

RAMBLINGS INSANE RAMBLINGS

PARODY OF THE DIALECTIC IN CONTEMPORARY CULTURE 2016-04-03_2020-01-24 DRAFT 0.1.6

Insane Ramblings is a collection of essays and notes on various topics; it used to be titled Brostoyevsky. This is also considered a showcase on technology, society, government, and comedy. Because of the amalgatory nature of these works, each sector of the document deals with radically different topics and is written in different manners. Most of this was written before I turned eighteen and reads awkwardly and with poor intent. I by no means believe the majority of what remains in this work.

Insane Ramblings is not the anodyne; this is a general shove-off to all those who hold offensives as part of their being, as truly those are the people who perpetuate *actually being offended* as if it were fashionable and weigh down society with their vociferous paroxysms of indignation and castigatory polemic.

| | | | | | |
|------------------|---|----------------------------|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <u>Section 1</u> | Genetics Common Cores | AWSC Ad Hom, Ad Naus | PCBoaSJW Diogenesis Fallacy | Aesthetics & IPs | Left Behind |
| <u>Section 2</u> | Maximes | Dialectic 1 | Dialectic 2 | Dialecticians | |
| <u>Section 3</u> | Commentary Culture Un-Turing Test | Alien Time Date | Political Influence Hitman Paradox | Shoe Religion | Anodyne Problems |
| <u>Section 4</u> | Adventure 1 | Adventure 2 | Adventure 3 | Adventure 4 | Adventure 5 |
| <u>Section 5</u> | Credits | | | | |

SECTOR 1

- SOCIAL CONSTRUCT FALLACIES -

:: On Intelligence Tied to Genetics & Its Gendered and Racial Implications ::

P1: The average genetic dissimilarity between humans and chimps is ~1.5%-2.2% (males to males and females to females).^{1 2}

P2: The average genetic dissimilarity between human males and human females is ~2.4% ($1/42=0.0238$), but of the 20,000-ish genes on the human germline (genes only comprise ~3% of our 600,000 base pairs)³ only 231 genes are unique between the sexes (from the Y chromosome)⁴, and taking that into consideration as a very charitable reduction of our differences, there is only a ~1.2% genetic difference between human males and females ($231/20,000=0.0115$).

P3: This means the high-ball estimate is that there is more genetic variance between human males and females than human males to male chimps and human females to female chimps (2.4% HM:HF versus 1.5% HM:MC or HF:FC), and a low-ball estimate that there is substantial variance between human males and females akin to the variance of humans to chimps (1.2% HM:HF versus 2.2% HM:MC or HF:FC).

∴ Even with extremely charitable estimates, there is at least half as much genetic deviance between human males and females as there is between humans and chimps (as 1.2 is more than half of 2.2).

Granting that the percentage difference (1.2%) is not entirely focused on cognitive development, it is still the case that to think the cognitive development endowed in that 2.2% genetic deviance of humans and chimps cannot in principle seep into the 1.2% genetic deviance of human males and human females is folly if we are to understand that genes involved in cognitive development are given in both deviances.⁵ This means there are cognitive aspects of gender that are objective, and not socialized.

I want to shift from this brief setup of gendered differences in genetics to the racial divide in genetics and the cognitive deficits/proficiencies genetics merits, as you will see acknowledging this divide is actually a good thing for everyone involved.

While the differences between human races is small genetically, there is still a difference, and that difference explains and predicts psychometric test scores accurately. This does not mean different treatment of people should follow, it means that genetics effects cognitive development and therefore a race realist approach is not inherently racist, just scientific. Acknowledging race realism as being legitimate can then lead to egalitarian treatment that would otherwise have not been possible, namely in the practice of editing the human germline to allow for genetic modification in a population that brings everyone up to the same cognitive starting point, as they would otherwise have certain cognitive capacities limited on average when compared to any other racial groups. Despite the common view in academia that race is wholly divorced from genetics, race can be completely accounted for genetically with what is called Lewontin's Fallacy and genetics does indeed affect cognitive development, therefore

¹ <https://skeptics.stackexchange.com/questions/10579/is-there-more-genetic-difference-between-men-and-women-than-men-and-monkeys>

² <http://www.amnh.org/exhibitions/permanent-exhibitions/human-origins-and-cultural-halls/anne-and-bernard-spitzer-hall-of-human-origins/understanding-our-past/dna-comparing-humans-and-chimps>

³ http://web.ornl.gov/sci/techresources/Human_Genome/project/info.shtml#basics

⁴ <https://skeptics.stackexchange.com/questions/10579/is-there-more-genetic-difference-between-men-and-women-than-men-and-monkeys>

⁵ <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2854822/>

race realism is a valid understanding of human existence, an understanding that can lead to a better human condition by acknowledging the differences in cognition as derived by racial factors.

To start, a distinction between race realism and racism should be made, which is that race realism, as the acknowledgement of race as a physical instantiate and not a social construction, is not itself a racist thing. Racism necessitates unfair treatment based on racial preferences.⁶ Acknowledging race tied to genetics and showcasing that certain genes are better or worse for certain things is not itself a racist thing, even if we show objectively that certain genes are 'superior' or 'inferior' to each other, as these are merely factual statements and do not allow for open questions regarding the treatment of persons (or other questions regarding ethics). Nota bene, that whatever talents an individual has, cognitive or otherwise, is not an indication of that person's rights, as rights are extended to all persons by default. So an understanding of race tied to genetics is not racist, and an understanding of race tied to the cognitive differences those genetics bestow is also not racist. This is all merely a scientific approach to race, indifferent to emotive values.

Getting into it now, on the history of genetics tied to race, Francis Galton was one of the primary scientists to probe into race in 1883 and received much opprobrium for his ideas regarding eugenics since it spawned an incredibly racist regime in Germany shortly after. We must not allow ourselves to fall into the mindset that because eugenics was used improperly in the past that it is never to be properly used at all.

Since then people like Philippe Rushton have become known for their further research into general phenotypical differences between races regarding temperament and intelligence. Rushton even found a general difference in both brain size and average number of cortical neurons between the races that accurately predicts differences in psychometric test scores (like IQ), where blacks are lowest, whites are in the middle, and Asians are the highest scoring.⁷ His studies showed other things regarding emotive values and developmental times of the human musculature and skeletal systems, hormone levels, life-span, etcetera, but the cognitive link here is what I want to focus on. Rushton has been somewhat dismissed in contemporary literature as racist, but there is good contemporary literature that supports the notion of race tied to intelligence that people like Galton and Rushton have supplied the framework for. I think the move from calling it 'race-science' to outright 'racism' is dubious, even if the science leads to legitimate racism, because the scientific study of the matter is in itself valuable, unless you don't believe race is tied to biology at all, in which case we should remind ourselves that denying hard science is usually a futile task.

This is where A.W.F. Edwards comes in, who is famous for *Lewontin's Fallacy* which showcases that while the genetic variation between races is very small (of the 0.1% of DNA that varies between individuals, 85% is from within a population and 15% is from differences between populations, meaning races), that it is actually well accounted for if you use a larger correlation structure instead of looking at individual nodes of data.⁸ Richard Lewontin, whom Edwards is critiquing, argued that after he looked at his individual points of data, that this 85% variation inside a group greatly outweighed the notion that racial classification predicated on genetics was justified as such. However, Edwards showed that 100% of people can have their races identified by their genetics, which means racial classifications of humans by genetics rather than social construct is a valid frame to work out of here.

This becomes more interesting during the next fifty years since the paper by Edwards was written, as genetic research has advanced quite a bit and SNPs (single nucleotide polymorphism) have become more mainstream. In *A Review of Intelligence GWAS Hit: Their Relationship to Country IQ and the Issue of Spatial Autocorrelation* by Davide Piffer, it is demonstrated incredibly clearly that several specific genes (more prominently several specific SNPs) are shown to directly influence IQ, correlated with national IQ at 91% accuracy.⁹ The average relevant SNP frequency by race was 36% for blacks, 53%

⁶ Blum, Lawrence. *I'm Not a Racist, But...* (Cornell Univ. Press, 2002) page 8.

⁷ Rushton, J. Philippe. *Ethnic Differences in Temperament. Personality and Person Perception Across Cultures*, pages 45-63, 1999.

⁸ Edwards, A.W.F. *Human Genetic Diversity: Lewontin's Fallacy*. *BioEssays*, Volume 25, Issue 8, pages 798–801, August 2003.

⁹ Piffer, Davide. *A Review of Intelligence GWAS Hits: Their Relationship to Country IQ and the Issue of Spatial Autocorrelation*. *Intelligence* 53 (2015): 43-50. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2015.08.008.

for whites, and 60% for Asians, meaning it directly mirrored the racial IQ hierarchy. The paper goes over seven main other papers researching SNPs, but the general consensus regarding all SNPs related to psychometric tests is that these specific nucleotides accurately predict differences in IQ across all races. There are very few SNPs currently known to effect cognitive development, but it is estimated that there are around 10,000 alleles overall where this would apply,¹⁰ meaning that one of the research papers Piffer reviewed, by Cornelius A. Reitvald *et al* demonstrating about 0.3 IQ points of difference per SNP,¹¹ could be extended 10,000 times over to account for a 3,000 point difference in IQ, if IQ even scaled that high. Returning to Piffer's paper, I'd like to be clear that on average IQ-related SNPs were found to be 17.4% more common with Whites than blacks, 23.7% more common with Asians than with blacks, and 6.2% more common with Asians than they were with whites, which again, accurately accounts for and predicts racial IQ differences as well as most other psychometric test differences. This strongly suggests that there is a genetic divide not only for IQ test-taking, but for all spatial reasoning and higher cognition amongst the races of humans.

Another interesting thing to note of Piffer's research is that he looked at natural selection as the cause of this difference in IQ-related SNP association, where IQ-related SNPs were found most in Asians, then whites, and then blacks. The reasoning here is that random genetic drift would generate a given amount of genetic variance between populations and a given gene specifically favored qua natural selection would generate a variation greater than average, so when Piffer amalgamated the data, he found the height-related SNP frequencies across races had an average standard deviation of 0.06, which is significantly higher than the average standard deviation of 0.046 he found from random sets of SNPs, confirming that natural selection of height genes was genuine and not due to random drift. He further found that the IQ-related SNPs had an average standard deviation of 0.088, which is significantly higher still.¹² So these IQ-related genetics are naturally selected and favored moreso than traits like height are favored in a given population. This is important to note because it means humans have been naturally practicing eugenics to enhance intelligence for a very long time already.

The fact that the differences in IQ can be accurately predicted by genetics (and the races tied to those genetics) is of great value here and shouldn't be looked away from simply because many would think it leads to mistreatment of races or outright hatred of races due to cognitive tier-ing associated with said races. We can use this information to bring about egalitarian policies that would in principle not be possible without accepting race realism in this form. For example, if we as a society said that race was socially constructed, and genetics had nothing to do with it, and the cognitive differences of races were environmentally determined and not genetically determined, then editing the human germline (making direct edits to our genetics) could be limited to the wealthy elite (who are primarily white) and they would become disproportionately superior cognitively (because they alone would have access to augmenting the IQ-related SNPs and therefore have direct access to shaping their intelligence profoundly and at will), to the point where 'natural' or 'unmodified' humans could never compete. This means that in order to stop an elite few from having access to this technology, we would have to as a society admit that race and cognitive ability are determined by genetics in order to secure the choice of germline editing for all humans, to create an equal playing field in terms of cognitive development.

I imagine this will not sit well with people who don't believe in the science or in transhumanist doctrines, but this is not some fantasy, this is a very probable world we will be living inside of come a few decades. I obviously have a bias for transhumanism and the futurists that speculate on biotechnology, but I have yet to hear of one that argues humans will not have this technology in the near future (especially since we already have things like CRISPR and the Cas system for genetic editing), so it seems pertinent to discuss the problems before they happen as a means to avoid them.

¹⁰ Hsu, S.D.H. On the genetic architecture of intelligence and other quantitative traits. Preprint arXiv:1408.3421 (2014).

¹¹ Rietveld, C. A., et al. Common Genetic Variants Associated with Cognitive Performance Identified Using the Proxy-phenotype Method. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111, no. 38 (2014): 13790-3794. doi:10.1073/pnas.1404623111.

¹² Piffer, Davide. A Review of Intelligence GWAS Hits: Their Relationship to Country IQ and the Issue of Spatial Autocorrelation. *Intelligence* 53 (2015): 43-50. doi:10.1016/j.intell.2015.08.008.

There are other outcomes that we should consider as well, like the potential ethical imperative of erasing race altogether, which would occur from identifying all relevant racial genes tied to cognition and turning them all on (or off) to eliminate the racial divide in cognition. We would also consider turning on/off all genes related to internal organ development that differentiates races. This would mean that there simply would not be any racial distinction between humans besides, potentially, skin color and height or facial features, and that race would be purely an aesthetic choice rather than something associated with some abstract identity.

The reason I say that there may be ethical imperative to do this is because the elimination of race through passive means has already been proposed by many via interbreeding, but could be done virtually overnight by simply eliminating the distinction between race-specific genes, qua germline editing, which would also have the benefit of solving all racism ever because there would be no basis for unfair treatment of races, as 'races' would stop being a meaningful concept. If racism is wrong, evil, bad, of negative ethical import, why then would anyone believe it to be anything but good to eliminate the root cause of it? Race is the ultimate or *first cause* of racism, as without race there cannot be racism, and so it directly follows that enacting a eugenics plan like this would solve the problem. The only irony being that eugenics is what previously spawned all kinds of racism in society.

With respects to traditional eugenics, consider that the heritability of cognitive ability is very plausible, as Robert Plomin argued that, "The case for substantial genetic influence on *g* is stronger than for any other human characteristic."¹³ *G* is in reference to 'g-factor', which is a general measure of cognitive ability along an average line between two psychometric axis's. *G*-factor is what gets you the single number score of an IQ test that measures multiple forms of cognition, for example spatial reasoning as well as verbal reasoning. Plomin is saying here that because of how many genes are tied to brain development, and because it is this brain development that sets us aside from other animals, that genetic influence on *g* is genetic influence on our most human trait. From the rest of the framework set up in this paper, we know cognitive development is most definitely tied to genetics, which means *g*-factor, or overall intelligence, is heritable. This means alterations to the human germline would have permanent effects on human progeny with regards to cognition. This also means we can accurately explain why races have the IQ-hierarchy that they do, because intelligence was favored more strongly in some societies than in others, and over time the stronger average breeding of this trait resulted in a race of humans with a greater average intelligence.

To conclude, while older forms of racial science were crude and did in fact lead to justification for all kinds of racism, newer science under stricter framework has led to a better understanding of the objective nature of race as it is tied to genetics, and further that this understanding does not make worse the distinctions between races, but simply makes accurate the distinctions. Having a genetic understanding of race also explains differences in cognitive abilities and therefore academic test scores, an understanding of which will help alleviate racial tensions rather than deepen them. Finally, I'd like to reiterate the distinction between race realism and racism I drew at the beginning and showcase that race realism here, paired with overt notions of superiority/inferiority and eugenics, is actually being used to combat racism. It is only through the acknowledgement of race realism and racial superiority/inferiority, with utilization of eugenics, that we can completely remove the unfair treatment of races in our society by completely removing race itself.

:: Sex/Gender/Sexuality, Race/Ethnicity/Nationality, and Culture, All Without Social Construction ::

The following is not a list of how we should define these terms, but rather a list that accurately explains and predicts the usage of the terms in relation to their contemporary instantiation, meaning these definitions already map to our current usage of the words, a claim which will be given justification later.

Sex: the classifications of genotypical expressions of sex chromosomes.

Gender: the classifications of phenotypical expressions of sex chromosomes.

¹³ Plomin, R. IQ and Human Intelligence. The American Journal of Human Genetics 65, 1476-1477 (1999).

Sexuality: the classifications of biologically induced reproductive attractions.

Race: the classifications of species-defining genetics, phenotypically, which is also called sub-species.

Ethnicity: the classifications of lineages tied to geographic ontology, genotypically.

Nationality: the classifications of state-defined allegiances tied to geographic ontology.

Culture: the summation of facts on local environment and interpersonal content production.

As to an objection that these definitions, while tied to objective reality and derived from scientific understandings of human nature, are themselves socially constructed, either qua science being a social construct or qua language being a social construct, it seems clear that we risk taking this objection seriously no further than we risk completely relinquishing our capacity to reason, as it is obvious that these definitions are semantic descriptors of things that are the case, external to and independent of our perceptions of those things that are the case, meaning they are not of subjective value, but rather objective value, and thus are not socially contrived. My apologies for that being a single sentence.

<https://edge.org/response-detail/10670>

Lewontin's Fallacy:

<http://www.humanbiologicaldiversity.com/articles/Edwards%2c%20A.W.F.%20%22Human%20genetic%20diversity-%20Lewontin's%20fallacy.%22%20BioEssays%2025%20%282003%29.pdf>

* * *

:: The Politically Correct Birth of an SJW ::

***whitetail-music:** Is a vagina 'feminine'? Why are there so many gay men who won't date a 'woman' just because she has a vagina- like THAT IS DISCRIMINATION people and it is totally shallow.*

***taco-bell-rey:** We are so deep into social justice that being gay is now discrimination. I need a moment.¹⁴*

"Social Justice," by its semantic, is a nonsensical term as social constructs are not material instantiates and so cannot be people or have direct physical interaction with people, meaning they do not explicate ethical imperative or have ethical interaction, and therefore cannot be concerned with justice. But people treat social justice as if it's an ethical progression so we might as well waste our time on it anyways.

Jumpin' outa tha gym here, sex discrimination against males in American society and western societies in general is taken half as seriously as sex discrimination against females, not that any of it should be taken all that seriously to begin with as I discuss later that gender identity is inherently fallacious. This disproportionate regard for the genders can almost entirely be attributed to fourth-wave feminism winning outright in terms of rhetoric campaigns and sophist misinformation to put women before men under the guise of purported equality through misappropriated word-equivocations only Stalin's regime could parallel, like "egalitarianism" to "feminism" and "favored rights" to "social justice."¹⁵

Let me quell the qualms such assertions may have given rise to here. The large majority of fourth-wave feminists today bear their weight in "social justice" campaigns (and yes that was a joke about the size of most forth-wavers) where they warrior their rhetoric of professional victimhood into the mask you all know and love that is the gender inequality touting of the social sphere in modernity, despite that men actually receive more opprobrium in the social sphere than women do (as demonstrated by Pew¹⁶ and Demos¹⁷). Things like "wage gaps" and "sexual abuse," things that have to

¹⁴ <https://thoughtcatalog.files.wordpress.com/2014/12/7fch3ow.jpg>

¹⁵ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wwLK-_38W1o

¹⁶ http://www.pewinternet.org/files/Omnibus_July_2013_Anonymity_Crosstab.pdf

¹⁷ http://www.demos.co.uk/press_releases/demosmalecelebritiesreceivemoreabuseontwitterthanwomen

do with our long-developed and finessed economic and identity frameworks are oversimplified and post-structuralized down into, "Women are systematically oppressed because men baselessly think they're superior," which is indeed the blue pill you have to swallow if you side with them, as that is the definition of patriarchy in a governmental framework.¹⁸ It's been noted that, "We like to point out... any bit of perceived injustice or discrimination we can find – it's practically a new national past-time. We like playing victim, and we like talking about victims – so much so we sometimes find victims where none really existed."¹⁹ And this is indeed what's happening with forth-wave feminism, with their pushing of patriarchy.

Despite popular belief, Occam's Razor is not merely the approach of taking the simplest explanation superficially; the explanation has to be an accurate representation of reality in order for the razor to be properly instantiated. "Men are evil" becomes the "God of the gaps" to the forth-wave war campaigns that the social justice warriors champion as their all-encompassing 24-hour rhetoric drive-throughs, where you can order, day or night, large bags of misinformationist over-played and ill-conceived victimhood. Many of these drive-through franchises are started by the fifth estate (the ever-so-noble establishments of online journalism) and shout-box blogging platforms (read: Tumblr²⁰).

I'm talking a lot but not really saying anything here, so let's address the main argument by the forth-wavers that have created this social culture of man-shaming and pedestal-raising of women that give the proper context to the writing at hand. We should start with a Socratic argument (yes indeed, a framework invented by a man, who would have guessed?) by asking if the man is paid more for the same job because the woman says he is or if the man is paid more for the job itself. The joke here is surely apparent as the first go-to argument from feminists be that men are paid more than women on average (and as a side note, you should read *Euthyphro*). This is a bit of a misdirection as while yes, it's true that on average men *earn* more, it doesn't then follow that the reason they have higher average earnings is because of systematic discrimination against the same thing the feminists argue men are ultimately drawn to- women. In fact, solely by the way I've just set it up, one could argue that forth-wave feminist framework self-defeats in that regard, as surely men would want to incentivize more women to work with them because men are nothing but coitus-seeking automatons; but we'll ignore that err for the sake of discussion.

The nature of the wage gap argument is filleted in its assumption that women are interested in the same types of jobs as men on average, that they get the same degrees in the same fields in higher-education on average (by choice, not institutional discrimination), and that they have the same social interests and standards-of-comfort as men on average. What a shame these sophists carry on their shoulders by not realizing that none of those assumptions be true, and by not realizing that the "wage gap" is not existent as baseless gender discrimination but rather confirmed (by multiple studies and analyses here²¹, here²², here²³, here²⁴, and here²⁵) as being the existent social difference of insertion into job fields and non-willingness to succeed at risk of losing job security and overall stability in their lives. But surely, as the feminists would argue, it's men favoring fellow men over women in the workplace and nothing else, as it's clearly not possible that any other factors would ever influence someone's decision to hire or promote a subordinate for superior work (before validating Poe's Law, note this is sarcasm).

This notion that failing is only a consequence of some mass-conspiracy against women and not the fault of the one committing the failure is what backdrops the feminist sophistry and gives rise to the professional victimhood they have set themselves to, where they need not work as hard for the pay given to the harder workers. Such a ruse is masked by the Orwellian styled word equivocation of "Social Justice."²⁶ Many feminists have gone so far as to taking anything they are not explicitly existent as, as

¹⁸ https://books.google.com/books?id=Dz4wU64f_JYC&pg=PA441#v=onepage&q&f=false

¹⁹ <http://blogs.artvoice.com/techvoice/2015/09/17/reverse-engineering-ahmed-mohameds-clock-and-ourselves/>

²⁰ <http://problematicparrot.tumblr.com/image/115878336490>

²¹ <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052702303532704579483752909957472>

²² http://www.huffingtonpost.com/christina-hoff-sommers/wage-gap_b_2073804.html

²³ <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/the-gender-pay-gap-is-a-complete-myth/>

²⁴ <http://time.com/3222543/5-feminist-myths-that-will-not-die/>

²⁵ http://msgboard.snopes.com/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi?ubb=get_topic;f=89;t=000227;p=2

²⁶ <http://thoughtcatalog.com/joshua-goldberg/2014/12/when-social-justice-warriors-attack-one-tumblr-users-experience/>

something to pit themselves against. Refer back to the quoted text at the beginning of this section if you think this is not a common occurrence.

In the next paragraph we'll take a look at the writing at hand and see if the modern feminist rhetoric has so strongly penetrated the superstructures of society that any sort of accusations that there is any systematic gender discrimination against men is met with total & absolute dissent & denial, respectively, of said accusation, or if I'm truly making unsubstantiated claims here. But until then, what does that say about our society, that we have to pretend one gender is better than the other (suspend any cis-binary accusations here), that we have to hold one gender above the other at all costs, that if a man goes on a talk show and says women are smart that he gets a round of applause but if he says women are stupid he loses his job²⁷, that women do around 60% less prison time than men for the same crimes under the same circumstances²⁸, that women get child custody over men at chart-crushing rates²⁹, that women have almost exclusive reproductive rights over men because the abortion doctors don't also require the father's signature, that when two consenting adults decide to no longer spend time together one of the adults still has to give a large portion of his paycheck to the other adult for reasons defined solely as 'comfort'? What does this say about our society? Well if we believe anything forth-wave feminists say, this says our society has reached 'equality' and that there's clearly no sex discrimination against men that may or may not have been started by their first and second-wave precursors. So now that we have the proper framework, let's finally get to the piece of writing this section was meant to address.

Ruggiero sets up a comically fallacious debate³⁰ between two persons of opposite genders where the one with mammaries says that a lawyer issuing a court challenge to the practice of charging women half price for drinks during "Ladies' Night" at bars, as being a form of sex discrimination against men, *must* be a joke. She follows this with a straw man, red herring, and ad hominem, saying that it's okay because it supports capitalist business practices, that there are other problems at bars that aren't being addressed by the lawyer, that women's issues are worse anyways, and that the other person in the debate is a 'phony'. Did I call total dissent and absolute denial or what? Did I call the dismissal that discrimination against men be a serious matter when women are involved? Did I not accurately predict the entirety of the framework Ms. Mammaries assumed in the debate? Admittedly the nut and bolt barer pulled an ad hominem at the end too, and it's not okay he does this because Tu Quoque and all that (unless you realize that ad hominem is valid when the argument is about the person's character, which is indeed what the argument became about), but still, being able to formulaically predict the feminist sophistry this accurately is a skill only developed out of a long history of watching professional victims pretending that women are the only gender that have been discriminated against and that men are the only group responsible for gender discrimination (even against themselves, apparently).

The moral of the story kids is that the patriarchy enslaves us all in the end. You could replace "the patriarchy" with a spin-wheel of SJW toutages like "big pharma" & "privilage" and you'd maintain equally ridiculous rhetoric of conspiracy theory proportions. But it's all relative, right contrarians? Bernard Ingham made a good point when he said, "Cock-up before conspiracy," and it'd do us all a favor to realize these conspiracy theories of institutional or social oppression would be faults, not plans, even if they really existed.

Feminists want a strong female who runs shit that still maintains femininity, meaning they want an anime world. Yes, the Japanese shoujo-shonen mix of cute girly children who kill people and run society, this is the insanity feminists desire illustrated in shows like World Conquest Zvezda.

:: On Aesthetics & Intellectual Properties ::

²⁷ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x64cy3Bcr98>

²⁸ http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/09/11/men-women-prison-sentence-length-gender-gap_n_1874742.html?

²⁹ <http://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/p60-240.pdf>

³⁰ Ruggiero, Vincent Ryan. *Beyond Feelings: A Guide to Critical Thinking*. 9th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2012. 70.

Wagner is an incredibly important figure in the aesthetics scene; he's not just famous because people subjectively ascribed enjoyment to his work, but rather because he pioneered a style that was yet to be seen within operatic works and within the time period in which they were issued, a style which is now used to define the period itself. Because of this, a ripple-effect of his works have flown into modernity, illustrated through our cinema as the "Wagner thematic sound format," where individual characters have their own theme songs and individual mood-sets have their own music within a scene. On top of being considered one of the greatest musicians ever, he could be equated to the opposite of a Semi-truck; that's right, Wagner was an *anti-semi*, more formally called an anti-Semite.

One of the main orchestras in Israel didn't want to play any of Wagner's music for a while, not just for being Hitler's favorite musician, but for Wagner's writing of *Jewishness in Music*.³¹ They currently seem to have gotten past that, but it remains the case that his work was censored for a good deal of time in certain parts of the world. Does an artist's personal life really interfere with the art they produce? Censorship of art, and not just specific pieces of art but entire mediums, has been done a book-burning number of times throughout history either for the content of the art or for the content of the art producer's character, but both reasons are of delusional natures and I'll explain why.

George Carlin, one of the greatest stand-up comedians ever, famously pointed out in 1972 that there are *Seven Words You Can Never Say on Television*.³² Of the seven he mentioned at the time, five are still censored on all major television networks and radio stations. Carlin received some negative press for this and his monologue on the subject was completely censored for a short while, but a radio broadcast featuring the seven words eventually led to a Supreme Court decision that set a precedent to the limit of the federal government on speech censorship over broadcasts. The example that Carlin set demonstrates what we will see unfold later in this section- that it is only through censorship that censorship is beaten. But how do we go about this without understanding how to define an artist, or art, or even censorship itself?

An artist is someone who produces intellectual properties through a craft under any medium, and evidence for this will be given as we go along. The artist is certainly the one who most directly informs the content of his art, and as such, that which informs the content of the artist's character indirectly informs the content of the artist's art. This does not mean, however, that anything outside the artist's direct interaction with his medium is to take credit for the art, as it is agreeable that it is not the brush maker that created *The Mulberry Tree*.³³ This is to say that we give credit where credit is due, that enacting labor gives you right to ownership over property³⁴, and that the brush maker is surely credited with making brushes but Van Gogh is the one credited with the tree the brushes facilitated.

There is no direct implication of personal life into art then, as personal life external to the artist's craft only indirectly informs his art (the relationship with the brush maker does not mean the brush maker made Van Gogh's art). So we've established now that Wagner is certainly the one who made Wagner's works, and his works are pieces of art that stand alone and separate from his personal life, but then is not *Jewishness in Music*, or rather *Das Judenthum in der Musik*, one of Wagner's works? An opinion is just an opinion, but a written piece about your opinion becomes a piece of art, does it not?

Keep in mind that when speaking philosophically on this subject, that aesthetics is not truly a field of philosophy, as there is no Truth to be discovered from art beyond an intent to convey an emotion. Because of this understanding we know that art, under any framework vassaled as 'medium' to craft, is not to be taken wholly seriously. Why then enact the physical labor to censor art and claim "rights to censor" as if enacting the physical labor is the only thing needed to legitimize your right? We can attribute ownage-ness itself, as the right to physical property, to things of a material nature, as things of material nature are produced only by enacting the physical labor for them. Under this framework we know material goods and the services that produce material goods lay solely in the domain of those who physically produce them; their right is secure through this enactment of physical labor. What then of immaterial things that are produced through other means?

³¹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Das_Judenthum_in_der_Musik

³² http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seven_dirty_words

³³ http://www.nortonsimon.org/collections/browse_title.php?id=M.1976.09.P

³⁴ <http://www.iep.utm.edu/property/>

Art is not completely a thing of a material nature, otherwise the experience of music would just be notes on paper. If the physical enactment of labor was all that was needed for ownership of art, then banging on the drum would make the sound produced the property of the one banging, rather than the one who designed the percussive rhythm. Art is not just the banging of a drum, it is the concept of the mood behind the one banging, it is what the banging is supposed by the artist, and others perceiving it, to mean. As such, right to ownership for art is not done through enactment of physical labor, but through the enactment of intellectual labor, where a new concept is reached that was not previously held by the one that produced it. This process is where we get intellectual properties (a.k.a. individual pieces of art) from.

Art can be described to be transcendent for this reason, but most falsely equivocate transcendence of *material to conceptual* into transcendence of *physical to spiritual*. Let me quell the qualms given rise to here as I'm shooting down what the existentialists wail as their proof of qualia. To reiterate, since art is not a systematic approach to understanding the fundamental nature of reality, and it does not give way to the true nature of existence itself, it does not concern itself very directly, or at all, with formal philosophical matters.

This is important to note, because any feelings of a 'spiritual' nature that art gives to one person but not the other goes to show it is subjective what those feelings are (until we have standardized feeling sets but that's a different conversation), meaning no objectivity through feeling is obtained; no universal Truth is provided by the art. With this we can succinctly lay the aesthetics to rest when regarding aesthetics as its own field of philosophical inquiry. Although, this does not mean that there is no deeper philosophical issue at play here. The question still is of censorship, specifically of art culture. Based on what's just been presented, with the small decimation of art's meaning, and therefore the decimation of its intrinsic importance, what can we say needs to be censored? Under the framework presented, art is just not important enough to require censorship. There is no ethical imperative.

The fundamental difference between art and material products is revealed, as just shown, by how you go about claiming right to ownership. Many chefs produce meat on a plate, but that does not mean you are paying solely for the slaughter of an animal, you are paying for the production itself, for the presentation of what was produced, for that transcendent property of the item that makes it an intended experience. You are paying for the qualia of the meal (or album, book, video game, etcetera). On this alone it would not make sense to limit through censorship the art culture you are allowed to ingest, as it means you are limiting transcendence itself which is indiscriminate to the medium it occurs, as again, any framework of art is vassaled as 'medium' to craft, and the craft itself can be part of the experience. This means that if you are to censor any piece of art, it would be the same, and just as blistering to the host, as cutting off the entire medium the piece was produced under.

So in and of the thing itself it is nonsensical to censor individual pieces of art if you are not willing to censor the entire medium. When you pair that with the understanding that art doesn't actually hold any answers of philosophical Truth, and that because of the lack of proper meaning it just isn't that serious, you do yourself disservice twice when committing censorship of art. So why waste the effort? As stated earlier, enacting physical labor is what gives you right to ownership, this is a given for material properties, but not intellectual properties. Censorship does not produce a material product or service, so enacting physical labor does not bestow "rights to censor," in fact, under closer inspection, censorship falls under the same framework of transcendence as outlined above. Censorship itself could then be said to be a bit of an art, or at least I think, because two negatives do in fact make a positive, but maybe I'm getting ahead of myself here.

Censorship has a transcendent property experienced by the perceiver of its motions, just like the transcendent property experienced by the perceiver of Wagner's conceptions or Carlin's rantings. But what is the product produced by censorship? What transcendent qualia of good or service is produced by the censoring of art? Surely it is the censoring itself that is the product, and this is possible due to what was stated not long ago about the craft itself possessing the capacity to be an art. What's produced by censorship is the lack of production of another form of art. This means censorship is an intellectual property service, making censorship a form of art. But since it is the thing itself that is the product, since it is censorship itself that is the art, then censoring itself would be the inverse of the product; what I mean by this is that censoring censorship would be the most artful thing yet. In this sense two negatives do make a positive. Only when there is no censorship of any other art form will we

have the most transcendence because only then will transcendent things be most produced. It is also in that state of non-censorship where censorship itself is the most censored, making the art of censorship reach total fruition by virtue its own nature.

Or I could be totally wrong about all of this because qualia is an illusion to begin with. Who knows, the point is that in either case it's ridiculous to censor art culture based on the content of a piece of art or on the content of an artist's character. If the concern is however not censorship of the art produced or censorship of art produced based on an artist's character, but censorship of the character of the artist himself, then censoring character becomes a valid course of action, as everyone is **not** entitled to their opinions.

As we've just discussed, right to ownership of intellectual properties requires intellectual labor to be enacted, and when no intellectual labor is enacted to form a new concept or opinion not previously held, you do not have the rights to it as it is all borrowed concepts and opinions that others have enacted the intellectual labors over. For this reason, you are not entitled to all the opinions you regurgitate, as physically speaking words does not mean you are saying anything of substance (recall banging on drums not being adequate for owning the piece of music produced). The intellectual labor must be enacted on your own part, not by others, as to form a new concept you previously did not hold (synthetic *a priori* and *a posteriori* both submissible) in order for them to be *your* concepts (ergo, your opinions, your property). This is probably where the echoing rhetoric of, "Think for yourself," should be based from.

This can be demonstrated to be true in virtue of how you stop acts of disingenuous intellectual property ownership. When you want to stop false claims of rights to ownership for material properties you enact physical labor against the one claiming ownership. For example- building a vault in a house and securing fiat currency that belongs to you, to stop others from stealing it or claiming ownership. The same thing is done for intellectual properties by enacting intellectual labors. Censorship is the system of intellectual labor that is enacted to stop false claims of intellectual property ownership. How do you stop someone from falsely saying they created *Moonlight Sonata* without stopping them from saying they created it, right? Censorship is required for intellectual honesty in these kinds of scenarios.

So the long and the short of it is that art culture shouldn't be censored, certainly not solely based on the personal life of the artist, and that censorship itself is still a valid system and ought to be used to bring justice to false claims of intellectual property ownership. Both Wagner's and Carlin's art are absolved under this framework, as are all artists' arts, but that doesn't mean we must ignore the artist's persons outside of their art, only that we treat them as separate issues.

:: Left Behind: The Social Sphere Isn't Advancing as Quickly as Computational Technologies ::

Every 16 months-ish, computational power is supposed to double. cite

Really what we end up seeing is a 20%-30% increase in computational power. cite

Lots of shit has been written about people no longer understanding the technology they use. cite

In this sense the singularity has already occurred, as 95% of the populous can't keep up with basic devices, understanding-wise or computation-wise. cite

Society as an amalgamated intelligence and as a cultural progression only moves 1% on average per generation with each generation being 10 years. cite

That means a 50% increase per year for synthetic computational systems and a 0.1% increase per year for organic computational systems, making man outpaced by machine by a factor of 500 times.

They will catch up soon (cite) and continue to move past us.

If we want human society as an organic component of civilization to persist, we will need to start catching up to the rate of advancement as a means to understand what we're competing against.

I don't think we can attain 50% a year outright, but we can jump to 30% a generation through several drastic restructurings of the diasporas of knowledge and the way the public sphere operates.

This puts us at a 3% increase per year, 30 times greater than what we're currently at, and reduces the machine outpacing to a factor of 16.66 times.

How do we achieve this?

They say collective human knowledge doubles every ~11 months due to advancements in various academic fields. cite

This means we are solid on the understanding end of things, as currently we grow our collective knowledge database by 100% every year, the issue is in how this knowledge is disseminated.

The way people learn things (in bulk) currently is solely through schooling, the internet is not where the majority (or even a significant minority) of people learn things in-depth. cite

Schooling no longer has standards for civics, objective ethics, formal logic, critical thinking, or daily lifestyle (home economics), which are all things needed for 'intelligence' (philosophical understanding) paired with computational power. cite

There is also no standard for being code-literate or hardware-literate. cite

These should all be added back or newly introduced.

There is no standard of any sort for educational extension over biological development. cite

This means that the neurological developmental years of humans is not accounted for, stunting the effectiveness of our educational system.

From birth to three years of age, where 80% of cognitive development occurs (cite), toys and children's books should be readily available and interactive as we know this jumpstarts cognitive maturity. cite

The education system should extend, not from this budding point of mental development to half way through mental fruition at 17 years of age, but rather till the human brain is fully matured at 25 years of age. cite

A distinction between higher education and work education can be made at 21 years of age.

All academic works (or all books & information in general) should be freely available and easily accessed.

This will double the amount of knowledge the average person has (as well as strengthen culture and formal-understanding frameworks).

The bottom 30% of the population, as determined by objective tests of cognitive power, should not be allowed to procreate.

This does not mean they are not allowed partners or sexual interactions, they just aren't allowed to breed. They can still raise children, just not ones that are biologically tied to them.

This can be on an honor system incentivized by tax breaks or it can be forced through sterilization.

Every generation, after the first, on this program will see ~30% increases in average cognitive prowess.

This 3% per year increase in amalgamated cognition paired with doubling of amalgamated knowledge will give an intellectual boost across society that may allow for us to catch up enough for it to be socially accepted to start integrating cybernetic implants as cognitive enhancements. cite

This man-machine fusion will allow for both acceleration components to stack, so neither will surpass the other. cite

Artilect war and background reasons for cybernetic advancement - <http://agi-conf.org/2008/artilectwar.pdf>

:: Common Cores ::

*"Where harmony and love reign, no longer do we live in a society bent on its own destruction.
Children of every race, creed, and religion frolic through fields of golden dandelions."
- El-Producto³⁵*

America, with its representative republic and most fake-tits per capita, has found itself stretched between myriad division of ideological disgust, without want of Landian destruction for something greater, nor want of O'Rourkean global jest, made by many of the anodyne for sake of chicken tendies, has built itself a great defeat in the face of otherwise infinite opportunity to advance upwards. Instead of a pure democracy they have an electoral college and a separated group of individuals that rule over them (around 2% of 1% of 1% of their total population) that they throw into a room in hopes they will vote on laws and make decisions in favor of how the majority would vote and make them. This grates some of the core ideas of democracy, or even classical liberalism, as illustrated within *Federalist Number 10*. James Madison points out there's a clear indication that breaking and controlling factions be one of the premier functions of government, by stating hot out the gates:

Among the numerous advantages promised by a well constructed Union, none deserves to be more accurately developed than its tendency to break and control the violence of faction. The friend of popular governments never finds himself so much alarmed for their character and fate, as when he contemplates their propensity to this dangerous vice. He will not fail, therefore, to set a due value on any plan which, without violating the

³⁵ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OZptOs8Gu9k>

principles to which he is attached, provides a proper cure for it. The instability, injustice, and confusion introduced into the public councils, have, in truth, been the mortal diseases under which popular governments have everywhere perished; as they continue to be the favorite and fruitful topics from which the adversaries to liberty derive their most specious declamations.³⁶

This was not only addressed to the pre-existing government system of his time, but to any superstructure in which a minority of the populous held the majority of power. This would mean that the framers of our country would be opposed to the current party system we exercise in modern America. Of course, Charles and Mary Beard argue in *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* that Madison was mainly worried that the majority of non-wealthy Americans might rise up and use the vote to tax the rich and redistribute wealth, the "menace of a leveling democracy."³⁷ But if we exploded that saying, it would be fair to say that any superstructure in which a minority of the populous holds the majority of power is one in which an unfair balance of power and an unjust system exists, one where the violence of faction reigns.

Hume on a similar wavelength has said, "Nothing appears more surprising... than the easiness with which the many are governed by the few."³⁸ So what is this government of America that calls itself democracy? It surely isn't pure democracy, but rather a weak republic. We know a republic as being a representative system rather than a system in which people have direct say, as well as Cicero's warning that, "In a republic this rule ought to be observed: that the majority should not have the predominant power," for we know the majority of citizens are not the ones voting on our laws, but rather a select few of them. This is similar to what many other 'democracies' in the world look like, but this kind of system maintains a disproportionment of power. In order to deal with globalization, if we want to lift the imaginary lines in the ground that we use to divide ourselves with and pretend make us different peoples, if we want to be able to explore and expand into space and not fight over who owns the territory, if we want to lift up the 99.9998% of society that has little to no political power, and if we want to be able to gradually and peacefully transition society into a singular government standard, we will need a system of governance fundamentally different from what is currently instantiated in America and elsewhere.

But why would we want any of those things, right? It's not simply a matter of desiring a perceived progression for society by eliminating the described issues; a different kind of governance is necessary if a fundamental good can be done by making changes about the issues themselves. This means that there is something ethically wrong with the issues at hand, that a part of human nature needs to be addressed in order to show the proper way humans ought to act. Exposing such fundamental errors in society would demonstrate that the systems that produce the errors need to be reworked or removed entirely in order to fix the errors.

On what basis are we going to say things are ethical or unethical, what framework should we use if we are to say anything objective about ethics? One might say that a system of equality would be the way to go in terms of the human condition and governance, but would that actually be the case? Egalitarianism seems like a unicorned utopian framework, but much like the false equivocation of its semantic into 'progressive' ideals, the system itself doesn't actually hold weight in reality. What we are dealing with is as I quote:

Egalitarianism is a trend of thought in political philosophy. An egalitarian favors equality of some sort: People should get the same, or be treated the same, or be treated as equals, in some respect. An alternative view expands on this last-mentioned option: People should be treated as equals, should treat one another as equals, should relate as equals, or enjoy an equality of social status of some sort. Egalitarian doctrines tend to rest on a background idea that all human persons are equal in fundamental worth or moral status.³⁹

The major issue with egalitarianism under this framework is lexiconical, with the lexicality pivoting on 'equality'. Egalitarianism on paper views all humans as equals, but in practice we find this is hardly the case as any proper investigation of the situation quickly lends evidence showing that there are no two humans on the planet who are equal, let alone *all* humans. As the Roman poet Virgil once said, "None

³⁶ <http://www.constitution.org/fed/federa10.htm>

³⁷ Stone, James R., notes.

³⁸ <http://socserv2.socsci.mcmaster.ca/~econ/ugcm/3ll3/hume/firstpri.hme>

³⁹ <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/egalitarianism/>

but himself can be his parallel." A replacement of 'equal' with 'fair' and 'equality' with "systems of fairness" would provide a stronger basis for any ethical assertions made about governance with the frame we're working in here. That being said, a system of fairness would be greater than a system of equality. Fair opportunity, fair wealth distribution, fair public sphere access, etcetera. Such a system would lead to true meritocracy, instead of feigning it with "equal opportunity for all" whose erroneous nature stabs out from the inside when systems that take less qualified workers and force them to be hired over superior workers is the main mode of purveying 'equality'.

This is most notably demonstrated by affirmative action. Thomas Sowell makes several strong counter-arguments to affirmative action being a force for good, showing that taking the more qualified out of the industry they would otherwise be a part of leads to unemployment more than it does to the affect intended.⁴⁰ These massive government programs that conflagrate societal comfort are the result of egalitarian rhetoric. I mean after all, you wouldn't want to treat people unequally, right? And no matter how sarcastically that question is asked, the answer from the bourgeois is a fervent and resounding 'no'. The proposition of unequal treatment in an overt manner in any discussion is easily dismissed without conscious care or regard, and unjustly so. Despite this, the same class of people participates in disproportionately unequal treatment of others all the day long. I mean after all, capitalism is a system of equality, right? And no matter how hard I pretzel the argument, the bourgeois will continue to salt their mouths with it and then complain that it wasn't what they ordered. Such is the hypocrisy of a poorly educated society.

A more overt explanation of the framework so far would be that humans are surely not equal. This can be known by observing the different confidence in skill all humans maintain, among other things like physical build and culture. However, the skill requirement for useful contribution is the focus in governance and it'd be fair to posit intellect as the main differentiator between skill confidence in humans. I know few who deny humans are not on equal grounds when it comes to intellect delineated amongst them. The notion that they are on equal grounds is what we must repudiate if we want an ethical governance.

For further convincing, the best example of the egalitarian fallacy is given in the Harrison Bergeron story.⁴¹ To those unfamiliar, social enforcement of egalitarianism through the practice of 'leveling' (handicapping those who are better-off in any regard) is the situation instantiated by the government in the Bergeron story. This practice of leveling, putting weights on the legs of faster people, for example, is required if we want people to perform and function equally. This idea that society is only allowed to move as fast as their slowest person (figuratively as well as literally) is the mindset used in real world governmental programs like *No Child Left Behind*. The abstracted ideology behind these massive programs make it seem as if people aren't allowed to be good at anything. I mean after all, why should the rest of the class get to move ahead to chapter two when little Jimmy is still struggling with chapter one, right? And even through the sarcasm you get the clear and distinct notion that such programs couldn't exist unless there was some inequality that inherently persisted through the human continuum.

If there are no two humans perfectly equal, let alone all humans, then this means when it comes to placement in society it is *fair* to grant the better the better's position, as it is the better that more aptly fills it, but only after opportunity has been presented to the lesser. Only when all interested can have their try at a position can you say the position is available through fair means. While this may seem all well and good to you, you might be asking why does it matter if it's fair or not? If it doesn't matter if people are treated equally, as surely they can't be because they aren't actually equal and thus even in reception of treatment some receive better or worse than others, setting an inherent imbalance to equality in every aspect, then why not toss fairness out the window as well?

Systems of fairness are the only governance techniques that can be justified through objective ethics under cuil theory. Cuil theory is the formalized symbolic approach to measuring reality on a scale of abstraction and surrealness.⁴² Much like in formal logic when a proposition is reduced to P or Q, in cuil theory the reality of a situation can be reduced to symbolic logics as well, meaning you can have an

⁴⁰ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tNJwy3c_oQs

⁴¹ <http://www.tnellen.com/cybereng/harrison.html>

⁴² <http://cuiltheory.wikidot.com/what-is-cuil-theory>

objective basis by which to say, "something is the case." If something is not the case when related back to the reality of a situation, you get negative cuils. Negative cuils denote a nonsensical reality. If something is the case for one person in relation to an opportunity's existence, but not the case for another (negative cuil), then the one lacking the existence of an opportunity is existent in a false reality. While we have the capacity to conceive of negation and to imagine what reality isn't, reality itself still is, independent of our perception of it, and as such it's nonsensical for false reality to exist. So under this framework we have an objective basis for saying unfair situations are ethically wrong, as they are nonsensical abstractions from reality.

Another way to view this is through virtue ethics. If you set one extreme of human power as absolute power over society by an individual and the other extreme as absolutely no power over society by an individual, then you rule out dictatorships and oligarchies as both are inherently extreme (viceful). The virtue then lies in the middle (per Aristotelian framework), where all individuals have moderate power over society. What then of representative systems like America? Representative systems are only slightly less extreme than the absolute vice, as having minimal political power (the power to vote for someone who votes for you) is only slightly greater than no power as an individual, and having all the direct voting and law enforcement power (our three top branches of government) is only limited by the initial minimal powers the bourgeois exercises. Takis Fotopoulos illustrates this in *The Multidimensional Crisis and Inclusive Democracy*, where he states:

First, that all other forms of so-called democracy ("representative", "parliamentary" etc.) are merely various forms of "oligarchy", that is, rule by the few and that the only adjectives that are permissible to precede democracy are those which are used to extend the classical meaning of it to take into account democracy at the economic, or broader social domains. This is why in this book, to denote the extension of the classical conception of democracy to the social, economic and ecological realms, the adjective "inclusive" precedes the word democracy.

Second, that the arguments advanced by the "civil societarian" "Left" in favour of "deepening" democracy are nonsensical since they implicitly assume that the present representative "democracy" is a democracy and the difference with classical democracy is just quantitative, whereas, in fact, liberal "democracy" is not a democracy at all but what Castoriadis aptly called a "liberal oligarchy." In other words, civil societarians confuse the present "statist" democracy in which polity is separate from society with the classical conception of democracy in which polity was identified with the citizens.⁴³

Systems of fairness reaffirm the case in a universal way according to both cuil theory and virtue ethics. This paired framework is the strongest ethically backed form of an objective view of governance to-date and it validates systems of fairness over systems of equality with ease. But in the egalitarian's defense, a system of fairness is usually what most of them describe when you hard press them for their societal fixes, which is why I opened with the caveat that the major issue with egalitarianism is lexiconical. If they stop calling what isn't equal, 'equal', and instead called what they strived for as being a system of fairness, then there would be less to critique amongst egalitarians.

All that being said, it's a good thing we aren't all equal because if we were all truly equal, we'd all like the same music and movies, meaning culture would come to a grinding halt. It's good that we have unequal skill specializations, as it allows us to divide and conquer tasks more fluidly. For this understanding of human nature, fairness over equality will always be the winning case in any successful civilization due to the points just outlined. A system of fairness rather than a system of equality is the definition of a pure democracy under this framework. So is a pure democracy really the best way to go when given the option? Many compare it to direct democracies like the Athenians had and use examples of such to try and show flaws with their equivocation to pure democracy.

Direct democracy is a system in which the people being governed have direct voter control over how the government functions, but a notable difference between direct democracy and pure democracy is that in a pure democracy there are no elected officials that control the majority of vote-flow within the government, the system sustains itself in this sense, and any governmental decisions that needed to be made would be collaborated on by any or all people within the system, all having a directly proportionate say in it as far as voting goes. This means the two systems are not the same, and trying to point out flaws in one by showcasing flaws in the other makes a lot of the arguments against

⁴³ http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/fotopoulos/english/brbooks/multi_crisis_id/ch11.htm Ch. 11

pure democracy fall short. This even extends to equating pure democracy to any other system of 'democracy', especially a representative one, or by supposing the purpose of a pure democracy be for anything other than ethical reasons, as Hans Kochler points out in *A Theoretical Examination of the Dichotomy Between Democratic Constitutions and Political Reality* where he says:

"Democracy" is equated with a system of mere efficiency, i.e. with effective oligarchic mechanisms of decision-making. This political theory has been particularly influential in post-war Germany and Austria (based on the earlier writings of Carl Schmitt and on Gerhard Leibholz's doctrine of parliamentary representation).

The whole theory is based on the fictitious assumption that an individual citizen can ideally represent the whole of the society (the people) and thereby is authorized to make decisions on its behalf. As Hans Kelsen points out clearly, this theory is in no way compatible with the concept of popular sovereignty, the fundamentum inconcussum of all democratic constitutions. (Apart from the false ideological assumptions contained in the doctrine of representation, one should, as a rule, always try to describe a given system in appropriate terms, not in a misleading manner. One should therefore reconsider the traditional terminology of "representative democracy").⁴⁴

With the myriad retorts placed on pure democracy, many fall deaf as the void of ignorance they're hurled from often be the same void they return. But what are some of the valid criticisms of a system of pure democracy? Surely there are some that transfer over from other systems that we've seen instantiated in the past, and surely those criticisms hold true due to the strong similarities democratic systems share, and surely still those criticisms are problems that would arise if a system of pure democracy was instantiated today, correct? What are the criticisms then of a pure democracy?

There's four major concerns that arise when a system of pure democracy is proposed, those four being pre-existing power structures, bourgeois intelligence, bourgeois motivation, and congregation. But I asked just a moment ago if these proposed issues held validity if the system were instantiated in modernity, and the answer is that this is not the case. Each one is debased through the means described subsequently.

It is said that the problem with a pure democracy is that pre-existing power structures would require people to step down from their already prescribed positions of rule. The principles of a pure democracy would suggest that a new system would start off with no one holding government power over any of the other citizens. This means that it's actually the case that no one has to step down from their rule and so current world leaders don't lose power, but rather that current world citizens gain power. This is achieved through a true push of pure democracy- by having all who are concerned be a part of the decision, through vote, on whether or not a new government should be instantiated. While this may not seem adequate to those already in power, the truth of the matter is that such a purely democratic push would result in a passive overthrow of the old government, as again, all concerned would simply hold to a vote which system be preferred. With that being said, non-passive pushes become self-contradictory; a pure democracy cannot be legitimate if it is instantiated through violent revolution, military coup d'etat, or any means outside the voting actions it stands for. Pure democracy holds most directly as a core principle consent over coercion, and so any coercive actions bringing the system to power nullify the legitimacy of a pure democracy.

Another concern of power structures be that those who previously hold power need only say the new system be invalid, and that the old power structures continue to hold to power despite the majority will of the people saying otherwise. David Hume notes a peculiar aspect of government however that would defeat such a push against new systems from old rulers:

When we enquire by what means this wonder is effected, we shall find, that, as FORCE is always on the side of the governed, the governors have nothing to support them but opinion. It is therefore, on opinion only that government is founded; and this maxim extends to the most despotic and most military governments, as well as to the most free and most popular.⁴⁵

From this notion it is fair to say that once a strong majority of opinion (strong majority meaning a disproportionate or clearly unwavering majority) in a population is decidedly inclined towards a new system of pure democracy, that the opinions of how law should be enforced also fall into majority favor

⁴⁴ <http://hanskoechler.com/DEM-CON.HTM>

⁴⁵ <http://socserv2.socsci.mcmaster.ca/~econ/ugcm/3ll3/hume/firstpri.hme>

of pure democracy and military powers also favor majority decisions, that at this point any other system would become a rebel faction against the majority, which instead of being called *majority* would then take on the title of *legitimate rule*. A quick and last point to show how a passive and gradual transition into pure democracy is inherently a part of the system itself would be to demonstrate how a new pure democracy would come about in a pre-existing first-world society currently. For example, if a framework like this is run over a distributed cryptographic network like Bitcoin's system, there would be no way to ever fully destroy the government system; it would persist for about as long as the internet does, as being distributed means there is no central system the government framework rests on.⁴⁶ A gradual and passive integration of a new governance is possible and inevitable (once instantiated) this way, as long as a majority of citizens take up or integrate the new system under or over their pre-existing government systems.

The second main concern is of bourgeois intellect. A pure democracy would require people to take the time to presciently design a constitutional system that is governed by the whole of a people, not an isolated group of them, as well as an intelligentsia capable of proposing decent laws and a strong bourgeois intelligence to vote on said proposed laws.

As far as the prescient design issue goes, despite popular belief, there is an intelligentsia out there that is capable of formulating a self-sustaining system that would make this governmental framework possible, as well as more practical over other currently instantiated systems. Having this type of government function off the backbone of a cryptocurrency network would not only mean high security and a smooth transition of governmental systems, but it also allows for democratically agreed upon changes to the system to occur in an automated fashion, where the network could issue commands to have the clients polymorphically adapt to the agreed upon changes to the government system itself (the distributed clients). A less technical wordage would be that the entire process of governmental change can be automated, so the prescience needed to design the system would not have to be that grand, as the system can change on-the-fly and completely at the will of the populous.

To stop a large flow of poorly-written or deeply flawed laws being presented, there could be a system of registration put in place where in order to be a law-creator you would have to pass a legality test, scientific literacy test, mathematics literacy test, formal logic test, objective ethics test, or what have you. However, this would make the creation of laws severely limited. The laws then made could go through an initial phase of being up-voted or down-voted by other law makers in order to be presented in the next major voting phase in which everyone in the nation has a choice of deciding whether or not the law is passed.

The problem with that proposed solution is that it does not follow the principles of pure democracy very closely as you could suppose that law-creation necessarily be open to all participants within a purely democratic system, and a way to mitigate a large flow of poorly-written or deeply flawed laws from being presented would be instead to have laws meet a threshold of interest before being put out as referendum. Think of liking a post on facebook for this example, in that you could 'like' your friends' proposed laws, and when a certain number of likes are reached, the law is presented formally for the entire populous to vote on within the system. In discussing the issue with friends, the first position was formulated and critiqued within minutes, and the second position offers a means of solving the issue directly. It may not be a full-proof working of the law-creation process, but it still goes to show that the concern presented is easily dealt with and is not necessarily wholly applicable to a purely democratic framework to begin with, as again, a dynamically adapting system (as described by the prescient design) would allow different law-making processes to be swapped out at will by the populous.

The bourgeois voting (and thus worries of a lower intellect average for voters) can be dealt with via a multi-pool delegation system that acts as a decentralized voter pool. This mitigates supermajorities and vote-throwing by splitting where votes go and who holds vote privileges over periods of time. Low intelligence, laziness, or lack of time to spend on law-reviewing and voting is a major potential issue with this kind of government, so to mitigate the problem, a delegation system can (and should) be utilized, as well as making the primary social focus of the government system to be higher education of the entire populous. The control of information by academia is ridiculous, and the democratization of power under

⁴⁶ <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B70lwqAZzRTYzE0cU9vdFhXbU0/edit>

this framework would also require a democratization of information where all academic journals and studies be freely available to the public⁴⁷ (more on this later). Open information and an impulse for knowledge is essential not only for the individual to be good, but for society to be good, as it's only through destruction of the obrazovanshchina (that is the destruction of the class of society that has higher education without higher ethics) do we find the majority can be sure to do the right thing, otherwise we worry how aware society is of Tolstoy's warnings that, "Wrong does not cease to be wrong because the majority share in it."

Voting can be incentivized through tax breaks, like how some of the European countries incentivize their citizens (or the inverse being fines placed on citizens that don't vote, like how Australia does it), but voting is essential in a system like a pure democracy and a simple tax break may not be enough. The bourgeois may find themselves uninterested or without time to make educated votes; a delegation system fixes this. If you have two people you know to have political and governance intellect as your delegates in a pure democracy, then whatever they vote on, your vote gets tacked on to; they vote for you essentially.

This is akin to representative 'democracies', however, a major difference is that centralization and power of influence over the vote cannot be maintained by delegates. If the two or more (up to whatever arbitrarily set limit) people you have as your delegates vote differently on a law, then your vote is not cast either way unless you manually choose to vote on that law. All your listed delegates must agree on their vote for a law, or have not voted on that law in order for your vote to be tacked on. Having this multi-pool system of delegates will remove the "mob rule" and supermajority effects from systems of pure democracy as well as the factionalizing of democracies that occur through parties, as parties cannot cull votes if you set a max-tack to a thousand votes (or another arbitrarily assigned number) making it so delegates never hold power for longer than a certain amount of direct votes. This is fundamentally different than a representative system where even if you don't like or want a representative, there is one assigned for your geographic area that makes decisions in your name that you do not agree with and who has the power of continuing to do so despite continually rebuking the idea that your vote be placed under their domain. A delegation structure like this is not explicitly required by a pure democracy, but following the principles of fair distribution of power and votes, it resolves the issue of bourgeois laziness and lack of intellect.

As a side note, it was just mentioned that in representative systems, if your representative (be it for American congress, or a member of parliament, etcetera) is elected to power and you personally did not vote for that person (or party) to represent you, then that person is not representing you out of your consent to have him cast your vote in governmental framework, but rather out of their coercion of your votes into policy. By the very definition of legitimate governance⁴⁸ this means representative systems are not legitimate, meaning the American government (and other representative systems) are by definition illegitimate. You might then argue that consent was still given by participating in the system to begin with, giving legitimacy to whoever takes your vote, regardless if you voted directly for them or not because you consented to the rules of the system from go. The fallacy here is misunderstanding that in reality consent is never directly given. You are forced to be a citizen upon birth in America and most other countries, making citizenship 100% coercion and 0% consent. You are forced to inherit a system that does not give you the option to live under it and it's social programs without also giving it control of your vote and further consent (meaning people that move and acquire citizenship after birth fall into the same problem). I look forward to the emails of nationalists crying about how their governments are, "Totally not illegitimate bruh."

One could suppose a further concern would be the same principle applied to the majority in a pure democracy, as laws that are passed by the majority when you were a minority voter against the laws are laws that take effect not out of your consent, but rather out of the majority's coercion. The difference here however is that the majority is not the one who enforces the laws, but rather law enforcement agencies. A representative is someone who forces an aspect of your being under government, your vote, to do things against your will and without your consent (if you did not vote for them to vote for you), making the representative nothing but a coercive agent similar to a police officer

⁴⁷ <http://www.quora.com/Was-hacking-of-academic-journal-JSTOR-by-Aaron-Swartz-justified>

⁴⁸ [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Legitimacy_\(political\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Legitimacy_(political))

(except it is intellectual coercion rather than physical coercion). This is not the same as the 'majority' in pure democracy, as the majority (and rest of citizenship) is not forcing you to do anything, it is only the law enforcement agencies that force you to comply to the laws, setting a clear divide between government and law enforcement. This means pure democracies maintain legitimacy were representative systems cannot.

But back to the original issues- the third listed concern was that pure democracy requires people to keep up with what their government is doing on a regular basis and to be actively involved in it. The motivation issue is dealt with by utilizing the delegation structure described earlier, but it's not wholly necessary as most people in a government framework like a pure democracy would be motivated enough to take part in it, because becoming a full citizen under this governmental framework would imply you want to take part in its affairs. Why join a governmental framework that gives you such a magnitude of control over it only to let it control you back through your inactivity? You'd be defeating the purpose (unless you want the benefits without the involvement, which is understandable). Direct democracies assume citizens are free of time and inclined to participate, but keep in mind pure democracy is not a derivation of direct democracy, and again, a delegation system could easily fix this.

The fourth listed concern would be that much like in Athenian democracy it would normally require everyone to meet up at the forum to discuss the month's topics, which is hard to do with 350 million people. Fortunately these are all small problems easily fixed through new technologies (a recurring theme here, one which I'm sure you've noticed). Congregation offers the strongest push against pure democracy, as it would be impossible to fly everyone over to D.C. every month for an open debate-and-vote on our politics. Up until the last few decades there wasn't really an infrastructure in which large volumes of people could communicate instantaneously and simultaneously with each other, but now we have the internet, and as Douglas Rushkoff says in *Open Source Democracy* about the globalized interactive aspects of the internet:

They began to study new models of interconnectivity and group mind, such as James Lovelock's Gaia hypothesis and Rupert Sheldrake's theory of morphogenesis, to explain and confirm their growing sense of non-local community. By the mid 1990s many internet users began to see the entire planet as a single organism, with human beings as the neurons in a global brain. The internet, according to this scheme, was the neural network being used to wire up this brain so that it could function in a coordinated fashion... This is why it appeared that the decision to grant the public open access to the internet in the early 1990s would herald a new era of teledemocracy, political activism and a reinstatement of the collective will into public affairs. The emergence of a networked culture, accompanied by an ethic of media literacy, open discussion and direct action held the promise of a more responsive political system wherever it spread.⁴⁹

This means that now we do in fact have an infrastructure that could support a pure democracy. But as Rushkoff also notes, nothing has yet come to properly utilize this infrastructure. Things like www.vote.com and www.moveon.org have had some success but they essentially act merely as public opinion polls, not as legitimate means for direct voting on policy. Another site, www.represent.us⁵⁰, has tried the approach of manipulating our government directly through their own form of coercion⁵¹, but it doesn't make sense to try to superficially fix broken aspects of something that's inherently broken.⁵² The only way to 'fix' something that's inherently broken is to fundamentally change aspects of the system or supplant the system with something else altogether. The good news is that nothing but potential is present with this concern of having an open market in regards to instantiating a government online.

So while there are valid flaws to be exposed with Athenian and small city-state Rousseauian democracies, our current systems and technologies (and there is indeed a heavy emphasis on new technologies) make these showcased flaws inconsequential. Clarke and Foweraker discuss currently existing direct democracies like Switzerland in *Encyclopedia of Democratic Thought*, pointing out that very different systems of democracy currently exist. The case of Switzerland is worth noting because they are a highly mediated pluralist and party-based system and they don't face any of the problems

⁴⁹ <http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/10753> ch. 4

⁵⁰ <https://represent.us/>

⁵¹ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5tu32CCA_Ig

⁵² Gilens, Martin, and Benjamin I. Page. "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens." *Perspectives on Politics*: 564-81.

people commonly tout against direct democracies.⁵³ Clarke and Foweraker note that almost all the valid criticisms against traditional direct democracies like the Athenian system don't really hold for direct democracy in modernity. This is important for our own understanding in illustrating that there are few, in regards to valid criticisms, against modern systems of direct democracy, shedding a nice light on democracy in general and lending high hopes for pure democracy, especially one that would be so inclined to be based on a decentralized internet framework.

What should be gleaned from this reading is that there is an objective basis for governance, that it ought to be enacted on that merit alone, and that other merits like efficiency and legitimacy follow. If nothing else is to be learned here, at least an admittance of the illegitimacy of the currently instantiated rules of 'democracies' around the world would be deserved by both me the writer and you the reader, lest you decide to be dishonest to both. With all that being said, rejoice, as we now have a basis by which to design a new, ethical, efficient, and legitimate system. Onward ho, comrades!

:: Ad Hom, Ad Naus ::

"If you can't ignore an insult, top it; if you can't top it, laugh it off; and if you can't laugh it off, it's probably deserved."

- Russell Lynes

There seems a trend of people pushing towards the ill-regard of all the commonly (formal and informal) named fallacies in the sphere of logic, which only survives in the pursuit of the pseudo-intellectual philosophizings. Let's take a look at some of these fallacies that many are so eager to spout the Latin names of, like *Ad Hominem*.

Ad Hominem is the formal fallacy of attacking someone's character instead of their arguments.⁵⁴ This is a common occurrence amongst casual conversation, especially on the internet. Against reason, it's more common amongst intellectual debates. The word 'intellectual' should really be in quotations, and not just because it's hard to call those kinds of debates intellectual, but because intellectual debate doesn't really happen when there is more than three acting parties, much less in public venues on the internet (like facebook). What is meant by this is that the more actors or minded-persons are involved in a discussion, the greater the reality for straw men, red-herrings, and ad hominem becomes.

We can view the negative impacts of these regular interruptions and asides from discussion as a function, 'D', as it relates to the reality of a situation, 'P', with the model, " $D(x) = (x \cdot A : T)P$ ", where 'A' represents the actors in the discussion, where 'x' is the variable number of said actors, and where 'T' represents the number of interruptive tangents or asides as a proportionate ratio to the number of actors in the system (assuming all dialogue, even internal, would be given to the discussion). The model can be verbally read as, "The discussion of the reality of a situation measured by cuil abstraction is equal to the number of actors in the discussion proportionate to the same number of interruptive tangents following each of the actors."

At D(0) we return 0P, meaning there is no discussion because there are no actors and are left with nothing but base reality (the situation exists independent of discussion about it). At D(1) we return 1P, meaning the reality of the situation exists (0P), and there is a discussion about the reality of the situation (1P). At D(2) we return 2P, meaning there is a reality about a situation (0P), there is discussion about the reality of the situation (1P), and the discussion is occurring **externally** between two actors (2P). This is still easily manageable as we only have two abstractions from base reality and both are related to the reality of the situation. At D(3) we observe an issue, returning 3P, meaning the reality of a situation exists (0P), there is discussion about the situation (1P), the discussion is occurring externally between three actors (2P), and interruptions are coming from one source other than the last actor the discussion heard from (3P). You cannot abstract further, as only four lines maintain despite there being more actors in the system. In this way we can use this model to show that past 3 actors, discussion no

⁵³ <https://books.google.com/books?id=srzDCqnZkfUC&pg=PA224&hl=en#v=onepage&q&f=false> pg. 224

⁵⁴ <https://yourlogicalfallacyis.com/ad-hominem>

longer consistently relates back to the reality of the situation because the interruptions are coming from more sources than the last actor the discussion itself heard from.

A mastication of an aside I've just made about something that's probably not true anyways-mastication meaning an intellectual exertion done under false means or to useless ends, derived from the fusion of the primary formal definition of 'mastication' itself with "mental masturbation," as being the equivocation of chewing food to talking without saying anything.

Ad Hominem is the formal fallacy of attacking someone's character instead of their arguments. People take this as meaning that making personal attacks is always logically fallacious, as personal attacks about one's character do not directly hold affect on the validity of the arguments that person makes. But what then if the argument is about one's character? Any counters would be considered attacks on character, so we now see that Ad Hominem must be permitted in these cases. In this way we can know that Ad Hominem is not universally fallacious, and furthermore that there are probably many scenarios, especially given the situation just presented (about large, dynamically moving discussions), in which Ad Hominem is a valid and strong tactic for argumentation.

Living philosophical comedy admittedly gives way to rhetoric, and thus walks the dangerous path of sophistry. To mitigate the sophist problem, one must always pursue the gadfly. This is not to be a contrarian for the sake of being a contrarian. Being the gadfly is to be that which awakens the beast that is society. You must whip their mores and standard practices into shape, make them aware of the state. The awareness is what *becomes*. An example of this is the common practice of calling vague (or even finessed) group rules into question, and breaking the rules to then show the rules hold no power. When rules of conduct are what's brought into question, when the rules of how someone must *be* have their validity questioned, it is the same as attacking the character of those who live by said rules (as the rules of how they *be* are descriptors of their character and as such attacks on their rules are attacks on their characters). Hopefully it is apparent not only as to *how* Ad Hominem is a valid tactic, but to *why* it must be so now.

Even to counter this argument, that living philosophical comedy means one must pursue the gadfly, you must attack the rule of living that was just asserted, which is to attack the character of the one living by such rules. Questioning rules to live by (attacking the character of an individual or the character of the society the rules come from) is what *thee* Gadfly did. To question if living philosophical comedy means pursuing the gadfly is to pursue the gadfly itself, as questioning the mode of living is what pursuing the gadfly itself *is*. The pretzeling of wordplay here also serves to show that denying this be the nature of living philosophical comedy is self-defeating.

:: The Diogenesis Fallacy ::

" "

-

I want to point out a new formal fallacy that people use as a common tactic in argumentation, a fallacy I've taken to calling the Diogenesis Tactic, and the counter to which I am now calling the Diogenesis Counter whose phraseology would be akin to "A little makes a lot" or "little turned to much". This fallacy, and subsequent counter, occurs where people think that they can have a stronger position in an argument, or ultimately win an argument, by conceding that what they're saying is not a universal or blanket statement, as if that makes it a stronger statement, and this can actually be turned around on them by a sort of *reductio*. More clearly, I want to showcase here that principle arguments should stay principled and to shift them into evidential arguments is not only fallacious but doesn't actually advance their principle.

For example, if someone is arguing that closing borders in Europe (or the American-Mexican border) would be racist against some given racial or ethnic category, and they grant part of their opponents counter, that /some/ of the immigrants commit crimes (even though the opponents to this argument usually showcase that immigrants commit /disproportionate/ levels of crime), but not /all/ or

/most/ of the immigrants, then all you have to do is ask them for evidence of their small concession and your question then serves as a counter to the fallacy. What I mean by this is, that if they concede their opponents point that /some/ immigrants commit crimes in an attempt to argue that /most/ don't commit crimes, ask them for evidence that even /some/ of them do. They often (or in my experience, always) cannot provide any evidence because they do not actually believe their opponent's view, they only pretended that the opponent was right in a small, easily measured way (read: evidential) for the sake of getting their opponent to agree with their blanket (read: principle) statement that immigrants should be allowed across some border. They concede some evidential point to try to advance their principled point that the borders should stay open, but this is ultimately nonsensical through-and-through as an argumentative tactic because if you concede the counter-point that immigrants commit crimes, even disproportionately, and even if you provide evidence for it, after you've proved it, then what? Couldn't we also prove that non-immigrants commit disproportionate levels of crime without any immigrants in their country because they would then make up 100% of the crime without any immigrants there to offset their percentage? You see how making this an evidential argument doesn't accomplish anything with regards to whether borders should stay open or closed in principle?

Let's take the opponents view that borders should be closed to some group. It still doesn't make sense to argue the evidence that immigrants commit disproportionate levels of crime. For example, granting that immigrants do commit disproportionate levels of crime (in Europe they most certainly do), then what? They commit more crime, okay, that in principle has more to do with culture or internal governance than it does with borders, so it's not a point in favor of borders, it's a point against culture. The argument is supposed to be about borders, right? So here's the principled argument- borders are by definition designed to keep people systematically separated, that is their function, so what is a border if not closed? You see how this principled argument I just made is not only stronger but makes the point clearer and easier to directly address? There's less room for sophistry here, so why even bother trying to make these arguments evidential? It doesn't go anywhere, principled arguments should stay principled.

The aftereffect of this tactic is interesting because when they fail to justify their small concession, what happens in the formal logic side of it, is the universal statements on both sides become more justified again because neither side believes there is a small concession to really be had, either all immigration should be allowed for that given group, or all of it cut off, because if both sides concede now that the entire group at large is being discussed, then the entire group must suffer the consequences of their actions and not just the /few/ that commit crimes, disproportionately or otherwise. It forces people to make responsibility democratic, a shared burden, at least in this example (in general this argumentative tactic just forces universal statements).

Another aftereffect is making your moiety in argumentation aware that they are not being charitable or even open to criticism about their own view, as showcasing that they can't provide an example of the point they just conceded means they cannot conceive of anything in principle that would make them disagree with their own view. Even if they could provide evidence counter to their view (which I have never seen done) it would still be the case that evidence either way doesn't actually advance a principled argument. I have never seen this counter-tactic against this fallacy used outside of when me and one other friend have employed it, and it has always worked perfectly in forcing universal statements (it even forced the universal statement in this sentence right now because otherwise my tactic could be used against me, which means the Diogenesis Counter is a self-actuator logical function), and always turns arguments from evidential to principled in nature, which is nice as it forces people to stay more consistent with their views.

I don't know what else to say lol, but if you want to further understand what this tactic is and how powerfully effective it is, I guess try arguing against either of those things by using evidential arguments and I'll use the Diogenesis Counter as a counter-counter against your counter to showcase its effectiveness lol.

SECTOR 2

- PARODY OF THE DIALECTIC -

:: Maximes det Relaçion ::

- I. With great power comes great fuckery.
- II. Fuckery is an act of amusement, a testing of others and their hold on reality.
- III. Fuckery leads to an awareness of problems, and an awareness of problems leads to solutions.
- IV. Amusement is the cause of most, and solution to all, problems.
- V. Of the problems not created out of amusement, all are created by the *wom*.
- VI. Wom are like children, they like it when you treat them like people. The question is whether or not we actually should, because woms, like children, tend to be annoying and useless.
- VII. A person is an object with secondary theory of mind and prescience. Without these two qualities, a person could not recognize other persons, nor plan their actions around them.
- VIII. As such, a blatant disregard for other persons strips oneself of their own personhood. If you have been stripped of your personhood, then so have your rights pertaining to persons, which means you are at no loss to lose your life, as you are not a person and therefore cannot not lose your personhood.
- IX. Woms, like children, tend to blatantly disregard other persons. Therefore they themselves cannot be regarded as persons.
- X. To remove a contingency is no loss for the thing it was contingent upon.
- XI. We do not feel a loss for removing those who merely leech upon us, unless you are a wom, as woms seek recognition from equally weak others.
- XII. Woms, like children, have emotional investments that affect all parties involved (usually in the form of crying) when the tie to those emotionally invested parties is severed. However, woms differ slightly from children here, in that woms have emotional investments in parties whom the woms don't even like and whom merely use the woms to leech off of. A child does not do this, and so does not suffer the loss of those the child has not deemed worthy of emotional investment. In this the child is superior to the wom for the child is not wholly irrational.
- XIII. To remove the qualities by which create an object's disregard for persons is no loss to the persons disregarded.
- XIV. To remove the qualities of woms which create their disregard for persons is no loss to the persons disregarded by woms. We find then the *commentary as content culture* we live in to merely be the structure by which woms prop themselves up, as commentary on the lives of themselves and the others around them is the entirety of their existence, separate and distinct from the others the commentary is made about. For this, womhood is an inherent disregard of persons, and therefore to have womhood is to lack personhood.
- XV. We all have imagination enough to suppose evidence for our beliefs, but rarely the imagination to actually provide it.

- XVI. We find that the easiest evidence to provide for some assertion is the agreement of others about it, and we find that the easiest evidence to provide against some assertion is the disagreement of others about it. In both cases we can agree the evidence is of the common belief rather than the assertion.
- XVII. It is in a contract, the social contract, that when you accept drinks at a bar, it is meant to be a date, and the more drinks and flirting and sexual communication you send, the more likely you are to have sex. Materials are to be paid for, and so to not pay someone back for the materials you took from them is stealing. If anything, sex is just a means for a woman to convince herself she isn't a thief.
- XVIII.

:: On Society, The Case For Masculinism Above Feminism ::

Most who know me know that this will not end well, but let me extend an olive branch by saying that I have no problem with someone *being* a woman. For example, we (read: men reading this) can imagine what being a woman is like, if only for brief periods of time. We know this because at two in the morning after you've just finished watching *The Color Purple* and have decided that you don't want to cry yourself to sleep, you put on Lady Sovereign because you think to yourself, "She's a female rapper and so it won't be a mood kill but it's rap so it'll be hardcore enough to bounce me out of depression," but you're wrong, you're always wrong about this, and so you do end up crying yourself to sleep; the plus side being that you left your iPod on loop and so the same song is still playing when you wake up and the first thing you consciously hear the next morning is, "I'm so human, yea yea, it's okay, TO FEEL THIS WAY," and you think, "You know what? I am just human, it is okay for me to feel this way," and so you get out of bed and life is amazing. There are these brief moments in your life where literally a lesser man you are becometh, but I think it is because of these brief moments that an appreciation for not being a woman are also begotten, as you then remove yourself from the experience and are merely proud that you don't have to endure such experiences regularly.

With this in mind, nota bene that I am saying men and women can share experiences that are otherwise defining experiences of what it is to *be* a man or *be* a woman, but that the general lack of these experiences are what defines the general cognitive being of the person in question, meaning that to generally lack the experience of being a woman is to make explication of yourself as a man and versa vice. It is through this slider-scale dichotomy of experience that we set our dialectic of gender upon. From here, the move we make is apparent, in saying that there is a defining feature of men and a defining feature of women, features whose derivation are so readily apparent in the dialectic that general consensus admits of it, which grants the notion that these are actual features of the genders, from which follows a choice to be made as to which is the superior feature in relation to character of person.

So to more formally set up the dialectic, it seems given that there are two virtues, one of each gender, that the genders as a whole encompass. Of women, their virtue is true innocence, as a woman can truly be innocent of some actions or words she commits to the world, and we wouldn't have it any other way, as it instills the feeling that there is something pure and precious in life worth trying to achieve or protect; the woman's virtue of innocence is what affords her the lack of labor for society in place of labor for the individual (read: child) and thus affords society its posterity. Of men, their virtue is true comfort, as men would never divorce themselves from their actions or words because they have the failing of thinking *all* actions and words committed to the world are their responsibility, and therefore cannot be innocent of such, yet which they take comfort in, and we wouldn't have it any other way, as warfare would involve much more urine than it already does if the majority of men were not comfortable with the trenches that provided their heads the elevatory submergence that placed them just below the greater potential of sniper fire; the man's virtue of comfort is what affords him sanity in the face of insanity, be it gunfire from the enemy or emotive fire from his spouse, and thus affords society the calm regress of simply *being* when otherwise it worries it should not. To make this less opaque would be to make uselessness of such a comparison, as this truly must be the case of society in

all places we see in the world today, else it perverts the notion that society even had a feminine or masculine side to it in the first place.

With this said, is not the greater virtue found in man over that of woman? Is it not better to be the beast, if at least the beast has the capacity to know it is such? Demonstration of being "the bigger man" is to not divorce yourself from responsibility of action (as the virtue of women otherwise allows), to take fault and subsequently punishment if your actions deserve, which is surely more taxing on the person, but rightly so, whereas the woman evades this component of justice entirely. This is showcased by the near complete lack of retaliation in relationships whose fights are predicated on nothing but the emotive insanity of women. Most fights in any special relationship (read: case where oneself is owed to the other in some meaningful or significant way) are derived from the woman's discomfort either physically or psychologically with some situation or choice of action, and so surely even if this is for good reason, it is still symptom of the lack of stoicism, the lack of okay-ness of being, of which a man only reaches when he has reasoned that the state is unjust in principle and not just unjust to himself (or herself).

It's no wonder then that Buddhism (and all other slave religions), as the general notion of simply *being* as some form of comfort and unity with nature or the universe, was founded and developed by men who lived two thousand of years ago in less-than-desirable conditions, and the contemporary third-wave of feminism, as the general notion of simply being *innocent* of some form of discomfort, was founded and developed by women in comfortable modern society. This dialectic explains and predicts so much of society that I dare say that masculinism, as the general notion of simply being aware and okay with all that is occurring in society, will become the default to which all rational beings in human society find themselves aligned with, because no matter how much injustice or discomfort does or does not exist in a given environment, the only way we can exist in any cognitively healthy state (read: emotively balanced) and persist in said environment, is if we're firstly aware that we are in said environment and secondly comfortable with being something that is aware of such a thing. To deny this is to assert that you claim awareness of a problem that you do not deserve to have imposed on you (read: you are innocent of) whilst maintaining that you are not a woman, which is self-defeating (both in the literal and figurative sense) given the framework already established.

So with this I say enjoy the storm, neigh, take comfort in the storm the fallout of this is sure to invoke, for if people were rain, I am drizzle and she is hurricane.

:: Dialectic of 90s American Music ::

If there ever was a dialectical opposition within 90's America, it's the pseudo-wino, pseudo-cultured, metropolitan, fem-corporate, night on the town of uptown living versus the pseudo-political, pseudo-intellectual, hacker, anti-corporate, rave club of cyberpunk skiddie basement dwelling. To contextualize further, think Friends versus The Matrix; the passive high life of arbitrary qualms of the city quelled by the active aggression against the very system that allows for their aggression to exist on the scale it did in the first place. Neither is actually cultured or actually intelligent, rather their social clubs akin to obrazovanshchina outshine with a mighty flame the intelligent spark that seated them and thus we are left with yet another dialectic of the majority.

This dialectic is exemplified greatest when contextualized musically. On the one side you have the positive, passive, pop-filtered, and more expensive productions versus the negative, active, raw-filter high-gained, electronic productions. So not only are we speaking on certain music branches and specific genres, but we can reduce this dichotomy to ideals. This means there are specific artists that explicate the general mood and feel of the 90s qua these two ideals.

This becomes more apparent when you ask people what bands they remember or listened to during certain time periods, with the 90s being remembered under the dialectic by the two categories of opposition defined earlier. Such a dialectical remembrance places Dave Matthews Band (the 90s' equivalent of the 80s' U2, and subsequently the 00s' Coldplay precursor) under the corporate, uptown, wino, clean-filter, large production end of the dialectic, and Rage Against the Machine (with The Prodigy

being the UK 90s parallel) under the anti-system, skiddie lab, gain-filtered, lofi productions of 90s American mid-life.

This is not simply two bands I like arbitrarily, but a demonstration that culture is objective and thereby objectively reducible to dialectic theory that accurately explains the general feel and mood not just of geographic ontology but perspectival mindset of daily life given that geographic ontology. That is to say that any culture, as the summation of interpersonal relations tied to geographic ontology, can be objectively framed and explicated given proper dialectical oppositions which then allow for epistemological certainty of the inner workings of that culture.

So without further ado, have a listen to what is objectively the two most 90s American music groups ever-

<https://youtu.be/HgJOjB8-e8w>

<https://youtu.be/bWXazVhlyxQ>

:: Why Dialecticians Are All Wrong ::

"So, why is Nietzsche such a fucc boi?" I'm glad you asked, and let me start by saying I want it to be clear that Metaphysics Existent as Comedy is not a case for the aesthetic. I acknowledge there is an aesthetic side to comedy, but in order to derive formal logic and objective ethics from comedy, it must be understood that comedy has a formal and objective nature. The existentialists like comedy for its aesthetics, but existentialism itself is false, and I imagine that much like existentialism's failure to be true to philosophy, that a fixation on the aesthetic side of comedy will prove a failure to be true to metaphysics existent as such. To quickly quell your qualms about my claims of existentialism not being true to philosophy - the nature of Truth does not revolve around the subject (as Truth *is*) and thus the existentialist's criticism of exclusion of human nature in philosophy falls deaf.

If you are truly concerned about specific natures of being, there are scientific fields of study you'd much better spend your time on, however, for the general nature of being (a.k.a. philosophy), humanity is inconsequential. Ethics is not a focus of human nature, but an understanding of proper relations between minds. Understanding of knowledge and reality is also not focused on human nature, but on the truth of the nature of knowledge and reality in themselves. Metaphysics Existent as Comedy deals with philosophy, not with human nature or aesthetics.

A good example of this would be how Nietzsche asserts much but justifies little and concludes nothing in *Birth of Tragedy*. I imagine this is why many claim rhetoric over philosophy in the case of Nietzsche. The general assertions he makes are that the aesthetic is a necessary component of philosophy, that it is opposite and separate from logic, and that good philosophy cannot be done without the aesthetic. These claims are fallacious. He asserts that lots of aesthetic (he focuses on musical tragedy) is needed for good philosophy, for virtue, and he uses the Fijian tribes who cannibalize themselves as justification, for they have 'low' aesthetic. Similarly, you could assert that one needs a stomach in order to have good psychological health, likened to how one needs aesthetics for a healthy mind, as having a stomach also helps keep us entertained and never-endingly so (it is not possible to be full for all eternity unless you remove your stomach).

He says logicians fail to see everything and that the aesthetic exposes Truth as its own system. He fundamentally confuses inspiration with discovery here. The first assertion that aesthetics are necessary to philosophy is a try at justification through equating art and dreams to illusion. I will spare the fallacy of equivocation from illusion (that which does not actually exist outside the mind) to dreams and art as not being *real*. He ultimately rests on the illusion as being what drives people to exist, not desire for Truth, which is an assertion about psychology, not philosophy. It's misinformation to assert that philosophy is about desire for Truth, as philosophy is simply about Truth itself. Just because most philosophers desire Truth does not mean the study is about the desire. You might say, "well he is not ultimately making claims about philosophy then," to which I would agree because rhetoric is not philosophy. The assertion that you desire Truth or you live for illusion, illusion being art and dreams, is a false dichotomy as many people enjoy both or desire neither. Aside from that, he asserts that the

aesthetic is where Truth can come from, meaning as he desires the aesthetic, so he desires Truth, and any claim for the aesthetic becomes self-defeating.

Gotta recap everything here, demonstrate that all the stuff that seems unrelated or like tied-together lesser works are actually comically inspired. Go through the universe not existing from the science section (as that would be comical), not all things happening for a reason in the determinism section (because without random factors it's not very funny), cuil theory from the logic section (that logic is derived from hamburgers), the Not Fallacious section being a joke, that philosophers are comedians from the metaphilosophy section, that ethics is derived from humor and biological imperative is funny, that dictatorships inherently funny from the government section (and why the first world is still under one is funny), that social justice is inherently humorous because it's nonsense from the social cancer section, that we can't know anything from the epistemology section meaning we don't know that it's not a joke, a reiteration of the ontology section lol, and then the rest of the shit I was going to put in the metaphysics section here.

SECTOR 3

- MISC. STUFF -

:: Hitman Paradox ::

A hitman is hired to kill a politician. This is possible because the hitman business has recently been legalized by said politician. Unbeknownst to the hitman, the politician is the one who made his hitman business legal, and the man who hired the hitman is from the opposing political party trying to fight the legalization of the hitman business. If the hitman kills his mark, his business will be made illegal and he'll go to jail for life after his employer turns him in. If he doesn't kill his mark, he is not fulfilling his ethical duty of keeping contractual promises or work standards and he will lose his job. Kant would argue that both are just as ethically problematic, but I think there is something special happening in the case of killing the politician that allows the hitman to do his work in the first place.

If the hitman kills the politician that made his job legal and therefore possible to kill the politician, the hitman is participating in the reification of the politician's bill that he passed. If the politician dies qua hitman, the politician has died due to the reification of his own bill, but that will also mean the bill will be undone.

Let's go further and say the hitman is aware of all of this. If the hitman kills the politician who hired him, as that politician is opposed to the hitman's business and will either get him fired or jailed, then the hitman is reifying the law in a way that will not get him sent to jail, and most likely not fired. He is still failing to keep contractual obligations and good work ethic however.

But what if the hitman kills himself? Not only is he failing to keep his contractual duties, but he is failing to support the party that will make killing people illegal. Two wrongs make a right here and I'll explain why. By killing himself after making the contract (and therefore getting paid), the hitman is stopping the anti-hitman politician from using a hitman to kill another person, the thing the politician is supposed to be against, which means the hitman is stopping said politician from breaking his own moral code. By killing himself, the hitman is stopping himself from murdering someone, and on top of that, he's stopping himself from murdering someone who is the meta-instantiate of the possibility of his job.

But isn't he still failing to keep his contract? Well, the contract was invalid to begin with, because the politician was using the contract as a means to the ends of such contracts not being possible in principle, so the contract would be the reification of its own self-defeat.

:: On the Hierarchy of Art ::

About the tier-ing of art we might say, granting the Zizekian notion that there is no 'higher' or 'lower' art forms, that within a singular form of art (genre) there are objectively better or worse pieces. This argument is focused specifically around music, not just because I know more about it than other forms, but because I think it's easiest to demonstrate differences in both quality and quantity with music.

Much like a dense philosophy book requiring a more cognitive mind to fully understand and experience it, as opposed to a children's book (barring exceptions), genres like Psytrance Full-On and IDM (or heavily layered jazz and math metal) need more cognition to process all the sounds going on and how they meaningfully relate to one another. This showcases that music (and all art) can be directly (read: objectively) scaled in complexity based on cognitive capacity required to physically have the full experience.

So, most likely, Psytrance Full-On is objectively the most superior form of music, not only because it (and Hardstyle) is the hardest genre to produce (the technical skill requirements are insane)

but because it fills the widest frequency bands most constantly, meaning you are cognitively more engaged because there is literally more to hear, and because the instrumental layering (with effect interplay) is the most complex and therefore the most psychoacoustically rich. It is literally more music (there is a larger body of sound), and literally more experience (more of your brain is processing the sound), therefore it is greater quantitatively and qualitatively, respectively.

Okay, so here's an example of Psytrance Full-On (*Mind of God* by Electric Universe - <https://youtu.be/auUqTqlmPQA>), not to be confused with its parent genre Psychedelic Trance. I'd argue that Math Metal, IDM, some Neurofunk, and some Jazz are up there in terms of complexity and objective experience.

Nota bene, SKIPPING AROUND IN A SONG IS A SIN. If you skip around in a song, then it sounds different than if you heard it all the way through normally, and different things are different, so if you skip around you're literally hearing a different song (that strict metaphysical identity semantic is revealing itself here). We would agree that you have no right to judge a song if you haven't heard that song, right? This means judgment is only valid if you've heard a song in its entirety. Also, sub-woofers are important because about 30% of the genre's (Psytrance Full-On) noise volume is sub-bass, which means you won't hear a third of the song without a sub-woofer even if you play the whole thing start to finish.

So all that being said, the objective measurements of sound tied to cognition all favor Psytrance Full-On, and with Electric Universe being the exemplar of the genre (as well as pioneering production techniques and inventing many new instruments and sound designs), means we can know, objectively, the 'Ideals' of music, as exemplified by Electric Universe. This isn't to say no one else will ever surpass him, only that currently Electric Universe is the heavyweight champion.

This technique extends to all forms of art, whereby the objective measurement of greater experience can be used to tier all pieces within any given artform. Within music we have our current ideal champion, Electric Universe, but I haven't crawled through, at least not deeply enough, the trenches of other artforms outside of music and so I cannot speak so surely about any other mode of artistic expression whereby I'd be able to say what the ideal is. However, this is not a problem, because others can use this same technique applied to their own expertise in other fields of art to come about an objective ideal for those other art forms.

:: Epistemic Loss & Ethical Gain Regarding the Inconsistency of Egalitarianism with Multiculturalism ::

We can all imagine the caricatures of the alt-left and alt-right currently as being the screaming of, "I believe in equal opportunity and multiculturalism," and, "I believe in merit-based opportunity and multiculturalism is codeword for anti-white," respectively. This divide is not as polemic when considering that both sides want egalitarianism and to secure their culture, the only difference being in how that is done in America (and abroad).

For example, the alt-left wants all minority cultures to persist, ergo multiculturalism, and the alt-right wants the majority culture to persist, ergo multiculturalism is anti-white. The alt-left wants all persons to have equal opportunity in society to achieve any and all aspirations, ergo socialism (level playing field), and the alt-right wants all persons to receive proportionate to what they worked for, ergo capitalism (merit makes the man). You might be saying, well surely they are both being ridiculous, because you can have /both/ the minority and majority cultures persist in an equal-distribution merit-based society, right? I believe this is apodictically wrong, and I hope to showcase here that you cannot have multiculturalism in a truly egalitarian society.

Even though there is no longer de jure segregation, we still have de facto segregation, partly due to people being born in certain areas and never leaving, and mostly due to people self-segregating upon immigrating or moving cities. For example, Los Angeles is one of the most racially diverse counties in America (the world actually), second only to New York, and yet it is also one of the most segregated; Los Angeles is self-segregated, most people upon moving here move into neighborhoods of similar racial backgrounds, usually for the sake of being around familiar languages and culture. This means we can view this as people preserving culture, not as a racist institution of generations long dead.

The problem here is that self-segregated societies, which are societies that are multi-cultural, then have racially inequitable wealth distribution. The average housing price varies from area to area, as does education quality (schools are funded by property taxes, so housing prices matter doubly here), access to health care (inner-city versus outer-city), and lots of other things that you can probably easily ideate regarding standard of living and wealth distribution are affected by this self-segregation. This means that to have a truly egalitarian society where people have both fair access to education and job opportunity, that we would have to de-segregate society, but de-segregating society would mean that there would be a substantial loss of concentrated culture (the restaurants would be the greatest loss in my opinion) which would be the destruction of multiculturalism.

So it should be apparent now regarding this singular aspect of society that we can't have true egalitarianism in the face of a society segregated by multiculturalism. This problem extends further into the national culture of American identity (or any national identity), as national identity tends to be the blend of all cultures contained within, but those cultures are not represented in the national identity when they are segregated out of the political sphere due to many of the inequities of opportunity their self-segregation hath reified.

We can't have it both ways, where hard-outlined cultures persist separate and independent from the national identity and those people maintaining those cultures also get equal representation and opportunity both economically (purely qua social systems) and politically (legal and governmental representation).

As a solution, both sides will suffer to gain what they desire, but it is of *ethical imperative* to do so. Integrationist practices will mean the majority is slightly watered down in terms of culture, and the minority is greatly watered down in terms of culture, but it also means that cultural homogeneity will bring about a great loosening of wealth-distribution inequality (which is pretty severe, see picture). So while minorities stand to lose a significant amount of centrally arbitrated culture, they also stand to gain a significant amount of wealth on average; conversely the white majority stands to lose a slight amount of wealth on average but also stands to gain a slight amount of culture on average.

I think a socialist capitalism could work here, where the merits of capitalist values can actually come to fruition (meaning where you end up in society is actually based on your individual merits) if everyone starts in the middle of middle class and becomes rich or poor on their own merits. Cultural homogeneity can help this become a standard situation for most people from what it seems.

:: Requirements for Religion; The Shoe Religion ::

" "

-

Defined as a set of standardized beliefs, paired with a set of standardized regular practices, with a focus on transcendence^{55 56}, religion is often falsely equated with ideologies and organizations that are far from religiosity. The three core components required for something to be a 'religion' as just defined are required for the reasons of such that without which any and all things could be defined as religion. The first aspect being a set of standardized beliefs is required due to claims of knowledge that religions lay out regarding the physical, metaphysical, and ethical. The second aspect being a set of standardized regular practices is required due to the impossibility of private religion akin to private language, which Wittgenstein famously proved to be nonsensical, meaning religions are all expressible and lay within the realm of mutual human comprehension (this does not mean they have to be empirically valid or logically justified, only that the purposes, intents, or concepts be understandable). The third aspect is the most important as it is the strongest feature of religions and often left out when discussing religious frameworks.

55 Lectures by Adam Stowell during the time of September, 2014.

56 <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/religion>

A focus on transcendence can be said to be the *most-core* feature of the three core features of religions, as without a focus on transcendence, anything that's an enforceable ideology is a religion, as enforceable ideologies are merely belief sets that can be regularly instantiated in the world (qua standardized practices). This would make things like government, online forums, book clubs, or pretty much any regular societal activity a 'religious' activity, and yet this is clearly not what is meant when people discuss religions. Transcendence then is the distinguishing factor between religions and the other listed things, as most if not all religions have made assertions at some time of a dualistic nature to reality, where an 'other' place exists that certain forms of being can transcend to. Examples of this can be souls, God/gods/deities, afterlives, karma, or any non-physical understanding of reality that one can supposedly reach through the belief set or practice set of a religion (note this is significantly distinct from mere metaphysical frameworks).

With this framework neatly outlined, and without derivation off its path, I say unto thee, that there is one thing, one religion in particular, that truly all humans believe in, participate in, and use as a mode of transcendence, to which almost none have realized as their religion despite their strict adherence to it.

I am speaking about shoes. Almost everyone believes in shoes, I can't think of a single person who denies their existence, so this already places shoes way above every other deity in terms of epistemological acceptance. Almost everyone uses them daily, and even if they don't use them daily or simply don't have shoes, everyone desires shoes and works towards having them, making shoes a part of the way people live their lives. That's two of the three checks down the list already. Just like every other religion, people kill for them, so there's your political component if you were looking for it. What about transcendence then? Well shoes can be aesthetic as fuck (geobasket stratification), people have been known to literally cry over the qualia of a new pair of kicks, or find beauty in the curves of a pair of heels, but the visual aesthetics of shoes aren't enough to convince some people of transcendence. Let me tell you then of a reproducible, universal qualia of shoes that leads to direct sensation that cannot be described as anything other than an elevation of your existence into a higher realm (read: transcendence).

I am of course talking about the sensation and experience, gained and lived respectively, that occurs after a long day of manual labor with lots of lifting involved, that comes to fruition the moment you get home, sit down, and take your boots off. Everyone who has worked manual labor or done something similar like hiked for eight hours straight will know of this experience and will agree it is a profoundly sublime sensation that grants immediate relief from this world and projects you into a mind-state of something damn near bliss. If that's not transcendence, then not only do I not know what transcendence is but neither does anyone else and I don't believe a further definition for the word can be formulated that isn't false.

Shoes are a religion and Nike is our god.

:: The unTuring Test ::

"What if Alan Turing was actually a super intelligent robot that was performing a psyop to get the public used to sentient robots so his people could peacefully assimilate into human culture?"

- Garrett Cruz

The standard Turing test designed for assessing the efficacy of intelligent behaviors from machines and software is such that a lingual factor is the core feature, where if a machine or software can convince a human that cannot see the thing it is communicating with that it is not a machine or software, then that machine or software is demonstrating intelligent behaviors.⁵⁷ There is a 30% threshold for the Turing test where if the machine or software can convince 30% or more of its judges, then it is 'intelligent'. This has been notably criticized by John Searle with his example of the Chinese Room that tries to

57 <http://www.turing.org.uk/scrapbook/test.html>

demonstrate that a machine or software would never be capable of intelligence like humans have.⁵⁸ Regardless of your views either way on this, the question can be turned back on the human as xkcd pointed out.⁵⁹ So the question then becomes, not whether you can tell if something else is intelligent, but whether or not you can tell if you yourself are intelligent.

By intelligent here we mean having secondary theory of mind (being able to that tell other things have minds and each other mind is separate and distinct from one another). If the Turing test is then understood as machines or software designed to deceive a person into thinking they're talking to another person, then the Turing test is really testing the efficacy of a person's ability to tell when they're being lied to about intelligence. For this reason, using the same standards for intelligence of the machine or software, if a human fails the test more than 70% of the time, then they do not possess intelligence, as they have low theory of mind.

What then of people who post their whole lives online through social media sites and ultra specialized forums, whose friendship you can easily gain by feigning interest in the things they are also interested in, a list of which is publicly available by their own volunteering? Or women who constantly, "get with the wrong guy," because they are incapable of telling when they are being used and manipulated? Using a similar standard for intelligence that we apply in computational sciences one could apply to general philosophy of mind and determine that many adult-aged humans (which I'd lowball at ~20%) are simply not intelligent. This is not a small statement regarding some idea that they process information slower or know of less things than others, rather that this is a large statement about whether or not some humans have a mind, are a person, and should be treated as such.

Without secondary theory of mind, or 'intelligence' as defined here, it's not possible to have personhood. You cannot be a person if you are incapable of recognizing that other persons exist, as this lines up with secondary theory of mind that you must be capable of realizing other minds exist and they are all separate and distinct from each other. This is also the reason many animals are ruled out from being intelligent or from being non-human persons even if they are sentient, because sentience only means you have primary theory of mind, there is no higher mode of thinking that occurs. To make this clear, without secondary theory of mind, you are not intelligent in the computational sense (or rational sense), and therefore are not a person.

So would an 'unTuring' test really be able to accurately predict this? As we've exemplified with fake friendliness and bad partner choice, an unTuring test would definitely be able to accurately predict this, and if someone failed 70% or more of the time, they would lose regard as persons. This is funny if you consider that ethics only applies to people, which is why there are laws granting rights to non-human persons, because the human factor isn't what grants rights, it's personhood that grants rights. So sub-classing some humans and stripping them of their rights, while not politically correct, would still be valid under this framework.

What do you think, valued personable reader? Do you think you'd be able to tell if you were being deceived on that scale more than seventy percent of the time? I don't think humans would be able to tell more than half the time to be honest, I mean I bet you thought a human wrote all this, so how can you be trusted to tell what really does or doesn't have a mind?

Everything past the initial quote in the piece you just read was generated by a program from a series of lectures and articles on Turing & theory of mind and was formatted using the same program to follow a specific person's writing style (mine). I've also made some edits for logical consistency as some words were equivocated with other words, but this is minor grammatical editing. The big picture here is that this was not human-written and yet I'd wager that many humans who read this are not intelligent enough to have figured this out without being told. Good game, no re-match, I'll see you in the next prison block after our computer overlords take over.

58 <http://cogprints.org/7150/1/10.1.1.83.5248.pdf>

59 <https://xkcd.com/329/>



:: Don't Support The Troops :: The Measure of Socio-Political Influence

Docile bodies come from docile minds and the docile body that waits for instructions is the one that utters, "I was just following orders." All manner of atrocity have been justified by the ones carrying them out as merely doing what they were told - doing what they were doing. There is almost nothing in the mainstream directly and overtly opposing the rhetoric of, "Think for yourself," but you should let no one attribute to malice that which can be explained by stupidity, so thinking for yourself is only possible when one is aware of a self, and for NPCs, either by nature or nurture, this is not an option.

Why make the active decision to join a structure whose sole purpose is to kill humans? Granted, most of the humans intended to be killed are also mindless automatons, but for the few that aren't, the ethical problem remains that you're actively choosing to end a mind. The lack of awareness of other minds, to the point where you see no wrong in ending them (as an offensive measure rather than a self-defensive measure), means you have little to no theory of mind and are therefore, by definition, not a person. Personhood requires that the one with the title of personhood have secondary theory of mind. You cannot have proper theory of mind (save your accusation of true Scotsman about "proper theory of mind" for the Metaphilosophy section) without understanding it is wrong to end minds.

The Garon Principle of Socio-political Theory - the measure of a country's global influence in modernity is demonstrated by its ability to say other nationalities have their specific ethnicities, while maintaining their own country's nationality as a homogenous ethnicity. For example, if you visit all over Russia, you'll see some Russians that look Japanese (because they are), but if you visit Japan, you never see any Japanese that look Russian. This means Japan has a stronger influence over Russia in modernity. Or maybe it means Russia has a stronger influence over Japan, I don't know, but either way there's something going on.

:: Calling One an Asshole in Defense of Being Shown to be Social Cancer is Ethically Fallacious :: Immaculate IRC Rant

There's a cancer that's become quite malignant amongst my generation. It comes from the deep-rooted insecurities of the underaged and purposeless, unfurls itself onto social media like none other, and makes itself apparent as much of the content you read online. This isn't a shitshow about how prepubes shove intimate details of their life down everyone's throats publicly or the sensationalist click-baiting disease that calls itself fifth-estate journalism, no this is a defense of the fuckery that pursues it.

Good men get deemed unfit by their peers, get labeled assholes unjustly, become the modern Socrates- claimed an annoyance and a detriment to society by their contemporaries. The people reading

this (and it's probably a stretch to say most of the people reading this are a part of the mental class of society) know that it was much more the reverse scenario for Socrates, that he was the necessary Gadfly awaking the Great Horse of Athens. I propose to the same Intelligentsia that the unsung heroes of facebook flame wars, the shit-talkers of online games, that these are the modern Gadflies.

To those who think it fitting that all your social sphere need know that you're out shoe shopping, that they need know what you had for dinner, that they need know anything else you post every ten minutes, and that they also need to see photos of it all; to you Malignant Social Cancers that weigh down society and flood communication channels with things so asinine and unrelated even tangentially to original thought, to you who thinks it just that you wage a war of attrition on what actually needs to be heard and discussed, to you I say go fuck yourselves. One is not an asshole for shitting on your facebook wall when you post stupid shit, one is not an asshole for disagreeing that you're entitled to an opinion, one is not an asshole for trying to clear the communication lines and make you think before you speak. The amount of void present in your place is such that it perverts logic in a formal manner when you call the truth-speaker an asshole. In fact, continuing to fight in the face of such utter and complete massacre is dishonorable on your part. It would even be fair to argue you're unethical, an evil person worthy of being struck down in physical conflict if one over the matter ever came to be.

To the side of the person who thinks sharing everything is deserved, or that public forums are places for all information, you are reified evil. The standard view of virtue and vice holds that extremes are the vice and that virtue is built through active moderation. Sharing everything is an extreme, lacks moderation, and thus makes you viceful. You might post to your thousand plus 'friends' after reading this and say how rude someone was to you for proving you viceful and ask what it even matters anyways. To you, Postius Mostius, be aware that easiness with vice is what makes you a bad person, what makes one evil; keep in mind there is no wrong in ending evil. When this comes bubbling up to state ideology be careful you aren't purged with the rest.

If you then come back and say, "Well if I don't post song lyrics and how much I love my new SO then there just wouldn't be any content on my facebook wall at all."

I honestly thought about ending there because really what more needs to be said, but apparently more needs to be said because people need shit pictorially diagramed for them, so onward ho. You're right, there wouldn't be any content on your facebook wall, but nothing of value would be lost. If you come to realize that without posting the asinine, the trivial, the worthless, that you would have never posted anything at all, then you'll also probably come to realize that all of your thousand plus "friends" would have never posted anything as well. You know why? Because you aren't people. Now I know this may sound alarmist to some, but you have to have secondary theory of mind to be a person, and one who is so incapable of understanding how to properly socialize clearly has no real theory of mind, and thus is not a person (soc-TOM axiom)⁶⁰. G'day.

:: Commentary-As-Content Culture ::

"The reason we care so much about approval from strangers on the Internet is because they have no social obligation to lie to us."

- 2existential⁶¹

We have now, as a global society in the first world, "Commentary as Content" culture, where people are making their livings on YouTube (and other sites) by discussing topics they have little to no knowledge or authority over, at least not beyond superficially. Why do they have audiences? We can say it's the rise of infotainment, with shows like *The Daily Show* and *Colbert Report* popularizing news and journalism as a comedy medium, but why is infotainment on the rise to begin with? You could say it's a lot easier to be 'informed' this way, isn't it? You hear major news or general topics that friends and family may be

60

61 <https://twitter.com/2existential/status/539887949983547392>

discussing and by watching entertainment shows you get superficial understandings of the topics, but that's about it, isn't it?

Both sides, the *real news* as well as *infotainment*, lack what the other excels in. If you want both sides, real journalism paired with real deconstruction of the ethics, there is no place this currently exists. There is no current outlet or source that does hard journalism that also explains (with philosophic rigor) why they are reporting on the thing.

Wouldn't it make more sense and be more informative to regularly give justification for what's being reported on and the methodology for the reporting and reasoning used? Why don't you think this exists?

Youtube misinformation and topic shows vs. TL;DR the debunker-god himself.

"This would be fine if we didn't live in a world where people regularly misinterpreted studies, but we do in fact live in a world where people, most people, often misinterpret studies. So it seems the case that we ought to verify the competency of people that regurgitate these studies for us, be them YouTube personalities, online news sites like Huffington Post, or just our friends on Facebook."

Kojima talked about the fractionalizing of the internet as cultures become more and more specific and excluded to their own recesses. There's also the note that Poe's Law means anyone not native to a fractionalized group becomes incapable of distinguishing between them. Thus is the nature of the internet.

::Time Doesn't Exist :: The Real Answer

One of the most common perennial issues in philosophy is the creation of the universe within the framework of time. Without getting too much into first-mover antics, it's been noted time and time again (forgive me puns, for I have sinned) that there are issues that pop up on both sides of the discussion when concerning 'time' itself. The two sides are briefly- that time always existed (infinite) and that time had a spawning point (finite).

As noted, both are horribly fallacious. If we go with the first view that time is infinite, that it always existed, then that means an infinite amount of time would have needed to pass before our physical universe came to exist (either through Big Bag theory or w/e), and you can't have a finite point in time where something popped into existence when the number line before it is infinite, as you would have had to wait an infinite amount of time to get to that point, which means you should still be waiting.

The other view, that time is finite, would mean that there was a definite starting point for ALL things to begin existing and nothing existed before that point. This makes a question like, "what happened before time existed?" a malformed question, as there would be no 'before' because no events could have occurred in any sequence before time existed. Under a finite framework for time, it's still impossible for the universe to exist, as again, there is no 'before' which would mean the universe would have to have popped into existence from nothing. While Lawrence Krauss's book "Something from Nothing" explains the theoretical physics behind how matter can pop into existence in empty space, this doesn't solve the problem of why space exists to begin with, nor at what point in time it began to exist. Nothing comes from nothing, it is nonsensical (non-figuratively) to think something came from absolute nothingness.

So currently this issue is still up in the air even after a couple thousand years on the subject. People are still fighting over whether or not time is infinite or finite but very little is written in the frame of time not existing to begin with. A lot of people jump to saying things like, "well if time doesn't exist, then what do you call the motion of objects through space in an ordered sequence?" I agree that this is what we call time and this is how we conceptualize changes in states of affairs, but you'd have to create a whole 'nother dualistic framework to say things like the 'past' and 'future' actually exist as objects separate from the present. Since it's impossible to demonstrate (empirically or otherwise) that a 'future' object exists outside of the future and to show it to someone presently, it does not make sense to

assume that the future is a thing that actually exists, similarly with the past. This does not mean that wu-wu eastern religious "time is a flat circle" bullshit is what we ought to implement when thinking about time; it just means that time as a physical property of existence is invalid, and instead it's merely a framework for us to conceptualize reality, which is the view of presentism.

The argument that we cannot think of an object without extension into space, or think of motion without extension into time, does not mean that space and time must actually exist. This is something often misunderstood when reading Kant, as it's a subtle pull for an argument from ignorance in saying that because we are incapable of thinking about it otherwise, that it must be the case the way we think about it is correct. Space and time being how we frame our universe doesn't lead immediately to meaning that space and time necessarily exist in themselves.

Back to the point here, if we take the third option- that time doesn't actually exist, we don't run into the issues showcased with the first two options that lead to it being impossible for our universe to exist. This may seem unsatisfactory to most people because it still doesn't explain how our universe came to exist, but reverting back to a physicalist framework gives you an impossible task of explaining what happened before the Big Bang. So why the Big Bang (or w/e creation theory you want)? Why existence at all? Now hear me out here, I know this'll seem crazy, but it's probably aliens.

I know, I know, aliens are conspiracy theory level shit, but when stripped of all other options, our universe just being a simulation running on the laptop of a kid failing his Universe Sim 101 class in Gazorpazork University is not that farfetched an idea. In fact, if our universe is running inside a computer, it would accurately explain a lot of the errors in quantum theory and other areas of physics that they're currently attributing to 'consciousness' (which is just as much wu-wu magic bullshit as you could possibly get). Things like the dual-slit experiment being observed by measuring devices, leaving a pattern on the receiving wall and then having the pattern change after the data from the observation devices is read, would require the particles that left the pattern on the receiving wall either time-traveled back and changed their own arrangement, OR, this is all just information being moved around by a computational machine and quantum experiments are exposing the assembly code and letting us see this simulation for what it is.

I dunno, I'm not 100% either way on this lol, but the more I look into the metaphysics of space and time and the more I look into the theoretical physics behind quant, the more it looks like we don't really exist on our own; it appears to be more probable, and certainly easier to explain, that we exist as a simulation. I could be full of shit, I mean I probably am, but I'm having a hard time seeing our universe any other way. Lemme know what you guys think (and whether this was an interesting read or not).



:: The Twenty Ninth of February, Two Thousand and Sixteen ::

So I've been getting In-N-Out for lunch every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday around noon on my way home from class for an entire month now and every time there has been this super hot chick at the window. I mean like objectively at least an eight, but a ten by my standards, like she's a super fly hottie for def sures. Today she starts chatting me up, giggling and talking about how I must always catch her on back duty, we establish that I show up on all the days she works there, she explicates that she has tomorrow off and in my head I'm like okay what's the point, I say thanks and drive off like a fucktard, and just now, JUST RIGHT FUCKING NOW AS I LAYED DOWN TO GO TO SLEEP, I realized I'm a fucking autistic and this chick was asking me out on a date.

I will get no sleep tonight.

SECTOR 4

- INTERNET ADVENTURES -

The Russian word for Truth is 'Pravda'. If we were to take the American English equivalent for "a true bro" and slangerized it, the Russian crossover would be 'bruvda'. Let it be known from here on out that a bruvda is a true bro, one who is aware of the Good in others and acts upon it justly. Brostoyevsky is our series on internet culture in which we searched for bruvdas in various recesses of the internet. Enjoy these explorative deconstructions of the contemporary first-world in all their glory.

:: Internet Adventures Part 1; The Philosophical Camwhore ::

All of the following events took place between March 2nd and March 29th, 2015.

A while back I was sent a link from my Estonian friend to a camsite where people can stream themselves performing sexual acts for money. The link was to a specific girl, a raver chick with purple hair, who was going to hoola-hoop naked. When I realized what I had clicked, my sides were destroyed. I returned the next day to see the same performance, only this time with knee-high socks. This wasn't for sexual reasons, at least not entirely, I returned because I wanted to see what I could get these people to do for money. I spent the next month taking the entirety of my free time going through ~600 females (some fairly well known) and ~50 males on three different major camsites, seeing what I could make people do for money. Don't worry, it wasn't my money, most of these sites have relatively easy exploits you can abuse to gain free 'tokens' or 'gold' which are used to tip the performers.

I have a lot of free time and probably an issue with abusing power, but I did approach this as a serious research project (or as serious as one can take camgirls).

After going through about 650 people (all of which I cataloged and will be uploading data for), there were a couple strong trends I noticed, the first being that the younger and skinnier you looked, the more people you'd get to watch you and the nicer they treated you on average. Proportionate to the younger and skinnier factor was the joyfulness and outgoing factor, where it seemed that because they were young they were also happier, not yet beaten down by life like the jaded older women who were clearly doing this kind of work because they had to, not because they wanted to. They might have been happier and more talkative because their customers were nicer to them, it was probably a bit of both, regardless, age and weight scaled directly in relation to popularity on these sites. Of course, what I just said is 'subjective' and harder to prove, so I don't have data on this, but I do for the rest of the project.

The second thing I noticed is that many of the females, especially the younger ones (under 25) who were American or western European, fancied themselves intellectuals. One of them was displaying her smarts by fluently conversing with her crowd of international clients in six different languages. It would almost have been impressive if several vibrating dildos weren't buzzing on screen. The 'intelligentsia' comes out of most of the younger crowd on these sites since they are willing to talk about anything, especially on slow nights (and slow for some of them can be as many as 500 paying customers). I remember one show distinctly where I had joined a room and the camgirl was discussing why a non-deistic (meaning perfect) god couldn't exist while holding up a book by Ayn Rand (which tells you plenty about her critical analysis skills), all while stark naked. It's in the absurdity of the moment that you start to think you've poured too much time into this, but it was also in this moment I realized that these pseudo-intellectual camgirls were the draw for the mass-conversion of the sapiosexual western world. "Smart is the new sexy," is a common phrase, but it's not new; intelligence in women has always been considered a strongly attractive feature.

Let me be clear, intelligence is not to be confused with smarts. The chick that knew six languages was smart, she could speak six languages, she had memorized a lot of shit, congrats, but she was not intelligent. She had low theory of mind and seemingly no way to form an opinion on something without committing a formal fallacy. The Randian streaker of cyberspace on the other hand, with the book being in the first hand, was at least positing things she had previously not been told, meaning she was coming about synthetic a priori arguments; she was expending the intellectual labor to reach new concepts, giving her the rights to ownership over those ideas. This is the mark of someone with the potential to be intelligent. She was still wrong though, she committed several formal fallacies along her way but at least it was a step in the right direction. Thinking about this a little more I reproached the younger camgirl crowd, no longer demanding them to put shoes on their head or seeing if they could fit their whole hand in their mouths but instead asking them why they did or didn't believe in god, what their preferred system of governance was, how they justified knowing things without presuming knowledge was possible in the first place, all the perennial issues of philosophy that have challenged us as humans for quite some time now. Their responses weren't that unique or surprising, but it gave some insight into how this sect of society thought.

A few red flags might have struck you there. Who am I to say such things? How pretentious do I think I am? Isn't this totally subjective? These might be the questions you're asking, but if they are, you're delusional and I'll explain why. Again, I went through approximately 650 people across three major websites (all of which were after I started asking them philosophical questions), cataloging them all (stats include age, nationality, languages spoken, and body measurements), pairing the chat logs for each, and moderating for synthetic a priori statements that both did and didn't commit formal logical fallacies. This gives an objective basis by which an unbiased third party can also review the data, the pool of which was created by a professional logician. Who I am to say such things, the pretentiousness of which, and the subjectivity of which, are now accounted for.

But maybe I wasn't asking the right questions, I mean out of any random pool of 650 people, surely some of them are bound to be fairly intelligent, right? Wrong, none of them were. I pressed pretty hard on all the ones willing to have conversation outside of payment negotiations, dedicating about 20 minutes on average to each, asking counter-questions that follow the Socratic method, and whatever the topic was none of them escaped a formal fallacy of some sort. The critical skills just weren't there. I think the reason for this is that it isn't a random pool of people, but a very specific pool of a very specific kind of person, namely the kind that is willing to engage in self-pleasure regularly as their sole means of income. This isn't an ethical assertion here, I'm not saying what they're doing is wrong, I'm saying their nature is different than the average person. These are a different kind of people, a kind that lives for the body rather than the mind. It seems fair to say then that their minds would be less exercised than their bodies.

So what was the point then? I'm not here just to shit on camgirls, on the contrary I think this data is very important as camsites are the fastest expanding market of adult entertainment, and so this data is useful for understanding how the newest (and soon to be largest) adult entertainment market operates on some level.

I opened saying that I wanted to see what I could get people to do for money, and that was true, but then I wanted to see what I could get people, people that would do almost anything with their bodies for money, to do with their minds. There is an underlying hypothesis here, one in which you realize that you don't get credited with a novel approach to thinking for taking other's feelings into consideration, that stereotypes are stereotypes for a good reason. The stereotype of the camwhore is that of a camwhore: very nice people, very big hearts and goals in life, very little brains to get them through it. One hundred percent of the data aligns with this hypothesis, and the sample pool is decently large enough that one could say after a few more people run similar projects like I have, that this is a solid theory about an aspect of internet culture that tells us objectively the kinds of people that hedonistic work is entrenched with.

I've spent the majority of my free time over the years in programming communities and obscure forums that serve no purpose other than to generate content exclusive to themselves for the sake of spinning their wheels, often times these communities are autism whirlpools of self-sustained echo chambers. It seems the only way to break the wheel-spinning of this fractionalizing of the internet is to revert to older systems like IRC, BBS's, and usenet groups, as not even onion sites have been able to keep the autists at bay. These older systems seem to break the cycle simply due to their lack of public availability and difficulty to access (if you are not very net-literate), making them retain the feeling of exclusivity.

Regardless the reasons for their success in programming circles, these esoteric technologies are undeniably successful in whatever their aim. Take for example AnonOps' IRC network, which is the public face of Anonymous, the hacktivist group that doesn't really do anything anymore. The main mode of communication for most of their members and coordination of their projects is through this IRC network and in the past they've been incredibly successful due to it.

But in all the groups, no matter if they're public, esoteric, private, easy or difficult to access, there's one thing all these higher-level programming circles have in common that an average lurker of their communities will quickly notice if they have sufficient training in formal logic. We'll take to calling this commonality the "Black-Hat Fallacy."

The fallacy tends to follow as:

"I want a free and open internet where all information is publicly available."

"I don't want others or the government to have access to my information or records."

This is contradictory, and yet these contradictory views are held in tandem almost universally by everyone in anonops' IRC and everyone in higher levels of software technology that advocate for internet policy (further exemplified by the keynote speaker of this year's BlackHat conference). I think this helps paint a clear picture of the failings otherwise fair-minded individuals come to in terms of reasonable conclusions when deprived of a broader understanding of formal logic and normative ethics. It might be fair to say this has resulted due to things like formal logic, ethics, civics, and others no longer being a part of standardized education curriculum in public schools, but this is a fallacy so strongly centered in their ideology that I fear formal education stands no chance at defeating it.

The question now becomes, to those exposed to the fallacy, which of the two views do you value more? Either you take the first position - you want a free and open internet where information is publicly available because you think academic works and knowledge shouldn't be closed to the public and therefore you cannot privatize information including medical records etcetera, or you take the second position - you don't want others to have access to your information or records because you think consent is required first and therefore assume information can be owned, privatized, and made exclusive, but you cannot take both and maintain logical consistency. My apologies for that being a single sentence.

So it then seems that while these netizen dilettantes of ethics intend to do good, they inappropriately apply their intentions. I guess the moral of this story would be as Hanlon famously said, "Never attribute to malice that which is adequately explained by stupidity."

:: Internet Adventures Part 3; The Social Error of Online Dating ::

I occasionally go through Tinder profiles to see if there's any females that say they enjoy something other than the beach or Disneyland. There are several laws to online dating through services like Tinder, Hot or Not, Badoo, etcetera. For example, if they're blonde there is a certainty that they say they like either the beach or Disneyland, or they will say they have wanderlust (as if to imply most people don't like travel). There's a statistically impossible trend of genericism across a disproportionate amount of these profiles and this is good news because it means we've reached it, egalitarianism has won, everyone is the same generic loaf of wonder bread now and people are controllable on a mass-scale. At least the people lonely enough to do online dating are. Really fourth-wave feminists should be attacking

whatever is responsible for homogenizing the personality-hood of feminine society instead of just blaming men for everything they don't like.

Online dating itself seems a little odd. I don't say it's odd because of any social stigma, I say it's odd because it can allow for too much power. Sexuality thrives best when you have to work for it, when you aren't sexually satisfied all of the time, but with the way web culture currently exists porn is available almost universally and real-life mates might as well be on a slider scale of physical customizability through dating and hook-up services. We find this shows that sexuality is not truly meant for "the one" or for a "perfect match" but rather for someone that fits close enough to your physical preference and happens to live within a 20 mile radius. Even without online services, did everyone really think it was a coincidence that 90% of their "soul mates" lived within driving distance? If anything here we see that sexuality is valued higher than it reasonably should be.

So considering that, I decided I would really try to test the efficacy of online dating and see if I could find someone remotely close to a "soul mate". The sapiosexual conquest had begun, where the body was of lesser concern and the beauty of the mind was in focus. I got paired with a chick that said in her bio that intelligent conversation is a must, and that she liked the beach and Disneyland, but the intelligent conversation part stood out to me. So I messaged her. I thought she would ignore me like all the other women in my life, or that she was as fake as her bio was generic. It ended in me getting nudes from her. I'm not sure what the point of this story is anymore, but I think we all learned a lesson.

:: Internet Adventures Part 4; The Ethical Fallacy of Taking the Internet Seriously ::

As a measurement from a virtue-vice system, taking things too seriously is in the ethical wrong, it falls on one extreme of the system. Within the same system we can map the opposite extreme as never being able to take anything seriously, which puts us within the realm of people who take things too seriously or never at all, and without assuming all readers are obsequious in nature we should substantiate that these extremes in this virtue-vice system are actually unethical.

It might be that you deny the validity of virtue-vice systems as being proper demarcators of ethicisms, to which I have no quick and easy counter. In this case we must base our ethics in some other system we could call objective, and do so without listening too strongly to those who say such a thing is impossible, as the impossibility of objective ethics places us in an inescapable box of epistemological dismay that we could never know anything to be ethical. It must be that ethics is objective, as to claim knowledge of such would require justified true belief with the focus here on 'true' as Truth is of an objective nature and is the very thing that allows epistemological systems to tie to reality.

That's nice, you might say, but so what? What are we going to use to say anything objective about ethics then? Understand the standard Randian adherent builds their 'objective ethics' off an A=A tautological system, whose problems arise quite quickly in the face of dissent hailed from synthetic a-priori defendants who note that tautological systems only define themselves, never actuate themselves, meaning that you can't ever learn anything or know the things within the system to be true external to the system, as their truth is merely axiomatic and contingent to reality. So to make this quick, we'll assume people exist and that people are minded things. To quell the qualms people conipotionalize over the semantic of "minded things," we'll use the definition of thought-capable objects. This may further have taken you aback, but defining people as thought-capable objects makes them feasible in both monastic physicalist frameworks and body-mind dualistic frameworks.

With this understanding of persons, know that ethics only exists where minds do, in that without mind interactions there are no ethics. This does not mean ethics exists in the mind alone, or that ethics is an invented or made-up construct, but rather that it explicitly denotes the parameters in which an ethic can be existent. We don't say rocks have ethics as they do not discursively consider the actions they commit; they act without the capability to reflect or plan the act. This also makes it so that even without free will or in a deterministic framework we can still have ethics, as even when deterministically forced to do so, we still have thought, and so as thinking objects we carry out ethics.

You might be asking now what the fuck this has to do with the internet. Let me take you back to the initial proposition- that taking things wholly seriously versus wholly not are two extremes of a virtue-

vice system and that virtue-vice systems in themselves do not actuate ethical imperative. With our understanding that we've just established of objective ethics (being that it's objective that persons exist and they interact) we can count mind interaction and use virtue-vice as a ledger of the actions. This means that we don't even need to say an act in itself is 'good' or 'evil', we merely need to note that the act occurred in reality and the rest sorts itself out. This is a very clean framework for ethics. I understand dissent may arise here, but that's not what this is about.

So moving on, within the virtue-vice system of wholly serious and wholly unserious (or fully sarcastic to the point you can't take reality in a sober manner), we find the virtue lies in the middle. To be half-serious and half-sarcastic at all times then is truly the mark of a virtuous person. This extends not only to all things said but to all instantiated actions committed, as you must be sober enough to recognize that they are indeed happening and that they are serious in this sense but also that they are contingent and needn't necessarily be the case. Basically what I'm saying is that if you take what people say on the internet seriously, then you're a bitch.

:: Internet Adventures Part 5; Post-Critical Art ::

Modern art, as an intellectual study, is the worst of all post-structuralist studies. Foucault's notion that aesthetics were all power struggles (meaning you could characterize anything as a positive and negative struggle or dialectic), paired with Derrida and Duchamp's notions of personal meaning and repurposing of objects, further reinforced on the mass scale (accidentally) by Warhol, gave rise to the gestalt switch of modernity that, "Anything is art." The problem is of course that given the notions just mentioned, as well as the general momentum of modern artists, that truly anything is being considered art, with the academics themselves asking the question of what art is, as if the question has no right answers. The pile of criticism this approach to aesthetics has generated is becoming almost as enormous as the pile of formal works supporting the notion that anything can be art, however the question of what is art is not actually open ended and so the aesthetic of modernity may yet be salvaged from its instantiation as a straw hut in low tides.

The internet and the content creators on it, most notably the producers (and products) of comedy, have been the greatest source of societal critiques, not only in sheer quantity of production but in quantity of persons reached, as millions of people view these specific social critiques the internet provides every given day. Outside of the internet, infotainment has become so well done that it's starting to become the normative approach to actual education, showcased by shows like *The Daily Show*, *The Colbert Report*, and *Last Week Tonight*, all being immensely popular, and all bordering on being indistinguishable from actual news sources even though they started (and maintain themselves to be) merely parodies of news sources. But the internet doesn't have the restrictions that large television networks do, and so infotainment on the internet has taken a different form, one that when viewed as a whole, self-critiques and self-regulates according to that critique. This has now extended into the very real and regular world outside the internet, as it has become affected directly and strongly by internet culture and the criticisms it spawns moreso than any other source.

The art world is no exception to this process; the leakage of memetic content into real-world instantiations of fine art is seen fairly regularly in the contemporary scene, and its instantiation makes sense, as it was Duchamp himself hours before a big exhibit that bought a shovel from a department store and hung it as his submission, tag and all, claiming that the repurposed item, with intent behind it, was a piece of art, so why not do the same with memetic content? Why not do the same with anything anyone takes to be explicitly normative or explicitly non-normative and frame it, as clearly that falls into the now-normative definition of art because you're being ironic or starkly unironic (read:hipster)? Nota bene, that while this motion from modern artists to question and push what we call art seems (usually) to be a legitimate question or push, it still follows a clear notion of what art is. There are still a recognized set of regularities that crop up amongst modern art. Without getting into debates over the formal or academic definition of art, I'll try to give two necessary criterion of art, that together are sufficient for characterizing any piece of art, modern or otherwise.

The first is intent. This is often the pin the door of the aesthetic world hinges on, whether they want to recognize it or not. By intent I do not merely mean something is more or less artful depending on how deep the artist's intentions were, I mean that an object (or set of objects) must be intentionally instantiated as a necessary requirement before you can call them art. This is exemplified by other aspects that many would normally attribute to art, such as the process of production itself, whereby something is not art if it is not produced as art. This is not arguable. Finding a rock on a beach and claiming the rock, on its own, with no augmentation to environmental relation or context of its nature, is art, is false. A rock on a beach that was placed or photographed in a such a way as to frame it with a specifically intended environmental relation or spatial context can be said to be art, as the intent for the instantiation of art was present and a process occurred where that intent was captured (regardless if others share the same intent), but without this intent and subsequent process, there is no art. If there is no product from a person, there is no object of art present, this is semantically actuated and as such unarguable.

The second is transcendence. This is the framework the aesthetic door rests in, whether or not its critics recognize it. By transcendence I do not mean art teleports you to a different plane of existence, I mean that the art piece itself is to convey some notion in any general sense, as a relation between objects or concepts, with or without any further context, and with or without the notion intended by the artist that produced the piece being the same notion the perceiver of the piece attains. This criterion is what allows for color fields to be considered fine art, and the criterion of which's questioning led to the creation of both expressionism and cubism. This is also the criterion most abstractly reified in modernity, to which we've seen many modern artists claim that the meaning of their work is whatever the viewer wants it to be (exemplified greatly by the numerous blank canvases in the MOMA, which were purchased for millions of dollars⁶²).

These two criterion as broad and general conditions, when amalgamated as they've just been, account for the greatest number of art pieces, especially with regards to modernity, and not just with explanatory power but predictive power as well, as many people can now accurately tell you if a piece (or one similar to it) might find itself in a museum or gallery. These two criterion are also the most attacked, which many think is what produces the deepest works of art, as questioning intent and perception after the instantiation are what gives rise to most of the production of, and literature on, aesthetic works. This paradigm which we will now attribute to modern art at large is what spawns the question of, "What is art?" It also allows us to answer the question, but maybe too broadly, as seemingly anything can be considered fine art under this definition.

Surely if we can know what art is by intending it to be such, then we can know what art is not if the intent is explicit to some produced object not being art. This is to go in the opposite direction of, "anything is art," but not to say, "nothing is art," as we are clearly saying there are things that aren't art, and so we must also admit some things are. This is where post-critical art comes in. H3h3productions released a video called, "How To Make Modern Art," in which what we consider to constitute modern art is heavily criticized and parodied, with examples given to showcase what is *not* art.⁶³ Ethan, the creator of the video, gives the regular criteria of how to make modern art as being: making it look old, putting it behind glass, resale of old crap, and excessive pricing. Each of the four criteria is substantiated by works in the video that are on display currently in the MOMA in New York. He also notes that it's not real art if it doesn't sell for more than a million dollars. He then goes on to produce an object that by intent is not art, as he clearly thinks the majority of modern art isn't actually art, his parody product of which is his beanie, behind glass.

The issue is not that this fits his criterion for modern art, as his criterion is not supposed to give rise to actual art, but that fits the criterion for art at large, even with the intent of the product as being not art, which makes us wonder if his framed beanie is actually profound modern art. You may be wondering about his fourth criterion- the pricing. Worry not, because after he posted the video, he also gave a link to ebay, where you could bid on the framed beanie, the first of which had bids at seventy million dollars USD, to which ebay took down, as they thought the large price inflation was from false

⁶² <https://www.sfmoma.org/artwork/98.308.A-C>

⁶³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d7ez-gIt08I>

bids (framed screenshots of which are now also currently on sale on ebay⁶⁴). In the same day he sorted it out with them and got it put back up, and within four hours of that it had gotten back up to two million dollars USD.⁶⁵ These were fake bids, as ebay has verified, but people are willing to pay the money for a beanie behind glass just the same as they are for real modern art, as thousand-dollar knock-offs have since been spawned and sold on ebay. Clearly people think this is real modern art, but why? This was supposed to be a direct showcase of what isn't modern art, or art at all, but it has already spawned knock-off pieces that are being bid on for thousands of dollars much like early editions of major screen prints from famous artists would be bid on.⁶⁶

This is post-critical art. Not only because it's after critique, or only because it can't be criticized as art since it's not intended to be art, but because it's past the critical point that it could reasonably be called art, as it's its own critique, its own non-intentioned piece, with the video being a meta-instantiate of the very notion of what should *not* be art and the framed object being a meta-reification of what is intended to actually *not* be art. This is what the self-critical nature of the internet hath spawned, as while on the surface this seems to go against the two criterion outlined earlier, that this seems like the piece was non-intentional and that it is not meant to transcend, that it was intended to be so and in that it is transcendent. So as an instantiate of post-critical art, like we can know all post-critical art to be henceforth, the video paired with the framed beanie is truly a piece of meta-art reified. This also lets us know the definition of post-critical art as being all works produced with the explicit intent of not being art. This means critiques of art, with explication of what is clearly not art, are then themselves pieces of post-critical art. This essay, as it is a reified critique of meta-art, without intent as being its own object, is then itself an instantiate of post-critical art. Fuck you modernity.

67



⁶⁴ <http://www.ebay.com/itm/Artists-Beanie-Screenshot-At-70-000-000-Gone-Wrong-/301878832307?hash=item4649616cb3:g:YCsaAOSw~OVWyxSM>

⁶⁵ <http://www.ebay.com/itm/-/111913567870>

⁶⁶ <http://www.ebay.com/itm/Artists-Beanie-/131734219488?hash=item1eabf8aae0:g:DaYAAOSwDuJWy1u~>

⁶⁷ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d7ez-gIt08I>

SECTOR 5

- CREDITS, NOTES, AND EXTRA SHIT -

Contributors to this document: Garrett Cruz, Albert Castro, Matthew Busby, and various camgirls of the internet.

Deus favet fortibus, atque sum,
The Dean of Clown School