from theory to hypotheses to what would count as support for those theories. These inferences are made by using logical principles, which must be universal to ensure that the scientific results will be universal (since the evidence is surely not universal). Because the sciences use logical principles in order to proceed from evidence to results they assume the existence of a scientist (a knower) either to gather the relevant evidence and generate a hypothesis and ultimately a theory, in the case of inductive science, or to move logically from theory to hypothesis and then to find evidence that supports his theory, in the case of a deductive scientific inquiry.

... In fact, it might be said that to speak of "science" as a disembodied form of inquiry might be

having a visual approach, we must suppose to the effect that your perceptual perhaps an evil demon makes the hat look green to you when in fact it is pink perhaps you are the evil demon why the favored explanation always looks

hypothesis to illustrate that difficulty

inference to the best coherence

defined by the American Heritage Dictionary as "infliction of severe physical pain as a means of punishment or coercion." Let's not quibble with the definition as some politicians might as a means of dodging International Treaty obligations. Let's just accept a naïve definition in the meantime; at least for the sake of this essay. The justification for torture is typically utilitarian as opposed to retributivist (the belief that we should punish criminals because they are guilty, that is, "an eye for an eye"). That is, we don't torture criminals because they're guilty, but because of some good we could gain from their torture. Simply put, utilitarianism is an ethical framework based on the quantitative maximization of some good. So, a utilitarian justification for an action (let's call this action X) takes the form: doing X provides more of a certain good than not doing X. As we all know from the horrific events in Abu Gharib, knowledge (or intelligence) is often seen as the good torture provides.

As a result of its utilitarian justification, if torture did not produce knowledge then the utilitarian calculus in its favor would

too abstract to be helpful. If viewed from the perspective of the scientist one might say that it is actually what scientists do that constitutes science and the fact that scientists are ideally rational is what allows for science to be “structured and systematic knowledge.” But either way, that is, taken from the perspective of science or from the perspective of the scientist, scientific inquiry presumes (and requires) the existence of a scientist who can employ universal logical principles consistently and universally. In short, science assumes the existence of a knower in the robust sense indicated by something like the Standard Picture, which I will explore in a moment. If a science did not assume such a person it would first, not be general enough to be called a science and second, the inferences which scientists made would not be able to

affirm me
else stay inside
read the last section
the one where
she gets really weird
and metaphysical
and starts asking all these things
that we cannot
say question about
however, she does and stands up
or forward and bends,
say to the side, or in front
and says
“invoke”
say in breath,
say it with a little
but not too little,
too little is insufficient
and i am looking for
a necessary and sufficient blow
to the head
to know a proposition like “i exist”
with all certainty
you are wondering where the pointer
is in all of this
and with all certainty i have been
asking why a point and why
something to point with
and i am making this
anthropological point that humans
manufacture points don't they, yes
yes we do and we ask for
reasons if we're lucky at least, if we
are not philosophers

fail and torture would thus be left with no justification to speak of. If you want to justify torture, then, you must show that it produces knowledge. The way to do this is to idealize torture. The idealized structure of torture is known as the Ticking Time-Tomb Example: You hold a prisoner in custody. The prisoner knows the location of a hidden ticking time bomb that will soon explode and kill many people. And you know that the prisoner holds this information. Given these circumstances, many people believe that torture is justified. There are, of course, many problems with this idealized example, all of which circle around the fact that it never actually occurs. But what if it did?

Obviously, torture will not produce scientific (or generalized) knowledge, but will instead procure particular knowledge. That is, the torturer doesn't want the tortured to spout some theory about how things are or how they might be. He does not want to know the theory behind terrorism or how bombs work. The torturer wants to know specifics, not generalizations; actualities, not potentialities or

be repeated (since they would not follow by logical principles). In fact, the etymology of 'epistemology' reaffirms the relationship between science and epistemology and thus between science and an ideally rational knower. As Theo Theocharis writes, "The early Greek pioneers of science insisted on the careful distinction between 'techne' (= traditional practical know-how) and 'episteme' (= scientific knowledge), which the speakers of Latin later called 'scientia', and which the speakers of English today call 'science.'"...

...However, the survival of mankind does not require people to be fully rational. It merely assumes that people will act rationally enough to survive (note the adverbial usage). Life merely gears us toward adaptations to an environment. And, in fact, since most people make decisions under constraints of time and cost, it can be

from elimination
 is not basic
 with regard
 arises of where...
 suppose again you notice...
 "either loop back to b_1 or continue ad
infinitum"
 both of these possibilities are
 unacceptable
 therefore
 if there are justified beliefs
 there must be basic beliefs
 whether
 we may make use of the input our
 faculties deliver

probabilities. That is, he wants to know that a bomb will explode the Thursday after next in the Starbucks at 53rd and 3rd, or that the Foreign Minister of Iran will be assassinated on Thanksgiving. This type of knowledge is not general or generalizable, but is instead particular. It is not a scientific theory and, as such, cannot be applied except in the circumstance indicated.

This particular type of knowledge might not even count as knowledge. Instead, following Plato, we might say that it is a "true belief," which is untethered and likely to fly from its source. That is, the particular piece of information might not be attached to a theoretical system of knowledge (which is what actually counts as knowledge). The difference between (1) a particular piece of knowledge and (2) a science (a theoretical framework for knowledge) may be seen by comparing the difference between a person being wrong about (1) and (2). If a person is wrong about (1) she will just move on, but if a person is wrong about (2) (for instance, modern physics) she will be forced to change the way she lives. Being mistaken about a particular instance

said that people are only minimally or boundedly rational. The idea behind bounded or minimal rationality is basically that when people make decisions they are always under time and cost constraints and so employ shortcuts (such as the availability and representative heuristics) in order to save time and expense.

...One reason for this is that the conditions under which these heuristics and reasoning schemas function are domain (or environment) specific. This means that they work well in certain domains (or environments) and not well in others. This specificity makes modeling the rationality of humans extremely difficult since the degree to which humans are rational can be said to change depending upon domain.

... Another way of stating the degree of man's rationality was proposed by Nobel laureate Herbert Simon in 1972 as "Bounded

right opinion right opinion
 right opinion
 birds flying out
 capture me knowledge to stay bound
 bound feet to earth
 bound knowledge to ideal

fastened by a rope
 fastened by a now
 (experience tow)
 tow me through heaven
 a place for it
 in the ideal

howwhoever
 'god exists' is not a knowledge claim
 plato – 'right opinion'
 wittgenstein – 'hinge proposition'
 (belief in god is necessarily

affective)
 wittgenstein's remark that the
 tractatus
 was an ethical work
 consisting of what was not there
 leaves one with a negative theology
 (i.e. god
 unapproachable
 with descriptive language)

conclusion, therefore god is
 accessible
 only with poetic language
 (heidegger)

conclusion
 man's most important
 role is
 the poetic

of knowledge will lead a person to change her views about that piece of knowledge (for instance, if the bomb turned out not to be in the school cafeteria, she would not persist in believing that it was). Whereas, being wrong about a system of knowledge (or science) will either lead a person to radically change her entire belief system (that is, maybe if the next criminal the police officer catches isn't a young black man then the police officer will cease to be such a racist) or, alternately, it could lead the person's invalid belief system to become more entrenched. This entrenchment might result from the person's understanding of the enormous costs of changing one's belief system. Of course, a lengthier discussion of this phenomenon is outside the narrow parameters of this paper. Now I must move onto the other side of the equation: profiling.

One of the definitions given for 'profile' in the American Heritage Dictionary is "a representation of an object or structure seen from the side." In terms of law enforcement, the subject is seen from *the side* of his race, class, gender, or neighborhood. That is, his

Rationality.” The idea is put most succinctly by saying that human rationality is not limitless, but is instead bound by cost constraints (in the broadest sense of cost). Simon described the idea as “that property of an agent that behaves in a manner that is nearly optimal with respect to its goals as its resources will allow.” Bounded rationality assumes human rationality has its limits, especially when operating in conditions of considerable uncertainty. And most of the time when people make decisions they make them under conditions of uncertainty. Simon proposed two major reasons why human rationality was bounded. First, there are limitations of the human mind. This observation is simply that the human mind under time constraints does not have the capacity to carry out the operations which predicate logic entails. Second, the environment within which the mind

it worked
and it didn't know how
it worked
perhaps
it didn't
work

but it did

it worked
and i
didn't know how
it worked
secret wrapped
so i could still
see its shape

it worked
hidden
orange light on blue ocean mixed
kelp wrapped around your legs,
a few cogs

it worked

what one knows about either the
focus or frame

silhouette is viewed through that lens so that the law-enforcement officer can prevent crimes from occurring. Profiling has the inverse relationship with knowledge that torture has. It is the use of generalized knowledge, as opposed to the acquisition of particular knowledge. To profile is to use generalized (or schematic) knowledge in order to either prevent a future crime or to catch a criminal in the commission of a crime.

What happens when an official, such as a police officer, racially (or otherwise) profiles another individual? First, there is a theory: such as “African American youths commit more crimes than white youths.” (Of course, there is the question of whether ‘commit’ should be replaced with ‘are caught committing.’ But this paper is not the place for that discussion.) Next, there is the action that results from the police officer believing the theory: pulling more young black men over than young white men. The element that the official is using to profile is brought to the forefront. So, the official asks: is this person black? Is this person male? Is this person

operates changes. This is important because many of the heuristics and other simplified reasoning strategies are domain (read environment) specific. So, if the heuristic is environmentally specified and the person's environment changes this heuristic will perform poorly. For example, the availability heuristic works well in environments where decisions must be made under time and cost constraints but not in environments where these constraints to do not exist. This is because relying on the ease with which instances come to mind, as opposed to searching out all relevant information saves time and money, but there are environments and circumstances (rigorous computation, test taking, computing) where these constraints are much less of a factor. Simon's point is that moving from a cost-constrained environment to an environment where

no little dog says who i am
some tortilla chips, corn, eggplants
chili sauce, tomatoes, green pepper
and other liquids
define me

a little dog might know me without
my knowledge

but if i know a little dog i'll probably
know it

unless: self deception
some work with equations
several variables
a little dog juggles
shits on magazines

young? These three questions, of course, are each layers in the overdetermined profiling of an individual. Overdetermination is another realm of profiling that should be investigated in relation to knowledge. Unfortunately, this investigation will have to wait for another paper.

Simply put, knowledge is needed on several levels in order to effectively profile. First, (1) a general theory is needed. Second, (2) the profiler needs to know if people belong to class that has been theorized about. Interestingly, (1) is a piece of scientific knowledge – a schema in which to place other knowledge, while (2) is a piece of empirical knowledge. (2) is particular knowledge again; the type of knowledge acquired with torture. However, it is a different subcategory of particular knowledge than is acquired using torture. (2) is public particular knowledge, whereas the type of knowledge acquired with torture is private particular knowledge. (2) fits into (1) and if (2) does not fit into (1), that is, if the black man pulled over is not committing a crime, this does not disprove (1) since overarching scientific knowledge is not

costs are minimally constrained makes it such that the availability heuristic will fail to give us good results. Further, he believes that this movement from environment to environment constitutes a limitation on human cognition and that this limitation is part of what is meant by people having bounded rationality...

...The new and burgeoning field of behavioral economics has come to question most basically whether economics should study Homo Economicus or whether it should instead study the behavior of Homo Sapiens. That is, economists have been questioning whether they should study man qua scientist or if they should rather study man qua *man as he is*. At the center of this field is University of Chicago economist Richard Thaler. In his paper "From Homo Economicus to Homo Sapiens" he writes, "I am predicting that Homo Economicus will

you don't know what a hammer is until it breaks down

to count as knowledge must have a justification for that belief
the patient did not know [s believes that p] insufficient
does not want to accept is to do no more than to think for whatever reason that p is the case agrees with the common sense

notion
that we can believe things without knowing them distinguished by by its justification

except when mutually contradictory pluralism is always grounded in agreement

conceive of circumstances knowing how (to ride)

disproved with counterexamples. And in fact, as I have noted previously, further entrenchment of an invalid belief system often results from alleged empirical disproof of that belief system.

It is obviously always ethical to acquire (2) since it is public and every person has access to it. And it is also ethical to use scientific (generalized) knowledge when it is correct and when it does not infringe upon the basic civil liberties and rights we Americans hold so dear. But this is the problem with profiling. It often uses erroneous generalized knowledge and applies it to publicly available particular information. An example of erroneous generalized knowledge is the theory that Martians are more likely to commit crimes than Caucasians. In addition, the use of generalized knowledge is not always ethical, because the user could be wrong (1) about its validity or (2) about whether it applies in a particular instance. For example, it may be true that Martians commit crimes at higher rates than do Caucasians, but that does not mean that the individual Muslim the police-officer pulls over is more likely to commit a

evolve into Homo Sapiens. This prediction shouldn't seem outlandish. It is logical to assume that basing descriptive economic models on more realistic conceptions of economic agents is bound to increase the explanatory power of the models." Thaler is saying that economics will begin to study man qua *man as he is* and will give up on man qua scientist as its subject. His article outlines several ways in which his prediction will be borne out. That is, he makes six smaller predictions for how economic models will change once their fundamental subject has changed from Homo Economicus to Homo Sapiens.

All six of these sub-predictions boil down to telling economists to study what I have been calling man qua *man as he is* instead of man qua scientist. Specifically, the ways in which he thinks economics will change are that (1) Homo Economicus will begin losing IQ;

explanatory coherence of our beliefs could argue as follows [to every unlikely]

dealing with the mundane tasks typically defended

"makes excessive intellectual demands on believers"

even though it *looks* blue to her but is another

"is first justified, then unjustified, and eventually justified again"

absurd {we never demand of others

to justify the way things appear to them

in their perceptual experiences}

crime than the Caucasian her sees on the corner.

However, even if it turned out that this theory were correct, most people would not want politicians to enact policies with such a repellant theory in mind. This is because we hold the rights of the individual more dearly than we hold scientific theories. We value human rights above scientific knowledge, no matter how correct this knowledge is. In the political realm, all citizens are supposedly viewed equally. What this means is that any scientific theory that negates individual rights must not be used in the public sphere. In addition, we need to remind our elected officials that this is the case. However, in the end, it is the interaction of scientific and particular knowledge that is especially intriguing, but this is again outside the scope of this slim paper.

To connect torture and profiling through their relationships to knowledge would be to say that they fit at jagged edges to each other. To profile is to work from probabilities and statistics to individuals; whereas torture uses the individual to generate particular knowledge. The torturer really doesn't

(2) Homo Economicus will become a slower learner; (3) the species populating economics models will become more heterogeneous; (4) economists will study human cognition; (5) economists will distinguish between normative and descriptive theories; and (6) Homo Economicus will become more emotional...

...One of the most interesting shifts Thaler predicts is that economists will distinguish between normative and descriptive theories. He writes that psychologists who make the distinction between normative and descriptive theories believe that "normative theories characterize rational choice: examples would include the axioms of expected utility theory and Bayes' rule. Descriptive theories try to characterize actual choices" (138). This shift is similar to the shift that occurred in epistemology from the Standard Theory

leap of birds followed finger along chalk hours along wartime thought shaman spoken unedited mistaken word now and again(st) your logical investigations how about examples how about tying the birds to a contingent being within which transcendental experience appears vague appearance/reality distinction

[why is it history flowers as narrow definition of a rose? why is it this structure forces itself along these folding lines?]

project than which none speaks before this way of thinking is a machine whose on/off switch must be investigated not logically but through metaphor

across jumps in consciousness there is expectation an internal relationship between the expectation and that which is expected this internal relation (to speak of one is to speak of the other) is how this world, our world is bound together dim of dusk trust of love presupposition to ask even the simplest

want the type of knowledge needed to profile (this is obtained through assiduous research), but instead requires knowledge that will be acted upon and will be subsequently thrown to the wind. However, the knowledge obtained from torture, the specific knowledge of bombings, prison breaks, coups, etc., can be a contribution to the research projects that may subsequently be used to profile various groups. Once this occurs, if any member of a profiled group happens to commit a crime the researcher is given further knowledge since confirmation of a theory is itself knowledge. In this way, the use and acquisition of knowledge become mixed up along with the ethical standards binding them to humanity.

The ethical limitations on torture and profiling are connected to their respective relationships with knowledge. Particular knowledge is typically ethical to use. For instance, if a police officer knows that Tommy Hilfiger is going to blow up the Empire State Building most people would agree that it is ethical for the police officer to intervene before Hilfiger has the opportunity to detonate his bomb. However,

to a more naturalized epistemology. If epistemologists took man as he is as its subject (and were thus more descriptive) it would do a better job of providing an account of what man knows and thus, epistemologists would know more and would be more in the position of being scientists (and thus, being fully rational). This is because epistemologists would know more about what non-epistemologists know and knowing more facts about a given field means that inferences between those facts will be more universally applicable. Knowing more facts about a given field and making universally applicable inferences between those facts is equivalent to being man qua scientist. To reiterate: this analysis is equally true of the economist and of the epistemologist: the more he is willing to give up on studying man qua scientist the more he will be in a position to be man qua scientist.

[appear to us as infallible indeed, such a demand]

a new class:
the epistemology of management

to think
this is not possible
is to mistake
the epistemological
for the metaphysical
the epistemology is empirical
we come to learn *identity statements*
through empirical means

but metaphysically,
names are necessary

structured like a building
rests upon a foundation;
damage you may cause
to the argument

[not easily dislodged]

particular knowledge is not always ethical to obtain. This is often the case regarding torture. On the other hand, the production of generalized knowledge (science) is normally viewed as ethical. But, as I have shown, generalized knowledge often has no place in the public sphere, at least to the extent that we believe civil liberties to be fundamental and inviolable. So, the dilemma becomes: (1) it is typically ethical to use particular knowledge, but not necessarily to obtain it; and (2) it is not always ethical to use generalized knowledge, but it is generally ethical to produce it. An understanding of this dilemma and of the distinctions outlined in this essay (between the use and acquisition of knowledge and between particular and generalized knowledge) will help activists generate a better position to argue against the state's unlimited use of torture and profiling. However, the actual positions of these activists must, again, be excluded.

¹
Sewer Society

The bathroom means more than just a porcelain bowl.

09/02/2005

The bathroom, and particularly the bathroom outside a commercial setting, is a shelter for the metaphorical shit of our culture and our lives. It is one of the few places that remain unmonitored, largely because, in principal, it is difficult to supervise the activities that occur inside.

But we all have an idea about what goes on in bathrooms because we all use them. There are, of course, cases where forms of monitoring do occur in the bathroom - police officers often patrol public bathrooms in cities and service attendants watch over the facilities, towel in hand, in fancier restrooms. But, by and large, the bathroom is a wilderness from the eyes of society.

The public restroom is a vacuum from security: a holy place. After all, God knows what happens there; perhaps no one else does. We all know that the bathroom is not monitored; everyone knows that no camera exists within those bowels. So everyone knows that anything is possible in the bathroom, even sex and drugs. But, alas, it is true that not much rock'n'roll comes out of the bathroom.

And, of course, bathroom sex and drugs are the metaphorical excrement of society. They have no value. And society gives the people that have bathroom sex and do bathroom drugs the tools that allow them not to be seen. Society gives the underbelly of society its lack of knowledge in the form of the bathroom. It turns its proverbial head and gives bathroom sex its tacit consent. Yet, as more and more public bathrooms are shut down or more closely monitored, this fact slowly

erodes.

Everyone knows that society has given over the bathroom as a resource, much as everyone knows where the pipes in bathrooms lead: sewers. The bathroom thus becomes a synecdoche for moral and physical sewers. But, of course, the synecdoche hides in much the same way that the sewer is hidden. Presence is not what the bathroom is about.

In truth, the bathroom is about the indirection seen in the curve of the pipes that lead to the sewer. It is about implication. And this is, of course, another important epistemological point. In this way, the interpretation of the bathroom as an unmonitored oasis is based upon a lack of knowledge on the part of the reader of that bathroom. This is the darkness of the restroom, or the flickering light, that makes you squint in order to see.

But there is another side in the equation of knowledge in the bathroom: the light in the writing on the wall, the idea - etymologically, 'idea' derives from a Greek word that meant light. The old writing on the wall metaphor calls to mind falling civilizations and prophets. The perfect example of this is of a prophet that writes on the white stone walls of the city about that city's demise soon before it is demolished.

Of course, nobody believes the prophet in that famous example. Or alternately, everyone believes the prophet's words, but the prophet does not. In either of these scenarios, the camera should fade out on the image of the prophet's words crumbling into pebbles.

Of course, this is not what we find in the bathroom, but these two scenarios are almost mirror metaphors for each other. The writing on the bathroom wall is the unknown society - unknown because it is unmonitored - resurrecting itself from the monitored city that has already fallen.

But the difference is that the society of the bathroom erects itself as the Victorians erected ruins, that is, as a society that has already fallen. This society advertises oral sex ("For Good Head Call 869-9200"), writes quippy notes to each other ("Here I sit/Broken hearted/Tried to shit/And merely farted") or merely writes their names on the walls ("CJ was here/September 28"). The writing on the walls exemplifies the knowledge that this underground society exists.

And so, we have the two nodes of knowledge present in the bathroom: the lack of knowledge that the monitoring society has over activities that occur there, and the knowledge of this fact that users of the bathroom possess. The notes written by the users of the bathroom, who are members of the underbelly bathroom society, are the only communications between those two nodes.