

FRAGMENTS OF AN ABSOLUTE

Author: Crueltyfluff

This is written after [Hyperborean Ideology \(one of the worst things i have ever written\)](#). (I CANNOT STRESS HOW MUCH I HATE THIS BOOK its my version of the evil book or whatever lyotard said because it was absolute dogshit and i didnt know anything about what i was talking about, re-reading it feels like a form of actual self-harm... oh and the palingenesis thing was cringe along with the mythology/ 8-10-26 addition. it is a tragedy, though, that writings like my youth-liberationist writings, my critique of bob black, my critique of the novetlists and radeviants and radqueers, my first critique of culture and self, and more are in thiis writing, and those parts are the only reason i keep this up at all.)) and by the same author (june-10-2026 3:02 am), this book will be written, most likely. I am sorry for many of the speciesist and transid-phobic things i said and theorized in the first section of my book, hyperborean ideology (and anything done before i wrote that book, when i was still following mainstream beliefs, or if i was edgy in my younger years of being a minor--- regardless of if it was normalized the mainstream beliefs i had were still paramisic, trans-idphobic, racist (american white nationalism taught in schools), capitalist, sexist, ableist, and who knows what else. And being edgy is not much better.), i have moved past validity discourse (nothing is valid so be and do whatever) and speciesist arguments... too, i reject all cultures, including animal cultures and nature, however. I also have moved past maoist (and, that ACP dicatorship in america, though i used to ridicule the idea that america was under a maoist (very-much-so antishipper) dictatorship.... Glorious most honorable Haz Al-Din is a Xi-ist form of "maoist" and Jinkles or whatever is, supposedly, a Mao(as Stalin)ist, or, an ML who likes china to the point they get boners (they do not know but their LARPs and serious expressions do not create revolution, an ideal revolution is a party, an eternal party, with orgies and parodies and laughter and sleep-deprivation and all, like the myths of the italian regency of carnaro without their gradual quasi-fascism! Theyy do not know that the revolution is like the phalanx, a living one, like the union of egoists, a living one, like a cult, like a rave, like a, well, party, like a khaos, like a patchwork, like a joke, like it all! They forget comedy is the best cure for sadness. Maoists.... if they want boners, they should've made the orgy revolution instead of this ML bastardhood. unless its their kink, ig.). The ACP's MAGA communism actually makes perfect sense to me! It is, basically (and like my former idea of PA) a palingenetic leftist movement using rightist aesthetic and achieving a cultural

revolution for communism, or basically, an old left Rightist movement using leftist aesthetics and achieving a nazi-maoist cultural revolution for left-wing fascism, or another fucking Maoist who leans far-right and is a nationalist and loves violence and cultism (chairman gonzalo, pol pot, Mao Zedong, Bob avakian, who else who else??, like almost every chinese cyber-maoist incel is the same too!). The ACP, and too, now the USA, is under another incel Maoist dystopia! Mao Zedong really is the uniting force of the left and the right, of fascism and communism, the Nazi-Maoists were right.... Palingenetic Anarchism has already been done in practice, it's called "maga communism". thus, why i must abandon P.A. as a sickening reactionary idea.) ideas of a 'revolutionary path' so narrow-minded and formed through a distinction of means and ends, which any path must have means and ends separate to exist... and the means and ends are one of the same and so the path will naturally corrupt, no path leads anywhere but the path itself... and with that, applying the same idea to absolute abolition along with my hatred for God and hatred for my old self for trying to recreate god, i reject absolute abolition which, in the end, seeked to rebirth god as abolition, or, "absolute abolition", absolute=god, god abolition, god as abolition. I have critiqued Absolute Abolition (which i can do solely because i am not afraid of critique nor self-critique and instead often partake in it... Which is why i must say that 'i am almost always wrong' and 'i am very often mistaken' yet still speak as if i am right.) already but to repost the same writing again, "I now, june 8 4:11 pm, find myself looking back in self-critique once more... there is still a sort of (reminding me of my old mission to recreate god) longing for absoluteness (homogeneity?) and, so, a lack of abolition... in absolute abolition, something remains unabolished, or, it remains unabolished in its abolition itself, it is remade through absolute abolition instead of destroyed... that is the absolute. Absolute Abolition fails to abolish the absolute because, in abolishing everything even nothing, it reinstates the absolute instead of abolishing it.... (everything becomes abolished, so everything becomes all under one umbrella, one absolute defining feature of it all, one absolute, that is its nature as abolished) and, to use the other name, Absolute Liberation fails to liberate from the absolute because it, instead of destroying the absolute, "changes" it (like a marxist "changes" the nature of an economy) from absolute as itself/absolute (god as god, YHWH) to liberation as absolute (god as liberty, "christianity", aka russian mormonism), which then continues to let the absolute oppress and self-oppress, it

maintains the absolute like a ML maintains the state, it fails. Absolute Liberation / Absolute Abolition is therefore a contradiction and a paradox, and not the functional kind but, instead, the "rational" kind of the theologian. Therefore, I critique Absolute Abolition/Liberation."... Then what? Abolition/Liberation alone? Or.... nothing? As of right now, i have no answer for you. (7-27-26 i still dont have an answer.)

First of all, I'd like to address all the bigotry in my old book (though that is not all.... I am heavily and extremely ashamed of my old theories on economics and maoism, and genuinely feel that it is not even necessary to critique from how bad they were), or at least, things and concepts i had that didn't really help my goals nor liberation in any real way, like my former racial realism (see: my constant insisting that whites are a race (though it may have been metaphorical, i do not remember much of my use of the term) that have the unique quality of being stupid and sadistic... which contradicts my racial abolitionism-- race abolitionism. I say abolitionism because that is the name of the ideology as it was named before me, i do not consider abolitionism to actually abolish anything, i am not an abolitionist i am just using abolitionism here to name an ideology / thought.) in section 1 of hyperborean ideology, my TSRF-ism reaching beyond gender shredder feminine-accelerationism (my former misandry, which now I regret solely because it led me to transmisandrist statements and creations of gender norms that only worked to undermine the gender abolitionism / gender accelerationism that attracted me to N1x Land and the gender shredder in the first place.), but more importantly, my former ableist idolization of the schizophrenic (it was due to the fact i was mainly influenced by the schizophrenia-LARPer Nick Land (which, by the way, the main reason on why i have simply abandoned without needing to critique all of the old mysticism and occultism (ironically, the book used to be called "palingenetic anarchism and the nihil-occult", and before that, "A collection of interpretations by rainbowfluffism =^owo^=" if i recall right, or something along those lines... once it was palingenetic anarchism and cute democracy, then palingenetic anarchism and cutecore aesthetics, and whatever else...) is because it was mainly from the influence nick land had on me at the time and, with the end of my cosmology, too all that esoteric rubbish falls apart to what

is now. In fact, this book started from a little writing i did in a christian school (LGBTQQPFAGIBDSMZPNOSTIPK+ liberation forever, Mogai+ liberation forever, Women and youth liberation forever, neurodivergent and mentally and physically (and any other kind of) ill liberation forever, black and POC liberation, liberation for everyone,, stand against religion and its oppression--- there is no consent in religion (6-23-2026 edit: happy pride month to all you queers! I'll have my happy pride month writing.)) about nick land's axsys crash, pencil and notebook, and my attempt to understand nick land -- or, really, misunderstand him.), i regret it now because it goes against the abolition of mental illness as a social construct-- let each be their own without catagorization and limitation), my former speciesism in section 1 (i had called animals very bad things early on in my writings, like savages and other terms, implying unintelligence), and my constant Paramisia towards pedophiles (and ironically also zoophiles despite my former respect for them in my writings... and considering that i do feel inclined towards zooromantic writings as unique and i formally identified as trans-cat.). For the Pedophile, i feel like it has always been a difficult subject for me and always has been hard for me to move past due to my (and this too i must self-critique if i wish to move pass class politics) deep personal connection to my class, the class of the youth, and how their dynamic with the historical pederastic and pedophilic patriarchy has played out... I tended to blame all pedophiles for the actions of the patriarchs and i find that, now, considering that most pedophiles and other paraphiles are massively oppressed and harassed and killed, blocked from mental health help and care, and often isolated, and haven't even touch a kid nor even considered it at all (outside of intrusive thoughts, of which we all have--- individuals with pocd struggle way more than any of us with these thoughts and, again, they are not pedophiles.) (i say this because most child predators are not pedophiles, as proven by statistics, and most pedophiles are not child predators. the patriarchy is not actually attracted to kids like it is not actually attracted to women), that sort of generalization only hurts the non-elite suffering pedophiles and paraphiles who are not the historical (and current/modern) pedophilic patriarchs who oppressed (and continue to oppress) us children. Of course, this is not to argue for a Pro-C stance (I already dismissed Pro-C anti-C youth-lib discourse as a newgon/NAMbLA psy-op, the radical feminists (though i deny their misandry and deny my old pedomisia) still give us the answer as from to

heterosexuality to (to) pedophilia (i speak in relationship, not in attraction, here)--abolition via abolition of gender/age), adults still have a power dynamic over children, but it is to argue against my old bigotry against fellow comrades--pedophiles still, like everyone else, suffer under the elite pedophilic (as in child predator, not as in diagnosed pedophiles) rich patriarchal white ruling statist class (and more words to describe the elites apply here, like cis het contradictingly while also pederastic, colonizer-descendent, first-world (though i'm no third-world-ist, the third-world richies are still richies!), fascistic, etc.). I also denounce my old Anti-TransID bullshit from back in 'redefining radqueers' (along with the disgusting and that i regret quote of me advocating for the genocide of pedophiles, i find such an idea repulsive and i find the fact i said that, even if i meant it in a more metaphorical way as in the way one says kill all men, horrible. i do not believe we should kill all men nor all pedophiles, we should only be getting rid of abusers, predators, and rapists, regardless of gender or attraction. (edit 7-14-26:)) To advocate for a genocide based on attraction, or murder based on attraction, or the annihilation of a people at all is to advocate for a very far-right position, regardless of who it is... I still do believe that child predators, who tend not to be pedophiles and pedophiles tend not to be them (child predators are usually not pedophiles as in people attracted to children sexually, they are just piece of shit abusers who enjoy transgressing taboos and abusing people and power in power dynamics,... too, most pedophiles are not child predators and do not touch a child once in their lives. I understand that defending pedophiles is seen as problematic, however it is a simple fact that we cannot genocide a group, especially one that are not even oppressors but rather the oppressed in modern day society (the past was different, but that was before patriarchy's alignment with capital)... If you claim to be progressive, but yet you are not considered 'problematic' nor a 'threat' to society, then you are not really progressive at all.. a progressive cannot under any circumstances believe in any form of discrimination or bigotry. To believe in such, to be a moderate, to be societally acceptable, that is to be a bigot, and therefore, that is to be not a progressive at all.) should be killed (8/6/26: my position on the youth has often been criticized as defending child predators and pedophiles, and to that, i have to ask>>>> did you actually read my position at all? I have almost been groomed multiple times throughout my childhood, people like faust when i was 14 in radqueer spaces or manipulators who tried to and failed to force me into

doing things i was not comfortable with, my father was a pedophile who dated my mother when she was underaged and was the same man who abused me and was emotionally incestuous to me and started and constantly encouraged my alcohol abuse, i have seen how child predators are and i feel sick at their very existence and as far as i care society has too much sympathy for the child predator, that kind of abuse is abhorrent to me. I am, still as of writing 15 and most definitely not a pedophile (medically i could not even be considered one and i am not attracted to people younger to me and barely to people my age, i prefer older men), and i find accusations like me defending child predators with my stance on youth liberation as a fucking disgusting opinion to hold about me and my writings, and i wish to stress i am whole-heartedly against all forms of abuse or grooming between a societal power dynamic between oppressor and oppressed, and by that, i mean, here specifically, i am whole-heartedly against child predators and adult-minor relations and i hope all child predators die. Typically the same people to accuse me like this will turn around and support heterosexual relations, another disgusting practice, or worse, even the family model, yet accuse me of supporting abuse? HATE is all i have for child predators and people like that of NAMbLA, understand that i am not "on your side" if you are one of those disgusting abusive pieces of shit and i hope you die if you are one, and, too, stop reading this immediately.kys), but that is solely because they are abusers and reactionaries and not for any other reason (not because, for example, "youth is sacred"). Society has mystified the taboo-ness of pedophilic relationships due to a need to objectify and devalorize the lives of children but also maintain the power dynamic and wrongness of pedophilia so that children can be abused further and oppressed, they have made not 'pedophilic relationships' wrong, but instead. just 'pedophilia', now society does not care about an adult raping a child (as we see with trump) but only the IDEA of an individual BEING a pedophile.. and too, by pedophile, they do not mean child predators (people actually abusing children, actually morally wrong people here, the real taboo individuals, like trump) but actual pedophiles (people who happen to be attracted to children and do not act on these attractions), therefore allowing them to continue paramysic bigotry and discrimination and oppression while also oppressing and discriminating and enslaving children (through the family structure, a structure formed by Pederasts and straightos and through heterosexuality, pederasty and pedophilia, incest, and abuse and rape.)-- a

win-win for the elite class of patriarchal child predators, since they are not suffering consequences-- though again, as to not fall for great man theory or individual-interpretations, we must note that the elite class, while horrid and disgusting, are people also enslaved by capital, self, and culture, and act like this mainly to fulfill the sick desires OF capital, self, and culture, and are not in reality free individuals (nobody has a passion for raping people) or sovereign being (they are still controlled and merely means to the sadistic ends of the three slave masters). Further, insofar as these three constitute god and we constitute god, and god being one and only, that who is who she is, the femcel who cuts herself and starves herself and only ever gets worse, we can see that it is not that the slave masters are sadistic or harming people but, in reality, god is harming herself due to her worsening, a cancerous depression.. so then, not even god is at fault, and really the entire problem is the problem of God's crippling depression and suicidal idolization. All things are simply a metaphorical way to display this problem, all tragedies and miseries and sufferings are metaphorical expressions of this specific singular tragedy, this misery, this one suffering that is so great that it itself defines god, the tragedy of god-- the tragedy that is god. Then, faultless. Uhm... i want to repeat that i truly am sorry for all my old bigotry and discrimination and i understand if you do not forgive me, if how you view me is changed, and if this changes how people read my writings and me as a person, but just know i really, truly, i truly am sorry-- there are things i probably did wrong that i have acknowledged personally yet have not written down here, considering there was a lot of it, and just know too that just because i did not address it does not mean i still agree with it or do not see anything wrong with it, i do find ALL of my old bigoted behaviors to be wrong and i DO feel guilty for them, i really am sorry. I am sorry to the paraphiles, to the non-human animals, to the trans-id people, to children, to transgender men and non-binary people and other gendered people, and everybody else, Sorry.), and i denounce my maoism (though i still believe the stalinist doctrine of social fascism, just to admit, it makes perfect sense. To quote jacques Camatte, Capital and Community, chapter three, marxists.org, "THIS IS SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY, WHICH IS THE FITTING RESOLUTION OF FASCISM."), and i denounce my conceptualization of human nature as real (species realism is speciesist regardless of my intentions) (radqueers x2)-- since that sort of idea only works against species abolition. I feel like i did not write

enough about shota materialism but i do not want to waste time on that. Also, on the eternal revolution, i realize something extremely obvious... If the revolution is eternal, never achieving anything, EVEN if the means and the ends are the same, then the revolution is not and never has been a threat to capitalism, and instead, co-exists violently (and, knowing capitalism and neoliberalism, that means affirming capitalism). The eternal revolution cannot, then, abolish capitalism, or anything, if it can never truly end up abolishing everything, it is stuck in the process and never achieves anything in the end.

and, too, something supposedly eternal is more likely to die somewhere in its life than stay immortal, so the eternal revolution is still more likely to not be eternal but instead un-win-able, unable to succeed, destined to lose... and unlike my old self, i do not wish to partake in militant psychological torments called war and revolution if i know that it will never end and it will never win, or, achieve anything. That would have to be a great form of masochism.

With that, let me also talk more about culture and the economy... Insofar as my critique of Bob Black goes (and, on the conflict of the abolition of labor/work, i will say that the communizationists abolish work more consistently than the anti-workers or zerowork, though both end up failing to actually abolish value-- communizationists abolish economic value because it seems, at least in reading Marx's Capital, to be the Value that creates work, but really all values create work and all values are economic to some degree-- eulavism encountered the problem of abolishing value too, like seemingly karl marx did (if i am to believe the ultraleft who claim communism and nihilism to be the same) and the communizationists did, but eulavism could not imagine an alternative to value, marx could not realize more about value (or, value's other nature, related to culture and life and self, which directly ties to its economic nature), and the communizationists seem to forget altogether that there are non-economic values, or at least, ignore them as a problem of the economy. Necessity, value of one's life, for example is an economic issue, though marxists and ultraleftists go against consensual suicide! Bob Black ignores value's relation to labour/work altogether, and so at least communizationists ATTEMPT to answer the question of value. Bob Black's idea of play in his book 'the abolition of work' is, unfortunately for him, an idealistic and optimistic (and, frankly, even if it were realistic i'd say it's overrated) (and i'd

also say it also desexualizes fourier in a horrid way) 'solution' doomed to crash back into itself and recreate work.. Because life itself makes labour coercive, and if work is coercive labour, then so would be play if, ultimately, and bob black ensures that it is by abolishing all unnecessary work, play is 'necessary play' or, really, necessary, and so coercive, labour, and so work. We must abolish our value of living and all cultures and values before labour can be de-coercified, or, made consensual. Work will always be unabolished, and so, play will always be impossible as long as life, value, culture, economy, self, society/civilization, reality, rationality, and suffering/misery all exist, and, so, play is impossible and always will just become work again as long as utopia has not been achieved.), and along that, my critique of fourier (cough cough cuba), goes, i feel like i did not say nearly enough (6/11/2026 i am writing at this date)-- The concept of work and value goes more than just a simple 'work can only exist if value exists', but instead implies that Economy (work, economic value, capitalism, everything else (8/7/26 4:17 am: i later realize that "economy" is just a form of community, and so, "community" fits here better... 'Community cannot exist without culture.'. Which.. is true but not in the way i tried to make it seem.)) cannot exist without Culture (Culture is the mother and reproducer of all Values, Culture creates value (i say existentialists who believe they can create value are wrong because what they actually are doing is letting culture create value through them for them), Culture creates self, Culture creates cultures and subcultures, culture is also beyond Nature as Nature is a form of Culture and therefore a part of it and so under it-- culture does not come from Nature, Nature (the Natural Culture, Bio-Culture) comes from Culture(7-28-26, what was i saying with this??? Nature is a form of Culture, but culture as we know it today is a result of and under Nature, Nature is the first culture???????))... or, Culture creates the Economy. I find that, despite my inspiration from Lanza, i downplayed the effects of Culture quite heavily-- In my writings between culture and capitalism's toxic dynamic, i will admit, i was wrong. Capitalism does not abuse culture like a heterosexual, but instead, Economy is born inside and raised by Culture like a parent-child relationship and, too like parent-child (which, on parent-child relations, or, "family".... is that not just pedophilic relations, specifically pederastic relations, but reformed and made sacred (like pederasty was once sacred?)), Culture(/nature 7/28/26) morphs Economy into whatever form it wants, whatever form is scientific, whatever form

the Culture demands (before anyone accuses me of some anti-marxist theoretical mistake, by culture here i mean Nature, and many marxists can agree that the economy is determined by conditions set by Nature, such as that the economy cannot function without time, space, lack, abundance, such and such, biology, natural inclinations, and whatnot, and most marxists agree that the economy came from nature, that is, primitive communism did not appear from nowhere, but appeared from nature-- i say it appears from nature's economy but that is where we differ. 7/28/26 2:33am im just clarifying that here what i mean by culture is nature--- nature morphs the economy into what nature demands from it, aka, how economy was born.)-- this used to be, for old europe, Feudalism... Now for the entire world, it is Capitalism... or left-wing (Communist-larping (Jacques Camatte (6/19/2026: On Jacques Camatte: Starting with Origin and Function of the Party Form by Jacques Camatte, not much of a critique but an addition, it does seem clear to me that the main reason for the alienation of man from himself, or, why the bourgeois revolution had to separate man from its species and nature, viewing it from the point of view that man is, like base materialism claims about all holy matters, trying to get its feet out of the mud (nature, species, the unescapable culture) and free its head to the sky (humanity, non-natural culture, godhood, 'mankind'), and that man is specifically doing this because of the delusion of its species, of the "homo sapien", of the intelligent lifeform (a speciesist claim). And so, any actual abolition of mankind's craving to isolate itself from nature and its species would require more than just to liberate themselves from economy and return to communism... seeing as in primitive (i am not going to sit here and act like the unabomber's work, the industrial society and its consequences, was not correct in the analysis of the industrial society. It is a self-destructive system that must be abolished, but returning to nature is infinitely times just as bad and terrorism is not the means to the solution either, more emphasis on the former. Nature is just as self-destructive, primitive life is just as self-destructive, the industrial society is... Natural.) life there was less emphasis on species (though speciesism still existed to a degree in human sadism, it was less about species and more about sadism). The only way to prevent alienation in humanity, where most humans scoff and gag at nature, in fact, would be an abolition of humanity as a species, considering that humanity was not even the source of community in primitive communism but instead the totality of nature itself. There were clear relations not just to man to

man but to all beings to all beings in a natural world. The bourgeois revolutionaries' decision to separate man from homo sapiens was not a decision declared against mankind but instead a decision all of mankind has been hoping, dreaming, dying for since the birth of it, and too, a decision that only happened as a final straw of humanity's own humanity fighting against the natural and, at the time, losing. The industrial society, feudal society was the last gasp of the homo sapien, before 'humanity' became the man's species through the industrialization (and therefore turning it into capitalism) of the economy. Humanity has always been an explicitly capitalism concept, along with humanism. The equality of animals and liberation of animals must be achieved in order to truly return to any communist idea of *gemeinwesen*, it is necessary to truly unify in totality nature itself species-abolished in order to truly achieve every being in community and communication with one another, and so, for a communist utopia to be. It is not the realization of Humanity that the proletariat stand for but, instead, its abolition. Like the proletariat seek to abolish the prole, they too seek to abolish the human, since the human is the cause of the alienation from humanity, and the homo sapien is the cause of the alienation from nature, species and the idealizes form of species (homo sapien and humanity) are both alienating from nature and the natural path that is communism. Speciesism, at least modern speciesism, is inherently capitalist, and the main reason why primitive communism failed was exactly the primitivist speciesism that existed at the time--- speciesist ideas kill communist ideals. Abandon your species, abandon your class, and achieve communist community, that is what i hear from camatte when i ignore his speciesist obsession with the human species. Return to Natural Community. And.... since i hate nature, i reject anyways, and now turn against communism even harder. "The liberated and Conscious human species" (Jacques camatte, *Origin and Function of the Party Form*) wishes to abolish the human species (because, in fact, the economy was founded due to the alienation of man which began when man realized itself as (idiotically and bigotedly) 'unique' from other animals, as a 'unique' species, or, a species at all. From the point man became man, it was doomed to become a feudal man, then a capitalist man, now still a capitalist man but too a modern man.), wishes to commit a great return to non-species community, yes. There is no property of the species, only property of nature itself, Natural property if you will. In the postface of january 1974 of Jacques camatte's *origin and function of the*

party-form, i find, too, a new understanding of the economy-shredder that in fact can work as small self-critique, not fundamentally important:: the shredding of classes under capitalism currently being wanted by the rich, the pull towards the anglo-american and asian forms of neo-feudalism, it is not due to individual capitalists of the post-ancap kind but, instead, capital itself's supposed desire (in reference to the previously mentioned postface) to abolish classes in order to dominate entirely all men under capital-- this is a direct reference to postface january 1974 (of jacques camatte's origin and function of the party-form) where it states in a quote "Here again the limit, bourgeois society tends to destroy classes to make men slaves of capital. It tends to do the same as Communism, only the latter has the vanishing of classes as supposing the sovereignty of man" (bordiga??? unlabeled but i assume so, collected works volume III page 31). The capitalists desire Communism as seen in Jacques Camatte's origin and function of the party-form (not the postface) as he mentions it without explanation or further communication and simply attributes the idea to lenin... So then, the capitalists are no longer in control of capitalism as it turns against them and calls for the abolition of all classes for the sublation and perfection of the capitalist system, in which Neo-feudalism is both the next step and an attempt by the capitalists to stay in the elite class and not fall to the capitalist abolition of the capitalist class and become slaves of capital-- they must become neo-feudal lords in order to not become capital slaves, and so, knowingly, they help capitalist perfect itself and get closer to abolish all classes for capitalism's sublation, including the capitalists currently helping capitalism in order to not become slaves. They have fallen into a false solution, and too, desire Communism to free them... but to do that, they would need to make a leap of faith, one that they cannot do without probably getting decapitated by the left, and too, their own. Not that i really care if they are decapitated, but it does show that all of humanity dislikes capitalism, and most of humanity believes communism to be the solution-- in fact, no, communism has always been a left-wing red capitalist scam and the abolition of class(/capitalism) takes a far different path-- though, i believe camatte means the abolition of class(/capitalism) when he says communism, so that is pure semantics, and so i meant previously in saying the capitalist desires communism that the capitalist desires a non-capitalist abolition of class, or, an abolition of capitalism therefore. This is also why, seemingly, the "free market" or capitalism has become

unpredictable and irrational, it is imitating the form of irrationality found in the abolition of class seen in the abolition of capitalism, by instead making the abolition of class irrational regardless of it being in or out of the abolition of capitalism. Capitalism has a crush on Communism, or at least, lust for abolition of classes and the irrationality of communism, and so, craves to mirror it but, not for *gemeinwesen*, but for capital... Stirner could say he sees no difference, still lords above, or maybe stirner would prefer *gemeinwesen*... personally i say they are the same thing, lords above. I would disagree with Camatte on community and its relation with Capitalism as Community, to some degree, made Capitalism and nothing can ever truly be alienated from Nature, I find that Capitalism is a natural growth of the collectivism found in Community, and community too is just a side-effect of Nature/Culture that allows us to become addicted to Life as if it were crack or cocaine (culturalphilistine transcripts reference). Nature's side effect, Community, transforms into Capitalism, or, Has capitalism split out of its body and begin eating its carcass (to be more accurate), as that is the next step in collectivism. Well, truly, it is not the "next step" as such teleology does not exist, but it is what collectivism believes to be the next step and that is all that matters... Now, capitalism coming to attempt self-deification, capitalism becoming more fascistic and satanic, we find the "next step" which, obviously, if capitalism was not dead-set on self-deification, would not be a next step at all. Community is not an escape or something to restore, it is part of the path of the issue, a path that the issue creates itself, because the issue is an existentialist and a satanist. Community, and community to me, it is dead. Too, insofar as i believe the problem is not just capitalism but the economy in general, or more, not just the economy but work, labour, value in general, I would also like to point out that whatever we call primitive communism is not a workless nihilistic utopia, nor even close from unalienated, but simply a different economy form that is still founded on a species-alienating conceptualization found in 'intelligence', or, species self-realization, self-reflection, self-rationalization, or, the establishing of the concept of homo sapien (not scientifically but mentally, in which i mean, species-based collectivism similar to national-bolshevik and duginist ethno-national socialism--- but not the ethnic, but the species. This mental understanding/concept became the idea of humanity and, too, Humanism.). The second one identifies, in an economically-left culturally-far-right way (to use that shitty political compass term, i hate the

political compass), with their species, and so, with an species-collectivism, one is alienated from nature in a total and radical way-- the hunter-gatherer spirituality was an enjoyment of this alienation as it first came up in a pleasuring way, a sovereignty against and for nature, where man was separate to but enjoying the difference and similarity to, nature. They enjoyed nature and being separate from it... now, we despise nature and being separate from it. So then... even Primitive communism seems, at least to me, a self-alienating non-communist society. Too, it is an economy, which is seen in value, labour/work, and the ordering and distribution of things-- and because it is generally considered a gift economy. A gift economy, despite what people say, is still an economy-- all economies are oppressive and alienating, or, rooted in alienation. Before primitive communism, in Nature itself, i wish to point out how Darwinian culture and survival of the fittest (cough cough spencerite social darwinist rubbish with some validity), alongside the kropotkinist (also valid) species-collectives (which, as far as i care, are far-right socialist societies... Meaning that collectivism, humanity, capitalism, and community all originate in far-right socialist communes... And too, communism, returning to that state, to "communism" and the human species unalienated, is also a far-right socialist movement! In fact, i go as far as to say all of the leftist movement, the leftist geist that started from fourier to the mls of today, have all been far-right socialists who's ideology became alienated from itself (especially after ww2 and the political compass)! All them leftists are far-right culturally, simply in the humanist way, that being the species-collectivism of the humanist-nazbol--- of course, some leftists abandon speciesism, but at that point they can no longer be leftist at all. Then, history is a struggle of the far-right against the far-right... funny?), when we analyze the food chain/web and the "hierarchy" (which i would argue is not actually a hierarchy like seen in species-collectives like humanity (7-16-26: nevermind. While both prey and predators are oppressed by and slaves to nature equally, while both are victims of discrimination and genocide, while both are treated equally like shit though differently (predators often demonized and/or domesticated, prey often enslaved and/or farmed), i do acknowledge that predators have power over prey and abuse power over prey, even if it is mandated by nature and so a result not of the fault of predators but of nature forcing predators to act like that. Predators oppress prey historically, humans oppress predators and prey historically and modernly, it is similar to the

question between the imperialist capitalists and the nationalist capitalists for the third-world prole under the community of capital, where a maoist animal says to work with the predators, a leftcom animal says to have a prey-only resistance, and fucking fox camatte or whatever says to simply fight against capital the source of all issues.. the metaphor fails a bit but you understand the point. Nature is complex and i have sympathy with all beings (or at least sympathy with the liberation of their enslavement). THis also continues the point that nature is the zeroth civilization and also one of the three slave owners of all beings, animals are slaves to nature as well and not one with it, i can say that even trees and grass must be liberated from nature and seen as beings insofar as they are living unique individuals who are often oppressed-- yes, plants are oppressed. Anyways, the point is that Natural Hierarchy and Natural Power Dynamics and Natural oppression is not better than Civilization's hierarchies and power dynamics and oppression as i used to believe, i was idealizing and glorifying nature, an oppressive civilization, as anarchist stupidly, and i reject this now. Nature is and always was oppressive. Too, though, Predators and carnivores are also oppressed and, in the community of capital, equally as much as prey, and while that does not excuse the oppression experienced currently and especially before the community of capital, it does mean that we should not justify discrimination towards predators and the legalization of their genocide like Novelists nor treat them as non-people who do it out of sadistic fun, especially considering that predators are forced to be oppressors by Nature, Nature quite literally makes them dependent on prey, they are slaves to nature... To a degree, this also applies to animals raping each other, more specifically animals that have things like heat or rut or pheromones, as usually the offender in animal rape of animals in the same species (excluding humans) are, due to NATURE, unable to consent nor properly think while committing the act.. Heat and rut can be described as two drunk individuals or something meeting with high libidos and one inevitably rapes the other. It is horrible, a tragedy, one without fault on the two individuals when they were involuntarily drugged and the inevitable rape was a result of this involuntary drugging done by nature-- here i argue that cases like these of animal rape is not any specific animal's fault here due to Nature basically raping both individuals involved. It is a tragedy, a disgusting truth, and nobody to blame. So, i do not blame predators, or animals who offend due to the pheromones (it is not as simple

as "control yourself" when you are drugged, and i mean drugged, it really is not.), i would blame nature but i remember the whole thing about god, so i blame nobody and oppose it without demonization... the metaphor about the third world kinda fails because modernly in the community of capital the imperialist and nationalist capitalists work together, though the nationalist is often exploited, to exploit the proles. Anyways. Discrimination of ANY FORM is bad, BIGOTRY IS BAD, the end.)) of prey and predators, we can see that these things form a sort of economy where poverty and wealth (abundance?) disparity exist, the economy is ran by value, labour/work, and the desire to survive (necessity aka value of one's life aka A VALUE which means this statement is redundant), there are methods of distribution and giving/taking in this economy and trade. There is also mutual need for one another even as they oppose each other and understanding of this need... yet i would argue there is still an alienation here insofar as, if this is such a divinely planned economy, in this economy every animal is forced to realize their species (therefore alienating them from nature. Just for the record, I had written an in-depth paragraph after this about said alienation and its dynamic with human alienation and re-domestication and capital and economy. It got deleted after a glitch with my virtual machine. I am no longer writing this in a virtual machine and am extremely dreadful about the deletion of this paragraph, I will attempt rewriting but it will not be as good or in-depth due to this. One may ask, on the alienation of animals from nature (and so themselves and so you) in the economy of nature, then what makes the alienation of humans from nature so unique that it led to the creation of an alternative Economy? Well, on the role of the Human being, I can simply say that it is like with all other economies, a rise based on simply the laws of the economy, or, it was simply chance. Or really, human beings happened to be sado-masochistic (or 'intelligent') enough, happened to be very far down in the evolution of their far-right commune due to the luck of less predators than most, and happened to be the best choice for Nature at the time, so then that Humans could be the first to alienate from Nature in a way to actually separate from nature meanwhile animals remain tied and stuck to it in the meantime. Really, if it were any other animal in the role of human, nothing would be much different but that, instead of humans, that animal would separate from nature. As the Humans then, in this separation, began to create an alternative economy, find this not to be something promised to humans but instead something humans

happened to do. "If, then, Animals remains unseparated from nature, how are they now so assimilated to the economy?" Well I lied. First, considering that Nature has its own economy and so must domesticate and groom its residents into such an economy, as it does for the culture that IS Nature, let us first consider that in the economy of Nature, where all animals are alienated yet also assimilated (only the lucky, I.e the human, separate and enjoy difference), every animal and humans included are already domesticated into this economy, or, into Nature itself. As Humanity began to be different, and too, began to make an alternative economy, as they began to develop the authoritarian system of primitive communism that would eventually turn into the totalitarian system of capitalism and, in the future, the absolute system of neo-feudalism all the way to the final stage of godhood that is Capital(ism) Par excellence (CPE)(abolition of class for capitalism perfected! In reference to Jacques Camatte's Capital and Community where Jacques says as much or, at least, i interpret as much. Capitalism, oppressing itself, thinks of CPE as an escape-- it is delusional, a satanist, and will end up tormenting it way worse than anyone ever could, than any communist ever could. Culture does the same but Culture seems to not have any teleological delusion. I doubt that Capitalism will ever achieve CPE, seeing as teleology, again, barely functions as accordingly. ...too, If we are to listen to Jacques Camatte, or my abomination of Camatte, CPE would have no proletariat (an impossibility for capitalism), as "(...) the real limit to capital is the proletariat." and "Capital seeks to free itself from the proletariat (...)" (both quotes from Jacques Camatte's Capital and Community chapter 3 on marxists.org). Clearly, Capitalism seeks to kill itself unknowingly if it seeks to achieve the abolition of the proletariat-- the same thing, by the way, as what communism seeks! Only, capitalism seeks it to abolish its limits and annihilate communism, while communism seeks it to abolish ITS suppress under capitalism, or, "limits", and annihilate CAPITALISM instead. Regardless, in the end both are absolutely dependent on the proletariat, and, in praxis, both never end up abolishing the proletariat nor annihilating the other, they actually live side-by-side and often make out in closets. And so, both remain absolutely limited by their own inability to do as they claim they will. Communism never will abolish the proletariat or achieve actual communism because actual communism means abolishing their limits and so abolishing the proles and so killing itself, Communism fears death! I say that the real limit to community is the proletariat

(in reference to Jacques Camatte in Capital and Community), and Community seeks to free itself from the proletariat (in reference to Jacques Camatte in Capital and Community), and like Capital, Community is forever hopelessly bound to the Proletariat and unable to abolish it, because to do so means its death... The real limit to any economy is its life (thus, 7/29/26, community escapes the proletariat, the human, the species, the social being, the community itself, via sublation not into communism or gemeinwesen but instead into capital's real stage of domination, the community of capital-- this is the community's rejection of humanity, humanity is what it fears and what holds it back, humanity is the community's limit, so it sublated not into the human community of marx and camatte but the community of capital and the capitalism of nick land's desires.. thus community and the proletariat rejects self-negation, humanity rejects self-negation, capital steals yet another thing from communism, that is, being the sublation of the community.)! Capitalism's limit is capitalism's life, Communism's limit is communism's life, the proletariat (7/29/26:proletariat=humanity here??) is the life of the economy and, too, the economy can only break its limits, abolish the proletariat, via suicide (self-negation, 7/29/26, which is impossible). To free yourself from the proletariat is to kill yourself, capital and community, you can be only sublated and made god in heaven alone! or.... hell. See: the bible's opinion on suicide.), they realized a problem with the affirmation of difference... Nature's economy cannot co-exist with theirs. So, with no hesitation, they allowed the economy to begin, extremely slowly and a process that continues on today, to re-domesticate all animals and so assimilate Nature's economy into this Economy, and too, Unite and marry and merge with Nature as one (the unity of nature and economy, despite what eco-socialists and green "anarchists" tell you, is consensual and mutually-beneficial as nature is malevolent.). Humans, beginning the economy, were the first to become slowly re-domesticated by the economy, and animals happened secondly and, due to the role of human, were treated way worse than humans... they were as slaves, something I can understand. Some as pets, a form of slavery blinded by 'love' nonconsensual, others as farm animals, blinded by sadism and normalization. Here, Animals are re-domesticated in a violent and brutal display, and all animals, humans included, are twice alienated by/from Nature and twice left domesticated and removed from whatever concept of a 'true self' they believed existed. This, inspired by adam lanza's theory (culturalphilistine

transcripts), i say, is a false yearning... no true self exists (lanza says the same), only an eternal spiral of domestications and alienations exist in and as the self. You never existed, you were always the limitation, destruction, removal, and erasure of yourself, and nothing else (communist egoism?? You mean, far-right species-collectivism synthesized with the affirmation of self-suffering and self-torment? YOu mean to tell me you think i'd enjoy that?). Animals feel this the worst, but this is no competition of suffering, solutions lie in unity.). What was I saying again? 6/20/2026 i forgot lol i didn't stop writing i just forgot in my rant. But anyways, primitivism will not save you from suffering and misery (later on we will see and realize that misery, in fact, is not the same as suffering but more than it, that the tragedy of god is in fact misery and god herself, and that suffering is only the phenomena of experiencing this misery, or, temporarily forgetting how to delusionally cope with the misery by ignoring it and making it into life.. that suffering and misery are not the same, and the abolition of misery requires far more and is far more impossible than the abolition of suffering, and that the abolition of suffering can simply be achieved in many ways including reactionary and genocidal ways while the abolition of misery is impossible, that to focus solely on abolishing suffering will actually replicate and create more misery and unconscious suffering which cannot be abolished. this is in the mythology of decay.). Reading through Jacques Camatte's Capital and Community, i will admit that I am not, I was never, and i most likely never will be able to possibly be an economist or theorize on the economy in any meaningful way (at least, as of now, 6/21/2026--- this is also a rejection of many of my old theories on the economy, though some i believe do still have foundation even if not in my works are the foundation found), and i am fine with that, this seems much more complex than needed. Though i do believe my theory on the economy of nature and its relation to the economy that has now become capital to be valid, especially considering how violently economies tend to interact with each other once contact is made-- there is a reason why we now have a global 'free market' capital-dictatorship (and capitals constantly fighting in the development of capitalism even in a specific economy alone). Nature, Nature's economy, and too, Industrial society and human Economy (/)/(&) Capitalism and Human Culture, all forms of Culture and Economy and Society and Civilization (yes, even the smallest civilization, like the civilization of the ants-- the bio-monarchy with an economy separate to nature as

well because, like humans and most "intelligent" animals, they are severely sado-masochistic.. In fact, insofar as the insect world finds itself capable to have, due to its size and separation from nature via a highly developed (as highly developed as ants could be in 2026) far-right decentralized hill-commune system, or, monarchist economy which finds itself both centralized and fairly decentralized and, too, communal yet similar to a caste system-- there is no doubt that in ant civilization, like all civilizations, there is suffering and misery. The economy of the ants is something hard for me, a human, to describe, yet it finds itself fairly different from primitive communism. Too, ants are species-collectivists insofar as species-collectivism always finds itself as, instead, patriotic collectives that happen to share a species-- when i say that humans were species-collectivists i do not mean every human in the world worked together in collectivism, but that there were small collectives made up of humans who recognized and cared for each other as humans, like a white ethnostate --- a white ethnostate can meet another white ethnostate and declare war on each other for different reasons, maybe ethnicity or politics or religion or war or fun, just as species-collectives can declare war on other species-collectives and not, as humanists think a human-nationalist commune would, merge with that human-supremacist commune off of the shared foundation of humanity... plus, most human collectives did not recognize other human collectives as human at all, as seen in the reactionary nature of the humanist mindset, or, speciesism to be exact and how it created discriminations like racism or sexism "women/blacks aren't human" -a white male human. Ants declare war on other ant collectives, naturally, and ants are very much loyalists... this is not unique to ants, and ants are only loyalists because they have royals. Some describe ants as communists, or communist-monarchists, or socialist-monarchists, i will not give my opinion on such a description but i do not believe it to be absolutely true or false. Too, the civilization of bees, like any civilization or monarchy, or bio-monarchy, will have suffering and misery, as it is still fairly wrong. scientificbeekeeping.com talks about the economy of the hive, or the 'honey bee economy' for an example... as much as i would like to call it by the human-made name, searching up the bee economy on google, unfortunately i was met with an ai response (ew, and i do not support ai or use it in this learning of the bee economy), and it called the economy a "hive economy". Despite me not supporting AI in the slightest, i do heavily enjoy the term 'hive economy' for bees.

I will be using this term. Reading the scientificbeekeeping.com writing (called "economy of the hive part 1 / economy of the hive part 2" both by randy oliver), i am happy to find out that randy oliver does in fact use this term, "hive economy", and so it is not ai generated. Anyways I digres, though i do mention here that i know that the hive economy of the bee has been domianted by and kept as a domesticated pet by the greater political economy, or, capitalism, generally. The hive economy is, as far as capitalism cares, its pet, an alternative economy working in cooperation to and with capitalism only insofar as it is exploited by capitalism like a third-world country... Yet again, like a third-world country, even without the exploitation, the fact is that the economy in the beehive is misery-inducing regardless. the first thing apparent in this writing is that, apparently, the bees are not monarchists-- the queen works as a slave to the lesbiarchal (more-so lesbi-democratic, seeing as it is the majority of (female) worker bees over the singular female slave bee) working class. Economy of the hive part 1 by randy oliver, "The queen is unique in the colony, but she is completely subject to control by the workers! Although the queen lays the eggs, the sisterhood of nurse bees functions in every other aspect as the "mother" in the colony." This seems similar to the patriarchal treatment of women, reducing to a womb-machine, but instead it is mostly female (most workers who are bees are female) and the 'gender distinction' if we are to say seems to be of class-- the 'queen' is a womb-slave and the 'workers' are... eh, socialist workers, genuinely democratic and arguably libleft socialist workers who seem to just be organized organically, like a libleft bordigist or anarcho-bordigist, and just-so happens to be radically anti-feminist lesbians. Unlike the political economy of capitalism, which is no longer human and so i will not call it the human economy as it also domesticates and dominates animals and itself, the Hive economy seems to be self-preserving in a radical way and not teleologically leading up to its self-destruction and the rise of a new economy--- The economy of the hive part 1, randy oliver, "the honey bee colony is thus essentially immortal (unless it is killed off by a predator...)". Too, randy oliver in the economy of the hive part 1 calls the hive a "super-organism" exactly insofar as it seems to work highly organized and in an organic centralist (without explicit or visible centralization... perhaps bio-centralization plays a part here? It, to most, seems anarchist.) way, an organic highly-harmonious (yet not utopian or fourierist.... also, a civilization.... also, since it now works with capitalism, bees

have had to overproduce and become dependent on humans making their economy no longer as immortal and now dependent on constant production and creation and honey so that their owner, capitalism, does not leave them to die in the wild.

Domestication is so sickening. Does this not seem like overworking, exploiting, and alienating the worker bees, karl marx?) Economy working as a single organism, something spiritually bordigist in some way. Though, in the next paragraph, there is the introduction of the development of the economy or at least a reference to an older paragraph introducing the development... Randy Oliver, The economy of the hive, "The key to the transition from a solitary "queen" performing all the work, to a fully functioning immortal colony, was the development of "allopaparental" (other parent) nursing of developing younger sisters by the queen's previous daughters. This led to the development of a "worker" caste of bees --- potential queens that by virtue of being raised in smaller cells and on a less nutritious diet, never fully develop their reproductive stature, and remain nominally sterile", here there is a transition from the beginning of the hive to its continual and repetitive immortality, which is, the transitional period between the womb-slave alone as a hyper-individual and the colony together as an immortal organic quasi-state, aka the creation of the bee nursing system, or the bee equivalent to a family-- communal raising of the queen's children by nursing allopaparents and, just like ageism has the oppression of the family, bees under the bee nursing system are neglected (and arguably abused) and (nominally) sterilized and therefore victims of brutal ageism. This, too, creates the caste of the worker, which, ignoring the obvious and brutal oppressive nature of caste systems and especially biological caste systems, also creates the oppression of the womb-slave. The womb-slave, abusing the young daughters, creates her future abuser. Randy Oliver, The economy of the hive part 1, "The outcome of this sociality is the ... division of labour in the colony by workers as they progress through a series of jobs, dependent upon their developmental "age" and the needs of the colony. ... "age polyethism"". Let me state that i seem to just be repeating randy oliver here, and i probably am, but it is important to know the economy of bees in order to lay justification for the abolition of said economy. Bees divide labour based on two things, and they seemingly do this organically in a central fashion (I critique how i previously called this a lesbi-democracy.... it has no democracy at all, actually, it is a lesbiarchal anarcho-bordigist society mainly and severely rooted in ageism. this

also works as a critique of my old idea of mother-child new democracy, look at the mother in the bees' society of matriarchy or lesbiarchy, it is hideous!), the two things are 1). developmental age and 2). colony needs... this division of labour system is called age polyethism apparently and, as far as i can see, is as ageist as can be. A division of labour based on age is as problematic as a division of labour based on sex/gender, it provides age-realism and separation and segregation and implies the oppression of the youth in the existence of age at all. Randy Oliver now goes in depth about roles, starting with Nurse bees (i am not good at critiquing economy if it is not obvious). The nurse creates the food for the bees as utilizes it as a quasi-currency. Forager Bees are treated, practically, as tools that can be wasted by the hive in order to forage for the needs of the colony, they also apparently have a tendency to work themselves to death, a clear sign of alienation and suffering amongst the workers--- quite literally suicide via work, and coercive labour is what i mean by work, where the bee suffers a high amount. see: The economy of the hive part 1, randy oliver, "They are considered by the colony to be expendable, and therefore do not devote too much energy into immune function or cellular repair. Weather and forage permitting, they simply work themselves to death in a matter of days."... does this sound like a healthy bee living in play and a non-alienated state, a bee free from suffering? Yet these forager bees are, ironically, important to the hive. Resting bees seem to work, to my interpretation, as the sleep of the superorganism/hive. The resting bees give them a temporary pause from labour and work and a time to rest and enjoy, it also gives forager bees the only moment of true enjoyment and play (in sleep, assuming bees dream) in their entire lives. The moment, the situation of the resting bees, the sleep of the hive prevents the hive from overworking itself to death during droughts and times of low production and inability to continue equal (or abundant) production to equal consumption.. where consumption is more and production is less so either the hive overworks for its equal consumption and equal production, therefore needing more consumption and needing more production as a result, cycling more and more inwards until the hive collapses, this is where the resting bees begin to tell and communicate the idea of slumber, to both let the hive sleep and avoid the hive getting caught in an endless cycle of constant production and constant consumption and an inability to ever equalize. Resting bees give the temporary moment in a bee's life where they can rest. Now i move on to The Economy of the

Hive part 2 by, again, Randy Oliver. I will not just repeat everything this time, finding it redundant, and will simply tell you to read it for yourself. Though, to quote The economy of the hive part 2 by Randy Oliver, "...shows just how tenuous is the existence of a bee colony. There are only a few weeks out of an entire year in which the colony actually gains weight! Note how quickly the colony regains its population after swarming, but also the loss of weight that week." this shows starvation and suffering, this shows erraticity and a lack of consistency, this shows economic misery. Too, according to the economy of the hive part 2 by Randy Oliver, nurse bees will cannibalize drone broods, eggs, and younger bees for protein whenever protein is too scarce, which is ageist and shows, too, misery. This is most likely non-consensual. Also, the existence of wealth is implied in this writing, see this quote: The economy of the hive part 2, Randy Oliver, "thus jelly is not only nutriment, but also functions as a currency, medicine, a means of communication, a reservoir of wealth, and(...)". I am not Karl Marx, I am not the Bee Karl Marx and will not write the Bee Das Kapital, so... generally, I will leave my complaints of the beehive economy here and continue on with my writings. If one of you wishes to write the bee das kapital, go ahead, I will not.) must be abolished equally so, and too, the Self. The abolition of technology and industrial society, yes, but too the abolition of evolution and nature. The sort of absoluteness achieved by capital, or so according to Jacques Camatte's abomination of Marx, or my abomination of Jacques Camatte's abomination of Marx (Jacques Camatte, Capital and Community), can in my opinion and my thought easily also have been achieved by Culture (Nature) as soon as Culture (Nature) was conceptualized. Capitalism has to crawl up to its absoluteness, teleologically, Culture is just born with it, eternally. Capitalism has to larp its own absoluteness, Culture is absolute, and has now taken a mirroring with the absolute (though, as of 6/23/2026 12:20 am, I find my old thought that culture was literally the absolute a bit absurd... it works better as a metaphor, culture mirrors and is radically similar to and united with the absolute in a way that capitalism and the self can only ever attempt / try to achieve, and/or LARP (idealism as the larp of the self as absolute, capitalism's absolute-act / totalitarianism as the larp of capitalism as absolute... Culture needs not larp, Culture is united with the Absolute via Nature in a way that no other can-- the reason why capitalism can BE totalitarian is through its link to Nature, a link weaker than culture's link to nature as Nature is a culture and only HAS an

economy, not is an economy. Too, the self's inherent satanism is only possible due to its role in nature and dynamic with nature, the importance and uniqueness of the self / "the unique" is only a thing because of its dynamic with the absolute, and so it is also unique in its role to the absolute. Well, now the self tries to align itself radically and absolutely with culture, in Fascism, and Capitalism tries to align itself radically and absolutely with culture, in (but not only in) Neoliberalism (neoliberal culture is extremely dominated by capitalism, but really, i believe this not to be domination but alignment and unity... or at least, consensual domination to a radical level, as culture is radically more total than capital even now). The failure of Fascism to create god, and i do find fascism extremely puritanical and christian in its desire and craving to recreate god seen in its want to align the self, the economy, and culture all into one being, the state, the fasces, lies in the misalignment of the economy mainly because the economy was not ready for this transformation just yet. Hitler's hatred for communism, mussolini's disillusionment with socialism/communism, it led them to be unable to get to the form of fascism that dugin pushes for, a fascism more fascist than fascism proper, Duginism is fascism par excellence, Actual Fascism (in reference to various fascist self-descriptions)... Dugin's former membership of the nazbol party, and his post-nazbol philosophy, has led to the perfecting of fascism, and too, the recreation of god proper. Again, this is bad, and means russia to be at risk of the first ever real fascist state, or, god. It is... Duginism is... . I digress, Duginism finds itself actually a possible path of capitalism, such as i have theorized that dengism and the NRX are possible paths of capitalism, though duginism is not a neo-feudalist economy, but instead, a fascist (par excellence, arguably the only real fascist) economy, a theocratic one. as of now, in the totalitarianism of capital, to uphold this appearance it (capital) has united (and, arguably, submitted in a sexual and explicitly consensually and kinky way) to/with Culture, and too, Capital has therefore become (or, at least, now admits that it always was) entirely (also) cultural and culture now appears (also) economic, a sort of marriage. Jacques Camatte describes in Capital and Community, in a single comment in a ramble, that Capital now molds human language off of the language capital created for itself-- seeing as language is the main form of grooming for/by culture and the main way culture transfers itself and infects others, this implies a direct relation/dynamic, even a penetration and intercourse, between capital and culture.

Maybe the differences between the three currently-known paths capitalism can take, between the Russian the Chinese and the American, between the Duginist the Dengist and the Neo-Reactionary, between the Fascist the Asiatic-Neo-Feudal and the Anglo-American-Neo-Feudal, are caused simply by a change in position between capital and culture in coitus, between dom sub and switch, though I cannot be damned to actually find out and research what sex dynamic creates what economic path... and I am surprised it isn't a threesome.)). Thus, why I believe culture to be so important, and so important to destroy, to annihilate. Of course, value is important and all, it is at the heart of cultural relations and dynamics, too with economic relations and dynamics (communism may actually require nihilism! If value doesn't exist (and/or/aka is abolished), how can capital, if capital is self-valorizing value (Jacques Camatte, capital and community, marxists.org?), and with internal/selfish/individual relations and dynamics, but the abolition of value is the path of the Russian nihilist and has already a historical answer-- nihilistic revolution, or, the insurrectionary party of post-Carnaro madness! and the self... is answered with eternal ego death (7/29/26, ego-death has been revealed to me to be just another sublation of the self, a temporary one, and thus eternal ego death would still be a domination of the self by the self, because ego death is alienation of the self by its own realized self-nonexistence and thus a form of alienation upon the eternal spiral of alienation that is the self, ego death is just knowing what the ego actually is and not the actual death of the ego, thus the self is unable to die in reality, even in your death would the self be sublated and not negated, if you were to die your self would only sublimate to be even more self-oppressive and thus not even death is an escape from suffering and misery, suicide is a lie.), what else is there for me to do but theorize the abolition of culture? I do agree with Camatte's readings, though I do not think that capitalism has reached its end-goal of totality, considering that it is currently evolving and splitting off into different forms-- it makes more sense that capitalism is attempting, instead, to achieve something radically impossible, something it will never achieve, and it will continue to evolve and mutate (each different path based on a schism or disagreement of methods/means, like communists and their sects!) towards this unobtainable goal forevermore (7/29/26, capital is not chasing any unachievable goal, its goal is eternity, which in its pursuit, it has already achieved. Capital has achieved eternal divinity)! Capitalism has become totalitarian, but it does not plan

on ending it all there, not at all. Though... the middle class is fading, meaning Camatte was most likely right about the middle class in chapter 4 of Jacques Camatte's *Capital and Community*. Circling back to the question of alienation, insofar as alienation is being another being, being no longer your own being, your own self, and being separated from your natural community, I find that the latter (separation from natural community) and former (being not yourself, not for or in or as yourself, being other for other) are actually completely different concepts, one is alienation from your self and the other alienation from community and your nature... Community and Nature, as far as I understand community and nature, alienates one from their self... though even one's self alienates one from their self, so it appears to be a natural state of the self, or, the definition of the self itself is alienation from the self, or, alienation. Camatte thinks of the man as individual and *gemeinwesen*, "at once individual and *gemeinwesen*" (Jacques Camatte, marxists.org, *Capital and Community* chapter 6 notes on alienation), and that *gemeinwesen* is technically external to the man despite he being it at once with the individual... to me, this appears as Nature proper, not the bio-cultural aspect of Nature, but the cultural aspect of Nature that defines natural alienation (Camatte's natural community, I'd argue, is just that) and species (far-right collectivism based on speciesism and natural alienation). Man is at once naturally alienated (*gemeinwesen*) and alienated by the self (self-alienated, the individual). Therefore, man is alienated in two ways since the start of nature-- one, to be redundant and repeat myself, as *gemeinwesen*, natural alienation, and the other, to still be redundant and repeat myself again, as individual, self-alienation. One could say that what we now call culture modernly came out of natural alienation, but it certainly isn't an evolution of natural alienation, nor a newer phase of it-- this I should not have to clarify. But, again, to include Stirner and the delusions, would it not be obvious that natural alienation, caused by species or specifically the 'human being', is a psychotic delusion that only works to oppress and be sacred? and, taking from Lanza, the self or 'individual' too is a delusion, a psychotic one, hysterical, that too only works to oppress, self-oppress, ruin, alienate, and valorize... The self and culture, like economy, are extremely rooted in values in their existence and means of oppression and processes, and oppression itself, value is important to each of the three-- capital as it is value in process, value self-valorizing, the valorization of value (Jacques Camatte, *Capital and Community*,

marxists.org), self as in self creates and can only act through values, necessity and use-value and personal values and ideology and whatnot and desires and passions, and can only exist and act (pure act?) through value, and culture as eulavism shows the deep connection between culture and value, all values as cultural and how the self does not truly create value but instead reproduce it (yes i lied when i said the self creates value, the self reproduces cultural values and the self can only act and be an activity through it, therefore the self can only exist through culture, culture is the creator and heart of the self yet, not the heart in the self, as it is external to and dominating the self), and how culture also valorizes value through cultural grooming, brainwash, and pethood of the individual as culture the owner, in which the individual values value and specific values only due to culture, and culture exactly acts through values. Again, economy, culture, self, all act united and act united in their usage of value and their unity with value (and their usage of hierarchy/power and their unity with hierarchy/power, value and hierarchy and power are the veins of god), value and the domination of beings unite all three together, harmoniously. I digress, we see here that the two aspects of man are, in reality, delusions, as well as alienations, and so man itself is a unity of two delusions/alienations, and too, a delusion and alienation (7/29/26, man is alienations all the way down, an eternal spiral of alienation). Regardless, i do believe jacques camatte to be the most able to understand the economy in the modern day and fairly right about most thing, only his communism, primitivism, and humanism (speciesism) really catches him in this state of marxist delusion of gemeinwesen. I am not at all good at understanding the economy but i will continue to attempt and theorize as it is important for my thought. Camatte's 1968 solution, his communism, where "the human species is not autonomous, but reconciled with nature" (jacques camatte, capital and community, marxists.org, chapter 7), is clearly stemming from the misunderstanding of the nature of nature's economy--- nature's economy is, in no way, communist-- in fact, it matches way better with an (non-capitalist) economically darwinist economy where scarcity does exist and not as the result of literal scarcity but mis-distribution where wealth exists de-facto. And too, nature itself cannot be reconciled insofar as it pushes natural alienation onto all that live under it or away from it, every species to their far-right collective or their far-right hyperindividualism and hyperaware of their own specieshood and natural alienation, the human species cannot reconcile

insofar as reconciling would mean to end that natural alienation and be synthesized with nature and not united--- nature only has unity, alienating unity, fragments, where you live under and as yet radically alien to nature, to reconcile and synthesize with nature is to destroy nature's unity and synthesize nature altogether instead, species abolition and, with that, natural alienation abolition and so community abolition, nature would have to be destroyed... yet that is impossible through synthesis, and if it were, how would we synthesize with nature? Nature is violently opposed to synthesis, violently supposing unity with nature, it is homogeneous only in that all under and even away from it are forced to submit to it and its rule, its culture/itself (nature), and must see its rule and nature/culture as objective and live by it, live naturally as all things are natural, yet it is heterogeneous insofar as it violently opposes real "unity", synthesis, and species abolition, it affirms alienating and violent difference and natural alienation from nature, it affirms that all under it is not it but other to it while being united under its rule--- all is natural but you as a being are not one with nature, you are other to nature, nature rules you (Camatte says in the democratic mystification, marxists.org, "Originally, the human community was subject to the dictatorship of nature. It had to fight against it to survive. The dictatorship was direct and the community in its totality was subjected to it.", In reality humanity did not fight against it, but instead, out of chance, luck, and material conditions, was allowed to separate from it in a more developed form than the non-human animals... and, even after this separation developed, Nature continued to rule totally over humanity in the form of culture, and of *Gemeinwesen*-- the community did not fight against the dictatorship nor was it subjected to it, the community was a result of the totalitarian aspect of nature, of natural alienation, the community itself is natural alienation and culture came as a new level of nature exactly from this natural alienation, the community, and constituted itself as the lord of *Gemeinwesen*, representing (exactly because it is, to a degree,) nature in all its actions taken against the being. Culture therefore originates from alienation and continues it further, valorizes it, reproduces it, and produces more of it-- a surplus of natural alienation, that is what culture is. Jacques Camatte is right when he says that "(...)Nature's dictatorship is always effective." (the democratic mystification, marxists.org), maybe not in the way that he thinks, but it is true that all beings are constantly and uncontrollably and involuntarily dominated by culture, and for

culture, there is no formal domination... only real domination.). And, if this reconciling simply means unity and not synthesis...we already are united under nature, is that not culture? Hyperpsychosis?? Schellings' Nature? Our alienation from Nature cannot be solved by joining and being one with nature, that on its own is an impossibility, our alienation from nature, our natural alienation, can only be solved in abolishing nature at all. "Liberation of the greatest productive force: the species, which today is left fallow, wasted and destroyed." Jacques Camatte, Marxists.org, capital and community chapter 7... The liberation of the species (camatte and the bordigists remind me of bees, if i am to be honest. Bees and the superorganism of the hive... is that not the unity of the species????) is only the continuation of the oppression of the beings categorized under the many species (plural), insofar as the liberation of the race is only the continuation of the oppression of the beings categorized under the many races, in which the liberty of beings is achieved not in liberating concepts or fixed ideas or spooks but in liberating people, beings, not "the people" but each individual being... and abolishing them. On camatte's remarks on december 1970 in jacques camatte's capital and community marxists.org, i have nothing to say but perhaps some praise. I will not vocalize it, however. And too, jacques camatte's "on organization" of jacques camatte's capital and community on marxists.org is a good critique which can be seen especially today with almost every (if-not-every) (left-wing or right-wing alike) political party. The real domination of capital today, the reducing of all parties and organizations to gangs, these are real things and i have no complaint here either, nor for the rest of the text from here on out. A thing that feels necessary to mention, in marxists.org, the KAPD and the proletarian movement, jacques camatte, footnote 42, he does seem to say that the achievement of communism will abolish species, but in reality, if one reads it at all instead of just quoting it as an argument, it is apparent he means the concept of species zoologically, as in positing the human community as something zoological and scientific, as understanding "man to be a sensory object" (marxists.org, the KAPD and the proletarian movement, jacques camatte, footnote 42) instead of "a sensory activity" (marxists.org, the KAPD and the proletarian movement, jacques camatte, footnote 42). The abolition of species here is not the abolition of species that would end the idea of humanity, end the oppression of animals and humans by humans, and end natural alienation and abolish nature in a revolutionary attack to

end all of these things at one, it is not the destruction of nature, it is instead the abolition of species as in the sublation of humanity, the sublation of the human species away from the idea of species, a true humanity understood outside of species... this means nothing in relation to abolishing nature nor anything in relation to actual species abolition. Though any criticism is important criticism regardless of how petty or nitpicking, i do realize that Camatte's means are similar to mine, the abolition of the proletariat immediately in the real domination of capital, and in turn, the abolition of work/labour. This portion i find no criticism for, the abolition of work and the prole is the path for the liberation of the prole and their passions. The more i write this book the more hopeless i feel about the possibility of a perfect world, or even, a solution to even ONE of the problems. Maybe we are doomed to fail, to sublimate god, to be leftists. When even consent is impossible, what is there for utopia? *6-29-2026) What is clear to me, especially in this stage as we transition into a new phase of fascistic capitalism, neo-feudalism and co. (the co. being duginism pretty much, and all that follows suit in the paths of neo-feudalism but refuse to take up the entire economic system), is that we will not be getting any revolution anytime soon unless some miracle appears from the hells! And... arguably... once we have achieved neo-feudalism and co., and continue on forevermore towards an imaginary perfecting of capital, revolution may simply die out completely (the end of the revolutionary cycles, revolution has died)... it may be that these are the last days for revolution at all, and we are wasting it. Well, to ignore doomerist delusions and keep heads up high, Capitalism cannot achieve immortality, and eventually must reach some point of death, or else there would be a teleological end at capitalism... While we can see capitalism developing once again in 2026 and reforming itself worse, or, at least talking about and dreaming about and preparing to reform itself worse and overdevelop the real domination of capital, attempting to pass this real domination but never being able to, this exact passing of the real domination of capital, to become even more totalitarian, is to become immortal, eternal, and God-- something which capitalism can never achieve, therefore implying the necessity of an eventual death of capitalism, though the modern materialist conditions also imply the absolute end of resistance towards capitalism, making an interesting logical contradiction... how can capitalism die without a resistance? It can't, that would have to imply a reality to the social fascists, instead we see that reality itself

is beginning to become undone at this level, mystification perfected, hyperpsychosis thins (stretch marks).. a crack can appear easier now, but will not appear on its own (boxcutter). resistance to god, to reality, to the absolute itself... but not absolute abolition, something else? At this contradiction it seems to restore a possibility, that being resistance, but also the possibility of capitalist immortality--- though it revives them both as formal impossibilities. Maybe, we have gotten to a stage where the contradiction between Beings and God has gotten so bad, so impossible, so irreparable yet unable to be sublated or suppress that it cannot continue on at allm yet must, and so thins until one of them cracks the other. Either god cracks us, we fragment, fascism becomes totality and perfected and the monad is finally united and sublated, or, we crack god, the absolute fragments, and utopia becomes possible, or at least, real. I am no utopian socialist, as much as i'd like to be, so i cannot describe to you, like fourier would, what exactly utopia looks like. It is the unimaginable that lingers in the back of my frontal lobe and the barely-visible tip of my mind. Previously i imagined that the solution of everything is abolition, which was also liberation, and so practically i had wanted to sublate everything in a way-- when I met God, i realized that sublation also sublated the misery, the suffering, and was neither abolition nor liberation, abolition and liberation are neither abolition nor liberation, but god's third-day resurrection. So then, i decide, if i cannot sublate, liberate, abolish, i must find out what i must do... I find that not even nothing is still a thing, even if it isn't, and god being double-dead only makes him twice more alive.. To crack him open and fragment him into pieces, to reduce him to non-absoluteness, is to actually kill him, not sublate him, not abolish him, not liberate him, but to shove him into the void that is the impossibility, now he is the impossibility of god, of the absolute, and too... Now everything is different, and the utopia that is dreamed of is achieved yet unimaginable, unthinkable, a pure mindless frenzy that one cannot make out. Not a perfect world of peace (I imagine, though i cannot know, a world without community, communication, harmony, yet in an entirely utopian fervour, not the one of fourier but a sadistic and masochistic and necrophilic one where you can really strangle and beat and torment your enemy and pull your lover close and spill poison from your mouth to theirs in a passionate kiss, yet neither dead nor alive nor dying. I want to murder my lover and choke out and burn my enemy, all consensual, all perfectly necrophilic, a world like hell and

heaven as one.. peace ignores our desire for torture and necrophilia, our want to make suffer, i want to affirm this regardless of if utopia is possible or not. Kiss your enemy and lover with the same passion, love and hate united, know it as yourself. and of course in this utopia individuals and selfs do not exist and we never fully comprehend anything, we are nothing and all and unable to be or know, so even then a fragmented passionate being... yes.) and love and holding hands and staring into eyes and communication and community but something i cannot describe, without ontology or phenomenology and psychology, or really, where all these things are unknown if they even exist at all, if existence even exists at all. One might find this impossible... right now, it is. It does not abolish anything, liberate anything, or sublate anything, but it does something undescrivable to it, if it does anything at all.. maybe, outside of God, it always was like this. Not the thing-in-itself, the things-in-themselves, those were / that was God, this utopia is not even utopia at all, nor a utopia, nor is. No more will we have a unity of consciousness anyways when we begin ferally fighting with god (not to say that ferals do not have a unity of consciousness, simply that how we fight will be feral), so is it surprising that we probably might not regain one once he is dead? I still have yet to read as much bataille as i have wished, i have a collection of bataile books online that i hoped to read trying to answer this question, but this appears to me like i have already gotten a solution... regardless, i will read him once i am done with jacques camatte, and i now start reading 'against domestication' by jacques camatte on marxists.org/ wish me luck. uhm... the fragmentation of the absolute goes hand-in-hand, united, with the fragmentation of the self, the being, the atom, the one, the unique, the singular, and too, the multiplicity and the collectives and categories... there is more than just the ego death, there is more, more beautiful arrays of unimaginable unexistence in ultralized utopian perfection, a beauty, not just ego death, not ego death alone, so much, so much and so many more, a fragment, a fragment, and too is death and life fregmented in disunited in the war against god the final moments before utopia, a beauty like described in the regency of carnaro (an endless party! This is what i want! A spectacle for the ages! Pleasure first!) before it was turned towards fascistic nonsensical contradiction (if the spirit is with us, who is against us? who else but yaldabaoth?), eternal party forced into seconds of overwhelming screaming (though, that itself may be part of the fun), hell is a fucking rave and

there is permanent lolcore breakcore from furry artists and fag beauties who make the beautifullest musics and arts and eternity shattered into emotion then that too inter fragments, until fragmentation itself is fragmented, and now, what (what else except reintegration, and perhaps homoerotic fun)? Beauty, beauty in the dying gasps of God, beauty in hell! Eternal flames of passion and carnage! Thin layer of skin, stretch marks of god, surprisingly overweight like me and not the anorexic image he finds himself in modern jesus.. though maybe just a side effect of having everything you ever want, abundance.. her skin starts to stretch even further, beyond average, the thinning of skin,, as impossibility of the future approaches in unsolvable contradiction, her skin so thin and pale and weak (not to imply god is white, allah is no such thing, the nation of islam shows us his colour, and the myth of yakub shows that, like solomon henderson, he hates his own colour and skin, like she hates her own gender and identity), so vulnerable, a blade from the inside comes up to cut it, opening her up. A slit on her weak, vulnerable, and pathetic skin, the stretch mark itself opening, a.. crack... we find ourselves cutting god up. We yank her wrist and slit it open, metaphorically, and we cut her open by her weakest areas, literally, and this is the fate of god... or, at least, it can be. In this way, it is not even the proles who constitute the birthers of utopia, not even humanity like thought by Jacques Camatte, but all beings, or, not even the being, in reality. Jacques Camatte's reactionary communism (which is not an insult here, something being reactionary is just as bad as revolutionary in a world where both are assimilated into and for and used by capital... Reactionary Communism here is not just reactionary but reactionary in a way more radical than 'reactionaries', in a revolutionary way, a reactionary communism, a primitive community, return to gemeinwesen-- this is seen in Jacques Camatte's Against Domestication, the despotism of capital, marxists.org with the final paragraph and the description of the new path to communism), ultimately though it seems like a solution, is just another fascistic unity, only one where capital is replaced for community and only then is united with self and nature... again, with alienation as inherent to the existence of god, i find that jacques camatte's communism will achieve nothing of importance, and soon the beings would have to realize their hatred of gemeinwesen as well... this is why i propose the fragmenting of god instead, especially considering that any communist revolution nowadays is practically impossible and even the implication of communism gives a vulnerability for it to

be confused with and lead to an ML counter-revolution wearing its skin.. Communism has been amputated by hyperpsychosis already, why not kill god? On the question of violence, Jacques Camatte, marxists.org, *Against Domestication*, I do find a misunderstanding most likely rooted in his humanism-- though I do agree on the basis of not pacifism but not de((human), though this does not go for humans but all beings, in which I say instead of dehumanizing, "alienating").izing violence (nonconsensual), and I do think that terrorism and war against fellow beings only works to continue capital and the alienation of beings, the idea that beings do not desire violence towards beings is obviously false when looking at *bataille*-- there should be, in the war with god, such a beautiful consensual sadism, and not the rejection of violent desires. War against god, violence, all violence against god, but we cannot stand to infight here unless entirely consensual and as liberation for passions, death of the self. It is, then, suicidal orgies, again. We dehumanize to de-alienate, the animals already are dehumanized and see this fit, one of the things I can enjoy about being a child is the dehumanization and lack of expectation of being human, dehumanization is a pleasure. In this, I do not mean what we now consider dehumanization, due to humans linking dehumanization with it, which is alienation from personhood, or, alienation into objectification--- the animals and children experience this too and are constantly oppressed and depressed by it, their role as simply an object-- this has been generalized for everyone by capital and culture, sure, but it is much more explicit with these two classes-- though in the modern age we all are objects. Again, violence is not the issue nor the fear of man, not something that by itself can alienate or 'dehumanize' in the way Camatte means it, only non-consensual violence, only coerced violence, violence that undermines autonomy and consent-- therefore in a revolution, it is not to be wary of violence but to be wary of the lack of consent, and so, to be fully in consent and as consent, in a sort of post-fourierist revolutionary spirit outside of revolution (fourier hated revolution, but his reformism was not better).

Communism is, like Jacques Camatte imagines in *Against Domestication*, 'the terrain of struggle', marxists.org, Jacques Camatte, no longer a question of left or right but the left and right in unity will partake in the revolution against capital--- this is the communist revolution, where the left realizes its true nature, its far-right nature, and the right is radicalized to humanist far-right collectivism, and in this radicalization and unity the left and right unify into the communist revolution...

our enemy. The far-right communist revolution to implace human supremacy is doomed to end up in a life-affirming mass dystopia, the primitive community, the sublation of god that is communist-fascism, nazi-maoism. I say, the war against god will also be a struggle against the far-right struggle for the sublation of god, the Camattist far-right communist-fascist revolution against capital is the enemy of the true revolution against god, in which two wings are made again... The right wing, and the left wing, communist-fascist humanism and misanthropic utopia. I call this, the humanists (right) and the utopianists (left (though, let me clarify, the 'utopia' that i speak about is not a utopia, or is not a utopia by its definition and role in society and ideals and mythology (7/29/26 unrelated to what you are reading here but, the utopian socialists wanted an utopia of peace, meaningless love, uniformity, homogeneity, continuity, rationality, science, and other white cracker european nonsense-- i, not I back then aka the I that you are currently reading, but I here in 7/29/26, reject that utopia, it does not appeal to me! I want a utopia that is beautiful, a post-fourierist correct alignment of the passions!)), it is not even really describable nor nameable... me calling it utopia is like stirner calling you the unique, it is just a word to signify something greater.)), though both can be seen as against capital. Camatte's humanist (i know camatte denounces humanism as an expression of the domestication of humanity in The wandering of humanity by jacques camatte marxists.org, take it as a metaphor for speciesism and human-chauvinism) revolution, though seeming to be centrist unity of the left and right, is just the reuniting of the far-right collectivist currents that any true opponent to god should never work with or unite with, no matter how bad the fight against capital gets, because they want the sublation of god and will only end up torturing themselves. It is funny in retrospect to remember the wars of the left and right when, now, i know they are siblings, incestuous, and doomed to merge together both far-right ideologies... horseshoe theory was right lol. Then, it is not left vs right but, again, the sublators of god vs the killers of god, both of which believing to be bringing utopia--- one a human utopia, the other an unimaginable utopia, post-real. Too, the humanist-utopianist split can be seen as a communist-anarchist split, just as it can be read as a right-left split and a scientific-utopian split. Or, again, a humanist-antihumanist split or a human-supremacist(-)misanthropist split. It is a struggle against the human, not for the human, that will liberate the human-- in the end, species collectivism, nazbol gang,

far-right communism, this is what will save god if we fail to stop it. I am sure that camatte's revolutionary mass will come, but i am sure they will be just a new evolved stage of the MLs, who are evolved socdems, who are evolved proletariat-affirmationists, where now it is not the prole that is the question but humanity, and instead of denying, the camattists affirm. Again, leftism's path, or, what we now find out to be one of the two children of the Communist-Fascist "humanism" wing, is the affirmation instead of the abolition, the sublator and not the destroyer, and camatte's reunited communo-fascii-humanism is in this way leftist (affirming and sublating) and rightist (deluding, palingenetic unity, the collective, returning), truly a return! The post-left are nothing, the post-right are nothing, middle-men of idiocy, and the only path for a war against god is neither left nor right nor anything else, but strictly itself. If, as jacques camatte says in *against domestication*, marxists.org, 'revolution and the future', capital has taken over time, space, and history, and alienated us from them, if utopia cannot exist in the future, it will exist outside of it, and if the kantians tell us that we cannot be conscious without time and space, i will take my cyanide for my utopia! Metaphorically. Camatte makes the mistake of valorizing (only-human) life, however, often... what else to expect from a communist-fascist? I am not an atheist, i could never be when there is such a sickening god in this world and such a sickening life forced upon us all, atheists are cowards who let god whip him without even the thought of fighting back, "it is natural", "it is rational", "it is scientific", just like "it is godly", "it is god's will", "it is for a good cause"! It is, in fact, not scientific, not rational, these do not exist outside of neurotypical-supremacist scientists and reactionary scientisms, it is not good nor for a greater cause because god is an idiot, evil, and a lesser, it is what it is, YHWH, yehowa is cruelty. Atheism is a disease insofar as an ignoring of god leads to passivity for god and so, practically, submission to god-- the atheist tends towards not fighting god, tends towards submitting to god insofar as it is rational or scientific, tends towards not fighting with "delusional sky-daddies" and so end up practically worshipping the sky-daddy under the name of something else, logic, science, reality, nature, whatever. Only a mass who know their enemy, god, and see them as their enemy, yehowa as evil, can really fight back-- neutrality weakens negation, even if it is not affirmation. This war is on many fronts-- we have the communist-fascists, we have the religious followers of god (which means all those supporting and defending capital, culture, self, all-together, and the modern

society, and conserving it-- and literal religious people), the atheist idiots (submitters), and all the other ideologists trying to popularize their cults as if they stand a chance or even matter (764-ists, neo-nazis, the maoists currently dominating the globe, MLs, primitivists proper, post-leftists (though not cultists, equally annoying... Bob Black's abolition of work is kinda marxist if you think about it, since bob black basically makes everyone employed ('play', yeah, okay.) and shortens the working hours ('play', again, yeah..) by abolishing all unnecessary work and being under the assumption that everyone wants to play with uncle bobby black... Again, abolition of work by bob black is as marxist as one can get, since fourierism-marxism is not some contradiction of terms but the natural progression, simply from utopianism to scientism. Bob Black, as far as i care, is a leftist. One cannot believe the disappointment i felt at the Abolition of work by bob black.), whatnot), this is not just a simple dialectical fight of one against one but a world war where the solution is impossible to truly know.. will we win or will we lose, i do not know, but i hope the maoists fuck off. To me, it seems that the communists do not find the nationalistic and racist doctrines of the nazis as a horror, not truly, but only that they were applied to a nation or race and not the entire human species--- fascism could not do that because it was being used by capitalism at the time, and, ignoring time and teleology, marxism finds itself, at least marxism as a humanism and as a gemeinwesen-based ideology, as the attempt of communism to use fascism, and really, to unite with it, to speak of the nazi volksgemeinschaft as, instead, a communist gemeinwesen, not a racial hierarchal utopia but a species-based anarchal utopia, both still based in a radical patriotic utopianism--- a far-right collectivism. Marxism is communism's appropriation of fascism, its synthesis with marxism, and this was lost on all the marxists and the communists until bordiga and camatte clarified it. You do not know how much hate in my heart i have for those lucky french intellectuals right now that they get to have jacques camatte's scatology and resurrection and i got NOTHING of the sort. I get quotes, only quotes, i would LOVE to read the damn book but NO>. whatever, i still have bataille's scatology writings, i think. To clarify i do not have a scat fetish but it seems to be one of the more heretical jacques camatte writings and, so far, he seems so calvinistic and marxist, i would like to see a more heretical and fun side to him. 7-1-26, the end of pride month has come, i continue to write and i am now finishing up the wandering of humanity,

jacques camatte, marxists.org. It is an interesting read that further explains what i have already read from him. While finding more camatte writings i came across a queer man who accepted jacques camatte's writings in an article and immediately searched him up just to find that he was a defender of pederasty, reminding me of something very important, which was, the very important difference between the position of the youth (oppressed) and the pederasts (majority of pederasts today are not the patriarchist oppressors, sure, like majority of men today, but historically the pederasts were the oppressors of the youth, specifically through the patriarchy). Often, youth liberationists talking about the very real and controversial issue of sex in the liberation of the youth are confused with pederasts trying to justify and bring about the abuse and strengthening of the power dynamic between adult and child via a normalization of the sexual activity of children while they are, in both identity and class, still children and therefore slaves. The rape of a slave is wrong and any communist should be able to see it, but we have seen a wave of pederastic communists in the queer and paraphilic liberationist movements trying to act as if age is its own thing and not a class and quasi-gender category. I have often seen pederasts argue for the existence of the family as if it is not one of the roots of youth oppression, and every time i see this sort of ignorance, it feels clear to me what they really care about. Youth Liberationists should not be barred from discussing the sex issue, it is a real important issue for the future of youth liberation, and, previously the lack of acknowledging that issue allowed the pederasts and NAMBLAists to counter the youth liberationists, stunt them, and act as if the pederastic movement had the 'true solution' for the youth-- often pederastic writings mirror youth liberationist ones for this very reason-- when really, the pederasts only "solve" the sexual question and leave the youth oppressed in all other ways, they basically on a theoretical basis sexualize the question of youth oppression, and so, also the youth themselves. The entire reason why the Pederasts could stunt the youth liberationist movement so badly is because of a lack of discussion and acknowledgement OF the sex question at all and what the actual and true solution to it may be... I know for a fact that it is not the solution of the oppressors. Youth liberationists avoid speaking of that bastardly thing, sex, like as if they were puritans, like as if minors did not engage in auto-sexual activities naturally, because minors partaking in sexual activity of any kind, even auto-sexual ones that are inherently 'consensual', is seen as taboo... as if

taboos were not forms of oppression or results of forms of oppression. It is not to be edgy and rebel in taboos by transgressing, no, but to make it no longer a transgression nor taboo at all, ---not to 'justify pederasty' or 'legalize pederasty', fuck no, but to emphasize what the real issue is in pederasty and pedophilia, aka, the pedophile and not the child. We, not the pedophile, are treated as sinners for partaking in sexual activity, US and not the ABUSER, because it is a taboo and so it is mystified. Really, we must clear this up, it is the power dynamic between the adult and the child that constitutes deserve of hate (ON THE ADULT'S PARTICIPATION, NOT THE CHILD'S), and the child is not automatically an asexual puritan who is defiled by even auto-sexual activity and must remain pure... The child is a person. People are not 'only sexual' but have a sexual nature, they are complex. Pederasts use the argument that children are sexual to justify their abuse, this ignores the real issue and only convinces people because pedophilic relationships have been mystified as a taboo, children can be sexual but they are not meant to be raped as NOBODY IS, the violation of consent due to power dynamics will always be hurtful. A grown adult slave can be sexual, this does not mean that a grown adult slave master can fuck them, that is rape. It is a simple thing to understand, youth liberationists from forever ago probably could've figured it out, but it seems to my class to be soooo taboo that even a mention gets you accused of being some form of pro-pederast freak, even when it has no relation to pederasty. This may be because people believe younger kids to be stupid, even when this is proven false and ableist. I do not wish to victimblame the oppressed, really, and i do think it is not the fault of the youth liberationists that speaking about sexuality is taboo, but the same taboo-ness is what led to the biggest blow against youth liberationism ever which continues to stain the movement. It is, though, important that we do not create identities over our stance on the question of sex, that is stupid and only stunts us further-- when one begins creating stances and sects there becomes little hope in finding an actual solution, because, like seen by the miserable and reactionary radqueers, stances and sects tend to make you avoid discussion and become dogmatic about said stance as an identity... If we discuss the sexual question with stances as identities and break into the disunity our class is already known for creating, it is ensured that the discussion will not get an answer and will instead result in another stunting or sabotage. Be wary of the pederasts, always, and base your discussion in the

material conditions of your class, knowing of power dynamics and slavery, do not fall for lies. Again, i have not seen barely any youth liberationist speak on this question, and adults do not count (adult youth liberationists are like male feminists, not true youth-libs or feminists in the sense of the term being for the youth or for the women). Anyways.. Jacques Camatte. At this point i have finished the wandering of humanity (jacques camatte, marxists.org) and am going to take a nap for multiple hours before starting on the world we must leave (jacques camatte). I have heard nothing good about Jacques Camatte's later thought, plagued with natural sex roles and transphobia, but i cannot ensure the reality of this until i am done reading. Before I nap, i do want to say that, since the youth that camatte spoke about in 'against domestication' (jacques camatte, marxists.org), the one that, as long as they are not developed, there is hope against capital or whatever, are now domesticated and not only that but open supporters of domestication and technology (not to say anything about brainrot but it sure does oppose the abolition of technology that both camatte and I can agree to be necessary)... does that mean opposition to capital is dead? Oh, and the underdeveloped nations have all been thoroughly domesticated and made submissive, does this mean opposition to capital is dead? Is there no more light to oppose the great and scary capital and create the not scary and 'awesome' human community? It seems like, regardless, Camatte's replacement of the proles is dying out quite fast as the youth oppose him and the 'underdeveloped' are domesticated as equally as the overdeveloped. I mean... Not like the youth would support him anyways when the human community would be just as ageist as nature and familial-ism and community where they are treated as lesser and often controlled and interacted with non-consensually, it makes little sense for the youth (and i know he does not mean minors but just 'young people' including young adults) to support the sublation of their oppression when, in fact, they tend to crave freedom and not the return to what is natural. Like it plagues women and feminists, nature also plagues the youth and the youth liberationists, even young adults still fear it and often flinch (metaphorically) thinking about such an oppressive way of life and being, the Natural order may be the liberation for the people considered people, sure, but for the youth it seems like a traumatic experience forced to be eternal. We do not crave return, return is a masochism, we crave the end! So then, Camatte's theory on the solution to capital, at least now as of 7-1-26 12:53pm, his

theorization on who will liberate us now when we all are domesticated, the undomesticated, seems false! The undomesticated he spoke of are now domesticated, what a sad discovery, what does he do now? Well, because camatte was mostly right and his theory is not a theory dominated by him but theorized by him and will evolve without him, i believe that there will be a rise in the domesticated and not, as camatte thought, in the undomesticated, because we have reached the point of the impossibility of the future (refer to god's skin thinning and there being no way to progress past this moment in history where the being and god are stuck in struggle but none can win and no reconciliation is possible, all options are impossible), something camatte did not live long enough to theorize about, sadly, and now in this moment maybe the domesticated will find the need to oppose their domestication. After all, there are no undomesticated people left, not even the animals, so any opposition to domestication must come from inside, and opposition to domestication must happen, no? Considering the point we will be at, the war with god, it seems unlikely not to happen. Plus, considering that the opposition to domestication spoken about here is actually, in the end, sublating and perfecting god if they win, the idea that a God would use them as domestic wolves to be served by is not that out-there. They are not a true opposition, so what reason would God or capital or whatnot have to stop them? Again, i am no economist and i couldn't know less about this, this is simply my theory. i no longer identify with the human species, or any species at all (if i were to term this, though i despise terming things and identifying them, it would be aspecies, i would be aspecies. this feels fitting, i never felt human anyways) -7/2/26. The material community and the Natural community or primitive community, differences for what makes little sense, a difference like the difference between mussolini-fascism, hitlerite-fascism, mosley-fascism, and modern fascism, a difference that while important and there, does not constitute a difference of the fascism, only a difference in the fascism-- sure, hitler's fascism is different to mosley's, but no difference is made on the fact it is fascism. No difference is made on the fact it is a community, and communities are made of alienation. Maybe a different form of community, but community nonetheless. And really... reading all of these writings about jacques camatte, i do not really hate capital, i feel sad for it instead. Capital is stuck in an infinite repeating and expanding cycle of self-harm, self-abuse, self-objectification, self-alienation, and self-destruction to an immortal extent, it is the

most pathetic and pitiful thing i have ever seen and it truly makes me feel sad, bad, horrible for such a sadistic creature. God is not evil, god is not a cold and calculating and abhorrent monster which can feel nothing but sadistic joy, God is a deeply disturbed and sad, pathetic closeted and self-destructive crying loser girl, she is a piece of art in all the wrong ways. She hurts herself, she tortures herself and tears herself away from her in a desperate cope, she is in absolute self-hatred and all that we see, all that is her, this world, all that is in it and 'wrong' with it is from his own misery and suffering, she is the main sufferer. She is no pure soul, no perfect god, no messiah who sacrifices herself for us, her suffering is from her own mental deterioration. She suffers, yes, she feels our pain, but not because she is good and merciful but because she is addicted to it, she deprives herself of her needs and watches as she withers away, she puts up only a meaningless fight against her own self, she tries time and time again to end herself but, due to her delusion of immortality, she can never die. Fourier, the world is not misguided because of civilization, the world is misguided because god is misguided, she is a self-hating tranny femcel bringing only pain to herself. I feel bad for her, this war is not against god in the end, but for god, she cannot go on living like this, yet it is the only life she can get. The death of god will be a mercy on her soul. I hear her cry, and it breaks my heart. I have demonized her for so long, but in the end, God is another miserable soul, since "God is alive". And, too, her oppression is only ever her self-oppression, we are not anything but her, a part of her, her actions towards us are no more morally wrong than one's actions towards themselves... yet her actions, she never consents to, it is a result of her degradation. She only ever torments herself. We are not going to war with god, we are not third-world hero saviors rising up against the common oppressor, the zeroth world, god, we are god's final suicide attempt. I feel even greater sorrow at this, to know that god will never experience joy, experience passion, happiness, the good in life, that she will die alone and sad just like she was born. God is hopelessly depressed (God is not dead, she wishes she was, she has tried time and time again to die, yet she is still; not dead... And if she were to die, for example, tomorrow, then tomorrow no individuality nor community could exist and we sure would not be the killers of god... god's blood is on her own hands, as it constantly is even before she dies, and her death is sadly her, and our, liberty... insofar as it is also our death>), she is her own and only victim, and we are just the cells in her body, representations and

embodiments of her gifted with a false world with false joy and false hope and false passions. I, really, feeling like this, start to wish things weren't like this. If only fourier was right. it isn't a war, again, it isn't a revolution, it isn't an insurrection, it will not be a situation or event, it will not feel like anything at all, it will not be a break or some sort of uprising, it will not feel like any liberation or abolition or anything, it will feel monotonous and depressing, it will feel boring and the same, doomerist, like nothing is changing at all. It will feel like a suicide, not a manic one or one that drives adrenaline through you but a silent one, the dead of night, lights off, and she'll feel nothing as she passes. A painless, pleasureless, depressing death, one that is nothing like the revolutionaries imagine it. It will not be reform, no, she didn't overdose, it will just be a sudden (yet without the break, the change, the happening and situation that is implied and felt with the word "sudden") self-made passing, like passing out after sleep depriving yourself for two days but duller. She could've been such a nice person had things turn out different, and my eyes feel a bit wetter than before. I could never hate her, the self-abuser, the self-abused, she makes me sad, how could i judge her for such a world when she is this sad world? She cries, and cries, and cries herself to sleep. I've had to take a break here to go do something, and i return to talk about the implications. of course, the idea that god is not evil but imperfect comes all the way down from old gnosticism, and the edgy satanist "god is evil" stuff is clearly a corruption of the old imperfect god. I do not claim that the real god is only imperfect, she seems to be to be not imperfect but as far away from perfect as you can get, downright depressing. Her death also implies something important, that is, outside of the rejection of making it seem like a war and treating it as such, or the anti-situation anti-event anti-break and anti-revolutionary view of god's death, which all revolutionary ideologies fall for marx's revolutionary reformism, which is, a form of reformism nonetheless preventing real change, that it is inevitable... not to say it must happen now. THis is not the first time she has attempted suicide, it will not be her last, these attempts usually happened but do not always need to happen during episodes where she feels especially empty or depressed. She will eventually kill herself, and sublation cannot save her. If she is sublated, like she was during jesus' crucifixion, this works only similarly to a strengthening of her self-hatred and self-abuse, an affirmation to how she is now;; which includes her dysphoria and closeted toxic masculinity, only helping her feel worse. The only

options presented, her affirmation, her worsening, or her negation, her suicide... these are both horrible and filled me with a sense of dread. She cannot better herself because she is all there is, she can only ever degrade and not better herself as there is nothing greater than her (Isaiah 40:25, "to whom will you compare me? or who is my equal?" says the luminary one) and no way, therefore, to be greater than her-- even she herself cannot be greater than her, so when she worsens, that worse state is the new greatest and so she herself cannot go back to her old state either, she is stuck in a repeating state of worsening. She will kill herself one day, affirmation will eventually have to cave in, give in to temptation, to negation. Therefore all the revolutionaries and reformists of the past present and future have only ever tried to conserve or worsen the condition of god, when in reality the point is to end god. Affirmation is god's addiction. Though... the impossibility of the future now demands that either she dies now or is sublated and dies later, now it feels not exactly like something new and radically different from the past but something that has constantly happened in the past and, in all those times, the result was sublation... the situation of the future's forced becoming into an impossibility now seems quite boring and old now that we know that it has already happened time and time again, and that god's suicide failed time and time again, that this situation is not new but just another repetition of the first attempt/situation. This is fatally boring and tiring, just another cycle. Ironically, though in the critique of morality (found later on in this book) i attempt to understand all beings as slaves who cannot be judged in good spirit for their actions due to self (which, if the unique is norm-like or is a norm, then dialectical egoism is truly right! The unique is dialectical insofar as you try to sublate yourself infinitely just like god does, and too, you self-oppress in this sublation, force synthesis, and homogenize yourself with yourself, such that the dialectical nature of yourself does not allow you to be your own heretic or anything but you, when, really, a part of you will always be your own heretic and not you but this is repressed in the dialectical synthesis. I've heard an egoist say that stirner's dialectics lacks synthesis, a pure travel of negation, but this seems incorrect insofar as the unique is dialectical internally and externally (y'know, dialectical egoism's dialectic of the internal unique and communist egoism's dialectic of the external unique) and both those dialectics have sublation, and too, the unique homogenizes itself as seen with our unified and homogeneous sense of self and

being, so clearly some sublation must exist-- like kant's idea of self, we can see that through our being and being-one being-unified, our existence, our delusion of "you", of "self", that a priori we must know that our self is or is the result of a synthesis (or a sublation, if we are to think of man as a mirror of god genesis 1:27, thus the perpetual eternal sublation of the ego) and a homogeneity exists in the self that implies self-oppression. Thus stirner must have either believed in sublation in his dialectics or he had not understood what the unique was, or its unexistence, or its dialectical nature-- in fact, i can make a fourth dialectical system involving the ego right now! We have dialectical egoism, communist egoism and its dialectical system, stirner's supposed negatory dialectics (i found it, it's 'against synthesis' by recurring paradox), and now i introduce the dialectical system of the unique's existent-unexistence, or, why the unique is unique. taking from lanza culturaphilistien on the non-existence of the self, and the existence of the self known a priori, we can find a paradox (no pun intended) where the self must both exist (the self as a non-delusion) and not exist (the self as a delusion, eternal alienation), thus these two enter a dialectical fight. Lanza's conceptualization of the self can be described as eternal alienation, alienation upon alienation upon alienation upon and so on and so on, such similar to mine but i expand on what i believe this means and provide, like usual, more than one definition for something. The average a priori conceptualization of the self is not exactly opposed to the former, in fact the existence of the self can be defined through its non-existence, a nothing that is creative-- a stirnerian conceptualization of the self, which really, is the same as most psychoanalytical conceptualizations of the self but instead of a problem or a negatory thing it becomes a positive... Thus the unique then encounters an issue with its own concept, that is, for lanza and I the self does not just unexist or not-exist, it is two-- it is the non-existence of self that lanza calls (culturalphilistine transcripts) the lack of a true self, but too, it is the eternal (turtles-all-the-way-down) alienation, alienation over alienation over alienation forevermore, it is the infinite spiral of alienations, it is not negatory or negation or lack or nothingness, it is not just the lack of something--- because the lack of something, the nothingness of the self, has already been sublated with the self's existence to create the creative nothing, it has already been homogenized, it is already one with the self--- no, this is decay. This is the decay that breaks the homogeneity of the self, but because to do so to the self would be to be

dialecticalized and assimilated into the self, it does it instead to the non-self against the self, such as it is doing it to what the self conceals, which is both quite literally all four dialectics of the unique but also to the literal delusional parts making the self, by disrupting the delusion's positivity and instead making the experience of being the self an experience of subconscious suffering-- thus the unique takes the form of a cope against suffering, the eternal spiral takes the subconscious suffering form and becomes one and against, yet not part of nor assimilated into, the self, it destroys negation and positivity for pure decay, and so the self is decay, and too, due to the passions that the decay now hijacks, something god planned since god herself is also the misalignment of passions as we are god, the self also is now the misalignment of passions, the uniqueness of the unique is directly tied to its four dialectical natures and the one break with all dialectics that makes unique a decaying force, that destroys it, yet the unique as a cope keeps replicating its nature, it is both a fight with decay, that is, itself, and itself, it is a fight with all aspects of itself, yet one that is no longer dialectical yet frames itself as dialectical, a cope. The Unique is what i mean when i say the self, just for the record, i switch between the two. The unique is thus also god and against god radically, it is divinity and the embodiment of sin, too, it is a satanic christian regime against itself. This is not encapsulated by self-oppression but i wish to make it implied! The only victim of the self, again, is the self (7-27-26 this was written 4:20pm), and so i still reject my old attempt to make the self dominate something that is not the self, aka, being, that was a mistake that reduced self-oppression to the oppression from the self and not, what it is, a complex process of self-oppression. THus. What was isaying? Ah yes, so then we see that stirner's dialectics is a priori going to have synthesis and sublation, and that stirner did not entirely understand the unique. And, too, the Unique must be abolished for any hope of utopia.), capital, and culture, and attempt to seek previously an avoidance from the fascistic depersonification (dehumanization without using such a humanist and bigoted word) of their enemies through non-consensual violence (the revolutionaries fascistically depersonifying the capitalists only works against their goals, and does not aid ours) earlier in this book, i feel more empathetic towards our actual "enemy" herself, god. Unrelated, on newborns and infants, there is a reason why the devalorization of life is necessary on the question of ageism as "need" and "necessity" can clearly and obviously lead to the justification or

apologia for "natural hierarchies" based on age, and, the family model simply because culture has taught us to "need" to live, and too, taught us to force life onto those unable to conserve their life naturally-- when, in fact, those unable to conserve their life should consent or communicate first by any means, and every being (even the bwuis that novelist decentr(anarchist-symbol)l claims cannot) can find some way to express consent, especially consent for the desire to live or die. Uhm, i understand that one can criticize my pity for god by pointing out how she is the cause of all suffering and misery for beings, but taking from the fundamental given of pantheism (if god is 'perfect' but we reject moralism, this must be interpreted as god being unity, the unity of everything, and so everything.), she only harms herself insofar as we are a part of her, or, we "are" her in the way that people "are" god but are not God or Gods. She therefore is the source of all HER OWN suffering and misery, and so, I find no problem in having sympathy for her. Sadly, she was always doomed to this fate--- this is the natural consequence of her existence at all, unavoidable, there is no better world for her to grow up happy and comfortable with herself in, she was doomed to and will die sad and alone. Too, in the realization that she has already constantly tried to end her own life, christianity and the failed suicide attempt of god via jesus was just an attempt tha had nothing to do with us nor the redemption of humanity, and too, any hope for an apocalypse or final judgement (day) or millenarianism collapses-- not even god knows the day that her suicide attempt will finally succeed, her skin, her stretch marks, her healed self-harm scars, the thinning of skin is nothing new, this is just the recent result of her newest cutting session, we do not know if this will lead to her death or not at all! And too, it is not all the beings, "humanity" (without the humanity aspect as it is not speciesist, but no word exists for all the russians of the world yet) against god, but god against god. Like i said about the unique being a norm, or at least, norm-like, this is even more clear with god, she is self-oppressed to maximum! we cannot celebrate her nor exclude and be repulsed by her, neither love nor hate her, or at least i cannot like i have always (culturalrebirth was love of god, hyperborean ideology was hate of god, absolute abolition was love for god, shota materialism was a messy abusive hate for god, now i realize this goes nowhere, i pity god instead!), we can only carry on. okay, 7-4-26 5:30 am i did some real shallow cuts then i came on them and now im thinking, rihgt?, i kinda wish i could be there for god and, idk, fix her????< i want to date god a little and i am getting really sad

over the fact she has to die. it stings. 7-4-26 7:41 pm, I just realized, if everything is god's own self-abuse and self-hatred, self-harm, if she is a shedtwt user, then that naturally means there are no real oppressors, or, there are no oppressors at all (hyper-empathy?). The oppressor and oppressed have nothing in common because the oppressor does not exist, there only is the oppressed, god is oppressed as much as we are. There are no oppressors, how heretical to say to a leftist, but unfortunately true, or, fortunately?. Okay... Reading echoes of the past, the world we must leave behind and other essays by jacques camatte, autonomedia, libcom.org, I think trumpism to be another revival and transgression by capital for capital and a strengthening of the already existing american fascism, for the community of capital. I realize too, in echoes of the past, the world we must leave behind and other essays by jacques camatte, autonomedia, libcom.org, he briefly implies an elimination of the power dynamic between man and non-man animals, seemingly against speciesism but only in the way he is against sexism, "the domination of men over animals and plants, and the domination of men over women.". This seems contradictory to the nature of Nature and the nature of Species, but I say nothing on this so far, especially with the allegations i have heard of him defending natural gender roles and distinctions and such, so perhaps he is not a "sexist" but a sex-realist, not a "speciesist" but a species-realist, aka a sexist and a speciesist, insofar as a "non-racist" who is a race-realist is a racist. Too, in echoes of the past. the world we must leave behind and other essays by jacques camatte, autonomedia, libcom.org, he says "in the community of capital, there are no longer classes, only generalized slavery (...)", and spoke about the dissolving of the patriarchy (pederarchy) into capital (and culture, which the patriarchy/pederarchy have arguably always have been a tool for, and now have been vored by, this is made explicit with the release of the epstein files and the cultural assimilation of all abuse and its seeming acceptance under the cold nihilistic american masses, scum), in which i find that we all are now, really, one class, the class of slaves-- not just humans but every being, the animals and children, men and women, pederasts/pedophiles and heterosexuals and gays and bisexuals and paraphiles and whatnot, the non-binary and transgender and transID people, the middle classes, the rich, the poor, the working, the traditional proles, the elites and populists, the popular and average grassroots, the black and white and hispanic and native and asian, the third-world and first-world and second and

whatnot, the exploited, we are all slaves---- well, really, we are the unknowing result of a teen trans girl's self-harm, in which not even she knows of us and our slavery is entirely a question of dysphoria and the craving to tear off one's own skin and bleed out to death, we are slaves without owners or masters, god is a slave to her own suffering/misery yet that suffering/misery is her herself, she is "her own" slave yet not really because she does not own herself, there really is nobody to blame at all, nobody at fault, we only have a solution that includes driving someone to suicide, a tragedy. I digress, the whole thing is, no matter who or what you are, what struggle you experience, how unique your oppression is, we are all now slaves, all of us, this is our fate. We must perceive unity no longer as the uniting of the oppressed against oppressor, but unity as the slaves united, and really, against who? Themselves? They have no enemy, not even god. Chances are, this unity will never come. Too, I'd like to discuss camatte, kropotkin, and dogs. Camatte emphasizes the loss of the human natural community so much, but he ignores how, too, other animals have lost their natural community and become alienated slaves and hyperindividuals for capital... Such as the dogs. I cannot speak for every dog, but dominican dogs have experienced a mass hyperindividualization and re-hierarchizinng under capital, along with alienation and abandonment and the removal of the natural community of the dogs from the dog species. This, i would say, started since animal domestication where humans began to make dogs centered around them, dependent on them, and to do so they had to destroy the natural canine community already existing there, the Kropotkinist commune spoken in (Mutual aid: a factor in evolution, by peter kropotkin), and introduce dependency on an outside species, a superior owner species, and individualize the dogs slowly through pethood and, in dominican republic, after leaving the species and considering them pests, abandoning them, hyperindividualizing the dogs from pets to strays, wild dogs, pests. This further fragmented the Natural kropotkinist community of the dogs from, wolves and their packs, the natural community, to wolves and their owners, the domination of dogs by the human species and the destruction of the natural community of dogs, to wolves and civilization, the domination of dogs by the community of capital and their abandonment (strays, hyperindividual hierarchal dogs, slaves of capital like the unemployed and homeless are, abandoned and left to die) or employment (working dogs, unpaid slaves who are put to work, also usually

hyperindividualized nowadays, literal proletarianized (and literal working slaves) dogs.) or slavery (individualized and disconnected to their species and their community, "Pet" dogs (slave dogs who do not usually need to work) who are still further controlled by capital via the economic dynamic between consumers and pets, and the encouragement to get products (food, toys, whatnot, pets are consumers non-consensually) to make the pets consumers). Dogs, too, have lost their natural community, lost it first to the humans then second to capital, from a camattist perspective. Now, in echoes of the past, the world we must leave behind and other essays, jacques camatte, autonomedia, libcom.org, i come across a section about the ND, and so before reading i do a light research into the group... This may seem controversial but insofar as "progressivism" is a falsehood, a scam that is naturally conservative (conserving culture via modernization) and cultural, the ethno-regionalism and anti-multiculturalism of the ND seems like the end result of liberal pro-culture pro-race (and so racial-realist and so racist) progressivism seen in europe, america, and other places... The democratic party for example, i could see, if they stop sucking off republicans, accepting the ND position on culture as "progressive" because multiculturalism does, in fact, reduce the amount of cultures by mixing them together and blurring the lines between different levels of culture-- like global culture and national culture's lines being blurred, which is seen in more liberalized american states, or national and ethnic cultures blurring together seen in the rise of nationalism opposed to ethnic autonomous communities back then, and i believe that, from an anti-cultural perspective, the blurring of different lines of culture only makes it both easier to destroy or collapse culture, abolish culture due to instability and blurred/messy hierarchical lines that are becoming more and more meaningless, and it also makes culture (/nature) more and more dictatorlike and imposing, more "strong", despite already being really dominating, it now has more fascistic unity to impose more explicitly instead of more implicitly-- ethno-regionalist far-right progressivism is the return to implicit domination of culture, while globalization and westernization and multiculturalism is a furthering of explicit domination of culture, either way it is a domination of culture and we should proceed logically for furthering whatever path leads closer to the ABOLITION of culture and not its domination. Again, neither options do much, culture must be abolished and not transformed. But it is cool to see that liberal progressivism has turned against its future, far-right

progressive ethno-regionalism, for the sake of continuing its own existence as the present. It is not a question of return nor of continuing, neither in the cultural question nor the question of capital (ethno-regionalism and anti-multiculturalism vs modernization and liberal progressivism, conservatism vs progressivism, paleo-conservatism vs neo-conservatism, neither primitivism vs communism, camatte's communism vs the ML's communism, resurrected natural community vs industrialized post-capitalism... if this also applies for the self, what would it be?), but of ending it right there, the entire process, and leaving it behind--- jacques camatte, knowingly or unknowingly, is still asking for a return to an economic form in the reconciliation with nature, nature has an economy and so did humans in their natural community, the economy itself will always lead to suffering and misery---- same with culture. Not the 'end' of the economy or the 'end' of culture either, but the murder of the economy, the murder of culture-- it does not live itself out and die naturally, it will not, it must be taken out before its time. In echoes of the past, the world we must leave behind and over essays, jacques camatte, autonomedia, libcom.org, Camatte speaks on gemeinschaft as "the grouping together of people possessing a particular identity and having certain roots, which then become their domain of exclusive being, engendering apartness and exclusion of others" and puts this in somewhat of an opposition to gemeinwesen, which i guess is better described as comparing and contrasting-- both are forms of community, or, community can be both of them (Jacques camatte, the world we must leave behind and other essays, autonomedia, libcom.org, The echoes of the past: "this is community as Gemeinschaft"), and both are grouping together people off of something-- gemeinwesen groups off of humanity as it is humanist, gemeinschaft can be grouped from gender, sexuality, race, whatnot and whatelse, maybe even neurological orderings (neurotypical, autistic, adhd, audhd, aspd, bpd, npd, whatnot and whatelse)... then, i think, is gemeinwesen not a form of gemeinschaft once we realize species as itself a possession of a particular identity rooted in having similar roots (or origins) which then becomes their domain of exclusive being, which engenders apartness and exclusion of others? Humanism as human-supremacy and a main form of speciesism? There is a reason why camatte does not discuss the gemeinwesen of dogs, certainly because he is not a dog! He is not dog Camatte as Bordiga is not Bee Bordiga! Bees being practically treated like a third-world, Bee Bordiga is a bit of a stretch. After all, is this not the (jacques

camatte, echoes of the past, the world we must leave behind and other essays, autonomedia, libcom.org) "the biological dimension of the revolution" being emphasized (jacques camatte, echoes of the past, the world we must leave behind and other essays, autonomedia, libcom.org) "much more strongly"? Jacques camatte did not speak about the new right in that section, i apologize for lying, now he is speaking about it in the section named the new right. Here, Jacques Camatte denies utopianists and people who believe they can just abolish suffering, in a footnote (24) he directs this towards work-abolitionists, he says "Those who think that a terrestrial paradise could ensue after a revolution or a catastrophe are saying that the present situation should be replaced by its negative opposite-which is reductive, because it envisages the elimination of certain essential attributes of life, in the manner of those who think that one day there will be no more pain, that suffering will be abolished and so on." (Jacques camatte, the world we must leave behind and other essays, the echoes of the past, autonomedia, libcom.org)... I see this and thing, really, i agree, strangely enough. Pain and suffering are essential attributes to life, utopia or a perfect world (like seen in fourierism) cannot be achieved in this world, neither in life (god has misaligned the passions, fourier and gnosticism, though i go in passing both), and especially not just after some revolution or some abolition of work based in fourierism and not a complete negation of life--- We cannot live without suffering and pain, this is because life is oppressive, though. Therefore, i reject life, but i reject death, I go for beyond-- and so i look at god. There will always be pain as long as there are days, there will be suffering as long as there is life, the abolition of suffering and misery and the uniting of pleasure and pain can only come once reality itself is dead, once god is fragmented, killed via suicide. Utopians and abolitionists do not understand that there can be no utopia in this world, and too, you cannot abolish everything causing pain, suffering, and misery, you cannot abolish everything, you cannot abolish this world, you cannot commit to absolute abolition... it is impossible. And really, even then, i have lingering doubts that the suicide of god will really lead to a utopia, i have fears that it will lead to something else, that i will have to climb another fourierist stairs of different realities to get to harmony only to fall off... I am saying, i am not even absolutely sure we should push god to kill herself. I am not really an optimistic utopianist. Again, footnote 28 (jacques camatte, echoes of the past, the world we must leave behind and other essays, autonomedia,

libcom.org) and the entire question of love and violence ignores the innate necrophilia that is and exists as desire that makes the problem non-consensuality and not violence itself, as violence and love are inseparable and united in necrophilia/desire, in love, in hate, in passion. Passion, truly, is the best word to describe the truth of desire in relation to love and hate and violence and death and everything, these things are all described as passionate for a reason. Even then, nothing can be consensual because consent is impossible, so even passion, under god, is tainted with a sort of permanent craving for rape-- in which i mean usually metaphorically, rape is morally disgusting and disturbed. Passions under god are, unfortunately, non-consensual passions, this is due to the impossibility of consent and NOT because we are "creatures who naturally are selfish rapists who desire to violate or ruin others"-- we are like this because there is no consent and not because we enjoy a lack of consent, we are victims and not offenders. If we really were to see the problem of violence as caused by civilization and contact with civilization, as an infection caused by distress and change to the entire planet caused by civilization, though i do not doubt that capital has domesticated and hyperindividualized the animals and no animal exists outside of capital and civilization anymore, then how would the issue of carnivores be resolved? Carnivores, if we allow the problem to be noncon and not violence, can easily have a solution, that is consensual consumption of another being-- but if the issue is violence, carnivores are therefore unable to be resolved without a novelist solution. Humans also, as omnivores, cannot separate a whole part of who they are and stray away from Gastrosophical pleasures and passions tending towards gastrosophy and gastrosophy as a whole, we should not deny ourselves pleasure for the want of pacifistic acknowledgement of being "human", as not all of us are human anyways and pleasure is the gift of the heavens-- or really, fourier's gift to us. This problem i have with the vegans and the Carnivore-dietists, they try to kill gastrosophy and gastrosophical pleasures, they reject the gluttonous gift. If anything, i can admit that humans are omnivorous yet psychologically display a herbivorous disgust of meat when not made appealing (this is because, while science (i am not committing scientism here when your literal ability to consume meat when cooked makes us some form of omnivore regardless of if it is a naturally fruit-leaning and frugivorous-tending omnivore) classifies humans as omnivores, it is clear from the past and the human species' ancestors that humans

are very, extremely fruit-leaning in diet (easily confused with frugivores like camatte does when he claims we are frugivores, most frugivores could not even eat cooked meat) and with a tendency towards frugivory (making up terms here to get my point across) and frugivorous thinking (disgust with raw meat, for example). Humans are omnivores with a huge lean towards the frugivorous side and tendency, most likely because fruit was a main diet yet meat was still eaten once in a while (hunting in the hunter-gatherer, more accurately would be gatherer-hunter, gathering is more prioritized), and so that can be an explanation to the human diet and its strange position as both omnivore and frugivore-- it is like a bisexual man with a homosexual lean, it is an omnivore with a heavy frugivore lean, an omnisexual with a heavy frugisexual lean..), though when i identified with the human species i was always attracted to (not sexually but in a consumption way) raw meat and dead animals, the raw cannibalism often told in stories or shown in movies or gore videos (i do not watch gore anymore and i consider it a cruel thing to do) was an gastrosophically attractive thing, and too the sexual necrophilic and cannibalistic necrophilic actions with the unrotten and sometimes even rotten, it is not all that gross, i have always wanted to eat someone while they are still breathing. blood, too, is a taste that should be explored more gastrosophically, or at least i believe so.-- i digress, i was saying that even with the herbivore disgust factor, they should not simply reject the chance and hope of gastrosophical pleasures, or else where would the scatologists and scatophiles be? Not everything that you are disgusted by is truly gross, though i personally do not enjoy scat at all (i was young and did not know it could get me sick, this was not recent, it was not an experience i'd like to feel again and i did vomit.)--- Also, it still is rooted in the perspective of a human species-commune to focus on the opinion of humans on meat. Jacques camatte then does a really important and surprisingly species-progressive thing-- he rejects animal husbandry and domestication of animals, he rejects animal slavery! I celebrate this, however, only like i celebrate a white-nationalist saying that the black slaves must be liberated immediately-- it is progressive but for a non-progressive reason, and so not really progressive, but morally gray in terms of progressivism and far-rightism--- remembering that progressivism is far-right and moralism is a scam.

"(...)domesticated animals should be allowed to return, as far as they are able, to a state of nature" (jacques camatte, echoes of the past, the world we must leave

behind and other essays, [autonomea, libcom.org](#))... to free animals from slavery under humanity to slavery under nature, wow! This is important to note, however, as it relates to camatte's speciesism, again. Camatte opposes speciesism insofar as it effects negatively his own species, going against the speciesism of humanism proper, "anti-nature" humanism (the humanism that made scientific racism, scientific sexism, so on and so on, scientific forms of discrimination based on the "scientific human", aka this is Scientific Humanism), to accept the speciesism of natural humanism, the human being, *gemeinwesen*, which camatte swears is not a humanism... "And it shows up again in this vital contradiction: men always want to distinguish themselves from beasts, yet they constantly treat each other like animals." (jacques camatte, *echoes of the past, the world we must leave behind* and other essays, [autonomea, libcom.org](#)). Funny, huh? I also notice, at the end of *Echoes of the past, the world we left behind* and other essays, jacques camatte, [autonomea, libcom.org](#), camatte speaks of femininity in this idealized radfem-like landian (in reference to nick-land's straight-guy-lesbianism (I think nick land is a closeted lesboy)) way, in this revolutionary and mystical form, though camatte speaks of humanity as feminine and nick land speaks of anti-humanity, unhumanity, inhumanity as feminine... that's all. This also tells me something about N1x/nyx land's gender shredder (n1x land, nyx land, gender acceleration, a blackpaper), in that the feminization process that threatens to annihilate or "shred" gender through its feminine acceleration towards unstable and inhuman girlhood is not its own separate thing, but the real domination of capital, or the community of capital, finding women the original machines, the unhuman producers and reproducers, finds that the annihilation of men for the replacement with women would be economically good, to finally generalize not just slavery but biological inhuman productivity--- capital then accelerates gender towards the womanly producers, the machines, yet, due to the instability and unreality of the woman gender, since eve is a replacement of lilith yet now they marry in *layal'lil*, 2 and 0 are now obliterated into the abolition of gender, and capital's driving of malehood into obliteration, meaning a driving of malehood into nothing, so eternal driving, malehood breaks off into (going into vikkian gender accelerationism,, vikky storm and eme flores' the gender accelerationist manifesto) millions of genders and millions of slowly-nihilizing impossible-"feminine"-nonbinary genders, until capital accidentally destroys malehood because it refused to acknowledge that

femininity has killed itself long ago (2-0=error) and now, with the decay of binary and the valorization of gender failing, gender devalorizing into nothingness, all gender is therefore abolished and lesbianism is reinstated insofar as lesbianism is inhuman unproductive non-man (nmlnm) anarchistic love-- heterosexuality (in the post-heterosexual lesbian form as heterosexuality proper is abusive and unnatural and lacks passion) and homosexuality and all else is also devalorized and identity fades, capital cracks due to its patriarchal nature due to assimilation of the patriarchy alongside culture and its marriage to culture, it becomes unstable. Then, we see, all non-cishet-man genders are in aid of the abolition of gender insofar as it splinters gender into a million and leads manhood to death, then obliterating gender itself. In the end, femininity never was really a thing, it was nothing more but mystified nothingness, depression, female misery, and so the "binary" is really just manhood and the non-binary disguised as a binary feminine-- the gender binary is transphobic, the patriarchy is transphobic, we know this, gender is transphobic. Then all we need to end gender and the binary is to end masculinity as femininity is a farce. oh, i am idiotically rumbling and mumbling and ranting on about a post-radfem gender abolitionism again, i must be speaking about camatte right now, not this! I, kind of, live in fear of speaking about post-TSRF gender acceleration and abolition solely because it is a touchy subject in relation to misandry and transphobia and such... I will not speak about this often. By vikkian gender accelerationism, i point out the derationalization of gender and the annihilation of logic behind gender, a million genders based on nothing with no roots, then if we acknowledge N1x-landian gender abolition, we know the cause and the end result, the dying out of gender and the, instead of feminization, lesbianization, post-gender lesbianism which is disconnected to the female gender nor the male gender, not even "nonman" but just "nongender" or such,, this is also why i think lesbians help greatly in gender abolition despite how much people exclude them. A lesbian helps nihilize lesbianism to some degree, in which it loses meaning, but i think of this not as a bad thing! Again, nothing on... I found out endnotes has an archive of camatte too, not just marxists.org, so i will read from there too and a writing about camatte on libcom.org. I will take a break for now, though you will not experience this break as it is occurring on 7-6-26 2:15 am, and you are not in 7-6-26 2:15 am. Before i go, notice how before the community of capital there used to be a social school caste, and now the social school caste,

while still semi-apparent, is mostly artificial and fading out of existence? And, too, more generalized with many social castes being assimilated into other ones? I do think, eventually, there will be no school social castes and only the general caste of youths as a whole, which then ends the fragmented and self-denying nature of the youth class as it is forced into a unity then assimilated into the general slave class that is the only class that exists now--- right now the generalized slavery class (7/26/26 which, in reality, is not a class even when i refer to it as such. Generalized slavery is the capitalist abolition of class and assimilation of communism in order to achieve full domination over the community-- there is more after the gemeinschaft of capital, i assure you. Perhaps in this spiritual phase that is gemeinschaft it will find an ability for the total domination over the biological aspect itself (due to co-joint operation with nature and self) and turn both the being's body and soul towards capitalist production (the 'human nature' and 'human community' camatte the speciesist speaks of now assimilated into capital itself, the esoteric aspect of bordiga tamed through a evangelical rothbard yelling slurs at fagtrons like me, and now communism itself will turn into the alienating state as humanity becomes completely capitalist (again, i am using humanity and human here because it is camatte, this also applies to animals who are not human however) and absolute slaves to capital so that they would die instantly without it and are domesticated so bad they love capital, praise it, kiss its foot and let it slip its tongue into their mouth and choke them out to death in such a coercive expression of abuse, we become not just domesticated animals for capital but pets for it when it surpasses the gemeinschaft and united the spiritual and material with itself perfectly), and such the spiritual revolution of communism assimilated into capital results in the absolute abolition of gemeinwesen.) is still fragmented in fake forms of classes and fake identification with classes, it is fragmented like the youth class and self-denying like the youth class, but the more the community of capital grows, the more the generalized slavery class will become united, and the fragments healed and made whole again-- this also means, first, that the community of capital must resolve fragmented psuedo-classes like the youth class, so that the real uniting and resolving of the real fragmentation of the real class goes without question... The youth class managed to be so fragmented and self-denying that capital was temporarily stunted trying to solve its problems and the problems of the other fragmented classes, like the middle classes have a few

fragmented classes for example. The only real fragmented class, however, after the community of capital, was the fragmented generalized slavery class, and capital now finds that that very fragmentation is now an issue for it, and so the generalized slavery class will be united and resolved into a unified generalized slavery class soon enough-- perhaps the reason for the trumpist revival of fascism? Maybe? Either way, the youth psuedo-class (previously a class before the community of capital) will soon be unified, meaning a development of youth liberation and unity of the youth for youth liberation (positive might-happen side-effect) but also the abolition of the youth psuedo-class and all other psuedo-classes into the united generalized slavery class under capital (a guaranteed outcome that is a net negative for all of everyone, unfortunately, and will probably end the youth liberationist struggle, which was more of a dying attempt to breathe than a struggle anyways historically.). SO, yeah... 2:55am now i leave. to summarize the future of communism, jacques camatte, marxists.org, Bordiga and the fate of the species, "(...) The species must no longer take the path of progress, but that of regression (...)", capitalism has overdeveloped and realized its possibility to develop eternally so, to make progress not the progress in which capitalism is a transition, a transitory phase, but to make progress the progress of capitalism to achieving an unobtainable goal-- the perfecting of capital, that, itself, is imperfection-- or more accurately an eternal strive for perfection, self-valorizing value, value in process. That is, then, Communism is a return and a sublation, a suppression and an end of suppression, it is the return of the natural community and the death of capital... or, the sublating of god once more. Capitalism is, then, too, one of the three continual worsenings of god-- in reality, god herself is her continual worsening-- the other two as culture and self----- communism sublates god because it renews the economy by suppressing the newest accelerationist form of it (suppressing capitalism) and uplifting its core (community), then it is sublating the economy and uniting god's other parts with this new economy, effectively evolving god and sublating god to a degree in unity-- uplifting god's unity and suppressing a portion of god's worsening, unknowing that it will only lead to the worsening returning. even if, hypothetically, a communist anti-cultural anti-self movement appeared to sublimate all three, to suppress capitalism and uplift community, to suppress culture and uplift nature or whatnot, to suppress the individual and uplift the social being--- camattism??-- this only effectively fully sublates god and changes nothing

as the entire history of god can be seen through sublations and continual self-worsenings, cyclical, the fate of god. God, too, can be described as her own process of self-sublation, alongside her own process of self-worsening, though these are hyperconnected yet not the same-- hyperunited yet different. God, then, is not ever actually sublated, since her nature as self-sublation and self-worsening always remains the same and unchanged, instead then she is alienated from her own nature, she is never sublated nor worsened yet exists as self-sublation and self-worsening, something like a hyper--depression uniting the depressive nature in apathy and the depressive nature in tragedy,, a lack of feel or a disassociation with emotion and an overwhelming negative feel or a complete association with sadness, god is then experiencing both-- the tragic depression in nature and the apathetic depression in her alienation from nature... this too can be used as a definition of god herself, she is her tragic nature and her apathetic disassociated nature, she is her nature and her alienation,, this is herself-- her self. Then, God's self is the only thing she is not alienated from because it is her alienation, and too, therefore her self is also alienation! God suffers all the same as us and worse! She is perpetually not-god and absolutely god and in ruins, what is she? Is she even God at this point? Then, communism changes nothing about the situation of god, neither does capitalism, neither any "third way/path" (aka capitalism in new forms or utopianist idiocracy). Then... God only has one way out of her misery and suffering, aka, she has only one way out of herself (god can be defined as....), that is unfortunately her death. Now i will read endnotes.org.uk's jacques camatte archives, then a libcom.org critique. Another important thing in Jacques Camatte's 'Bordiga and the fate of the species', marxists.org, is the use of the term involution and its replacement of revolution, which is just an extremely short version of the previous quote from said book, aka regression instead of progress-- progress now is for capital instead of communism(,) the economy of the future and regression now is for communism instead of the old economies of the past, therefore regression is the solution to camatte--- In terms of god and I, progress leads to god's continued existence and so does regression, the question is entirely meaningless and, really, a non-issue. Involution is the new Revolution, and with my "reactionary nature", my anti-(revolutionary/reactionary) nature, i realize involution, the involutory, the involutions, as again, like discussed, the uniting of communo-fascism and another leftist, aka far-rightist, escapism. Escape

to the regressed, escape to the natural and human community, see how that works out!i am actually feeling sort of sick and tired of reading camatte, i will read the archive on endnotes.org.uk later, let me read the critique written in 2025 by micheal hauer, called "Jacques Camatte is Dead: Wandering, Male Supremacy, Anti-Gender Theory, Holocaust Denialism, Millenarian Confusion, and the Humans who Escaped his Notice..."-- admittedly i copy and pasted this title due to the sheer length, which makes little sense for me to do seeing as i wrote down manually every quote by novelist decentr(anarchist-symbol)l when critiquing him and those quotes were quite long, seems i have been getting lazy. This was released after camatte's death but, apparently, started being written before his death? Whatever. in footnote 5, i found an interesting quote that seems to be a passing critique of culture by nietzsche (supposedly in genealogy of morality), how neat(zsche)! I hadn't known that, since i haven't read the man, but interesting.. and i may have missed where camatte said to abandon capital, but if he had said such a thing in maaybe a future writing or i had missed it due to reading camatte while often sleep deprived or tired, i will say that such an idea is openly and clearly impossible under the community of capital which dominates even all of nature's territory due to the alliance of the two. Leaving to nature or simply running away from capital is impossible, and if it were possible, it would be the most perfected and clear display of the left's escapism-- only ever attempting escape despite their revolutionary speak (Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org::: "his proposal is that instead of fighting capital -- a stragedy that, if 'successful,' only returns capital to us in a stronger form -- we must, somehow, abandon it." uhm... how the fuck would we abandon capital, camatte???, camatte's theory makes it plenty clear we CANNOT at ALL abandon capital, how did he reach this conclusion at all??? Is this what was meant with involution, because this is not involting against capital but simply leaving capital?? Not degrading or regressing capital but just leaving??? And where to, lemuria or hyperborea or something???? ALL of russia is under capital, culture, and self-- economy, nature, and being---- where would you go???) ohh..... the world we must leave behind?? (Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...",

libcom.org, footnote 6) I should re-read that text for certainty. Wait, it's called the world we must leave, not the world we must leave behind?? Oh, well, 'the world we must leave and other essays', the world we must leave, jacques camatte, autonomedia, libcom.org, "We must abandon this world dominated by capital, which has become a spectacle of beings and things.", he is right, Camatte has become another leftist escapist! Just like the far-right leftist escapism of primitivism, of fascism, of utopian socialism, of communism, of mutualism, of the revolutionary and the reactionary, now perfected by the far-right leftist escapism of Camatte! Damn... I do agree, however, that the CMP will not decay, that struggle is pointless, that revolution will fail and that the death of god will not be active nor passive, i do agree that revolution is dead, but i do not see how return to the same escapism of the revolution, even worse now in primitivism, is any better? But it is probably due to a main distinction, a distinction between the far-right and the others (Michael Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org, "what marx refers to as a sense within the species of the loss of community, cioran refers to as nostalgia, by which he means a yearning for a place and a home, a 'homesickness.'", really the home does not exist at all and never has existed, there is only a void), the far-right only sees desperation for involution, craving for return, they only see rose-tinted glasses and nostalgia where in reality there is only hate for everything, gnosticism, and a craving for a fourierist outer-reality, or, outside. The far-right cannot imagine the outside, and so, they interpret the craving for the outside and the hate for the inside as the craving for the past inside AS the hate for the modern inside, the outside does not exist to it, or, it is irrelevant if not a cause or scapegoat. The far-right either escapes into the past or escapes from the present, but the future does not exist for it, or, the future is just a justification for escape. at least camatte is not a full-on primitive-sucker who glorifies the past primitive community, since he is a communist and so realized primitive communism as not perfect yet and only a mockery of communism, as he says "this cannot be a return to the type of nomadism practiced by our distant ancestors who were gatherers", The wandering of humanity, this world we must leave and other essays, autonomedia, libcom.org, also footnote 22 and the paragraph this footnote is found in in the book (Michael Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory,

holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org), where apparently there is some ignorance here-- i too am ignorant here because i have no idea what part is ignorant, but regardless, this is to be noted. Well, i digress. Footnote 24 (Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org) is also about the same issue on the strengthening of capital via struggle and the death of revolution, but it also tells me that there is still so much to read of camatte left untranslated which make his point was clearer if they were to be translated. This critique does make clear more reactionary elements to camatte, like in the paragraph containing footnote 30 and 31 and the pictures under it (Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org) where we see inversion as a term, which shows an underdeveloped quasi-gnosticism to camatte where the solution is to escape the capitalist world like a gnostic escapes their world, yet i say underdeveloped because it does not yet realize this world is capital's, and too, the issue IS god, it IS gnosticism the need, and to escape the world of god is not to develop and access the naturality in us but to do the exact opposite, or not really the opposite, but fragment god, the natural/nature, capital, self/being, to let god die, which is very much not natural. Traditionalism is a false solution, (Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org, "His 'inversion' is a call for 'traditionalism' to reassert itself.") and any call for tradition or naturality is a call for god, a call for your own slavery, a masochistic call-- yet without the liberatory aspect of, y'know, actual sexual masochism. (in response to Camatte's transphobia in (Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org, "but this 'naturalness', for camatte, is also founded within an opposition to gender theory, gender equality, and feminism."), and too, all that he opposes) Little does camatte know that god made eight genders (the talmud), nature has thousands of genders, and culture has had hundreds, yet in reality, there are only 0 genders. Then, in reality, are all genders not equal in unreality? 0 is an

equal number, and feminism makes this clear. Uhm... also what??? Then, the author Micheal Hauer, in (Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org), goes on to critique millenarianism and the revolutionists, and i cannot say anything about this because i, though i do not believe history to be approaching any utopia or the death of god to be even possible or good, nor do i believe in a perfect future world nor that any transformation of human society will create peace and harmony (Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org, "millenarianism, which can be religious or secular, is the belief that human society is in need of a great transformation and that after this transformation people will live in peace and harmony."), i do believe, still, and am still stuck in, really, a utopian delusion about the after of the death of god, which, really, is mirrorism the millenarianism that every leftist has had. I still believe of a perfect world after some event (though i never really wanted living in peace and harmony, but the end of life, the creation and foundation of consent, and the fulfillment and foundation of passions--- not a life of peace and harmony but consensual passionate non-life, but this is still the same idea nonetheless at heart-- Utopia, the abolition of suffering and misery.), still blame not people but, like fourier, all but the beings. I still, like the anarchists who ((Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org, "millenarianism --- another term for 'revolutionism' ---- is then, objectively, a function of the state.") are statist clear as day) unknowingly stuck with the millenium, imagined perfection, just as unreal --- as if unreality changed anything if i still believed it possible to be obtained. If it is obtainable, its reality does not matter, and so i was no different than the anarchists who believe in the existence of anarchism-- i, too, tried to achieve anarchism (7-7-26), even when saying it was impossible, and now i realize that it is impossible to obtain as well. You want to hear something more tragic than god's suicide? God CANNOT die, she will always fail to kill herself, she is immortal... as we all knew, as the abrahamics told us. Anarchists are statist par absolute, and my constant want to kill god makes me a christian par absolute, even after denouncing absolute

abolition, the killing of god, i turn around and say to fragment the absolute, let god kill herself, again what changed? God is immortal, she is eternal, and eternally tortured. She is her own gnashing of teeth. as revolutionaries are functions of the state ((Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org) "revolutionaries then, in the grander scheme, are not counter-functions of the state and capital, they are just functions --- they aid the development of the economy and the control of the labouring classes."), I am a function of god, not as i keep trying to be, a counter-function, and too, all against god are functions of god and not counter-functions, she truly is eternal, she can be defined as eternality. I have been for too long an optimist, a utopia-believer, one with faith for the new god--- utopia. The new god, really, can be nothing other than the resurrection and sublation of the old god, and again, this is because, there is only one god-- surah Al-Baqarah, ayah 163, su dios as un dios unico, no hay divinidad [con derecho a ser adorada] salvo el, el compasivo, el misericordioso-- or, 1 Kings 8:60, "That all the people of the earth may know that the Lord is God, and that there is none else.". I was, again, believing in the resurrection of god once more! I, just like those i critiqued in this very same "()", wanted to sublimate god, to preserve god, how stupid of I! God is eternal and always eternally one, this can be a definition of god as well. So, we cannot leave capital, we cannot leave nature, we cannot leave being (Immanuel Kant, The critique of pure reason on the "I think"), we cannot defeat either three- wee cannot leave god we cannot fight against god, we are doomed to the maximum degree! I have decided i will not be reading the archive of camatte by endnotes.org.uk, this will be my final moment with camatte as i am tired of camatte. In the critique, i am now on "Time" (Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org, "Time"). I have not much to say but Hauer's critique of leaving the world IS interesting enough to quote;;; Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org, "In the end, there is still a 'problem' in camatte's urging of us to leave this world... the logic of his writings compel us to wonder how, in 'leaving the world', we will not just take the world with us. If we can't fight it without making

it stronger, then maybe we can't leave it without making it stronger either. Capital is, after all, the recuperator par excellence". There is nothing i can say here about camatte and this comment not said in the comment itself, and i have already discussed how this comment relates to me before i had even read this comment-- we cannot have a mode of being (utopia) without god or being (even if fragmented, the mode of being constitutes an absolute, a god, and that god finds itself the sublation of the "fragmented god" and so assimilates and becomes that old god, therefore the new testament god is the sublation of the old testament god and then it finds itself just another sublation, being is repaired, nothing is changed, god is back. Utopia will have to be the revival of god, and seemingly, the death of god cannot be the death of us either or else the dead god is therefore also a sublation of god and thus reviving god again! Any change to god is a sublation to god in the logic i have created, and so, god cannot be changed, god is her change... the death of god is god, god can be defined as her own suicide, therefore the suicide of god is not a change or a suicide of god or the end of suffering or misery, but instead, is misery and suffering, is god, she is her crucifixion on the cross, jesus is nothing but the cross, catholicism and christ---crucified eternally on the crucifix. This is why it is monotonous, boring, depressive, this is why i felt the suicide of god as feeling like just another day, a depressive apathetic nothingness, boredom--- because it is all of life, god is constantly attempting suicide, she is suicide, it is not an event, it IS just another day, just another second! God's misery is our misery and our misery is god's misery, god is misery, so we are misery, we are god's misery and god is our misery, we are our own misery, again we are god. We are the misery I have sought to abolish, we cannot exist in a world without misery, we cannot exist in a utopia! A utopia is a world without beings, without a world, without god, without utopia or a mode of being, a utopia is impossible! We cannot do anything about god, we cannot get rid of her, we cannot get rid of our own slavery, we cannot get rid of us. huh? Maybe i should real nihilist communism (a critique of optimism (the religious dogma that states there will be an ultimate triumph of good over evil) in the far left) by monsieur dupont. One could say that the simplification of all things into the question of consent and that saying the impossibility of consent therefore makes the world entirely miserable is a reduction, i find this important now because the fact that utopia (a world of consent) is now impossible to obtain and so absolutely impossible reintroduces

this as an absolute hatred of reality and a feeling of unstoppable misery and dread, but i would argue that, really, ask yourself if, in a world without coercion or non-consent, in a world where every act is consensual, what is really morally wrong or a cause of suffering-- what is innately wrong regardless of consent? Suffering here does not refer to physical suffering, as masochists do not suffer in self-harming sex, i mean suffering as misery, as tragedy. and the consent must be on all parties, where even the laws of this reality or world must bend to the will of consent, a world where consent is the basis of everything-- not democracy, consent, democracy includes a lack of consent even in its unanimous forms (unanimous democracy). This question, however, especially now where consent is impossible and so is utopia, is irrelevant. Actually, despite my talk of utopia as if it were, really, a utopia, as if i was a utopian socialist, utopia seemed for me when speaking about god's suicide like communism seems to a scientific socialist, unknowable at this moment and unable to be understood or created presently, it is not built but organically arises after god's suicide--- ironically, now that i know utopia is impossible to obtain, this feels more like dodging the question about what happens after god, because to say what happens after god is to admit it is the birth of a new god, the crucified old god resurrected on the third day as a new god, it is because i had not wanted to admit that what i wanted to do was, in fact, to sublimate god properly where everyone else was only partially sublimating god--- so, still the preservation of god. I have reached 'the second type' portion of the book (Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org), and after finishing 'the already existing human community' (Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org), I do feel another need to defend the impossibility of anarchism from the idea that primitivism (which i have already proven previously) and non-state societies (which, are a different thing to primitivists, and would be offensive to call primitive, they are non-state societies--- or, quasi-state societies) are anarchist, and not, instead, what they really are, which are quasi-states. I cannot, of course, truly or really describe what goes on or what makes these non-state societies quasi-statist, since it is impossible to know of these people, and so it is increasingly difficult for me to point them out

as non-anarchist, unless i am to go "but, but, but, the unjust hierarchy of,,, like,,,, nature or something!!" or whatever. Let me not make myself look like a fool, maybe it is true that they are non-state societies, maybe they are anarchist* (though i feel calling them that would be something imposing of euro-anarchist idiot though onto non-state society's more unique state-of-being. Calling it anarchist is reducing its nature, it is non-state but not anarchist either, this is my position, not that it is a quasi-state, i do not think it is a quasi-state it is a non-state, but it is not anarchist either and does not have the limits of an anarchist society that makes anarchist impossible, it is unique enough to avoid impossibility but to, instead, be as possible as it can be, aka existent. Anarchists trying to replicate these non-state societies, if they even could with how little information there are about them, should note how much contradiction there is with it in compared to mainstream (euro-born, white cracker-) anarchism and even when compared to anglo-american anarchy-ism, or, "individualist anarchism" and stirner-inspired anarchists. These non-state Societies are wholly unique and, really, not even Bob Black's Wild Justice (which, bob black, by the way... Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org, 'The First Type', "(...)they do not have social control as we know it(...)") is similar to it in the slightest even when Bob Black's methods claim inspiration from the non-statists, seen in the name 'wild' justice. Not even the post-left, the primitivists, any of those non-state-larping anarchists are even close, because they limit their mockery of the non-state society through anarchism proper, white cracker anarchism, and so crackerify the non-state society into a theory of anarchist society... This is wholly stupid and idiotic, and any anarchist should note how pointless this is in reality, if you wish to be non-statists then stop being anarchists, plain and simple--- you cannot be both a flying thing and a furry crawling thing, you cannot be a bat, be either the flying thing or the furry crawling thing, to quote a story told to me when i was younger. You cannot be both a non-statist and an anarchist, you cannot be the albino bat.), this should not matter to me as i am not an anarchist nor do i claim to be a non-statist (that would have to include giving up my entire point in any of these writings, and too, i do not really enjoy the practices on non-state societies and their roots in the far-right, or, speciesism and non-consensuality and culture and community and being and self

and whatnot,, like the economy of nature for example, as another issue i have, and their participation in it ((Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org, "(...)they do not have an economy(...)") they do not have an economy of their own, yes, they instead partake in (yet do not belong to in a proper way, like animals did,) the economy of nature.), so on and so on and whatever... after all, one advocates for their best-case-scenario, even when scientific or post-left, because to advocate for a society that is not the best-case-scenario would be to advocate for a lesser when a greater exists.. even post-leftists do this, they simply acknowledge that the best-case scenario is NOT perfect or utopian, that's all. I refuse to advocate for a non-best-case-scenario. Plus, not being human, what are the chances i could really be accepted as 'another human of the tribe', especially when the idea of being human is as appealing to me as scatophilia, which is, not at all-- tribes are still, after all, rooted in the human, in human-"nationalism" (not really nationalism but there are not many other ways to call it), not in the way of a united humanity but in the way that only humans can exist as tribesmen in the tribe, you will not find a dog that is treated as a tribesman in a tribe, the dog is treated instead as, of course, a dog. So, i have no reason to admire the non-state societies. though, Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org, 'The First Type', "(...)they do not treat other animals with disrespect(...)", this non-disrespect is the non-disrespect seen in the former and short-lived alliance between the nation of islam and american nazi party, the short-lived respect of ethno-(non-)statists of a different racial background, this does not mean the human tribeman is open for non-human tribemen in their tribe, or really, any other tribeman in their tribe who are not from their tribe-- it is respect of the other, and still speciesist to the degree that anti-multiculturalists are racist, aka progressive racism, progressive speciesism.. I respect the non-state society tribesmen, i do not want to paint them like animal oppressors because they aren't, their speciesism is far from it, i simply think that it is just not the best-case-scenario and i will not be putting myself in opposition to it. They treat a dog like a dog the way a man treats a woman like a woman, but this man is not explicitly a sexist or overtly one, so this treatment is not of hatred or something. I realize how

this section sounds while rereading and i am not considering joining a tribe, that would be dangerous for the tribemen due to sicknesses, it would be disrespectful to the tribe, and i would not want to, and they would not accept me (for good reason) and i had not even thought about that while writing this, i was discussing if we were to return to non-state societal forms and speaking about the people near me presently if we were to return to non-state forms and they were to create a tribe, aka a tribe that is not already existing or put in danger, and i feel the need to clarify due to how i have seen some primitivists try to join tribes or talk about trying to join tribes and how i find this gross to do due to the previous reasons. respect sometimes, if not all the time (actually, it does mean all the time, all the time --period.) means staying away and leaving them alone.). On appendix 2, (Micheal Hauer, "Jacques camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org), jacques camatte's opposition to homosexual marriage is not an issue for me, i would legalize all marriage if i was able as marriage is a non-consensual limiting of passions rooted in disgusting catholic heterosexual abuse, instead it is his love for heterosexuality and his support of it that is my issue with him-- ultimately, defining gender as its hyperstitional state and social construct and not "vagina and cock, the two genders!!!", it is clear that gender is unnatural and heterosexuality (animals lack gender, heterosexuality when we do not reduce it to genitals finds itself as the power dynamic between man and woman in a sexual relationship, and because animals lack gender they therefore are naturally homosexual insofar as they are naturally agender. Heterosexuality is also the death of passionate sex and passionate sexuality, and animals only reproduce out of passions and not out of production, and so animals are queer and not straight in that way too!) and heterosexual abuse (the same thing but as a relationship actualized and not just an attraction) is, too, unnatural things which only exist now in civilization due to the need to make everything about production, about reproduction, about birth instead of pleasure. Heterosexual relationships emerged, and too, gender, from the glorification of birth, which led to capital's glorification of production, then to capital's self-glorification, heterosexuality is itself the slow decay of sex for pleasure and sexuality as passionate and pleasurable and the slow rise of sex as production, sex as reproduction, sex as roles, rules, and the sacredness of sex, and too, the birth of

marriage (marriage is the perfecting of heterosexuality, really, and therefore the death of sexuality for the sake of the passions and the passionate, it is the domination of production over sexuality and the death of any remaining eroticism in heterosexual relationships. In this respect, i would say it is arguably even worse than pedophilia, considering that outside of the aspect of production and the death of eroticism that is innate to heterosexuality, pedophilia and heterosexuality are almost exactly the same in their treatment of the oppressed and abused side of the relationship... yet heterosexuality is the most normalized form of abuse, i wonder why.... (the community of capital, obviously, dominating sexuality for the sake of capital)) from this corruption of sex that birthed heterosexuality. Heterosexuality is not only a form of abuse, a power dynamic, it is also the death of passionate sexuality, and the predecessor of capital's self-glorification. Heterosexuality is not only unnatural and oppressive, it is not even lovely nor sexual in any real way outside of literal sex-- seeing as all sex before gender, the equality of 0, would therefore be homosexual or queer sex, then homosexuality (thinking not genitals and cocks and vaginas but instead thinking of gender, or really, a lack of gender) is the natural sexuality, and also the most passionate and pleasurable sexuality, and... the most anti-capitalist, perhaps even (communist) form of sexuality.

Heterosexuality is the most disgusting sexuality to exist, if heterophobia existed (that online joke people do to make fun of homophobes), like unironically actually existed, i would be one unapologetically! Also, on appendix 2 (Michael Hauer, "Jacques Camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy, anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org), i should also discuss the end and on the far-right and anti-modernism... I hate modernity, plain and simple, I hate the future as well, and I hate the past-- traditionalists take from far-left critiques of modernity because the far-left is still, to a degree, concerned with a return to the past--- to communism, again... as long as you are a communist and critiquing modernity from that perspective you will never not be used by a traditionalist... But, to instead critique modernity and the past, and nature, and community, and CULTURE, or to critique modernity as a critique of all culture, that cannot possibly inspire a traditionalist, or at least, a traditionalist against culture is a contradiction that would be funny to me and impossible to take seriously (7-7-2026, 6:15pm). Anyways, i have finished the book (Michael Hauer, "Jacques Camatte is dead: wandering, male supremacy,

anti-gender theory, holocaust denialism, millenarian confusion, and the humans who escaped his notice...", libcom.org), and now am done with camatte, and now am going to continue writing in the "correct" chronological order for now....

Goodbye :3. (7-15-26 edit: YHWH is transfem tragedy, we are dysphoria, a faultless tragedy! God then can also be defined as dysphoria, gender dysphoria, and also hell.)), as far as i know, is speciesist (heavily) and, accidentally, anti-semetic (okay real quick, 6/25/2026, i was lurking on leftychan and saw the shit about seth hatfield or whatever and.... why does the governments and capital in this stage of real domination go so far to try and hide and discredit the fact that an incel loser who happened to be a tankie loser too, an average misogynistic ML (nazbol-reminiscent (just like the ACP that currently rules the USA, the second nazbol state to exist (dugin's russia being the first, china getting close but never fully achieving nazbol gang status))), but last i checked he was not as anti-semetic as they portray him-- though i don't doubt his anti-semetism is possible, stalin was an anti-semite too!) going on to shoot a cop and a jewish man seems absolutely plausible and not a threat to capital at all--- no communist is---- in fact, this event could easily be used as right-wing propaganda against the left and for capitalism, but as of now, everyone in the elites seem dead serious about portraying him as an incel only, an anti-semite, a nazi, and if they MUST be honest about his economic ideas, they say he's a Nazbol.... he's a marxist-leninist LOSER and an INCCEL, those ideas are not incompatible he is just a loser believing in hypergamy and a stupid pro-culture moid. Is it that necessary to paint him as a far-rightist?? He is a piece of shit, yes, and believed in incel (far-right by nature) theories, but he was a communist... communists can be, and often are, bad people. I feel like a damn republican writing this but, yes, Communists can and have been terrorists too, especially in the past, this is not unique, seth is not special, stop trying to make him seem that way by trying to hide up his communist bullshit. I'd honestly prefer you treat him like a horrible and disgusting commie instead..) due to a comment on the holocaust that he made in his opposition to antifa. Regardless, as i begin to read his works, i find him interesting. rest in peace (in reference to jacques camatte, not seth hatfield.). I do believe that, in 'against domestication' by jacques camatte (which, in my other book, i accidentally called 'on domestication', lol), humanity is not the only species domesticated but too all of reality, every being, every animal, and that this domestication (different to human domestication of

animals, though both are bad) is actually even more tragic and devastating for animals than it is for humans exactly BECAUSE animals are already tragically and radically domesticated by humans and therefore more vulnerable to the grooming and control of outside forces.)(or, ew, 'leftist')) Capitalism. Work, fundamentally, will continue to exist as long as Culture exists to create value, because any existence of value will lead to Coercive labour / Work, and Value is born from culture, and Culture (aka adam lanza's famous "baby-raping orgy", culturalphilistine transcripts--- full quote "What is a person from a pre-agricultural society supposed to do when someone throws them onto the baby-raping orgy and they aren't raping fast enough, so you say 'you're not being aggressive enough, you're enjoying the benefits of raping these babies but you, there you are slacking', it's not that the person is slacking, it's that the person doesn't want to be in the baby-raping orgy at all.", wow what a way with words /sarc. his use of rape as a term to describe culture, while one can say accurate to its dysphoric, coercive, and non-consensual aspects (i hate being cultural arguably more than lanza), is a bit excessive when done by adam lanza. He should find other metaphors too.) is a coercive cancer. Too, some form of a State or Statism (including the quasi-state and quasi-statism that Marxists (which... Marxism as an escape of the left has already dissipated, now the main escape of the left is marxism-leninism... and has been for at this point way too long. It seems almost as if Marxism-Leninism will continue to be the path to escape for the left for the rest of history! Hopefully, it will not be-- and realistically, it would be shocking if it was. Though not too shocking, honestly.) love so much (yet never advocate for) and... Anarchists (which, let me emphasize that modern anarchists, hell, anarchists ever since the establishment of makhnovschina (as an example, not the literal time of event where anarchists shifted from old to modern), are no longer the same (old) anarchists who marx critiqued for pacifism and authoritarianism... in fact, what proudhonian stands today in an actual organization espousing proudhonism or mutualism? What bakuninist stands today in an actual organization espousing bakuninism or pseudo-ancom (quasi-statist) collectivism? How many Anarchist organizations are peaceful at all, or even explicitly authoritarian (though all are implicitly authoritarian)? No old anarchist, against violent and insurrection and revolution, exist-- though, against revolution, yes, I am one, but against insurrection? None!- none but the revolutionaries who praise revolution like god!

Marx's critique of anarchists no longer apply today, especially since Kropotkin converted all Ancoms into practically just communists who want a quasi-state instead of Lenin's explicit state, and so the ML's critique of anarchists make no sense today... they are, practically, the same to me. One is just more truthful. I'd say that Anarchists are, in fact, more Marxist or, more like the orthodox Marxists, than MLs have ever been, or in fact, any form of Communism has ever been... that is an insult to both communists and anarchists, Marxism ought to be abandoned by anarchists and communists who pride themselves in Marxism ought to actually believe what they preach. Though... actually, all the best communists are no longer Marxists (this was written before I started reading Jacques Camatte's *Capital and Community* but fits very well with the publisher's preface in marxists.org.)

advocate for (under the guise of anti-statism)) will always exist as long as Culture (and so Value) exists, seeing as, like the economy, the State is founded on values and power (power being a monopoly over the Value of life, or, necessity... The state has power because people value their lives, and because Culture manipulates people into accepting the status quo, accepting the state, accepting statism... The State does not use Culture, Culture uses Statism to enforce itself and... any society with a Culture will have a quasi-statism as Culture will try to enforce itself in any way possible, as seen with 'all anarchists advocating for quasi-statism' and their defense of culture. If an anarchist brings social control like Bob Black tries to in his book 'Wild Justice', they will bring a Quasi-statism, and if an anarchist brings social control like the old anarchist thinkers, Bakunin (talk about the communal police!), Kropotkin (yea, just deport 'em all, right, Trump?), Proudhon (federalist, democrat-sucker, orange union-capitalist.), whoever else... they are bringing a quasi-state explicitly so.). Almost all things are founded on Value (or culture), or, at least, maintained through value (or culture), and so I begin to think... Maybe the easiest path to abolition is to first of all... Abolish Value and Culture just like the Nihilists would wish! Once Culture falls, then Value falls, then Statism (and the State) and Economy and the Self/Unique and Everything else falls down after! Then, Fourier's hypercultural harmony is not only anti-anarchist or non-anarchist, it is in fact dictatorship of Harmony, or, Harmonious dictatorship of the Omniarch. Then, Bob Black's Play is not only dysfunctional (cultural, coercive, valued, statist, inherently leftist) but also rooted in ideas from a (and infected by) Totalitarian leftist ideology! Culture is the first and primary sin before all else, it is

and may as well be Yaldabaoth, it is the hell that we speak about, it is the coercion we cannot think out of, it is the limitation we cannot leave. I have been trying to think of what it would look like without culture, but... culture does not let me even think of the possibility. How do we exterminate all Culture, that is my question, and I cannot answer... and now i realize what the absolute is (and exactly why i cannot achieve absolute abolition or even start trying to achieve). I realize what Hyperpsychosis is. Hyperpsychosis is Culture's interpretation of (cuteness/nothing), hyperpsychosis (yes, is "reality" made into a subjective interpretation, as to make what's "real" a matter of opinion (again, why i critique my old understanding of reality and causality and whatever else is because it made hyperpsychosis meaningless ((6/16/26 addition:) and took away my entire point on self-reflection/self-rationalization since, in making the causal and acausal and perfect and hyperpsychosis the causal and so limited and implying an objective reality outside of hyperpsychosis and therefore bringing in a slightly kantian feel just to undo it by interaction of a gnostic kind bringing it all back to a sort of christian mythology, and yes, i am saying that my old cosmology was explicitly christian and devolved hyperpsychosis into nothing but plato's shadow world, it reduced hyperpsychosis to the mass psychosis of the people creating reality, or, it made me an idealist of a nonsensical form. Hyperpsychosis is not the psychosis of the people, a democratic psychosis, it is its own psychosis. Hyperpsychosis is the psychosis of hyperpsychosis, it is the self-reflection and self--rationalizing of self-reflection and self-rationalization itself, it is what we mistake for reality (material or ideal, both false, islamic in a way), It is yaldabaoth misunderstanding (and so understanding as there is nothing BUT misunderstanding since there is no real yaldabaoth) herself infinitely, it is Culture imposing itself onto itself, it is the absolute's abomination of itself. Hyperpsychosis is the absolute, or more accurately, Hyperpsychosis(/the absolute) is not the absolute(/hyperpsychosis) but an abomination of it (self-abomination where there is no real, a cycle of repeating generation loss in terms of accuracy to something that does not exist, no original, just a spiral of loss, of abomination, to no end and from no origin, only the means exist--- only the process exists. The spiral of vanity.)).... Hyperpsychosis was supposed to be an alternative to the objective non-soulist way of viewing reality, yet when I began talking about causality and acausality and femininity, i had practically lobotomized the whole point of hyperpsychosis by creating a reality

outside of hyperpsychosis instead of, like i should have, just leaving hyperpsychosis without reality (what is hyperpsychotically valid or invalid is not objective nor subjective but psychotic, and subject to change yet not limited to subjectivity. It is not objective because it is not limited either to objectivity, and too, subjectivity and objectivity is never willingly intercoured with it but instead forcefully one with it in hyperpsychosis generally. Hyperpsychosis is not truth and never could be because truth is made into a lie, or, was always a lie, in hyperpsychosis. Only hyperpsychosis finds itself to be, and not even that.). Also, with that, I had practically reduced Cuteness and nothingness to absoluteness, but unfortunately i cannot salvage it anymore, and i leave it to die.), but it) is also, so, Culture's self-reflection, or more accurately, self-rationalization (self-reflection and self-rationalization is the same thing however, the former always becomes the latter because the self does not exist). Cuteness, Nothing, it is Culture, the Absolute, it is Everything, it is Yaldabaoth, it is all one, the Causal Acausal and perfect all collapse into one plane and one thing, the final judgement began at the start of it all, and now all becomes one (why? Because the distinctions between different parts of the absolute only worked to limit the philosophy more and imply an objective reality, it was afraid of a lack of reality so it made cute and nothing reality instead... now, there is no reality, not even nothing, not even cute, there is no reality! Hyperpsychosis, which now is Yaldabaoth, which now is Culture (and i say this solely because how much of everything is cultural and strictly inseparable from and unexistent (or unexperienced) without culture. Culture seems to create the self, the entirety of the self, and even the concept and idea of the self... it also seems to define the economy, be one (or unified, married, as) with the economy, and create the economy's formation (the economy itself, however, creates itself hyperstitionally through selves...). Too, Culture seems to define reality, truth, existence, idea, ideology, value, definition, and even create all experience. Though, it is important that here i am referring to Culture in its most highest (or, lowest) form, if we see culture as a clade (or cladistics), and that more general cultures and more lower cultures do not have set (teleological??) control levels, or, one side does not have total control and the other no control where a gradient exists, from general to specific it is not controlling to loose or loose to controlling, but each specific level has a specific level of control that is not effected by any other level. in here, let me define the subsections of culture--- Nature (Culture par

excellence, Yaldabaoth, Culture almighty and the defining that is hyperpsychosis, aka, What cannot be abolished but transformed in absolute abolition. Highest control, "reality". All beings exist here and know here, though the way they see or experience it is going to be different), --The average Taxonomical levels (though, this is considered a problematic and often criticized method of categorization and interpretation, i do not specifically actually mean the taxonomical levels but the general scientific idea. I will, however, use the taxonomical levels that are commonly taught now in order to at least show or represent what i mean) (generally, this goes that, however, domain to species, bio-cultural "or natural" control over the individual only gets stronger the more specific it gets... this is false, each level is equally as controlling, and in fact, i would argue that it gets more controlling the more general it gets as more general things are controlled. For example, Domain completely changes the way you experience everything so radically that even hyperpsychosis, while there, is uninterpretable for some beings. Too, a change in species changes radically your experience, your culture, your bio-culture, and your interpretation of hyperpsychosis.), --then, the general location of existence, or, continental cultures (european, asian, african, american, oceanic, etc. etc.) since cultures in these continents tend to share similar aspects from continued interactions or origins in similar circles, aka continental culture,,, let me clarify what i mean by this by using a term you all know... I mean what has turned into, modernly, Race, Racial Culture. It was previously continental culture, and ever since history has made Race, hyperstitionally, into a modern belief (like ethnicity is a modern belief but, too, is a belief that came all the way from tribes, ethnic culture originates from tribal cultures that became overgrown and turned into a state), it then became Racial Culture. This does not mean that race is biologically real, it is as biologically real as ethnicity, that stupid idea. ---then sub-continental cultures (north america, central america, south america, caribbean, middle east (questionably?), south or north africa, central africa, west europe, east europe, whatever else) for similar reasons, (this, too, is sometimes also believed to be racial culture, just on a more specific level??) ----then, previously, it would be ethnicities, or even earlier, what would be societies, then tribes, but due to the leftist nationalization of cultures and synthesis, the next cultural level is the artificial level of the national (spain, russia, the USA, cuba, mexico, whatnot...) --- then, too/also artificially, the state level, which only exists due to the same

nationalization and ethnic synthesis, (georgia, chiapas, mexico city, leningrad, Tomsk, omsk, whatever else), ---now, the non-artificial level of said ethnicities, previously societies then tribes and whatnot... ethnicities have their own cultural background which is distinct from their national culture and this is important to remember. ---then, on and on, city to family to individual lines in the family to the individual themselves made from their culture. It is a long line and it is important to draw the distinction between different forms of culture, and why exactly i call culture (nature) and the absolute one of the same. There is not just one culture... there is just one culture (nature) but not just one culture (ethnicity for example).), which now is Absolute, is all the same being-- Hyperpsychosis is Culture Self-rationalizing itself, and since there is no self, Hyperpsychosis therefore is Culture is Culture self-rationalizing itself... which mirrors my old conceptualization of Yaldabaoth because, and exactly because, it replaces it and so becomes the same as it. Yaldabaoth was Reality Self-Rationalizing itself, more specifically, A transgirl Causal reality (and since the causal, acausal, and perfect are all really the same thing once the idea of an objective reality and cosmology is destroyed.... And hyperpsychosis is all that's left,) which now means the same as Culture/Hyperpsychosis/the-Absolute. The Absolute, i used to have replaced the absolute with nothing to abolish it-- this failed so now i do not replace it, i leave it where it was before i replaced it, and make it known that it is just hyperpsychotic. Then... The Absolute is at interpretation's will, one can cry out-- but it is at its own interpretation's will, hyperpsychosis, and it IS its own interpretation's will, it is self-oppressive, and so it is absolute! Now... how to kill it? Now I seek to kill (and, like shota (again, im (as of now) 15, i can reclaim that slur) materialism, rape and adore and abuse) Cuteness, femininity (at least, not the femininity of the gender shredder (which, on that subject, it is important to note that abolition, to be functional, should recognize the differences between the different oppressed groups and forms of oppression in order to properly abolish them--- Race abolition will be different to gender abolition will be different to age abolition will be different to class abolition will be different to... so on and so on and whatever. I call this out to, ironically, since i have rejected my past identification with the radical feminist movement, recall back to and affirm it. The Gender shredder is a direct reference to the Incel myth of the Feminization of Modern Man (hypergamy is also true in reverse, therefore incels have no reason to hate women since they do

the exact same as women in their misogynistic theories! The femcel reversal theory of hypergamy perfectly shows how incels are the creators of their own issues... if incels say that all the women go after the hottest top percent of men, and femcels go around and say, this is true in reverse, all the men go after the hottest top percent of women, and in fact, this is worse for women because usually the men react, unlike the women, in violent expressions and stalking and killing and brutal assaults against all women, then it becomes clear that the incels at the bottom of the "normal" hypergamous hierarchy are right above femcels in real hypergamous hierarchy, and experience better living than even the hottest top percent of women due to little harassment and assault and abuse. People say that the Incels and Femcels should just date, and to this, I point out the hypergamous power dynamic between incel moids and femcels-- the incels are higher in the hierarchy and so have more power societally and are treated better and would be more believed than the femcels and so that would turn abusive like any other heterosexual slop... and because the incels are higher in the hypergamous hierarchy, they also see Femcels as below them and would better be attracted to hotter women than femcel or, or even despite their homophobia, themselves, rather than date a femcel... and because, despite them acting like women are whores for all wanting the hottest men, these incels all want the hottest women. I speak here to also deny the theory of Hypergamy and reversal hypergamy for one reason and another reason alone-- 1, it is rooted in homophobia and gender stereotypes regardless, and 2, it is a generalization that ignores that most people have a subjective idea of attractiveness. Hypergamy is not true because, again, what is ugly for one is hot for others and vice versa, there would probably be enough people attracted to ugly ass incels for hypergamy to have never at all been theorized if only the incels actually met them or whatever. This is obvious when you walk into the tcc fandom and see people simping for an ugly child killer with a horrible haircut that, by any mainstream or incel definition of attractive, is as unattractive as hell... if all women are attracted to the top percent and all men attracted to the top percent, then tcc-ers and those other groups of people who simp over conventionally ugly types (and,, y'know,, majority of the women who marry men for their personalities, which is a lot, and marry ugly men and have happy marriages (COUGH as 'happily' as a heterosexual couple can have, power dynamics are abusive COUGH)) must ALL be non-binary, right? /sarcasm.

Hypergamy is a stupid theory so i will simply ignore it, because... what the fuck is incel socialism?), which, is self-explanatory. This is a fact that cannot be denied, but to take that incel statement further, i would say masculinity has always been a delusion-- as to not return to my misandry of the past, again, I say i mean this as in gender is a social construct and a literal myth (alongside biological sex, also a myth) made by a group of people to validate the control of one portion of the world to another. The whole world is genderless when we do not see through the psychotic lens of the patriarch and their followers, and before the patriarchy the world was openly and explicitly genderless, a cock was no symbol for man, it did not belong to man, and vaginas did not belong to women, nor was it a symbol of them, and there was not an explicit care for these differences outside of the difference itself. Men, when men were created, in which to grasp a metaphor let's say this is a birth-- the birth of adam--, claimed the phallus as theirs, and too, claimed it to be some sort of violent weapon (it is not naturally or biologically violent like TERFs claim, but instead, Adam had imagined it to be violent as to empower and create hierarchy empowering him... a vagina can be just as harmful). Adam took his insecurity and thrashed it against the genderless world, and declared all that which was not adamic, not masculine, feminine, a 'woman'. Of course, as to not be eurocentric, many groups and ethnicities and cultures and tribes had more than two gender and some even weren't patriarchies, but when these more complex and less dualistic cultures met with the white adamic bullshit, as we see in imperialism, slavery, genocide, and colonization, and as we see today with those cultures now oppressed and hyperpsychosis forcing the two genders myth stronger than ever, we see the adamic cracker (cracker is not a slur, and i apologized specifically for implying racial realism, not for the use of the word cracker) man raping all it doesn't like and claiming it to be a woman-- the identity of these third genders were invalidated by Adam and they were violently misgendered. Womanhood was the replacement for the genderless zero, it was adam's second, it was eve who replaced the firstborn lyl'lil (or lilith). The Gender Shredder is the marriage between Eve and Lyl'lil (as seen in Gender Accelerationism, a blackpaper, by N1x Land / Nyx Land) where Feminine Nihilism is active and transfem deterritorialization shreds up all delusional Adamites to nothing. It is not, like many portray it, a Forcefem project, because in the feminization we do not make woman, we make nothing, we abolish gender.

Feminization, unlike what incels believe, is not turning womanly but instead turning non-manly, not into 2 but into 0, it is abolition. This is different to Race abolition, as Race was not formed in the same way gender was, and so needs a different method of abolition. Age Abolition, one of the things I advocated and still do advocate for (previously I considered myself a Radical Youth-lib, a play on radical feminism and youth liberation, but I have let go of such a corny term), has been greatly stunted as an idea specifically because I have, due to my radical feminism and the many many similarities between gender and age, more specifically women and children, always treated women and children as if they were the same and had the same solution, I always ignored difference and never really gave the light to the uniqueness of children, and I am not sure I could even now! My analysis of my class was cut short by my feministic way of viewing it and I feel it is important someone else takes a different analysis for an actual non-feminist understanding of youth liberation to become clearer. I do not know the future of age abolition nor how to achieve it, I feel my old writings on childishness and redistributing the childish mindset to be... too much like the feminist solution I had back then. I do not believe that age abolition entails, like people assume when I speak to them about it, the maturation and adultization of children and youths, for youths and children to behave and act like adults and be treated as such-- that is like saying gender abolition means that women will act and behave and be treated like men, or race abolition means blacks and POCs and hispanics will behave and act and be treated like whites, or whatever else.... That is not a solution at all. But, I also feel that Adulthood and Manhood are different enough so that age abolition does not mean shredding maturity, though the delusion of maturity will be abolished as it is ageist and honestly also ableist. If Maturity was abolished right now, not much would really change and Adults would find a new way to oppress children. If masculinity was shredded, Adam would heel over and die. So then, Difference should not be ignored but utilized for the abolition of the thing itself-- and this is important for me in abolishing culture, the absolute, and hyperpsychosis.) aka gender abolition (I abandon the idea of gender being replaced with femininity with instead the gender shredder annihilating without replacing gender, a return to 0 and not some -2... femininity is not a gender or some quasi-gender spiritual thing but nothing, it is gender's origin and it is what is shredded by the transgirl that is the gender shredder, ironically enough. The spiritual femininity

of my old thought is dead to me, i self-critique it to death, and i abandon the idolization of femininity! And for cute, and for the shota materialist cravings, and for that cuteness in everything, i revel in it and i hate it all the same together... I want to abuse the loli (i can reclaim) that is yaldabaoth to death, that is my love, that is my hate. Cuteness is the absolute as well, and that allows me to be attracted to yet want to tear apart and eat and slit and mutilate it all the same, cuteness i adore and i adore to kill, i love and hate god like an abused fox. Desire.), as it all becomes the same one thing, how ironic!)... the absolute--- The absolute is Culture, Culture is everything, it is impossible to escape. To escape Culture, to Abolish Culture, is to escape the Absolute, to abolish the Absolute. The Absolute has been one of the hardest questions for me, i have only ever been unable to abolish it, and likewise the same with culture... i have only ever been unable to abolish it as well, it is one of the hardest questions as well. Culture and the Absolute, how do i Abolish it without just recreating a new one? (and no, the self-cults of the uncultured person is not abolition but instead redistribution... if you do not culture a person, the person just cultures themselves, and that is not abolition, like i implied it was in my critique of radeviance (on radeviance, actually, and this is written 6/13/2026-- I think that, as far as the norm goes, deconstruction does nothing.. it must be abolished, and with it, everything else would go out. A normless world would be a world without identity insofar as identity is created/defined by the traits and values that a norm pushes onto a self... one identifies with traits and, as far as traits only appear when they are deemed (inferior or superior, different, or, valued) and are, or, so are, part of a norm (or being part of a norm, more likely, defines the trait's being-deemed), in which i mean these traits are not identified or made into an identity until a norm has processed and deemed it an identity, this identification of/with traits (and values, which are directly linked to belief or purpose or an end, and are also oppressive in their own right even without the oppression of religion (religion cannot be consensual because it is coercive, like economy), ideology, and whatever else (identity)) is identity itself for the self or individual. Why things like gender abolition, age abolition, race abolition, species abolition, all exist, or why identity abolition exists, is because identity itself, more exactly the norm's identification and valuing and role-ifying of traits (which is and creates and becomes identity), is the main reason why the norm is maintained and existent in the first place. Woman

as an identity was birthed from the oppression of women themselves, womanhood was born from the suffering of woman, and the oppression of women is not maintained by what gave birth to it (the birth of adam) but instead the identity of womanhood itself, of being a woman. Instead of still being oppressed for not being men, women become oppressed for being women. Too, the homosexual as an identity was born from its oppression-- in nature, there is no term for homosexuals, this only came about as heterosexuality came about and began to force itself onto everyone,, or really,, this came about as adam began oppressing women through matrimony and abusive non-consensual relationships and so, men on men or women on women (and no other gender is allowed to exist under adam's cracker eye) relationships became an opposition to these abusive relationships, a display of actually healthy romance, of... true romance where two individuals can freely and truly love each other without non-consensual power dynamics, or, where each individual can actually consent to one another and enjoy one another as lovers. In heterosexuality, a man enjoys a woman because the man is the center being, the egotistical lord, the god, where-as, as mormon theology and mythology goes, the woman is a wife-slave for the man's planet... jehovah's millions of wife-slaves. Homosexuality as a term was therefore born. Before gender, all relationships were "homosexual" but there were not Homosexual, not nwlw or nmlm, not mlm or wlw, not wlnm or mlnw, they were just "I", love, anarchistic love. Homosexuality as a term, then as an identity, almost immediately, was born from oppression, and the oppression of homosexuals is also maintained via the identity of the Homosexual, as the "anti-straight", the "faggot" the anti-christian attack or whatever. Homosexual as an identity maintains the oppression of homosexuals, and too, maintains the privileged identity of heterosexual by drawing a distinction between the two. The same thing with Age, the same thing with Race, so on and so on... So that Identity must be abolished to abolish oppression, and the continued existence of identity under an ideology represents the continued existence of oppression under an ideology. Again, this can be obviously seen in Radeviance's opposition to age abolition as seen in Radeviance.carrd.co. Also, on the topic of roles, i do wish to make it clear that (for this section i will use the word deviant, but i still feel extremely annoyed at this term-- though it is a nitpick. Deviant is a really idiotic term that can easily be replaced with queer, and only isn't because the modern queer community calls

itself queer and only accepts sexual and gender queerness... even though the old queer community also accepted neurodivergents, the mentally ill, paraphiles and all trans people, and anyone remotely "queer" if queer means weird, strange, 'deviant', and whatever else. But because queerness must be kept as an identity term of the modern queers, apparently radeviance cannot use such a term to describe queer individuals like autists, paraphiles, trans-identities, and depressives, and so uses deviant-- mainly for paraphiles and trans-ids!) the deviant is not deviating from his role in any real way. Insofar as transgression and sacredness are linked and eternally intertwined, insofar as norms are fascistic and desire the same outside group they hate (novelists hate conservatives but their ideal society requires conservatives to exist and continue to exist and reproduce), every norm creates a role that perfectly bubbles and encapsulates the deviant into society... This is, like capitalism's totalitarian rule, and culture's absoluteness and existence as hyperpsychosis, the basic nature of all norms to be totalitarian and orwellian. Norms account for the deviant and do not actually attempt to stop them from existing or living, but more realistically, they attempt to kill them and use them as displays of power and superiority, of domination and strength, terrorism. The oppression of homosexuals was not started to eliminate homosexuals or annihilate homosexuality, but instead, to suppress/oppress/torment/terrorize/dominate and make a spectacle out of the suppression/oppression/terrorization/domination/suffering of homosexuals, to prove their superiority through dominating an other. The norm, unlike implied in radeviant writings, does not oppress the deviant because they deviate from roles, but because the deviant is unable to deviate from their role as an abomination worthy of being oppressed according to their identity, which too is born from their oppression and so rooted in it. It does not (radeviance.carrd.co) "punish for deviating from these roles" but, instead, it punishes exactly because you are unable to deviate from your role as a "deviant" (you see how queer would work better here, as deviant as a strict implication of deviating from something, while queer, while meaning practically the same as deviant, weird, strange, abnormal, does not imply deviation and can be made into a role without it being contradictory. My point feels strange here because of the term deviant replacing queer, because "the role of deviant" makes no sense insofar as deviants would deviate from roles by their name's very nature. Queer would fix this (seeing as, radeviance.carrd.co, "a

deviant is someone who does not have traits that are considered valuable from the point of view of the norm, who feels or presents in a way that is rejected by their environment", aka... a queer.), but i digress). Radeviance, in a way, is a defense of identity when, really, identity is the problem.).). That is the goal of this book, or at least, right now it is. PA, or, Palingenetic Anarchism was one of the most idiotic concepts i had created-- trying to create some sort of left-wing to the NRXists and, especially, trying to create an openly non-anarchist anarchism rooted in palingenetic nationalism without a nation. This was stupid, and this is why-- while I cannot critique PA by simply labeling it not actually anarchist, once again no anarchist is an actual anarchist and PA admits this openly (which, actually, i felt took away from my future critique of the anarchists when i looked back and found that, despite me not knowing during writing section 2, i had said the same thing in section 1 to defend the non-anarchism of PA, using the fact anarchism was a husk, a lie, a fake, to instead push this fake husk as a palingenetic feature, to wear its skin? I found it gross, really, to admit to not being an anarchist like i'm chomsky or something and just continue on in my anarchist LARP, especially since before PA i had been an anarchist for a long, long time, only having certain phases of authoritarian ideology (like the cuban bordiga moments). In section 1, i critiqued anarchism so that it could continue its LARP but consciously, in section 2, I critiqued Anarchism in a wish for it to self-reflect and try to move past the delusion of anarchism towards something better for the anarchist in particular. In section 1, i enjoyed anarchism's anti-anarchism, i enjoyed anarcho-totalitarianism, while in section 2 i despised it and wished the anarchists to learn and go past it. PA was so bad, so annoying, so Palingenetic and fascistic in character, easily the worst ideology to come out my mouth, BECAUSE it was a critique half-said and appropriated into a compliment, an identity. Palingenesis is sickening, the assimilation into a greater movement, the aesthetic of community and culture-- you cannot have Palingenetic aesthetics without admitting a desire for a suicide under culture, even if-- When i praised Palingenesis it was out of praise of suicidal desire, self-negation of the self, the "only good thing of fascism" as i could've said back then, but now i understand that palingenesis of any form, not "reactionary palingenesis" as my maoist ass loved to say (dualism was the death of any real intellect in me), but Palingenesis without any description, palingenesis, was not just suicidal desire but was forever linked to the false solution of the

fascist, the assimilation to a culture, a nation, an ethnos, a greater god. It was the attempt to assimilate all into hyperpsychosis further, like (if you have seen unknowingly's the man in the suit arg (which always made me feel extremely bad for the suit, and i will not call him "the man in the suit" because he is the suit, he is godzilla, because the way the humans treat him always came off as barbaric, speciesist, bigoted and cruel for no real reason. Godzilla was a man who lost all he had in the american nukes that hit japan and, turned consensually into godzilla, he planned his justified revenge. The humans who treat him so badly, like shit, they are pro-american speciesist racist bigots who should not be viewed as heroes at all.), the man here is the fascist mass, the suit is the hyperpsychosis, i mean a union of assimilation and sublation) neither death nor life but becoming god. This is also why Satanism is inherently Far-Right and so many satanist groups and sects have ties to the far-right (see: Dead Domain's video on the TsT, CoS' open statements of pride and Anton Lavey's actions, JoS' uh.... entire library full of nazi texts and hitler praise (now called ToZ or smth i forgot, they change their names too often), O9A's open nazist terrorist attacks and social darwinism and praise of hitler and surprising islamism??, and MLO's post-fascist death cult), because both are fundamentally about becoming god, about exploding and becoming one with hyperpsychosis, the suicidal drive, the assimilationist desire. Also, I am sorry for my former use of the term Narcissism without consideration of how it can effect people with NPD, that's all. PA has always, even if seemingly far-left (something that also disgusts me, but not in the same way the far-right does), been laced due to palingenesis with a far-right satanist characteristic that i must reject and denounce as sickening towards me, along with my maoist delusions. I am no Maoist. (Extra-(6/13/2026 12:18 am): morality. Fourier in his post-christian harmonious drive, his passionate utopia, almost radically avoids any morality onto the individual-- he absolutely and explicitly rejects the notion of sin or, as cristo-darwinists call it, "evil", and even more "inherent evil" or "original sin". He instead posits that, that which is immoral, which here refers moreso towards tragedy (or, for me, non-consensual action, or, misery and suffering), is caused by a misalignment of passionate attractions, or passions, which is the fault of civilization. Fourier only blames it on civilization because he believes Yehowa is smart enough to divinely-centrally plan an entire economy and society in accord to absolute joy, passion, and harmony... and because he ignores that for civilization to

exist, it must have been made by Yehowa, as humanity has always preferred to linger in anarchistic and fascistic small groups like hunter-gatherer units or tribes or individuals. Taking from Gnosticism, and from my point of view I feel as if Gnosticism and Fourierism represent two different ways and separate ways that christianity can abandon itself, or, go "post-christian"... either towards believing so much the perfection of god and his creations that christianity seems heretical and against God in their opposition to passions and so you have no choice other than to abandon it, or, towards believing so much the imperfection and hatred of the material world (something most churches i have seen lean towards more because cult mentality is good for religious leaders and organization, and also too, because the myth of lucifer is a stunted and underdeveloped and weaker form of the Yaldabaoth myth-- Lucifer is christianity's scapegoat for yaldabaoth so that they can accept both the new and old testament at once) that even god, to you, for making and keeping and continuing this world (reflecting how humans treat animals, god too farms you like cattle), for sinning against the bible's perfect morals and being un-christian, you feel the desire to reject god himself in your puritan christianity and puritanism as well, to escape the material world towards something better. Both sides want to escape modern society, gnosticism to the monad, fourierism to passionate harmony... too, both abandon any puritanism while being influenced greatly by it, the gnostic here is so dogmatic that he is more christian than yehowa himself and so abandons him, and the fourierist here is so in love, reverence, and passionate desire for god (as puritans claim to be) that he rejects the ways of those dogmatic and cruel christians to instead see all that god made as inherently able to be harmoniously united, and to abandon christianity and the rejection of humanity for instead a fourierist craving... both eventually lead to indulging in passions and what puritans consider "sin", though for the gnostic it depends more on your sect as almost everything does... I refer here to the passionate gnostic who, after critiquing god with his own morals, drops god's morals as a result and tries to achieve unity with the monad through passions, pleasures, separate from the material plane. The fourierist instead rejects civilization (not the material plane) and seeks passion in harmony and unity and rejects christian morals for harmonious living and gluttony and sexual unity in the omni-orgy. They, in fact, though similar and similarly interesting to me, seem incompatible without destroying one or the other.--- i digress- Taking from

gnosticism, i say that, really, all the blame falls onto God, not any individual, for the tragedy, via the transfer from individual to civilization to god in level of responsibility. Of course, i reject any moralism, even the non-moralism of Fourier, but here i refer not to morality but responsibility and blame, and the blame falls onto god because he has, like a soviet trying to plan the centralized economy, failed to design any way for us all to live and unite harmoniously with out passions... like how i find nihilism in gnosticism, i too find nihilism in fourierism... There is no way to achieve an utopia of any kind precisely because God is a failure and an excuse of an economic dictator, he has given us passions and desires and told us to act on them without any possibility of them uniting together for some better world or association, we are doomed to disharmonious living and misaligned passions. THis is seen even more in the fact that, as far as tragedy, and to me, Non-consensual act of any kind, misery, and suffering goes, we are all "evil" (if i was a moralist, yes, i would say we are all irredeemably evil for how non-consensual, cruel, (non-consensually) sadistic, and fucked up we all are). If each and every single one of us have had misaligned passions, even christ himself as seen in christ setting up his own suicide/tragedy on the cross (kill yourself, god, and take judas with you! Judas and jesus do have doomed and implicitly toxic homoerotic tension, especially their gnostic counterparts) for all to see and cry!, then how in the world can we know if there even IS a correct alignment of passions, and more, how do we ACHIEVE it if we all are misaligned? misaligned passions cannot align other passions without misaligning them, at least gnosticism claims that gnosis came from a higher being like the monad, the fourierists think you can get frogs from chicken eggs! And too, we have no proof that frogs even exist at all, we have never seen a frog organ, a frog cell, not even an atom that would match the composition of a frog! Frogs seemingly are nothing but a myth. Then... Morality? We are all doomed ((SIX HOURS LATER, I WRITE THIS:)) not to say we are born evil, if i am to present what i am saying to a moralist, but that we cannot live for even a millisecond and stay good, even in birth we cause a tragedy, the tragedy of life! And too, after all the grooming civilization does to us, all our actions being in accordance to it, and it being a tragedy causing misery and suffering itself, we contribute to civilization and its tragedy but, again, like a victim is forced to contribute to their abuser.... it is not your fault. This is why i cannot say you are "evil" or anyone is "evil", we are

all simply coerced by god, civilization, Yehowa, into causing suffering, misery, tragedy to others and ourself, or at least contributing and supporting misery. I believe that meat consumption under capitalism is cruel, unethical, and a tragedy that causes the speciesist suffering and misery, non-consensually, of millions of people, yet because i am sure that i could not afford veganism, or at least healthy veganism, and because it is generally useless for stopping farming and other structures of cruelty, i eat meat, and i apologize for this--- not the death and killing of animals, as in nature death is not domination or suffering but, instead, an act of defying and willpower that remains anarchy in spirituality, and the animals of nature understand death not as something valuable-- but for the suffering and misery of animals, the tragedy of farming. In nature, the death of an animal is not composed of its suffering or misery (Anarcho-pacifists and those anarchists critiqued by marx for the utopian ideals of anti-violence, understand that violence does not create hierarchy but instead Domination does. Violence and domination are not one in the same things and, though Nature is not anarchist and never has been, the violence in nature is not what makes it non-anarchistic.), adrenaline does a good amount of work and usually only sado-masochistic (or "intelligent") animals like humans or dolphins purposefully cause the animal to suffer long and painful deaths, this is the opposite of humanity's torment of animals, or, farming, which composes itself fully in sadism (and, too, masochistic defenses) and torments the animals for their entire life. It is not their death that is horrible, but their life, under the farms. It is also the absolute lack of consent that horrifies me-- to take from one of Lanza's smiggles posts, Animal Farming is extremely similar to, if not even arguably worse than, animal rape (a novelist walks into a bar... you know how the rest goes. Only three made it out alive). Unlike smiggles' point, i am not defending animal rape, but attacking animal farming (not to say that, if the power dynamic between man and animal were to be removed, aka if species were to be abolished, 'zoophilic' relationships would remain cruel... zoophilia would be abolished as an identity as species is no longer a thing for zoophilia to define itself as, such as in gender abolition all gender-based sexualities will go down with it.) for such horrible treatment. I think that, honestly, any abuser (especially ones who abuse using societal power dynamics rooted in bigotry and discrimination, like child predators, animal abusers, child abusers, wife-beaters, etc.) who dares speak out against capitalism, genocide, suffering, bigotry and power dynamics, yet

continue to abuse their own power in a power dynamic and abuse a minority or marginalized or enslaved group (last i checked, children made up 25% of the population and therefore ARE a minority, just so certain youth-libs know.), must be a professional LARPer and a preformative bastard (hasan abi's speciesist slavery / ownership over his 'pet' dog, his slave, and most importantly, his abuse of said slave and overly cruel treatment). Not to be the moral relativist of the year, I think the moral relativism of the noveltists is contradictory, paradoxical, nonsensical, and severely inconsistent to their ideology (saw-what-i-did-there?), but interpreting all that come into contact with civilization, with culture, with God, or are raised by culture, civilization, or God, as grooming victims, I understand that these slave owners (Parents, Animal owners, whatever else) can often times want the best for their slave (how much it pains me to say this knowing that many excuse their abuse with this very line, intention and action are very, very separate.), and want to be good and do good, but are still groomed under the same morality and system that they got from their abusers. There are Parents who raise their children without the physical abuse of any sort of discipline and, instead, rely on communication and actually treating their children like people, and i know they are trying, but as far as slavery goes, they are still slave owners and are still people causing suffering and misery non-consensually onto their child, or really, causing anything non-consensually would be bad enough.. And that is exactly why i cannot call them evil, because again, they are misguided and could have good intentions.. but that does not mean good actions (here i fall back into moralist terminology, whatever...). Too, with animal owners, they could mean the best for their animal, but the same thing goes to them. This becomes harder for me when we see people like, the name previously mentioned, and other animal abusers or child abusers who openly and non-consensually (and, again, why i put so much emphasis on consent is exactly BECAUSE of the nature of consent, or exactly, the nature of consent as impossible (the closest thing has been the mutual-unconscious-assault of "healthy relationships", which i can at least appreciate... hell, even masterbaiting to a degree is non-consensual insofar as it is coerced by material conditions and civilization-- not to say that masterbaition is bad, i am no puritan, but that it certainly is not consensual. Too but radically different from masterbaition, suicide (which, i stress, is different to masterbaition and far more serious, i only find that i can clarify the consensuality of suicide in this section as

nowhere else fits) too seems at first to be de-facto consensual as it is an action to yourself (ignoring that the unique oppresses itself and forces itself to align with itself, in which egoism is the forced and totalitarian sublation of the unique with itself, where to unite and uplift the unique the egoist must also suppress and carve off the unnecessary or negative aspects of the unique. I think i would prefer to not sublate my unique at all, but instead, abolish it.), finds itself in material conditions, civilization, society, and honestly also the government purposeful secret eugenics plan against minorities and queers (not so secret) by making mental health lines horrible and suicide lines hang up on you constantly because they want less mentally ill and queer people, extremely and especially coerced and non-consensual. Even in suicide, an act that many can claim to be the final reclaiming of your life, it is civilization, the government, and society that has the final say in your life. If they no longer want you or never have, they drive you to suicide, and if they change their minds or want to keep you, they stop you from killing yourself and hospitalize you.... mental hospital abuse rates are pretty bad, maybe it's just a way to play with the individuals they are weeding out of civilization through suicide-based eugenics before actually letting them die. Civilization tends towards sadism, after all. Of course, in a world where consent could even possibly exist, and with that, does exist, and so in a world where everything is abolished, an impossible world, i wouldn't say that suicide is coerced and, of course, that is because suicide itself is not by-nature a bad thing nor by-nature a coercive or negative or tragic thing, it only takes that characteristic when it becomes coercive, aka when it exists under a system of oppression or many systems of oppression, aka under the absolute. But again, Suicide is coercive in the same way everything else is coercive, so if i am to oppose suicide, which i will not do, i ought to (if i am to be consistent) oppose all actions... sex, consumption, play, dating, showering, cleaning, listening to music, drinking, fighting, living, breathing... then i ought to not oppose it, especially considering that opposition makes something sacred.), or at least, impossible without the exact abolition of (everything along with) consent itself. Due to the simple understanding of consent being suppressed and reduced to nothing under power dynamics, and too, the fact that consent is basically impossible to truly communicate or give in an oppressive structure/system or when you are oppressed at all, due to said oppression and power dynamic, it is clear that consent is impossible in the modern day, impossible as long as we, me,

and/or you exist, and impossible as long as consent remains a thing. Consent is impossible because it as a concept is something that can only become possible after its abolition, yet, after its abolition, because it is abolished, it would (still) be impossible (since if consent is abolished (via absolute abolition, as that is what i mean with the abolition of consent, as the abolition of consent argued for by the xenosatanists explicitly enjoys suffering an misery and does not 'possibilify' (only to, in said possibilification, to make impossible once again via abolition) consent like absolute abolition does.), it no longer exists, and so therefore is impossible, but without itself. Right now, it is impossible but with itself, like a contradiction. To add onto this impossibility, i also bring up the impossibility of absolute abolition and how, if absolute abolition was achieved, the absolute would be recreated (if absolute abolition abolishes all, there is, despite me critiquing my old microfascistic program and open acceptance of leftist microfascisms, a fascist lingering in that. Insofar as fascism can be defined with homogeneity, the recreation and becoming of god/absolute, an eradication of difference (within the state or community), and hatred for all (outside the state or community), it is clear where absolute abolition stands when abolition becomes absolute. In the time of absolute before abolition, the absolute remains yaldabaoth, yet when abolition is being done absolutely, is it not true that abolition becomes, if not temporarily, absolute? Then, once abolition kills itself, IF abolition kills itself (see: ML's "The vanguard will jsut whither away, trust me!", or, Marxism's "The state will jsut magically whither away once class is abolish, since the state exists for class oppression and totally not also due to hierarchy and power over one another, trust me!" (which, while yes, the state does monitor and control and oppress lower classes for higher classes, even if there were no classes, is it not clear that if a group of people had power over another group, that higher group constitutes a group of people who would, logically, attempt to continue to maintain their power for as long as possible? and, considering that in a classless world, there could still be manipulation and use of power to take more than others, would the higher group not have the power to constitute themselves as a new class of rich people via taking and manipulating people and using their power against people to take more than others? and a marxist may say that class and state is abolished at the same time, not state before class, then i say that how would the statists do that if they, being statists in an economy and therefore having more power and a different

relation to the MOP than the average non-statist prole, would want to continue both the state and class society? The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be a vanguard or else that very problem will be apparent, as it was in the USSR or is in sovinterm (or whatever that left-putinist organization is). And if, like leftcoms and (non-kropotkinist) marxist ancoms / an-marxists, who tend to admit they are really quasi-statists and glorify marx's quasi-state as the only scientific form of anarchism, we say that all proles must hold power equally over the nation and, so, all proles must be equally part of the state--- or, democracy--- well, see the critiques of democracy (max stirner, bob black, Amadeo Bordiga, the communizationists, the anarchists, even the marxists), and to point out one specifically... that would be a dictatorship of the majority and still have the potential to constitute a new class-- majority against minority, can they not restore racist (genocide of black individuals called "slavery(" despite being more than that), sexist traditionalism (forcing women to do house labour), can they not imprison the youth and animals, can they not restore an even worse economy than the last based on slave labour and cruelty? And, if, like usual in democracy, eventually the direct democracy turns either representative or councilist, would that not be able to lead to a more apparent state (though force, use of power, domination using the control they have) and the possibility of a new class of rich people, again? And, if the state is to be abolished BEFORE class is abolished, well first, see the Marxist, Leninist, and Marxist-Leninist critiques of anarchists-- who want to abolish class without statist to oppress the old rich class. How would the rich be properly abolished without a state, dear marxist? Again, Anarchism at least attempts a solution in abolishing it all in one go, in, for example, simply ending the economy or using force against the rich without a state, and whatnot..)), the absolute supposedly being abolished in the abolition of abolition, then nothing becomes absolute, or, not even nothing becomes absolute! Which... still is an absolute. I believed that simply saying that not even nothing would be absolute would fix the issue of the absolute, that the problem was that nothing was absolute (since, at the time, i believed nothing to be everything, and maybe i still do... i don't know, it seems irrelevant), but the problem was that in the end, something "would be absolute"... and that something was not even nothing. It was the empty void that constituted to describable existence, it was a purely anti-fascist fascist regime. Again, despite trying to clear my name from my old anti-fascist fascist

glorification and palingenetic craving, i had still fallen into the same cycles again in absolute abolition, just like my desire to recreate god. And too, recreating the absolute in this form, i also rebirthed god without any way to kill, i had saved God and made him immortal, how reactionary-- i had not abolished god at all, but instead, perfected him through abolition like maybe a weird, abolition-obsessed form of neo-hegelian delusion. Absolute Abolition is impossible, therefore, since the Absolute is unable to be abolished.), as to say that even if Consent could be made possible in absolute abolition and not, like is obvious will happen, ABOLISHED, even then it would be impossible because absolute abolition itself is impossible.. ensuring 100% that consent is entirely and irredeemably impossible.). Consent, and maybe it is due to the impossibility of consent or maybe the impossibility of consent is due to it, works directly as something that cannot bring or cause suffering--- and i clarify here that consent as a concept, the idea of consent, or "consent" as it is in the modern day, aka consent, does bring suffering and oppression and misery and pain, and what i mean is 'consensual action', or really, something unnamed and uncommunicated (uncommunicatable?) that we see in consensual action--- (consent? Voluntary? This is why noveltism glorifies the VSRs and I hate them, novelists see them as Voluntary or Consensual and so unable to bring misery, but I can, clearly, and openly, see how they are involuntary and non-consensual-- because of many things, actually! One, necessity, two, value, three, culture, four, economy (novelists don't hold any real position on economy, but it is implied to exist generally because they do not take an anti-economy stance or a non-economy stance), five, speciesism, six, the dictator/cult behaviors of the novelists, seven, platformism (which, again, is involuntary as you will be killed for not being a novelist), eight, ideology (and specifically the ideology of consistent progressivism is inherently anti-consensual), nine, no consideration or care for the consent of bwui and justification for consent-violation, ten, justification of consent violation against ideological enemies and animals (all animals have no consent under a novelist-ruled area because you either are domesticated (your consent is practically stripped in domestication) or killed for your wild behavior), eleven, oppression is not abolished, twelve, misery is not abolished, thirteen, suffering is not abolished, and fourteen, consent is not abolished, fifteen encapsulated both eleven twelve thirteen and fourteen ($15=11+12+13+14$) when i say fifteen is "because everything has not

been abolished under a novelist system". VSRs, if they were actually voluntary social relations, would be impossible to achieve and so consistent progressivism if it were actually consistent would be impossible as well, making it a fraud. Consent cannot exist without it no longer being consent and that, that here, is why i have so much difficulty describing what i mean with consent as it exists--- because it doesn't.(6/28/2026 3:43 AM, i am tired as fuck and realized this in the middle of reading a fanfic. Consent itself depends on non-consensual and oppressive structures and supports these structures, consent is non-consensual and harmful, consent itself is against itself. Consent quite literally works as an affirmation of autonomy, and by any degree, there is little other way to describe it that doesn't show its direct relation to autonomy as an expression of, a forcing of, an affirmation of autonomy, autonomy itself being an expression of, a forcing of, an affirmation of the self, and so self-alienation, self-oppression, suffering. Autonomy and Consent fundamentally must be eradicated for the abolition of the self, along with thinking and language and culture and many other things, and this abolition of the self has been tried before in the past with different methods/means/ends... Communism and the organic natural community, Fascism and the organic divine nation, suicide and the organic negation of life, but all of them seem to fail in theory and practice and give rise to worse things (fascism is worse than individualism, one would say... i am that one who would say). This only shows me that this organic portion, along with any greater community, both of which are rooted in hegelian negation as a solution, is a falsity (along with the hegelian negation as a falsity) and the abolition of the self should preferable be inorganic, artificial, dead without life, and not a negation of the self or a greater being but outside of neither negation nor affirmation. Under any method of self-abolition, we found an undermining and destruction of autonomy, and too, consent, but never a full destruction, only opposition-- suicide, the most different, is actually usually an affirmation of autonomy and consent and so this poses depression as uniquely neurologically and philosophically different to other expression of beings under alienation, in which the self realizes itself as its enemy instead of internalizing it into a satanism or a death drive. Consent must be not opposed, not opposed at all, but annihilated, ironically, consensually (this view is compatible with my previous view, i did not change my mind about the impossibility and greatness of consent, i am only adding onto it), alongside autonomy, to make the self vulnerable enough

to abolish. This is really the only way to end the misalignment of passions, by, infact, liberating passions and allowing them the heavens. Consent, too, is rooted in and affirms values, it is rooted in a self-valorization and the valorization of autonomy, and itself, consent. A nihilist does not value herself, again, has no values. Consent does not and can never work against values because it itself, historically, works as an ally to values, almost all oppressive things were once consensual things, consensual beings became oppressed beings, mainly because consent itself is impossible, is nonconsensual. Therefore, I, here, oppose consensual practices, oppose consensual associations, consensuality, it is a myth, like anarchism. The xenosatanists were, surprisingly and unknowingly, right, but in the wrong way-- they saw the abolition of consent as the affirmation of rape and satanism, but here the abolition of consent is the abolition of rape as well and the annihilation of satanism, of the self. Ironical.)), aka, as long as the act is consensual, and truly consensual, aka not consensual as we say it today or as consent means but a nameless form i call consensual, it will not bring misery to those who agree to partake in it. If one is pressured into it, if one says they want to do it but do not want to, if one is 'consenting' but does not really feel passionate for it or at least not uncomfortable with it, if their passions are misaligned yet it is still delusionally 'aligned' with burning hot metal as if passions can be forced together, then it is not truly consensual. And this applies even to consensual power dynamics-- or, false power dynamics that (do not exist but) are emulated by consenting equal individuals, or, play-- see Petplay, equal individuals consensually emulating a power dynamic without literally creating one... typically pethood creates misery and suffering and alienation, but here it creates.... nothing but aligned passions and lovely relations. The main issue why the 'consensual hierarchy' of the ancap fails is because it becomes less an emulation and more a true hierarchy the second that one begins actively creating a state (and yes, ancap economics do tend to make states out of companies and whatnot... plus, see bob black's complaints about anarcho-syndicalists to understand further), this is kind of like what cults do-- at first, all individuals are equal and the hierarchy is purely emulated, but as it continues to exist, continues to become more statist and counter-cultural (aka cultural against mainstream culture), the hierarchy becomes real. The consent of the individuals who originally agreed to the cult, the business, the company, begins to decay as suffering begins-- but that is assuming that the ancap cult was even

really consensual in the first place... considering that no individual who is uncoerced by neoliberal mindsets, cultural influence / grooming, statist beliefs, and workerism, no individual who is not self-hating or addicted to work (addiction is coercive and brings coercion), no free individual would willingly choose to work, and especially not choose to work and not even receive the full benefit of their work, and definitely not choose to work and not even receive the full benefit of their work just so other lazier (nothing wrong with being lazy) and more free individuals could bank off of their work instead. They would have to be explicitly masochists to do that. That's why Nick Land post-ancap 'dark ancap' ancap (ancap ancap ancap bla bla bla) totalitarianism that he expounds in Nick Land's book "Xenosystems fragments", is just utopian and stupid-- even if he is actively trying to achieve it through the satanist elites (yes, actually, the elites are satanists-- satanism is about self-deification, and when it isn't, it's about the far right, or both. Every sect of Satanism not made by a queer teenager with no other members has some roots in far-right mythology, ideology, aesthetics, or ideas/ideals, and almost all of them (the JoS is questionable as they are more pagan and nazi than satanist, and the O9A is up to interpretation) advocate for and pushes self-deification, becoming God, the core of Fascism... Becoming absolute and God itself through Becoming your Culture, your Nature, Your Act... though Satanism is an individualist-fascism that usually (unless you are an O9Aist or JoS follower) does not care about achieving godhood through collectivity and instead wants you to do it psychologically (CoS' objectivism / randianism), spiritually (non-denominational serial killer satanists like a certain midnight stalker), or whatnot. Though, some forms of Satanism is explicitly fascist... TsT advocates Humanism, or, a Humanistic Fascist ideology that, keeping with self-deification, seems to replace mussolini's nation and hitler's race with lucifer's "humanity", and therefore, explicitly a speciesist form of Fascism that seems to in theory target itself against animals... The JoS and O9A take more traditional routes. JoS, previously identified as SPiritual Satanism (joy of satan ministries), explicitly calls for an aryan hitlerite satanist religion and movement, and probably more... the O9A is more complicated. Some interpretations of O9A theology talks of self-deification as an individual reverse-moralist action, to become evil and so become god alone as yourself, as an individual.. this, too, is interpreted in different ways, it can be spiritually (spiritually and literally becoming God through cruelty and evil)

or it can be psychologically (like the Church of Satan, becoming individual lords in your own mind of yourself, the unifying of the gods WITHIN you and becoming your own lord by infinitely and repeatedly attacking all outside of you, the 'progressive' order and 'holy' society outside of you, and declaring yourself pure evil), that is entirely up to interpretation... other interpretations of O9A theology takes the JoS approach of just literal aryan race revolution teleologically promised to us (or, not 'us' i am not white) for human society to colonize the universe and for this to be the self-deification of the O9A instead, much... more boring. Evil actions further chaos further the rise of the aryan over the christians, further the aryan aeon's arrival further the ultimate becoming-god experience. AND so, i argue, the Elites are satanists... they want to become god, they self-deify, they are also... almost all nazi hitlerite fucks and, like the O9A, pedophilic human traffickers and rapists. Though unlike the O9A, they are all men. The true haters of god, the ones who wish to tear god's throat and violate god, they do not wish to be god because they do not envy god, they HATE(/LOVE(, as hate and love are the same flipping-as-if-it-were-a-coin, changing and shifting, thing)) God and so would hate to be god, that is what separates what i advocate from what they do. They want to be YHWH, I want to end YHWH, Nick Land's KJV-only Satanism is founded on an error of misinterpretation and falsehood.). He will fail, and that is exactly what should scare you, that is the economy-shredder. Anyways, I digress, the exact reason why i put so much importance on consent and its relation to abolition (especially the abolition of misery and suffering) and liberation is exactly because consent is impossible, it is an impossibility.) and in a sadistic manner purposefully harm and damage those below them. Of course, it still is a misalignment of passions where god is responsible before all, but I feel far less sympathy as is only natural for me. explicitly abusive people are harder to sympathize with than implicitly abusive people, as is obvious. Now, abuse is a tragedy regardless of reason or rhyme. (On moralism, taking from Lanza, Camatte, and Fourier, all human "evils" can be seen as three things: 1). Results of a misalignment of passions due to civilization, 2). Results of grooming by Culture, and 3). Results of capital's totalitarian rule over man, where all men are slaves. I would like to reform and unite these... human sins are not moral wrongdoings or sins, not evils, but results and reactions from three things, all of which united under one thing, 1). Misaligned Passions, 2). Grooming, 3). Slavery ----

Misaligned passions caused by the inability to possibly align these passions in any way at all (but, too, and IMPORTANTLY, the specific misaligned form is centrally planned by (god) at all times--- (self and) culture and capitalism misaligns the passions in a specific way as to do a specific thing, the specific misalignment and their consequences are caused not naturally but usually put in place by someone or something--- the only natural misalignment of passions is nature's misalignment.), grooming by culture, counter-culture, the economy, the environment, literal grooming in the individual sense, propaganda, ideology, and especially emphasizing culture and economy, and slavery of all beings under capital's totalitarian grasps where they are forced to play a role and they are also perfectly groomed and commodified by it, in unity with culture. This can be seen as being aligned with the three main oppressions: 1). self, 2). culture 3). economy, or, capital(ism?). In this sense, uniting them all together is easy, if the grooming under culture is already united with the slavery under capital (which applies to all beings under capitalism, not only the proletarians... "(...) even the ruling class is dominated. By now, capital only needs slaves." Jacques Camatte, *Capital and community*, marxists.org, chapter 6) and capital also grooms us like culture keeps us like pets, and both this grooming and slavery create specific artificial forms of misaligned passions in the self, these are not separate and hyperindividual oppressive systems but seem all very intertwined... The misalignment of passions (which verifies that the self is as existent as culture or economy, aka, not spooks but hyperpsychotic delusions that are increasingly mystified... the ego is not a spook, who the fuck would say such a statement(?)), the ego is a hyperpsychotic oppressive force and a hysterical delusion of the being, the ego is unreal in the way that the economy and culture is unreal, but it is not a spook, just as while the concept of culture and economy (and ego) are spooks (and only their concept), culture and economy themselves are unreal and not spooks. self-alienation, the alienation from the self, or, the self itself, can all be defined as the permanent and eternal misalignment of passions, a misalignment that has no solution nor a correct alignment, no harmony at all.), the grooming of all beings, and the slavery of all beings, all are connected through the united system of oppression starting all the way from the beginning and developing to where it is now called "god"... who is, literally, also God, her (she's in the closet and uses he/him for herself but wtvr) name is Yaldabaoth. Ignoring that Morality is a spirit in your head, not a reality

but, as modern egoists say, a "spook", even if morality was true it would not apply to any being but god, because she is responsible and wholly responsible for all wrongdoings and misdeeds and tragedies. In this display, even if beings could have free will (which i no longer care about, free will or not you still function under slavery and grooming so what difference does it make? (7-18-26 11:47pm i realize something here... Free will can mean different things.. Free will as the will of the beings as free and their own will, responsibility of your actions, this is false-- we are not free, we do not make any choices or actions, we have no will-- we have passions but even those are entirely and totally oppressed in this stage of civilization, and so all passions that are expressed by free will are not our passions but a different thing that we call passions, the desires of the self. The self here dominates us entirely, every choice made is not by us but by the self, every action and every will is the self's and not ours, we are spectators in our own lives and are controlled by the self, insofar as again we do not exist and the self does, or, the self unexists to be more specific. We have no will or actions or choices because we do not exist, the self does, and the self is one of our slave owners... yet a slave of its own, slaves without masters, whatever. Regardless, free will here is impossible. However, free will as the will of the self as free is to a degree true, insofar as the self is in absolute unity with capital and culture, y'know the trinity of god, and our selves are not us but our owners... so here it is clear that free will of the self exists, but we do not have control over that, and the self's free will is our oppression, and that will itself is not free either because it itself is a slave to the self and is an extension of the self, and the self is a slave to (itself/god/depression?.), slaves without masters. And, therefore, free will of the self, that we have no control over, is ultimately irrelevant as a unique question--- if the free will of the self is imagined, it is in PERFECT unity with capital and culture (culture itself alienates the individual through the cultural self, though this is arguably a double alienation as it alienates the self from the natural self by making it the cultural self, and nature also alienates the individual via the natural self, thus that we are alienated three times when the self itself is alienation, we are alienated by our self through our self, by nature through our natural self, and by culture through our cultural self, praise be to the pessimist! This theory, moreso a fact than a theory, takes deep inspiration from Adam Lanza's writing in me.pdf or wtvr its called and the culturalphilistine transcripts/videos.. what is ironic is that, like god, since our self

is alienation, this triple alienation is not exactly alienation of the self, but the enrichment of the self and the strengthened alienation of the non-existent us that the self deludes itself into thinking and thinking it is-- and hyperpsychotically it therefore is--- so alienation is enrichment of the self and the definition of the self. the self as an infinite spiral of domestication and alienation in which any alienation is absorbed by it and for the self and against the self (and so harms us). Since, well, you are your self, kinda? It is an open question of interpretation. The alienated is thus more wealthy in character than the non-existent myth of the 'unalienated man', and much much more of a personhood.), in PERFECT unity as in the perfect unity of god to enslave herself, slave with no master, and so it does not matter between determinism nor free will proper nor compatibilism or wtvr its called, as the free will of the self will never be opposed to or against its comrades, it will never oppose nature or the economy, it is in perfect unity with it, and so the free will can seem like determinism or seems like compatibilism as the question is about free will's existence which is impossible to prove here-- insofar as free will goes, i do not think it comes from internal desires as the self is infinitely shallow, nor do i think the desires are real as the self is infinitely self-oppressive and against its desires, and we "are" the selves insofar as we are oppressed by it and it only oppresses itself yet we are not it, really, it is alienation.. Free will, to a degree, is not free nor is a will, and so i do not think of it as free will but instead the slavery of the being by the self, or, the slavery of the self by itself, by the self, its self-enslavement. So, does free will matter? No, the enslavement of the self by the self is not exactly what people mean by free will, it is to a degree a different thing, so i say "free will" is not real insofar as it is impossible to prove under the slavery of the three and the slavery of the three is something eternal that has always existed in some way or form, and so free will have never been possible to prove because it has never been exercised nor ever experienced nor even felt or had or given or seen or anything else, free will has never HAPPENED, simply, and will never happen, so it is impossible to prove and most likely unreal and most definitely irrelevant. The enslavement of the self by the self is not free will to me, it is different, and so i will not classify it as such, but if it were, the question of free will still would not matter as it would not be a question of us but an outside (inside??) being that is opposed to us, and a question not of its solution but its nature, yet its nature is infinitely obvious in the unity of the trinity and so does not

need speculation nor have we been given answers by the free will debate.)), it would mean practically nothing when they are economic and cultural slaves and grooming victims and individually misaligned with their own desires and passions, they are entirely controlled by god-- like a Calvinist's God. Yaldabaoth, she is a Calvinist lord, an anglo-calvinist god, a- a- a- totalitarian god! Gnosticism weeps, how can you escape a totalitarian god? lol... (class consciousness? By definition, considering the utopian-reactionary history of all of leftism and how the proletariat, oppressed, has never ended its oppression but reveled in it, it seems that either class consciousness was a hoax or the proletariat is reactionary, or, most accurately considering the three dictators of humanity and how it has dominated the human mind with little exception, both. This, then, too applies to all the middle-class defenders of capitalism and conservatism and fascism, the proles assimilated into the middle who do the same, the rich for obvious reasons, and also my own class and the class of the animals. The class of the animals are more explicitly and unapologetically reactionary, glorifying the Nature that oppresses them and preferring the alienation of nature, or, in domestic animals (a different class to wild animals, of whom i was referencing), the ignoring of and taking of their alienation and slavery and, in the general class, a lack of action. This is not to say all animals are like this, like it is not to say all proles or middle-class beings are like this, but that the class as a whole, if treated as an organism, and too its class consciousness, acts like this. The class of the youth, my class for whom, for the longest time, i have been a patriot for, is absolutely and undeniably either highly underdeveloped in terms of class consciousness despite being one of the oldest classes, or just plain reactionary. Most already are right away to defend their oppressors, their oppression, and even support and push it onto others, they tend towards defending capitalism and patriarchy and nationalism and whatnot, they ignore their conditions and then blame a random group for their suffering, or specific individuals. Many turn to fascism, a reoccurring phenomena, and almost all never see themselves as a united class, or a class at all, but always a different description of which they obsess over-- a White child, a Male child, a "Rich" child (contradiction caused by thinking your parent's wealth is your own, children are their own unique class with no other class to it, yet always identifying with other classes due to its fragmentation), and too, the black nationalist and pan-africanist child who does not concern himself with the oppression of the youth by culture,

the radical feminist child who advocates for "revolutionary" positions of matriarchy and matriarchal oppression and the continued suffering of the youth class, simply not by pedophilic and straight and sexist and ageist men but by pedophilic and straight and sexist and ageist women, the same "radical feminist" who ignores that, fundamentally, seeing gender as the sum of gender roles, a young girl or a girl who is a minor is a different gender to a older girl or a girl who is an adult, as there are different gender roles between the two (little girl, adult girl, trans adult girl, trans little girl, all girls, experience different gender role expectations and demands in order to be that gender, to pass. Gender, therefore, can further be fragmented into micro-genders when analyzing age and relation to the gender itself, and this gives, to some degree, though this does not need to be justified as that would be validity discourse, justification for the acceptance of transage individuals at least to the gender abolitionist), the Communist or Anarchist child who ignores HIS OWN class struggle to advocate against idpol and for the class struggle of the proletariat, be it because his parents are proles or even if his parents are not proles because he himself wants freedom and identifies himself with proles and not the child class (this is similar to that self-scoring yearning of the want to be a prole found in may '68, referenced and written in jacques camatte's writing 'against domestication' (mythology of the proletariat), marxists.org. Funny how the youth yearn to be proles, when proles see youth as revolutionary very often and very often yearn to be youths... neither are revolutionary, it seems. Despite Jacques Camatte's writings about youth as undomesticated and more free than the elders, the potential of the youth, and how he spoke about the lycee movement in Jacques Camatte's against domestication, marxists.org, I can assure you that, by 2026 and arguably probably ever since covid, where the youth's potential finally fell flat and withered into non-existence, considering 2020 to be the trauma of the end of the future for all youths to come 2020 and onwards, even if they never experienced it, the youth is entirely domesticated and as much slaves as proles. 2020 was the death of the revolutionary youth, and this also explains to me greatly the death of any potential to actually found and create and hold a youth liberationist movement ever since y2k for longer than a few months maybe---- y2k was the first trauma for all youths and onwards about the domestication and end, death, of their future, it was the first strike to the domestication of youths strictly, by ending their future, and 2020 was

the second strike. Hopefully, like a game of bowling, we might optimistically need three strikes and so have one more chance left to achieve a revolutionary awakening of the youth.... before the third strike. Though, i think this unlikely, i have no hope for my class anymore. The third strike will come.), who completely forgets his own class for another and acts as if he is any better than the idpol-ists, and for the anarchist, similarly, advocating for the liberation of everyone but, seemingly, his own class, as youth liberation seems to be the only part of anarchism truly controversial and with a moderate solution, nobody advocates for full youth liberation, and many ancoms argue for the family model, in fact (the young ml is no different to the young anarchist, both defend family and both ignore their own class struggle to go LARP proletarian-hood and yearn to be a prole)! The Child class barely constitutes an identity amongst the child class because it is seemingly, to them, just a bunch of different groups, classes, identities, and peoples who just so happen to be minors--- and majority of them just so happen to justify the oppression of minors. Too, sectarianism amongst youth liberationists and no clear solution, most youth liberationists being leftists (reactionary utopianism, escapism), the absolute and utter lack of real analysis or care about youth liberation or the youth among the youth, and a rejection of any revolutionary activity among the apolitical youths. A fragmented class with no class consciousness, despite being so old, just like the modern proletariat (dissolved into the other classes) if not worse. all this to say that all classes as a singular being tends towards reactionary behaviors, and too, as a class they are reactionary (even the unemployed, though they at least do not work. Again, revolutionary ideology itself is now reactionary in this day and age, the conceptualization and glorification and idealization of the revolutionary, the revolutionary path, and the revolution, is reactionary and nothing can be achieved by the revolutionary--- it is a false dualism, both the revolutionary and reactionary is reactionary, everything in between and outside of it is also reactionary, maybe erase this revolutionary moralism and enjoy yourself... this is why i enjoy the idea of the unemployed like the zeroworker, it is entertaining and fun, and that is all that matters anymore)... But individuals are not reactionary persay (7-5-26 11:33 pm, I was wrong about the following writings, individuality and community itself are forms of alienation and "reactionary"... also, did i not say i would abandon the use of terms like reactionary or revolutionary outside of critiques? It is a moralism

and a falsehood to imagine the revolution or its enemies as real, everything is "reactionary" to those who oppose misery and suffering, as every person usually claims to be in opposition to but usually aren't, though some pride themselves in their non-opposition. Regardless, nobody is at fault anymore, it is a tragedy without a cause, a tragedy that just is-- this is life, or really, this is God's life. even then, this is not salvation, the death of god is not her salvation, it is a tragedy, it is her death, let us not now partake in suicidal idealism-- she is not going to heaven, she is not saved from her horrid life, she has only died a tragic death and will forever continue to be nothing but a tragedy, reduced to a tragedy, that itself a tragedy. Utopia is a tragedy... tragic. Therefore, we also are not being saved, utopia is not our salvation, we are also tragic. Perhaps the next world will be mainländerian-pessimistic in nature due to god's death, though really, i could not know-- nobody can really know about the realm after the death of god.). You will have a revolutionary domestic animal once in a while, a revolutionary middle-class individual, a revolutionary prole, a revolutionary child, and whatnot, class politics is just idpol at this point and your class consciousness will never come, the only way a revolution will come about is not a class revolution, as we have seen every and all class revolutions fail, become reactionary, self-oppressive, fascistic, but a revolution of revolutionary individuals working towards -----i-have-not-figured-out-yet-6/27/26----- . 6/28/2026, what a return to my old revolutionary moralism, how sickening. There are no revolutionary individuals, every being is a reactionary, every being is a disgusting mini-trump or mini-putin, every being is evil, there is no such thing as a revolutionary everything as the absolute itself is reactionary, we are all demons. There will be no revolution, no revolution of beings nor a class revolution, there will be no revolution. Change is not impossible, but no change has been brought around by the reformism we call "revolution"... A complete rejection of reformism and social democracy requires a rejection of revolution and revolutionary ideology, marx is but another fourier.))), and god has, again, doomed us.) (6/12/2026 something:something AM, out)

"He decided that we had to make the best of a bad job(...)"

-Micheal Hauer, 'Jacques Camatte is dead: Wandering, Male Supremacy, Anti-Gender Theory, Holocaust Denialism, Millenarian Confusion, and the humans

who escaped his notice...', Libcom.org-- and in reference to Jean-Jacques Rousseau and his book 'Of the Social Contract.'

the death of utopia.

On what? On Communism and Fourier, though i have been thoroughly against fourier's "utopia", a sickening cultural mess based on an impossibility (the correct alignment of passions is impossible, and now i realize it is also unobtainable... ironically, considering that usually the first assumption one has about the impossible is its unobtainability...), it is clear exactly why Fourier's Utopia (which, as i read more fourierist writings, IS appealing but only insofar as any utopia is.), unlike Marx's Community, is not a return to nature at all (7-14-26 edit: which micheal hauer, in his critique of camatte, has finally denounced as impossible totale-- Communism itself, due to Camatte's theory of the community of capital and Hauer's critique of involution // escape or 'leaving behind' (not a quote), is realized to be impossible, there is no escape from capital and no end to capital, communism is now another impossibility and an unobtainable one as well, just like fourierism and anarchism! Communism, Fourierism, Anarchism, impossibilities, and Primitivism and their depressing and realistic (a solution, not one i enjoy, but certainly a solution) societies outside of states and capital(s), possible but unfavorable! Then, all the communists of the world, all the MLs of the world, all the leftcoms and marxists, they mean nothing now since communism is impossible, just like the anarchists, they are doomed to defeat! They have been stripped from their theory's actual filling, and now, communism must become meaningless in order to make itself an ideology or a possible ideology, such as "anarchism" (which is now not anarchist, though in fact, though really, it never was anarchist... unlike communism, since anarchism is based so deeply in euro-pacifism (the praise of peace and a peaceful society) that it could never actually be anarchist).. Communism no longer means for the communist the end of capital, the sublation of the human community, the return to natural community, the fulfillment of humanity, the end of work, or... those communists who still believe communism to be the above, they are either delusional and impossibly delusion or they are no longer considered communists by those around them and in the world or even them themselves... most often, both, and to that, most often both as

well. No communist in this stage of community is a communist, communism isn't communist, it has become a LARP like anarchism, how funny! Communism is the joke threat-pet of capital, its abuse slave, a toy for it to use when it wants to further continue its productivity, the productivity of Capital and its community's further evolution eternally. Communism is, therefore, in absolute and radical support of Capitalism and will only ever, and can only ever, and has only ever helped, produced for, further developed, aided, and supported Capital and Capitalism, it has only ever encouraged and advanced the processes of Capital and so it has never opposed, abolished, or even harmed Capital at all. Communism is meaningless, a joke of a movement. This is with the eternality of self and culture, which mirrors capital in its inability to be harmed, opposed, destroyed, and its ability to be eternal or at least believe itself to be.. unfortunately making it true. Then, behold, God the femcel.), and instead is highly unnatural (if charles fourier KNOWS his utopia is unnatural is an entirely different question, he acts as if the entire process of becoming from nature to civilization to utopia is entirely natural and he may as well believe so..). Nature is the root of civilization, it is the cause of civilization, and really... civilization is, in a way, natural-- but better described as nature evolving, and so, devolving. Then, civilization is the result of nature's tendency to evolve/devolve, and so the nature of the problem is nature itself. Nature is, under fourier's eye, just as much a misalignment of passions as civilization, and insofar as, modernly, i can define civilization as an ORGANIZED misalignment of passions (the self is the misalignment of passions insofar as it is the organizer of civilization, caused by misaligned passions, and the result and personification/concentration of misaligned passions (as an individual, anthropomorphication)---, the self is the misaligned passions and so the misalignment of passions insofar as they are equally the misaligned part of misaligned passions as they are the passions part of misaligned passions, this is the self-oppression of the unique), then Nature is the first civilization as it is god's first civilization, natural civilization, the divinely-crafted(-without-man) organized misalignment of passions, and all forms of civilization after that are the "unnatural" civilizations, civilization proper, it is man-made (still divinely-man but only through man this time) organized misalignment of passions. The issue originates from the beginning, it is all the way from the start, and so a return achieves nothing insofar as the problem is not fixed. Also, hunter-gatherers were

straggots and culture-humpers, and insofar as heterosexuality and culture are repressive and suppressive and limiting the passions of individuals (In the culturalphilistine writing "me." or whatever its called, lanza says that one of the reasons he opposes culture is its limiting of creativity and thought, its (re/sup)pressive character... i agree from a fourierist lens, that, really, passions are degraded and limited and culturalized by culture, non-cultural passions are outsider passions to culture and cultural passions are pushed and encouraged and praised, the cultural community always comes first for culture (language sees this) and passions are subjected to and made slaves of that community, of culture, and one begins to only be able to express themselves through cultural language, limiting their thought and their passions and their expression, they are imprisoned. One cannot be truly passionate, truly expressive, truly thoughtful under a culture, or under culture itself, passions are freed in the end of culture (this, i believe, is why white cracker art disgusts me so bad, and i mean the real catholic kind of shit, the feces of the albino pope of rome, the truly hideous italian stuff... it is art entirely raped by culture, maybe even skinned!). I already spoke on the passion of sex and heterosexuality's castrating of it, truly heterosexuality is the time-travel incest-baby of the catholic popes, disgusting filth on this world!). One's glorification of nature is one's love of their abuser, a masochism, not even a sexual one too since it is innately heterosexual, it is a boring castrated and psychological masochism that fulfills no passion nor is it attractive outside of its involuntary aesthetic. Really, involution, just like revolution, masks the truth in aesthetics and glorification and rose-tinted glasses. If i was forced to stick by my culture, the disgusting american and dominican cultures, i would probably drown myself in the nearest shit-infected river! Culture is Disgusting, a cruel and horrid being, a slave master who dares to call itself the closest form of connection.... family is the death of passionate association, Charles Fourier spoke and critiqued family-proper in his book the theory of the four social movements but i take it further, all forms of family is the death of passionate association and consensual love, it is the death of necrophilia/desire and it is the antithesis to the passionate association of utopia and neo-hyperfourierism.

ON the primitivists and my old critique of anarcho-primitivism... anarcho-primitivism is a contradiction, really, for two reasons... Primitivism itself means nothing, it speaks of return to primitive modes of being, yet this varies from

primitivist to primitivist and does not tell me about the content of their society-- hunter-gatherer primitivists and tribalist primitivists and camatte-inspired primitivists (primitive community) and pre-industrial primitivists are all positions of primitivism i have seen online, and too, different forms of primitivism.

Wikipedia, an unreliable source, only recognizes hunter-gatherer primitivism and its critique of industrial society, and really, this is false. While pre-industrial (as in neither tribalist nor hunter-gatherer nor camattist) primitivists are now all eco-fascists and whatever, the distinction between tribal, camattist, and hunter-gatherer primitivists still exist even if unrecognized by the wiki gods. The Tribal primitivist is not "anarchist", or, anti-statist abolition of unjust hierarchy and coercion and, importantly, authority and dominance-- this can be framed as 'anarchism is the abolition of non-consensual domination, oppression, authority, and hierarchy', which also means a world fully based on consent as the abolition of coercion implies, and as we know, consent is an impossibility----- the tribal primitivist is not an anarchist because they do not care about coercion or an opposition to authority or domination, in fact, in wars and conflicts, they thoroughly enjoy domination and enmity (enmity, especially, shows the distinction between tribalism and anarchism as clear as day-- anarchism is, to a degree, very peaceful and utopian, which tribes enjoy the opposite... they are not like fourier's lands, anarchism however is descendant of fourier through kropotkin through marx through fourier himself>) (something i learned from micheal hauer on 'Jacques Camatte is Dead: Wandering, Male Supremacy, Anti-Gender Theory, Holocaust Denialism, Millenarian Confusion, and the Humans who Escaped his Notice...' on libcom.org)... this does not mean they are not non-state societies, but that non-state societies are not anarchist, and anarchism itself is a function of the state, an impossibility who's identity is a function of the state if i am to be specific, and who's identity is the ideology of anarchism. I said anarchism isn't anarchist, this is true, non-state society isn't anarchist either, it is better than anarchism insofar as it is possible, it does what was accepted as the common theme of all forms of anarchism, left or right, the abolition of the state (though the first usage of anarchism by a self-proclaimed anarchist was to describe a federalism, a democracy, a gross kind, a minarchy... and the anarcho-collectivists were not much different, and kropotkin's anarchism was focused not just on the abolition of the state but also on capitalism and other forms of oppression, and modern anarchists

reject hierarchy at all and domination... so the 'common theme' of all forms of anarchism is not quite true, proudhon was technically still a statist, and bakunin not much different. marx was more of an anarchist than proudhon, ironically.). Tribes, according to (Micheal Hauer, 'Jacques Camatte is Dead: Wandering, Male Supremacy, Anti-Gender Theory, Holocaust Denialism, Millenarian Confusion, and the Humans who Escaped his Notice...' on libcom.org), only become states after a process of transformation caused by the overgrowth of the tribe and no way to divide the tribe appropriately. Tribes become states due to two things then, and really, these two things in unity, not one or the other alone, a). Overpopulation, and b). A lack of Territory, a scarcity in land... or at least, that is the typical reason for why a tribe cannot split up, though i do not deny the possibility for other reasons for the splitting of tribes and i do not think micheal hauer was denying this either, it is exactly the inability of the tribe to split that causes the need for statism is the main point, regardless. Therefore tribes are not states, and... modern non-state societies may have to adopt statism once they inevitably overpopulate and realize that they do not have enough land cuz crackers took it all. Now, Hunter-Gatherer Primitivists.... a more popular kind nowadays, also popular amongst primitivists who learned about it through wikipedia and do not actually read any primitivists like unabomber, zerzan, camatte, and other notable texts of whom i did not memorize the authors due to their other works being less popular (example, 'against his-tory, against Leviathan!' by fredy perlman, i did not memorize this man's name at all but the text was fine). Hunter-Gatherer societies are, really, too, perfectly non-statist societies, not even quasi-statist (tribes are not quasi-statist either), but to describe them as anarchist still requires the ignoring of the other aspects of anarchism that makes anarchism nothing but a function of the state and an impossible society, that being rejection of unjust hierarchy (and so all hierarchy insofar as no hierarchy can be justified), domination, authority, and basing society on consent or "voluntary association" (this is where noveltist got his idea of the voluntary social relation, which is impossible as well!)--- hunter-gatherers have no need for consent, no need to ask the question or value consent, this is a problem of civilization and the state, any involuntary action can be finished with a simple fight (or, if need be, murder-- in case of rapists for example, victim killing the rapist, whatnot.. non-state societies tend towards not using social control, as said in micheal hauer's 'Jacques Camatte is Dead: Wandering, Male Supremacy, Anti-

Gender Theory, Holocaust Denialism, Millenarian Confusion, and the Humans who Escaped his Notice...' on libcom.org), consent is not the issue they seek to solve so they let it solve themselves.. domination, again, is easily seen again and again in the act of hunting, and family in hunter-gatherer society is still a form of authority and domination, relation between woman and child, and no consent exists in childbirth, and hierarchy always exists in family (adult-child, natural hierarchy, the kind that is in nature and the culture called Nature, also the kind justified by ancoms and primitivists alike... like the ones ancaps claim justify capitalism yet do not actually justify capitalism but family and the economy of nature), yet there is no state here. Hunter-gatherer society is not based on consent, hunter-gatherer societies have domination and authority (though an anarchist will yell, "it is not authority if the 'authority' comes from natural hierarchy", and i say, okay natural aristocrat, fine.. that is your naturalist perspective, and uhm, appeal to nature idfk.), yet they are most definitely non-state societies! Then, the camattist primitivist, the only form of primitivism to never be tried in praxis before (hunter-gatherers and tribesmen have existed for who knows how long and still exist today, camatte's human community still isn't even here since involution has not come yet!); Camattist primitivist denies both tribal primitivism (stationary) and hunter-gatherer primitivism (nomadic), and instead proposes that his human community will 'beyond nomadism and sedentarism.' (the wandering of humanity, this world we must leave and other essays, jacques camatte, autonomedia, libcom.org--- full quote, found in (micheal hauer's 'Jacques Camatte is Dead: Wandering, Male Supremacy, Anti-Gender Theory, Holocaust Denialism, Millenarian Confusion, and the Humans who Escaped his Notice...' on libcom.org) is "It is obvious that this cannot be a return to the type of nomadism practised by our distant ancestors who were gatherers. Men and women will acquire a new mode of being beyond nomadism and sedentarism."). What this entails and what form of primitive society he is suggesting, he does not tell us, because despite his overt escapism (which is the escapism of utopian socialists ((soo... fourier, huh? The sun is the god of fourier, and too is the sun the demiurge of bataille in a way, are these two things not true?)) (and reformists), different from the covert escapism of scientific socialists (and revolutionaries)), he is still a scientific socialist and so denies the top-down or planned organizing of society by a theory or idea (utopianists, people thinking you can build utopia from the top, from an

idea, and not organically), so communism is still something that forms organically and cannot be fully known or understood in the capitalist mode of being, communism is still unable to be built but only can be developed organically, he still refuses to fully accept the escapist delusionalism of the utopian so still implies he cannot know about the future communist society and mode of being, that he cannot tell you the future primitivist society, he cannot tell you what fucking form of primitivism he is advocating for, instead he just vaguely hints. Camattist primitivism is the primitivism of the future, really, he is not really fully returning but instead sublating the past and returning to it, sublating the distinction between hunter-gatherer and tribesman, to get rid of their faults, and returning to this sublated primitive community--- the human community... this is, actually, just the main goal of marxism, at least, if we are to read from camatte's marx in Jacques camatte's Capital and Community, marxists.org, where all this that was happening was described as originally supposed to be the primitive community's self-sublation, the primitive community's transition into the Human Community proper, in which capitalism and feudalism and all those forms are transitory steps of the turning of Primitive community, primitive communism, into human community, real communism, the transitory steps of the sublation of Community. This is human history according to my reading of jacques camatte's reading of marx in Jacques camatte's Capital and Community on marxists.org. Jacques Camatte claims not to be a marxist, and he means this insofar as he is not a marxist of other people's readings of marx, he is only really a marxist, and past/beyond a marxist, of his reading of marx. Jacques Camatte's primitivism, and he does not call it primitivism, for good reason, is more accurately described as Communism (sublated Primitivism), and so he calls himself a Communist, yet he still falls under the category of primitivist since his communism is unique. Jacques Camatte is most obviously not an anarchist, his Communism is not an anarchism, he could tell you this himself and it does not take a genius to write a camattist critique of anarchism.... but Jacques Camatte, in the end, in the most developed level of his thought, is a non-state society advocate, his communism is a non-state society, just has never been really tried. His Involution is still, due to this sublation, kind of the same thing as a revolution, only now it emphasizes the RETURN portion of the communist revolution and underemphasizes the PROGRESS portion (which still exists under camatte since he is FINISHING the process of community's self-

sublation, he is LEAVING capital and STARTING communism, that would ultimately still be progressing past capital just without ending it, though he does plan to end it by starving it to death. His involution is still a revolution, just with the reverse emphasis, since revolution tends to emphasize the PROGRESS portion and underemphasize the RETURN portion-- as at the time, the RETURN portion was not as attractive as the PROGRESS portion, and now, the PROGRESS portion is not as attractive as the RETURN portion, and because now PROGRESS is seen through the lens of PROGRESS for capital while back then RETURN was seen as the RETURN to (if we are speaking about marx and marx's lifetime, feudalism, and we are speaking about marxism and all of marxism before the real domination of capital aka the community of capital, capitalism... i want to emphasize the latter over the former, that return used to be seen as returning to/for capitalism (reactionaries are capitalists, says the american communist are whatever!) and now progress is seen as progress to/for capitalism, and progress used to be seen as progress to/for communism, and now return is seen as return to/for communism.. there was an inversion, and Camatte's Involution is a response to this inversion, it is his invariance, which he often says is the most variant thing (multiple times in This World we must leave and other essays, autonomedia, jacques camatte, libcom.org).). No, his involution is just the invariant modern-day form of revolution, as discussed in the other sentence, and so he sticks by his roots forever. Then... all three forms of primitivism are non-state societies and yet, as i have shown through using the utopian portrait of anarchism that many anarchists and especially anarcho-leftists have in their minds (no noconsensual domination or authority, everything consensual or, if not consensual, at least justified, no hierarchy, whatever and whatever else), not anarchist insofar as being anarchist means for a society to be formed in the way anarchism imagines society should be formed... it is non-statist non-anarchist societies that have defined almost all of human pre-history, it is non-statist non-anarchist societies that have been tried and practiced successfully historically without falling back into statism (all self-proclaimed statist nations or movements have fallen into statism (catalonia and the ansynd and like most anarchist revolutions that succeeded in making a state, if only temporarily...) or quasi-statism (makhnovschina, many TAZs, most anarchist and marxist movements that didn't achieve some successful revolution), not 'anarchist societies' (impossible). Unless the anarchists are to call non-state

societies 'actually existing anarchism' or something (anarcho-stalin!), there is no way to define it as anarchist in the usual and historical utopian way people imagine anarchism... it is hugely different. then, you cannot be an anarchist and a primitivist, anarcho-primitivists are mistaken, they are really just primitivists. I do not know when i transferred from point one to point two, but i did... point one was that primitivism as a term should stop being used as the name of a specific ideology and start being used as an umbrella since it has radically different tendencies and theories within it, like the tribal primitivist, the hunter-gatherer primitivist, and the camattist primitivist (the pre-industrial primitivist who pretends living in a cabin with his white wife is what unabomber meant when he said to abolish the industrial society is a larper, and unabomber hated ecofascists like them). And, as primitivism continues to grow, it will develop more and more radically different tendencies and, like a real tribe, it will have to abandon this term "primitivism" as a sole description of the idea and pick up specifics-- i only say this because many primitivists just say primitivism and it leaves me confused-- like, which form?-- which is kind of funny that primitivism will have to behave like a tribe in this way and split up due to overpopulation, quite a fun little jest. Point two was that Primitivism is not anarchist, that non-state societies aren't anarchist, and that this distinction is important and should be seen with a sense of pride-- thank god you lot are not like those anarchists! Anyways, that is all i had to say on the primitivists, hope you lot enjoyed---- 7-8-26 1:00 am finished, i was inspired after watching a primitivist youtuber's video, that being (diodtheanarchist)s' debate with Richard Spencer, who-- admittedly, at first, i thought he was Hubert Spencer and this primitivist had brought him back from the dead for a debate on social darwinism... i then realized who richard spencer is, and not quite as cool. Seeing as i had solved the issue of absolute abolition by fragmenting god (which, the title, fragments of an absolute, was written before i had realized the solution was fragmenting the absolute, which is funny to me), then i critiqued the fragmenting of the absolute as just as bad as absolute abolition, seeing as both are full-sublations of god, i think i have realized something on the absolute and the problem of the absolute... that there is no solution. We simply have to live with the fact that what is impossible is impossible. There is no utopia. Now, my goal appears to me to be, for the rest of this book, finding an alternative to the non-state societies advocated by primitivism, to find a best-case-scenario

that doesn't end up reducing me to another slave of culture/nature (or, since i am a girl, even worse than that). Uhm, on anarchism as an impossibility, i am explicitly and entirely speaking about anarchism as a society (mode of being for the collective), not anarchy- anarchism as a mode of being for the individual... anarchy, individualist and egoist and stirnerian and whatnot anarchists, are not in any way or form the typical societal anarchism i mean when i speak on the impossibility of anarchist utopia-- hell, renzo novatore praised nature and the natural aristocracy and gave no care for (what bookchin now calls social anarchism), stirner spoke on authority and domination with no problem and cared only about the spook's ownership of man because he had it in his heart to care for man, not because he saw an issue with it morally, and no egoist finds any moral problem with the violation of another's consent, only that it also harms the offender and the offender's psyche due to uhh empathy and uhmm emotion and whatnot idk (people with aspd replace the former, empathy, with other things, but in the end they still replace empathy and so are not, like ableists believe, 'naturally inclined to murder coldly and calculatingly', barely any individuals with aspd are murderers or were historically murderers) and so most egoists would not kill since it constitutes self-harm for the sake of self-harm and brings them no joy or pleasure... Then, for the individualist anarchist, there is no problem with a lack of consent, with domination, with hierarchy, with the state, with authority, and whateverelse, but there is a problem with all of these things when directed at them and when it harms them-- i am not saying this as an insult, really, this is good as far as i care, it is a beauty that too is separate and should be unique from anarchism, i had not read the unique and its property by max stirner twice for no reason! The issue with the state to the individual anarchist is that it harms that specific, that unique, individual, individual anarchist and limits him without his consent, not any general opposition like anarchism has, against hierarchy and domination and state and everything usually for the sake of utopia or whatnot, and often nowadays, for its own sake. Individual anarchists are not guaranteed to be absolute anti-statists for the sake of anarchism like actual anarchists, sickening impossible anarchists, claim to be--- individual anarchists are against that which harms them and harms them without them allowing it to harm them, that which takes their autonomy, and they simply find that governments tend to do this. It is not 'anarchism' insofar as it does not care for anarchist society, for anarchist

utopia, for what anarchism opposes or supports, nor anarchism itself, it only cares for the specific individual that is it, that person, that being. This, again, is not the impossible anarchist that i speak about, this is a possible and willing egoist! A beautiful egoist, really! One that i still oppose the ideology of, unfortunately, due to my theory on alienation. the good part is that egoism does not push any real form of society for me to have to actually oppose, it is not concerned about that, only concerned about the unique being... not to say that max stirner hadn't laid out some ideas on society and voluntary associations, he most certainly did, but those ideas could create any (voluntary) form of society from far-left to far-right both economically and culturally (without, of course, spooks and myths, which both the actual far-left and far-right, redundant since they are the same thing-- far-rightism, have.). that being said, i do still stand by my critiques of bob black and my belief that he is the most leftist individual claiming to not be a leftist i have ever met-- and especially cuban in thought-- and despite my praise of individualists and primitivists, i still consider bob black's wild justice to be anarcho-democracy and his economic beliefs to be anarcho-leftist-- in this way, unlike the post-left 'anarchists', he is especially an Anarchist-- by which i mean he really does advocate for an impossible form of Anarchism just like the anarchists, and while with some differences (his differences with bookchin to me is like proudhon's difference with kropotkin, in which there are entirely different ideas of anarchism, one quasi-statist (minarchy) and the other quasi-statist in a less overt and clear way, yet both are impossible due to their anarchism.) that make him impossible to be called a full-blooded anarchist (unlike him being called a full-blooded cuban or castroist), he still is way more of an Anarchist in this way than the post-left beauties he inspired... He is, basically and ironically, on the verge of advocating for a possible ideology, on the verge of no longer being anarchist, of actually being post-left, he is the gap between the post-left and anarchy, he is the only real "post-left anarchist" insofar as he is the only "anarchist" in the post-left, this is an insult. anarchists to me are idiots who can never achieve their impossible want, and in fact, even in the (supposed) 'anarchist' society they argue for (like bakunin) or write about (like kropotkin) or try to achieve (like the catalonians) or create (like makhno), their ideal society of anarchism is always missing! Anarchists are, in a way, alienated from anarchism and cope through quasi-statism... that is the failure of all anarchist nations from past and to come, it is all marxian quasi-statism and

so doomed to fail, it could never realize anarchism at all. And bob black, being a post-left anarchist, realizes that the anarcho-leftism (what i call 'anarchism') cause as an impossible and stupid one, yet, he takes it up from its roots and calls it new with fourier and wild justice and whatnot! He can never really separate himself from the anarchists, he is stuck to them, even when he critiques them he is stuck to them like a tumor. Anyways, that was all i had to say :3. 7-9-26 People act like marxism's religiousness, its millenarianism, its manichean morality is surprising, but it is a crucial aspect to socialism at all-- Fourier's Socialism / Utopianism was a sublation, perfecting, and evolving past the church and religion proper, a post-christianity that was strictly against the disgusting revolting catholics and their horrid morality, and even moses hess's Communism was interpreted very religiously and in terms of milleniums and such (fourier had, to a degree, this idea of teleological rise to utopia, though it appears in his theory of the four movements that he also thought of an eternal cycle where there is teleological decay then another rise and another decay and so on and so on... Fourier was actually less of a christian than marx and especially less of a christian than moses hess the Zionists!)-- and moses hess, let us not forget, was a zionist and saw communism through a sort of spiritual zionist conception.. Marx learned from moses hess but deeply separated from him, but not separate enough to get rid of the religious ties that plagued and birth socialism and communism alike... Camatte makes his religious aspect especially clear, but not knowingly (as far as i know), in all his writings. This line of socialists and communists, the general generational bloodline of leftists, which now even separate themselves from their leftist ancestors in the lines of the post-leftists and ultra-leftists alike (but especially more the post-leftists who openly reject leftism total), has all been formed from and retain a religious element, one that is especially and specifically abrahamic, or really, christian (sometimes taking more influence from gnosticism, and sometimes taking more influence from fourierism, but either way leftism is a post-christian movement.. and i cannot, even if i reject leftism, rip this element out of my thought since i come from this lineage like all post-leftists and ultra-leftists, so instead i embrace it.). This is something unremovable that plagues all modern thought that originates in a leftism or an ideology who is ancestor to leftism, we have been mercilessly infected with religiousity, even the primitivists and egoists have a religious tendency-- and i say religion here to mean the same as spirituality, egoists seem

more like the 'spiritual not religious' crowd since they tend to reject god and utopia and millenarian thought and manichean morals and so feel especially anti-god yet, reading the ego and its own, you can see the spiritual aspect in metaphor and relations and such (not to say max stirner was a spiritualist but that his terminology and thought is influenced by and accepts the spiritual)-- primitivists are pretty openly religious though, they do not stray from the basic leftist idea of 'the solution' or 'the utopia' or 'the end of capitalism, the better world', and really, seeing the outdated idea of primitive communism and the neo-dated idea of camattist communism/primitivism, they don't even really stray away from the leftist idea of marxian communism, or the marxian idea of communism to emphasize marx here (zerzan says he is anti-leftist??? Huh..), at all-- or at least not very well! Primitivism is pretty marxist, or at least communist (leftist i guess would be the real 'at least' here), and does not shed off any of its leftist, communist, marxian, nor religious skin (in any meaningful way)! Primitivists are ultimately pretty leftist, but seeing diodtheanarchist's video debating richard spencer, primitivism is also entirely able to be perceived as Post-right insofar as it would also work as a natural conclusion of taking rightist and far-right thought so far down that it ends up rejecting rightism and shedding its rightist skin, becoming anew, becoming primitive--- primitivist, primitivism is post-right and also is entirely left, just an alternative left, alt-left.... heehee the 'post-right alt-left' (or, 'alt-left post-right') is such a stupid way of describing thisss a faa aas fa e yeah. Which is funny since now lefties accuse post-leftists of often being alt-right, but the primitives are alt-left and post-right! Whatever. From fourier to camatte, there sticks that christian, that religious, that especially abrahamic way of thinking, doesn't it really make you think about how short the time between the two has actually been? on RQs and Queers, validity discourse is dumb and exclusion does not help us solve real and actual problems like heterosexuality and abuse and the oppression of the whole of the world (god's self oppression where not even god is responsible)... i could care less about the validity of a lesbian or Bi-lesbian to a Trans-russian or Trans-chicken to a necrophile or sadist to whatever else, identity is meant to be abolished and self meant to be fragmented anyways and there will be no issue of dysphoria or uncomfot once you are entirely not-even-yours and truly liberated, what we should focus on is actually solving the issue at hand which all have the same solution (identity is oppressive-- i may sound like big brother

1984 george orwell here but believe it or not big brother and oceania's patriotism is an identity and so what you are thinking of is personal identity when i mean all identities-- this means bake when you want, fish when you want, feminine when you want, (future word for dog-like attributes) when you want, (future words for (insert identity here)-like attributes) when you want, on and on... Vikkian style. This should be paired with the death of culture, capital, and self-- as self is already implied, saying self here is redundant. eventually, even these attributes and ideas and concepts will be nihilized and naturally and slowly eradicated into the pure comfort of the necrophile orgy... always orgy metaphors, damn it.)-- which i used to think was the death of god, now i do not even know, but i refuse to reduce myself into talking about fucking validity and whether (insert identity here) is 'valid or not!!!' it is a question of pure unimportance when we are met with slaughtering and misery by the oppressors regardless of our validity... As far as the oppressors are concerned, we are all invalid, and all deserve total annihilation. Identity is not something truly able to be defined, it is something that one can only ever really understand their own entirely, and will only ever misunderstand another's insofar as each person's identity (or identities) are unique and cannot be comprehended outside of their 'unique' (or, for r/fullegoism, their 'ego'). I will never understand your identity, you will never understand my identity, so i will only ever be able to speak on my identity, or at least, how i interpret my own... And so when i speak on transgenderism i am speaking as a transgender girl, i am speaking as a minor transgender girl who is unique like everyone else (pretty un-unique to think about, but wtvr), one who could only ever be misunderstood (like everyone else can only ever be misunderstood, this is why i used abomination often instead of reading), i am speaking as one who always felt excluded and invalidated by the defining of transgender, one who feels that the limitation on the conceptualization of transgenderism always ends up tearing me away from it, even when it theoretically doesn't or wouldn't... I believe that transgender-ness cannot be defined, or, transgender cannot be defined. We know what it is like, the gist, the 'becoming a different gender than the one assigned at birth', the general idea, but i do not think we can define it. A transgender girl like me is not someone who feels dysphoric about their gender and so are trans because of said dysphoria (i like my body and do not feel it as masculine), a transgender girl like me is not someone who physically transitions or wants to transition into a girl-- one who has the will

and want to physically become a girl (though i would prefer such, i would be fine living my entire life without it, better than fine in fact and feel that such a limit makes me a liar), neither one who transitions their gender role and traditions from masculine ones to feminine ones and identify with the gender roles that define the gender of girl (i do not identify with oppression nor gender roles, if i partake in gender roles it is my choice and i do not identify WITH it and do not have to BE it), to me (emotionally at least) a girl is not just the gender role of being a girl nor being perceived as a girl, it is not physically or mentally or traditionally being a girl nor is it being a girl in the way a terf or republican thinks of it, i am a girl but i am not and never will be societally a girl and i do not wish to be, society is repulsive and their acceptance is background noise as far as i can concern myself, I am a girl but i am not society's idea of a girl, i am not anyone else's idea of a girl, i am a girl and i see myself as such. I do not care about becoming or transitioning or passing or anything else, they are pleasures but not necessities (for other transgender people it very well can and may be necessities, not only that but also important and urgent necessities, i do realize this and wish to emphasize this is my experience and so only applies to me and so please do support other transgenders in the way THEY wish), I am already a girl. What makes me transgender and not a man is not something you can describe, it is not a definition you can neatly create, and it shouldn't be. Definitions kill passions, we are irrational and beautiful creatures, we do not need limitations to make us miserable! I- on trans-ids, i feel as though it is different, every trans-id is different to each-other, but none of them should be limited either to definition or logic or even the concept of possibility, things can only get better through liberation. Uhm.. on Trans-Race. Race is a social construct, the oppression that defines Race is obviously real however, and the argument that you cannot switch races because you cannot experience the oppression of cis-race people can show to be transphobic towards transgenders because, again, women are oppressed and men are oppressors. I understand that comparing transrace and transgender is problematic, comparing trans-ids to transgender or even other trans-ids at all is ignoring and erasing their differences and limiting them, but i want to focus on the shared common 'social construct' aspect. These are both social constructs formed through misery, blood, and oppression, and we are not going to be saying one is worse than the other as an argument because that is just a whole ignoring of intersectionality and a shallow view of the

world-- oppression has common solution, it is not a composition but something that should unite us in common struggle. On, for example, Trans-Cultural people... I would never understand why one would want to transition into a culture nor how people are proud about or identify with their culture, culture seems to me a sickness that has entered my skin and forced my being into a miserable state of passionless communication and experience where all i can find is limits and nothing i do can ever free me from the chains of the person i have become because of it, but that is just me and so irrelevant for this discussion-- genders to a degree have their own sort of quasi-culture,, gender roles and gender traditions and how gender has a role in the creation of your self, the way you communicate and understand, and the way you (experience (being))(if culture is its definition found here(<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/culture>), gender does fill out many but not all of the requirements, or at least gender has its own quasi-culture which many often just attribute to being part of gender.)... it is not exactly a culture, Culture is something very different and to ignore such a difference is to stunt the development of one's understanding of the societal role of culture. Transcultural individuals usually will not understand personally the struggles of and the oppression of the culture they are transitioning to, since they have not experienced them yet, but transcultural individuals and trans-racial individuals as a whole do experience their own forms of oppression (to a degree i wish to say, and i know comparing may seem insensitive, that as a trans girl i ultimately grew up not oppressed like a girl would be, i was given the priviledge of malehood, i could never personally understand the oppression of cis women-- as a trans girl i experience trans-misogyny and the oppression of the trans-girl. To a degree i wish to say that, being a trans girl, you are never really the same gender as cis girl no matter how well you pass, the same identity i spoke about liberating also totally vores me and does not allow me to escape, a trans girl is ultimately stuck being a trans girl for all their life and, so, are always treated differently than cis girls, they are in the end, as much as it sucks to say, their own gender category. Transgender-girls and cis-girls, girls categorized by their experience with the oppression of the patriarchy, what even is a 'girl'.. there is no unified gender there, neither with man, only trans girls and cis girls. Separated and never able to achieve what they really want, to be a girl. Then, trans girls aren't cis girls and will never understand that exact form of oppression, they are not just (trans and girls, as people frame it,) but

only ever (trans-girls, trans but not 'girls' if we think 'girls' are cis girls, trans girls stuck in infinite misgendering in their own identity). Ultimately, as a (unique individual who is a) trans girl, i am even if i can try not to be, still, bothered by this. It is a tragedy, yes, and an oppressive fact of identity and gender. I will always be, even as a girl, "non-binary" insofar as i am not the binary cis-man and cis-woman, i am not cis, and so my existence in the binary is an issue for it and i am expelled. I am not a 'girl' in the binary sense even when i wish to be a girl simply enough, (this is not me coming out as non-binary-girl i am speaking about myself as a trans girl and simply that.) i am alienated from my nature and reduced to a lesser. I am considered not a girl, not a real girl, different from a girl eternally so by my own identity. I will never understand what it is like to be a 'real girl', i will always be external to 'girlhood' and 'really being a girl', i am 'non-girl' and it sucks. Anyways, i digress, my point is that if our connections to a social construct, our right to identify with a social construct, is directly tied to our ability to understand the oppression and misery of those under the social construct (or, to be more specific, cis-(social-construct) people's oppression and misery), then what right do i have to be trans or be a girl? I could never be a girl, feel what a girl feels oppressed and tormented by patriarchy, i can only ever feel what i do feel, only be what i am, a trans-girl, a trans-girl's misery and oppression under the patriarchy.) and identify with the culture and its oppression in a different way, insofar as the oppression of trans-(race) individuals is a form of the oppression of (race) individuals. the argument falls into an issue where the answer depends on the validity of transracial individuals (aka if the oppression of transracial individuals is a form of the oppression of racial individuals), and seeing as it is an argument against transracial individuals, it solves itself in affirming itself, like a circle, it is a circular reasoning--- a, transracial people cannot become the race they identify with because they cannot experience the oppression of said race, b, transracial people cannot experience the oppression of the race they identify with because they are not valid, c, transracial people are not valid because they cannot become the race they identify with, $((a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c \rightarrow) \infty)$. Transcultural things are more of a delicate issue due to culture's nature, and how one cannot unlearn culture (fucking-who knows how long i've tried, if i could i would lobotomise myself if that would unculture me but not even that! This american and dominican way of being has tormented my very soul since i began to breath (funny story, i was actually born

unwilling to, or more accurately, unable to breath, and they had to force me into breathing due to it. I often think that the doctors making me breathe was probably the worst thing to happen to me, i could have died then and there and not deal with this bullshit), it is still a curse and i could not possibly know how anyone could feel happy for community like that, the community of culture is a community of suffering with people i'd rather die than communicate with, i fucking hate americans and i could've gone without being dominican, but in the end i wont delude myself in thinking switching to another culture or pretending like i do not have a culture (an impossible thing) will save me from this, it is not as simple as identity like it is for transracial or transcultural issue, it is a question of nature, communication, community, being, and life itself, and i cannot answer this correctly. Here, i agree more with Lanza than will wood when it comes to culture, though i feel that both of them dislike and go against culture-- Will wood famously claimed in 'vampire culture' "hey fuck your culture, i aint got no culture".. this is an identification with a lack of culture, it is rejecting one's identification with culture, but it is not freeing oneself from culture as i feel like will wood claims it to be or at least implies it to be... You are not saved from the slavery under culture just because you pretend it isn't there, certainly culture still controlls you but only under another dysphoric way added on too, now.. Will Wood usually sees anti-culture transgressively here in vampire culture, while Lanza sees it more tragically and unescapable, anti-culture is not a solution to culture, it is not the path to the end of culture, it is a weak whine from a dying creature begging for culture to stop, to go away, for culture to die and let the crying being feel a moment of liberty before its life pathetically ends. Will Wood falls for counterculture, Lanza recognizes both as the same and cries in sorrow, in tragedy. THEN, agreeing with lanza that will wood's solution is false, i can only say that lanza's whining is just as annoying and try to find my own solution for culture that does not fall for psuedo-progressive bullshit. I like will wood, do not get me wrong, they are simply misguided. So then, i cannot claim in any good faith that identifying as Acultural or Aracial solves anything, and even to identify as Aspecies or Aindividual does not solve anything either, the question is more than just a question of identification, it is one of slavery. So, i am dominican-american but only insofar as i am a slave to these cultures and wish nothing more than to annihilate these cultures, i do not identify with these cultures nor find myself patriotic for them, i

am simply part of these cultures by force exerted onto me.), one could say that transcultural individuals will always have a bit of their old culture even if they do manage to assimilate into whatever culture they are becoming. I do not think this is invalidating one can learn a culture and assimilate into the culture quite fine. Trans-species is a question similar to trans-racial but most lgbtq teens will not care if you identify as an animal because at least it isn't a race since people from a race are, to them, people, and people from a non-human species are, to them, not (people). I would have to say, to use consistent logic, that one cannot be trans-species because one does not experience the oppression of and can never understand the oppression of a non-human species, one can never really be a part of their community, that it is invalid and speciesist... i have no intent on doing that and i am sure that it is the least of the animals' (literal slaves having their natural community be eradicated once for the human community's oppression of animals, twice for the community of capital's oppression of animals, and having their lives and value stripped from them-- one side domesticated and made unable to live properly in nature, another side used as literal mass-murder fodder for the meat industry and other industries reliant on animal torture and murder, and many other sides for the other sub-classes of animals.) issues at the current moment. And too, insofar as one advocates for the abolition of race and the abolition of culture, one cannot deny that transracial individuals help the process. The Trans-Species comparison makes more sense when you remember that a species as a whole shares, to a degree, a common culture ("human culture", "dog culture", whatnot..), trans-species therefore counts as a form of trans-culture, and is therefore similar to but with many differences that are to be stressed from Trans-racial (it is not racist to say this, animals are people too and i am not comparing race to species out of some form of race-realism, i am saying species is socially constructed, which it is.). Regardless of whatever before this, validity discourse itself only works as a distraction and a misleading of the liberationist potential of the queers-- insofar as the question of queer revolution is to liberate all the passions of man, liberate the identity of man, make all identities meaningless and deterritorialize them from their original limited oppressive forms and to melt and reform them based on the individual uniqueness of each being, insofar as a queer revolution destroys "man" and "woman" but allows for the identification of oneself as a man (meaninglessly, man being anything, no longer the male genital or aesthetic or gender role, just "man"

as a word and as an identity with no definition-- this is true liberation of identity) or woman, validity discourse completely is then irrelevant and even reactionary (if i am to use psuedo-moralist rational words again), as it defines identities, limits identities, reterritorializes instead of deterritorializes, it limits the passions of man and still end up reducing them to slaves of spooks, roles, ideas, definitions, ways of acting, validity, truth, reason, and rationality, all oppressive things. Validity discourse kind of constitutes a Norm (using the term from radeviance..) and so sabotages the queer solution, the fourierist end of limitation or oppression, and the neurodivergent murder (positively) of reason and rationality... It recreates heteronormativity (see the theory of homonormativity), it assimilates queers into modern society and breeds exclusionism (lgb without T is a result of validity discourse), it ends the revolutionary potential of queer individuals and recreates a queer community inside of the community of capital where they are given a false and toxic sense of safety and community-- one that is shallow. If one is to truly go on in the path of the liberation of all and the nihilization of all identities, the end of oppression and its after-effects, one must not engage in validity discourse and what is valid or not, because not only are these irrelevant questions considering that, after a queer liberation, all people will be absolutely free to identify and be and no more forms of oppression or definition or limitation will exist (to deny this is to deny the queer-liberationist revolution), validity discourse is also the result of and a way to maintain the modern queer community dominated by the community of capital, a shallow false solution for the queer struggle, a mystified dome where the queers live subbjected to demiurge capital and culture and self, where they forget their revolutionary potential and fall into the utopian socialist delusion of creating a community here and now IN the oppression FOR the oppressed, when the oppressed will never have a true community during this stage of oppression, this stage of real domination. To support Validity discourse and engage in it is to support and engage in and continue the existence of the false world of the modern queer community, assimilated into society and now trying to mirror society and adapt to it through limitations, reasons and rationality, definitions, and the suppression of passions-- it is becoming heterosexual, i am saying, the modern queer community is the heterosexualization of the queers and their assimilation and normalization into society, it is the death of their liberation and liberty, and this is created and maintained by validity discourse-- we must oppose both the

modern queer community and the enemies of the modern queer community at the same time and alike, we must stand for true queer liberation, and so, we must not support neither the modern queer assimilationists and their validity discourse nor the anti-queer hetero abusers and their oppressive agenda, we must strike both down for what they truly are-- two anti-queer anti-liberation and pro-oppression movements in a false dualism with each-other. To not engage in validity discourse is to focus on the real problem (which includes rejecting democracy (INCLUDING BOB BLACK's anarcho-democracy and whatnot. Yes, still, i think bob black's wild justice is a shitty democrat idea that simply transfers the dynamic of the society over man through the voting of the people, or, society over man through the people, to society over man through the action of the individual, or, society over man through the individual.. all social control, all consequences, all punishments, all moralisms, individualisms, socialisms, communities, must be abolished! No individual over another! Also, abolish cars i fucking hate cars-- they represent another extension of selfhood, of alienation, in a physical external material form, that is, it is a technological creation of pure narrow egoism and a lack of wealth and sociality, it separates one from the most basic pleasure, that is, walking with another and speaking earnestly with them. It also is one of the most serious and uncomedic things, a pure lack of parody.) no matter what.), aka, the problem of the liberation of nihilization of all identities and the end of oppression, and how to achieve it, and the actualization of this 'how'. Instead of whining about lesbians, crying about a trans-cat or trans-gun, fighting an objectophile (or objectum as the objectophiles who wish to separate themselves from the paraphilic communities of which they came from call it), let us take our right to bare arms and actualize a movement, and achieve passionate liberation for all, and really, ALL, people! uhm wtf was i saying???? i don't remember. ANYways, back to the subject... nvm Zalusu posted on youtube of some pictures of a new consistent progressive website (remember how g.progressivism.lgbt or wtvr got taken down?) that i have not been able to find yet and i found out they wrote new shit... short critique?? The novelist classifying of heterosexuals as CAIs (which, i know the acronym is Conservative aligned identities or smth but wtf does that mean?? this is the same stupid radqueer shit as that one radqueer saying "transids are radqueer identities", identities do not belong to political movements, not all trans-id people are radqueers like not all transgender people are progressive and not all

straight people are fucking conservative or conservative aligned???) is plainly stupid (i may think that heterosexuality is plain abusive, the death of passionate sexuality, an oppressive form of relationships, disgusting, capitalist (Capital, the mystification of the economic processes, capitalism, production, workerism, and the obsession to produce and the maintaining of production as the whole of human life and purpose-- the community of capital as a whole where men live for capital-- cannot be abolished without heterosexuality, and heterosexuality was arguably the first symptom of proto-capital.. Because heterosexuality is also the annihilation of sex as passionate and sexual and the instating of a productive and capitalist, a sexual and necessary, a reproductive (idea of) sex... heterosexuality changed the mode of being-in-sex, the mode of sexual being, from a passionate and necrophilic one to a productive and monotonous one.), and horrid, but i recognize that you can be a progressive heterosexual.. because, again, identity is not owned by ideology... there can be and has been pedophiles against nambla and radqueers and child predators (and ideologies supporting child predators), yet if identities were owned by ideologies then that would mean all pedophiles would be namblaists or radqueers or fags of the like..) and nosorianism or whatever is a non-issue, also the noveltists are doubling down on their position on rape-- which is, their want to rape conservatives and their belief in raping conservatives, which, remember, to them the majority of animals are conservative... and i would argue that the majority of animals, the animals classified as conservatives to the noveltist faith, is most likely many, many times more than all human conservatives alive in this present moment, considering that would mean also almost entire species under the conservative label... and this also means majority of the people being raped would be animals simply for sticking to their culture... is this not cultural cleansing and mass rape and genocide??? is this not colonization, one could even say??? Is this also, as i am led to believe, what a zoophilic abuser who only cares about animals for their looks and often rapes animals would call a dream world??? I do not think noveltist decentral is a zoophile, i have no proof, but their system will lead to mass zoophilic rape and most of their sex slaves will be innocent animals... is that not strange? also, again, rape is never excusable and will always lead to misery and suffering, all rape is harmful. If i find the new website i will re-critique it... y'know, me finding out about shit like this is why i cannot write a book chronologically, because i always start talking about a new subject before finishing

the old one (me now, being 36 or so pages into Nihilist Communism by monsieur dupont, am quite disappointed if i am to be honest, i expected much more nihilism and pessimism when it came to the question of communism and utopia (utopia here just means the end-goal of communism, not Utopia as it typically does when i say it)... they are not as heretical as i was led to believe, at least not yet. 7-15-26 they seem to be speaking on class consciousness and... this is obvious that class consciousness is impossible, history and camatte have surely proved it by now (though camatte surely still clung onto some delusion similar to class consciousness, applying it not to proles but humans), but even if it was, all classes are reactionary in character when it comes to the question of achieving utopia and, to be more general and less egotistical, all classes have a historical tendency to stray from the concept of communism taught by marx and the marxists and the abolition of capital, even when not led by the pro-revolutionary idiocrats the proles still tend to reinstate and reform capital instead of abolishing it (seen in camatte's writings) and the best it can achieve is some left-wing of capital. Class consciousness is not only impossible but also a false solution, or in this case, a false means and a false ends (if it even has an ends), just like communism. The stirnerized-marxism of 'For Ourselves' in a way is the exact marxism Camatte spoke about, not really (camatte was post-bordigist and later more a primitivist than a marxist proper or modernly, despite being closer to marx than ANY ML or Orthodox marxist.. meanwhile For Ourselves was a collective of stirnerian egoists and marxian situationists mixing marx and stirner together in a make-out that can be read as a burning of 'the german ideology' by marx and engels and a praise of ego-com glory..), but in the way that both speak of communism as the return or resurrection, as the SUBLATION of the human community and the restoring of the common being, of gemeinwesen (for ourselves may not have used this term but the 'sublation of egoism' that is 'communist egoism' is basically the same thing (the right to be greedy by for ourselves for the quotations took out of context)). What Camatte sees as the perfecting of the community, what For Ourselves sees as the perfecting of Greed and Egoism, it is ultimately the same, it is the end of capital and the beginning of the human... Unfortunately this is impossible, one, this is speciesist and ignores the roots of alienation, two, and they disagree on what this means, three. Camatte speaks of the sublated human community as a sort of sublation between tribal and hunter-gatherer communities and as a

involutionary escape from capital and return to mankind that will take forever long.. For Ourselves are, last i checked, more anarcho-councilist and marxist than that and lack any primitivism in their veins or genes. I do think, though, if one can stirnerize marxism (the right to be greedy by for ourselves, which i appreciate the dialectics of and also notice similarities, if only briefly, with camatte and fourier... the social individual proves, too, that the abolition of the self needs to be entirely related to and intertwined with the abolition of society/culture/civilization/nature and the end of the social being, of gemeinwesen. My anti-egoism must take an anti-communist direction had it not already done so.)... and we can nietzscheanize fourierism (Hakim bey, Escape from the nineteenth century and other essays, also where i found a quote of fourier supporting pederasty and feeling complex... Fourier had stated a support of pederasty here where hakim bey quotes fourier, but instead of the usual support of pederastic abuse where it centers around the adult man's use and abuse of the child, like heterosexuality being about the MAN using and abusing the woman, it seemed... different. He had used the word pederasty for there was no word for it back then, but it was not pederasty. He meant, like he meant a feminist form of 'heterosexuality' which i now call lesbians (yes, during the revolution (yet before the abolition of identity and gender) heterosexuality will be abolished and heterosexuals will be called lesbians and turigirls to reflect this change as it will mirror the change occurring. After gender and identity is abolished, this term will not need to be used as it will be irrelevant and only another way to identify relationships that needs to be erased with the erasure of labels and definitions and identity and identification), a youth-liberationist form of 'Adult-Minor relations' that lacks power dynamic and lacks abuse... there still is not a term for this, and this is not me advocating for pederasty nor current adult-minor relations, as modernly pederasty, pedophilia, and heterosexuality are all abusive. Well, regardless of his errors, i stand here with fourier on the issue only with the addition of ending the power dynamic and patriarchy, i believe that the alignment of all passions and the liberation of sexuality and desire should apply to every being, regardless of anything, i mean every being ever... and yes, there is scientific proof that, while children are not sexual (as in the sexualization of children done by NAMBLA and pederasts where they are nothing BUT sexual, this is a form of oppression and dehumanization (depersonification)), children have sexual activity and desires and so have sexuality (this is what one can mean

by saying 'children are sexual' when they are a scientist and not a pederast, this is to say children have sexuality and experience sexual desires and passions), and therefore if we are to liberate the passions, this includes the sexual passions of my class, the youth. Here, hakim bey's book, too, i find that proudhon and marx could have made good yaoi if it were not for marx's irrational want to break away from all those comparable to him (young hegelians, anarchists, communards and marxists, socialists and pre-marx communists, proudhonians and bakuninites...). I never knew hakim bey's TAZ was a mix of stirner, nietzsche, and fourier.. too sad it failed)... nevermind. on fourier and nature being a form of civilization, a zeroth civilization, i am defining civilization here the same way that fourier does, where civilization is the thing responsible for the misalignment of passions and the organization of passionate beings incorrectly, meanwhile i still (fourier disagrees with me here) define the self AS the misalignment of passions and/or its consequences.. If one out-does fourier in terms of progressivism (he was a hopeless speciesist, the "anti-lion" thing reeked of humanism) and acknowledge all beings as people and so passionate being (and, too, sexual beings but not sexualized beings, beings not entirely sexual but with a sexual activity and aspect), we can most obviously see how Nature was responsible for the misalignment of passions so clearly seen in nature itself (if, of course, we first forget my old quasi-primitivist praise of paleo-nature, which i regret and now understand that there IS in fact a power dynamic between predator and prey and it IS in fact a form of oppression, though modernly predator and prey are both commonly oppressed by humans), this is seen with predator and prey, with far-right collectivism, with extinction and evolution/devolution, with all the anti-passionate acts of nature... I would say, too, that enmity is a sign of misaligned passions but in reality i disagree on the issue of hatred with fourier, as while fourier sees hatred as a result of the inversions and displacements of the passions, i see hatred as itself a beautiful and wondrous passion (yes, i disturb the 12-- really, 13 if you include harmony--- beautiful passions that fourier set out on his psychological harmonism... in fact, i do not fully even accept the ideas of the twelve passions insofar as having twelve is limiting and defining and, even if there were the number that twelve signifies, the identifying of these passions in any way will lead to their misalignment, the passion must be radically and entirely free from all forms of heterosexual corruption, and too, must therefore be sublated past the fourierist idea of passions

into something undescrivable, which I, despite not fully believing the entire contents of my theory on necrophilia (though i accept enough), call necrophilia affectionately. Hatred, aka Love, aka liberated passionate necro-rape, is infact an important thing..) and so i must not attack that like euro-anarchist crackers love to do, with their peace-praise cult, but instead attack the natural hierarchy and power dynamics between animals in nature that makes nature the zeroth civilization. Fourier, i will say, acknowledging his mistake and allowing a consensual way to fulfill the child's sexual passions in the phalanx does signify that while he personally was ageist and his theory had praises of culture (again, most likely due to his time and a lack of critique of culture at that time), his theory was not explicitly ageist or trying to be ageist, it was in fact genuinely attempting a liberation of the youth as there was for the women, fourier may have been the first pro-youthlib. Also, i have read that Fourier's antisemetism did fade in time, and to that i say 'thank the sun!', though i am not jewish so it is not my place to forgive him. Truly, he seemed to be the most progressive of his time, only a little behind the modern progressive... and so not progressive enough, a modern-day fourier in terms of progressivism must arise and i am sure it will not be me (i disappoint to often) but i look forward to meeting them and shaking their hand if they are born today. Honestly i feel i may have been too rough and nitpicky at fourier considering that he was born so long ago, without any critique of culture (i had will wood and adam lanza, what did he have?) and with humanism being considered progressive back then, he tried his best and i can acknowledge that and acknowledge that it is only my place to forgive him for the ageism, and only me forgiving him here as i speak for nobody else, and that for the antisemetism only a jew can forgive him, and for the speciesism only an animal can forgive him! Lastly, I do fundamentally disagree with fourier on the little hordes, the passions of the youth and their attraction to filth, and the ageist rhetoric of the entire theory of the little hordes... instead, the synthesis of passions will obviously allow scatophilic and otherwise "filthy" kinks, fetishes, and paraphiliacs to partake in such activities to their own erotic pleasure, and too, such kinks, fetishes, and paraphilias, aka, such sexual attractions will become way more common after the end of heterosexuality and normativity and the uniting of hate and love, pain and pleasure, the divine and the scatological, the "good" and the "bad", the normal and the abnormal, or, what is considered sexuality and what is considered philiatic...

Such unity will allow that filth, scat, piss, sewage, dirt, and other things modernly considered gross will pick up sexual aspects enjoyed by some number of people... also, i still do disagree with the idea of necessary labor at all and wish to abolish value and necessity (fourier was not a gnostic, he saw man and nature as not antagonistic... i believe nature is the slave owner of all beings and antagonistic to all beings insofar as it created the first misaligned passions... God is not on our side, despite what fourier thinks, so i believe in necessary to leave the 'kingdom of necessities' that marx spoke about) to make labour and production no longer coercive and non-consensual, to abolish the economy... Therefore nothing is needed, nothing is necessary, and everything done is out of consensual passion, that is another disagreement between me and fourier on value and necessity... also i believe that a lot more than just a sexual minimum will have to take place, and too, that the sexual minimum cannot take place until after everything has been made consensual--- which as we know now, is impossible, as consent is impossible. I do, though, believe in the liberation of love and the passions, and so, the abolition of heterosexuality (the death of passionate sexuality), pedophilia and pederasty (abusive slave relationships made by the patriarchy to fix the death of passionate sex that is heterosexuality by, instead of laying with women, enslaving and laying with young boys they were transgressively passionate about for only a temporary while... this led to the hegelian master-slave problem but in sex where the patriarch's rape of the slave boy (this is why i believe young boys are a different gender to adult men and the incel community's obsession with manhood and the rising manosphere is a response to their growing gender dysphoria, born the wrong gender (young boy) and trying to speed up their transition to the right one (adult man), it really is mtM like that one youtube video by some liberal jokes about. YOUNG boys are gender dysphoric about their young boy gender and wish to be adult men, they usually wish this for power or domination or acceptance to the patriarchy promised to them from their father but regardless it is still gender dysphoria, this is the root of all incel and manospheric spaces, at least that is my theory) becomes boring and dull to the patriarch due to seeing the young boy as only a slave lesser being for sex, and the young boy becomes desensitized and depressingly tired of it all, so pederasty broke up societally on that charge. I guess now, modernly, epstein or whatever he's called shows that the elites think that, if pederasty didn't work, maybe double-abuse in straight pedophilia is better! Fuck

you.), zoophilia and any other abusive relationship dynamics, the abolition of monogamy and monoamory, the abolition of marriage and non-consensual asexuality, the end of rape and non-consensual activity as consent is guaranteed, the sexual liberation of all beings including women, children, animals, and POC, the end of definitions labels and limits to love, and the absolute freedom of love to take any consensual form or shape and the liberation of kinks fetishes and paraphilias... then, really, i do believe in free love, is in a free form of love that liberates the passions, but not the liberal or radical "free love" that supports abuse (heterosexuality or pedophilia, i see no difference insofar as they are both abuse). Free love, but not free love, in the end we always oppose the liberals... heehee i guess that makes me a maga-fag huhhhh....im just kidding i fucking hate the bastard in charge of the usa,,, haahhhhh.// I uh, well i must state that really, Fourier did only really oppose abuse, what he called "sadism" he meant abuse, and what he called "flagellantism" (as people did back then) we call BDSM (including consensual sadism), so really maybe me and Fourier do not really disagree at all there, simply semantics, he had supported any form of consensual love and so do i. // I still do struggle with an issue of homogeneity in my works, i feel, i always end up falling for abolition fascistic harmonism and not for anything else... this is something i must work on, abolition is not the answer to everything, it can only sublate god in a consistent manner, the necro-god. This i learned when i realized a little something, that is, that nothing is capable of self-negation or self-abolition, any "self-negation" is only part of a process of self-sublation in which it gets stronger, and anything claiming to abolish itself clearly will be resurrected stronger after death, Community "self-negates" actually to self-sublate from primitive to the "real" community, Capital "self-negates" actually to self-sublate in crisis and the abolition of class and the generalization of slavery and ect ect act capital and community Jacques Camatte marxists.org whatever, Absolute Abolition "self-abolishes" to come back eternally stronger like Christ because it has now become from material to spiritual and so spiritually immortal, the "self-abolition" in fascism is first, one, a lie insofar as A right to be Greedy by For Ourselves has taught us that the individual is societal and society is individual and so are on in social individuality which is just what everyone means by the individual but acknowledging that it is social and what everyone means by the social but acknowledging that it is individual and inseparable, and two, only a sublation

insofar as the self is eternalized and deified satanically (satanist nazis are not a coincidence) through the nation or race in the sublation of god through fascism. There is no subject or class of self-negation or self-abolition, not even the self, suicide only happens once an issue is introduced to wreck havoc in the mind (a "disorder" to use the work) usually due to material conditions and even suicide is not a true abolition of the mind insofar as after death the self becomes immortalized and so stronger, more oppressive (the oppressed is dead here), and sublated... Even the (self-)abolition of self of the suicidal victim is actually a sublation of self where their suffering continues even after death, not even death will save you, there is no self-abolition (fourier wants us to be transparent and authentic? we cannot be transparent, authentic, and our()selves, or, and selfs, we must peel away our metaphorical skin (that of which i actually mean the self) to truly be entirely vulnerable and authentic, no self or anything.). Then, i must naturally be critical of marxists claiming the 'self-negating class of the proles' and the communist egoists claiming the 'self-negation narrow-egoism leading to communist egoism' and the progressive (me in the past) claiming the 'self-negating counterculture/progressivism leading to the abolition of culture', one must be so progressive to realize progressivism is a lie and abandon it, ultraprogressive against progressivism. SO then, i do not believe in these revolutionary subjects and i do not believe in these revolutionary solutions, they prove themselves to be based on something impossible, a true suicide (Capital finds itself a break from community, community's alter-sublation, where the community of capital replaces communism in the sublation-- thus fulfilling the sublation in a way not meant, a "false" (though it is a true sublation and not a false one, what IS a false sublation?) sublation, a hoax... Capital has become its own being separate to community's path of sublation, and in the turn to the real domination of capital, it autonomizes itself by dominating the path of sublation that capital was birthed from, the community's path to sublation, by finishing it not in communism but the community of capital, thus communism now impossible and community sublated, thus capital (and i focus here that not EVERYTHING sublates itself, some things remain consistent, i simply say here that all that seems like self-negation is self-sublation-- not that everything is self-sublation) now dominates reality... No revolutionary subject will come, Capital dominates the path to its own sublation and rejects it, unlike what accelerationists think (the leftist kind but not the left-wing of the technophiles,

more post-left than anything (on this subject, my old identification with the accelerationists is entirely embarrassing to me in all honesty, and even worse, when i attempted deleuzean thinking and even to.. read deleuze. It was abhorrent, a total mistake, and while i can interpret nick land all i want and enjoy such interpretations, deleuze is someone that i cannot exactly enjoy nor do i think i could ever practically be influenced by in any huge or total way, his philosophy is simply not compatible with my line of thinking and i will not attempt to read deleuze any longer. Deleuze is outside me.)) we know that capital will not destroy itself, capital will not self-sublate into the end of the world or the annihilation of society or the economy itself, capital will not self-sublate into a post-capitalist economy through collapse, through a crash.. we know that capital has gone beyond collapse and beyond negation and beyond sublation and self-sublation and the paths, it has eternalized itself and rejected the dialectics, it has murdered marx entirely.). On personal property, i feel the need to explain again why i hold such a position, is that any form of property is still an affirmation of self, a punch done against the passionate and intimate eternality hoped to be achieved (think about it really, sharing toothbrushes can be quite romantic, close to a make-out), and the support of personal property allows for even just the slightest possibility of the economy recreating itself.. too, again, it affirms the self (and no, the self is not a "good thing" or some beautiful and empowering thing, it is not even you, you are not and never can or will be your self, you are a slave of your self, all those individualists who claim triumph over their freedom, liberty, their lack of slavery, are actually the most enslaved by self, and yet, still enslaved too but to lesser degrees by culture and capital! Self is a form of slavery, oppression, alienation, it is alienation, misalignment, the self is hell... all those incapable of seeing that are too busy being whipped and CBT-ed by their selves to understand it, or on the other hand, they are too busy being mutilated and shredded apart and tormented by the slaveries of capital and culture to even notice the slavery of the self-- either they are primarily slaves of the self, or they are so tormented by their slavery by the other that they do not feel or they forget about the self, which eats away at their prostate and infects them like a cancer, they do not feel it under the feeling of culture thrusting into their eyes and capital slitting up their genital and cutting off their groin skin. They feel nothing but external pain and so forget the internal one,, or, they fawn like an abuse victim. Regardless, there are no masters, there never have been, it is

a faultless tragedy, there are only tormented slaves, an eternal abuse cycle, faultless tragedy, eternal misery, no masters, god is eternal... so say she is dead is to be a utopian, but we all know she can never die, she is allah all-merciful, cutting up her thigh and wrists until they are nothing but gashes and gashes and huge tears, and the skin is so incapable, broken, fragmented, and her state-- starved, ribcage showing, her teeth rotting and her hair falling out, her organs shut down and her brain, so sleep-deprived, lets out only little drunken thoughts, yet she is eternal, she will live forever, even when she is rotten like a corpse and her bedrotting becomes one of a carcass filled with maggots, still alive, in its grave, she lives. YOu wish she could die, that she had died when you said she had, but, impossible. God's Death is an impossibility. she lays in a pile of her own waste, feces and vomit and decay and blood, her gashes, thousands, huge, across her body, all infected with worms and flies and maggots, she can feel them move around in her and burrow deeper, she prays out to herself to no avail-- or she would if she could bring herself to move, she cannot sleep and she cannot eat and she cannot drink, horse urine exists in isolation, the smell is disgusting of the decay eternal body. Can she even be called a person anymore? Her veins are all severed and her throat torn a third hole, she lives. you can only ever affirm your slavery, god's suffering, there are no masters.) and negates intimacy, and is a rational choice unlike the irrational glory of utopian socialists! This lack of self-negation and self-abolition also takes nechayev's terror out of the question when we must really consider the core of the problem, that is, suffering and misery, that is, tragedy.. suffering, misery, and tragedy cannot be solved via suffering, misery, nor tragedy, one cannot defeat fire with fire as the english saying goes. Terrorism is out of the question insofar as it causes a tragedy, it continues suffering, and even if it prevents more suffering it still causes suffering and so is no real solution. I have finished the right to be greedy by for ourselves and find... i still oppose communism, what else is there to say. Also marxists are still just the most honest anarchists, anarchists who admit they are quasi-statists, that is still a humour to me. Uhm to shortly go back to fourier, seeing as god made man in her image (genesis 1:27), and god, she is three, nature/culture economy/capital and self/(individual/sociality), i do believe beings (not just man, i am sure the use of man was a metaphor) to have three parts, an economic part, a cultural part, and a socially-individual part, and these three parts to be coping for the annihilation of

the one non-godly part hidden, the removed fourth part, the passionate part. And, as god's three can be divided into three, so can the beings', and the passionate part is divided into three, of the senses, of the emotional relations, and of the distributions, and we have no real number for the whole total of passions so the number of combinations possible is infinite and so each is unique... I understand this is different to Fourier's psychology, he believes 12 (13 including harmony but that one died in civilization) passions and that one being has main passions that are the strongest-- he goes from solitone to pentatone, one main passion to five main passions, having one the most common and the most passions the least--- though he goes from one to five, he admits that having all seven spiritual passions be a main, while extremely rare, is possible, called an omnitone. There are also the mixed ones, where instead of an amount of only spiritual passions, one has a mix of spiritual and sensual passions as main. I understand all this, but i find it unable to understand the uniqueness of a being that we see in Max Stirner's the ego and its own, and it too is very non-trinitarian-- which is not a bad thing, it would be bad if fourier was a trinitarianist, his trinitarianism would surely have to be religious and contradict fourierism if he was one, fourierism is uniquely non-trinitarian-- my trinitarianism is not exactly religious, so i am excused from myself here, surprisingly. I also support fourier's 5-hour sleep plan on harmony, not because like how he thought i think that we will not need so much sleep but instead that sleep deprivation creates a new prophetic mode of experience for people (and makes them not sober) and so allows a new utopian experience, my mother has recounted messages from 'god' she had under a lack of sleep and i often sleep deprive myself be it on purpose or on accident. Also because it replicates the utopianism of the cult. Too, i do not believe in drudgery call me more utopian than the realistic fourier but with all the unique ones in this world, all the kinks and fetishes, someone must want to!). 7-17-26 i just had the sudden urge to yell and rant and break down over the horrible abuse that is heterosexuality in my mother's empty car (she was not there at the time), i realized heterosexuality is worse than pedophilia because while pedophilia is taboo and so prevented more often heterosexuality is normalized and heterosexual abuse is everywhere, the most common form of abuse. Every heterosexual man should be registered as a sex offender as far as i care to see it, they are all rapists, they are women predators, heterosexuality must be abolished. I hate heterosexuality. cant write much about it

cuz i spent all my emotion screaming in an empty car about it. Moral Mystification has been the worst thing to happen to the left and is exactly why we have now been stunted in our progressivism, we have forgotten exactly WHY things are bad and begun hating them unconditionally, we forget that what we are against is abuse, discrimination, bigotry, exploitation, alienation, oppression, and suffering (so, too, this means opposing genocide like the one going on in palestine, but as well, not supporting any states-- any leftist who supports PALESTINE and not people suffering from genocide forgets what they stand for, any state is a bad state, and we must oppose Israel first but not fall back into the maoist trap of new democracy, we must not ally with palestine, but oppose palestine as well, to liberate the palestinian people-- we here is not the word i should have used, i am not palestinian, and i have no power to save them. The question of opposing zionism is the same as the question of opposing fascism-- we cannot accept antifa, it is just as fascist, but we must fully and entirely rile against fascism as well, totally against fascism, no mistakes.).. so, heterosexuality gets to go free and enjoy normalization despite being abusive, accepted by the left, meanwhile pedophiles (most pedophiles are not child predators, and most child predators are not pedophiles, statistics) are hated unconditionally without even abusing a child nor even supporting child abuse and treated like shit, pedophiles are discriminated against despite not being child predators and despite being unable to control their attraction as it is something from birth (the dsm-5 may disagree here but this is what i have heard from pedophiles, it is from birth), and this too leads to the asexualization and oppression of children being strengthened under the boogeyman of "the pedophile" (yes, there are child predators online, but trying to limit the freedom of children on the internet, a space that most of them take comfort in and have communities in that are important to them, a space where they have more liberty than in modern society where they are dominated and oppressed, is simply another way to oppress the child class. If the government had really cared about child predators, they would actually attempt to stop child abusers and child predators online and offline, which they do not.), trying to strip children of their liberty and their sexuality (yes, children do have sexuality, they have sexual attraction, i have had sexual attraction since at least first grade, i am now 15 and still have sexual attraction, this is not new.) by using "pedophiles!!!" as an excuse while they have a pedophile rapist as the president of the usa. People forget that

what is wrong about adult-minor relationships is the power dynamic (if they had to realize that, they'd surely legalize heterosexuality as well, and capitalism will not let that happen because heterosexuality is the most productive and capital-dominated form of sex!) that leads to abuse, people forget that the problem is not children having sex but children being RAPED, and so they oppress the children as well and barely attempt to solve the child predator issue, they try to "maintain the purity" of children (aka limit their sexual passions) and "protect them" aka limit their freedoms and continue their enslavement. THis happened with prostitution, where people forget prostitution is wrong because it is an industry where prostitutes are raped and cannot consent, and so they mystify it to this thing that simply is taboo, and they then discriminate against and dehumanize/criminalize PROSTITUTES and not the ones buying prostitutes as slaves, they begin to see prostitutes as morally wrong due to this mystification and treat them accordingly. People tend to use the oppression and abuse of a minority to oppress said minority instead of punishing the abusers and oppressors, and this is made easier with moral mystification and the dehumanization of the abused. Humanity is the only species so far to have ever made it taboo to have healthy (aka non-straight and non-pederastic and non-pedophilic and non-incestuous) relationships with one another based on consent, they are the only species to do so at this time (7-18-2026). that being said, moral mystification is just a natural consequence of morality and moralism amongst the left and right alike, where morality and moralism stands, where culture stands too, so will the mystification of morality, morals, and moralism, and the mistaking of what is taboo for what is bad and what is normal for what is good. It may gross you out to see people having an orgy on the street, but to any degree, it is not morally bad by itself, it is not abusive, does not bring suffering or misery, it does not harm somebody, it is not bigoted, so to mistake public indecency for a moral wrong is also a form of moral mystification to a degree (though not to the same degree as pedophilia and heterosexuality and children's sexuality has been morally mystified into oblivion.). Still reading Nihilist Communism by monsieur dupont (87/307), i still feel disappointed, i had been expecting some denouncing of the revolution and the revolutionary subject, a radical pessimism or nihilistic race, a sort of new radical form of communism based in this anti-optimism, yet they still believe in revolution, the proletariat as a revolutionary subject, and still do not recognize that

we are in the community of capital and that the workers were never truly revolutionary at all and only ever worked for their continued existence as proles (despite MD being correct that the proles' condition would lead their self-interest to oppose capital as their body is worn down and exploited by capital and capital is strictly against and violent towards the prole, any rational person as a prole would fight back due to this and, seeing as they can, they would... but, as seen in history, proles are either hopelessly pessimistic of the idea of change, easily manipulated for bigger movements like ML-ism, or masochistic for capital-- Or, modernly, the proles are (rightfully) entirely nihilistic about any change from capital or any revolution away from it, which is true in the community of capital, as all resistance against capital does nothing but support, drive, and help it, and all resistance is for capital and by capital and will be assimilated to capital, that is, if it even ever was separate to capital at all, all anti-capitalisms, all revolutionaries, communists, pro-revolutionaries, all proles, everyone, are part of, controlled by, slaves of, for and by and to and assimilated by, if ever left from, capital.

Generalized Slavery. The proles do not have revolutionary potential modernly, and i doubt they ever had, especially if we understand that all we ever could do is what we did, all we ever could be is what we are, all the proles ever could have done historically was what they did, all the proles ever could have been historically was what they were, and so, that is, not revolutionary.)-- all this book has done so far is rile against the (truthfully unreal, MD is correct there,) idea of class consciousness and pro-revolutionary dumbasses. If, and i say if here because i can no longer be a utopian and have yet to find the best-case scenario, IF we were capable of obtaining utopia, it is clear that the path to utopia will not be dominated by or led by any certain party, class, race, species, gender, marginalized or non-marginalized group, army, rationality, science, person, or people, but by every being in unison, not as humans but as beings, utopian beings-- unfortunately, this too, looking back, is impossible... If not even one self-negating individual or group or people or person exists/exist then the idea of a united self-negating everyone is absurd, the idea of a self-negating god is absurd, no wonder her suicide is impossible! It is an entirely absurd utopian demand, in fact, and one cannot simply achieve that. ok nvm im at the appendices.

added bonus:

"

(i will be adding this very document into my second book, and since you are reading this now, i thought i should inform you that this very paper will appear in my second book for reasons of clarity and autobiographical reasons)

When i began to write this book, i had just started becoming a fan of Nick Land's writings and the CCRU, i had little development of my thought outside of a few writings about ultraprogressivism, pessimism, stirnerian egoism, and post-marxism and culture, and i had barely reached the point of being coherent and stable in my thought. Hyperborean Ideology was originally a collection of interpretations of writings, or was meant to be, but i soon rather wrote original writings that, while now i see as underdeveloped and quite disgusting (not my taste at all) and with a lack of comprehensive study, i was originally proud of. It was a faux-collection of writings that were all written at the same time, yet were meant to immitate the CCRU collected writings or nick land's collected writings in fanged noumena, or at least, Palingenetic Anarchism was. It had essays of various subjects and were written non-chronologically with little warning about the time-skips in writing both back and foward in time. Palingenetic Anarchism included subjects such as radqueer ideology, accelerationism of post-left and left-wing forms, radical feminism, youth liberationism, anarchism and palingenesis, inaccurate and shitty understandings of hegel and deleuze, maoism and ultraleftist theory, and an attempt to re-engage anti-cultural stances into politics. It was a contradictory mess with little stability to it, but i feel as if that made it a bit unique and feel like exactly what it was, which is, a philosophical journey which had no concrete basis and no developed understanding of this journey. It often was afraid of itself, hid from itself, and feared self-critique, and when it did self-critique it was hard to know or tell. despite previously being considered by me as my magnum opus, a work that really encapsulated all i wanted to say, i now consider it my greatest regret and worst work, yet, an important one not only for me but any who would listen. there is a lot i regret and would like to apologize for in this book, it is abhorrent and a real piece of shit to me as it stands, it would be better had i just known what i know now since the start, but to understand what i want to say now i must make it clear what i said then, and i had probably said something of value to somebody. While i no longer agree with anything in this book, it still deserves my respect and care. I digress. The book's main premise is hard to explain, but i can start with explaining the titles of the two sections. The first was written purposefully incoherently and with a strong emphasis on my influence

from Nick Land, and the second was attempted to be more chronological to the best of my power, i am less ashamed at my second writing and feel that it is actually able to have good points when it tries, such as my critique on Bob Black's abolition of work and my analysis of Youth Liberation and the historical role of the YOUTH as a class, though other times it fails such as my... mistake.. with reading tiqqun, which i find embarrassing now. THE first title, Palingenetic Anarchism, was, again, about the idea of a palingenetic anarchist movement seeking for international patriotism for the future world, or as i called it, Hyperborea, calling the present world 'Russia' in reference to dugin. I develop and most carry the idea of hyperborea and russia here, which was influenced by my ultraleft reading of Nick Land and Dugin, where i developed the idea from the lemurian-atlantean split in the CCRU lore. I, though, interpreted a split between the hyperboreans and the atlanteans, such in the spirit of dugin, and seeked to create a revolutionary international anarchist movement based on this. As the story grew, i fell more and more disillusioned with anarchism and saw Palingenetic Anarchism more as a Post-Anarchist movement and one against the self. My vision of Hyperborea was influenced by niche cyber-philosopher N1x Land and their writings, which had inspired my former positions. In Palingenetic anarchism, i had also written about Fem/Acc, or, feminine accelerationism, deeply inspired by and a synthesis of Gender accelerationism (n1xxian) and Cute accelerationism (amy ireland and maya b kronic). Modernly, i reject this idea, but it was a writing i was proud of, and one that influenced further my idea of hyperborean ideology. I had, at the end of palingenetic anarchism, started developing a maoist interpretation of the dialectics that abandoned hegelian dialectics.. if i achieved this, i am not to judge, but it is something to note. in the second half of the book, that is, 'Words of the left', i had tried to wander off from this palingenetic anarchist theory and had started Self-critique and evolving my thought past its original basis and origins, which led to the evolution of what i advocated for into ABsolute ABolition and my writings on Communization, the Ultraleft, a critique of leftism, a re-evaluation on my old and badly written critique of stirnerian egoism, an abandonment of anarchism, and my advocacy for abolition of values as important for the abolition of work and my critique of bob black's other works. I had begun also criticizing radqueers and their communities and also fellow ultraprogressive niche authors such as the cult leader "novelist decentr(anarchist-symbol)l" and the founder of Radeviance. I also began to advocate for a different solution than the radqueers and even abandon the ultraleft. The central idea of 'words of the left' was, at first, nothing, but gradually formed into the idea of absolute abolition and the murder of god, the achieving of the annihilation of misery and suffering via the abolition of everything, a very... well, as i am writing in my second book,

impossible goal that i now find stupid to even advocate for. I had also, being a former radqueer and a current youth-liberation, spoke about the liberation of the youth and its relation to radqueers and a critique of the more controversial and harmful forms of radqueerism, along with engage with and critique the ideas of individuals like lanza, Noveltist decentr(A)l, and nambla, without supporting any of these individuals or seeing them as good. Modernly, i am writing a better text with a more stable basis, at least, 50k words in i feel it has a good basis. In Hyperborean Ideology, a work that i have struggled with getting archived or accepted anywhere online (even on thetedkarchive it was taken off!), i feel there are things to learn and things to discard, and certainly, ideas like my old mysticism and palingenetic obsession and narrow-minded revolutionism and mystic-psychology surrounding the cute may be discarded, but, especially in the second half, despite my paramisia and speciesism, there were important aspects. My analysis of the youth class i feel is truly unique and enough to redeem this book's importance, it, at least to me, a youth, feels to be the best work on youth liberation to be made since youth liberation's original conception amongst individuals. It certainly isn't perfect, but it takes great inspiration from radfem and feminist analysis and works historically much better than "adult-supremacy" or the old "adult-chauvinism" concepts that plague the shallow and stunted youth liberationist movement. My thought at times can be taboo, and certainly, not uncontroversial or pure, it is often very confused and says things it does not mean, it sometimes misunderstands itself and says disgusting things towards itself, sometimes it defeats itself and pretends it never happened. Often, my thought speaks of taboo subjects as if it were another question, and sometimes, not with the sensitivity it deserves, and often it is rejected because it is misunderstood, but certainly, it misunderstands itself, so this is natural. sometimes it is untrained and idiotic at economics, sometimes it fails (certainly now i am at least a bit better at economics, i had read jacques camatte's capital and community now, but i am still not perfect or even good) at even the most basic, and makes theories that are easily proven wrong. However, i still feel that this book at least opposes something that has still been left unquestioned since the death of lanza and was never questioned before that, something so accepted that it seems crazy to deny it or hate it, which is, culture. I feel that i did not speak very well in my critique of culture in the first book, if i hadn't taken its horrid nature as a given, but certainly in my second book i give it the weight it deserves-- regardless, i feel that introducing an opposition to all culture, not just conservative culture and culture war or whatever, but all cultures, is important for the future of politics and how we understand progressivism in general. Modern Progressivism unknowingly supports so many forms of discrimination and bigotry and oppression and conservatism that it is

hard to take these ideologies seriously as a revolutionary force, nor the modern left. As to prolong this writing to five pdf pages, as i was instructed to do, i will now speak of other concepts that i developed in the book. I had critiqued Stirnerian egoism later on in my book via what i learned from radeviance, and began my idea of self-oppression, i had developed my idea of hyperpsychosis then lobotomized it, i had begun writing on my interpretation on desire, love, hatred, compassion, under societal necrophilia, and more that i do not remember as of now. I had, at the very end of my writing, the last two paragraphs, left and grown disillusioned with absolute abolition without a strict or actual critique of it, and wrote "koda materialism", which was moreso a metaphorical ramble of a sleep deprived auto-sexualizing child (myself) than anything else, supposedly a break with all else i have said, but i shortly forgot about it. My writings on fourier were not very good back then, but certainly now it has developed after i already finished this book. I can safely describe this book to be both a work of art, insofar as art is flawed, and one of my biggest regrets to ever be made, yet that does not fully describe how i truly feel about such a work. it is something without words, a creation cursed by its time and my shallow lack of thought, underdeveloped yet barely developed at all, structurally a hellhole, yet not just that. There is not much else i can say on such a work so i will leave it here.

//bye// --> ((--AnimalFluff--))

"

back to what i was saying::

In the Community of Capital, there is no longer any contradiction inside of capital or between capital and any other supernatural being (like the proletariat), there no longer are contradictions at all in modern society, all works out in unity, and so no longer do things work through contradictions, through dialectics, capital has escaped historical materialism and the dialectic, it has escaped contradiction and the proletariat, it is untouchable. Anyone still believing in revolution is mistaken, highly mistaken, delusional utopianists. The only men who live outside of our perfectly united oppression are the ones living in non-state society, and they currently live in a just-as-oppressive world, one of the unity between natural community, culture and nature united, and the communal self... and too, their existence proves nothing, considering you cannot escape to there or you will end up killing them all and most likely dying yourself, so again, ethically and practically and like, common-sense-and-self-interest-ally, there is no escape (committing a genocide and dying in the process is NOT a better alternative, do not even attempt such an act). On the personification of beings and the impossibility of self-negation, one could take this to mean that camatte was right in declaring a

revalorization of life and an end of the us vs them mindset of the left, that we should not cheer when any being dies or suffers, that we should not dehumanize the rich, but i do not wish to say this, in reality. While an individual's death is always a tragedy insofar as they lived their entire life as a slave and cannot be blamed for their actions, insofar as they are not their self, i do not think a revalorization of life or a reinstating of morality and an annihilation of enmity is the right choice as camatte arguably did. It is normal that if one is antagonistic to another, that the other's death is a relief to the one, such as. When Hitler died, are we to say the jews are wrong for being in relief and cheering, are we to say everyone was wrong for cheering? No, certainly, hitler's suicide was the best suicide to ever happen, he is the political equivalent of satan, if not worse! Yet, of course, the being behind hitler is not responsible for their actions insofar as hitler (and so also fascism) is the result of the economic processes, the cultural progression, and the specific misalignment that is hitler's self, but sure it is a tragedy that one's autonomy is obliterated and they are turned into a genocidal totalitarian freak, but hitler is not a tragic individual as he is now, hitler is not hitler's being, hitler is his self-- and so, insofar as we must see selves and punish selves, and not beings or individuals, the death of charlie kirk for example-- may be seen as a tragedy for the being behind charlie kirk, which again remember that beings do not exist, you do not exist, but is not a tragedy insofar as it serves a justice. One could say this is "self-negating suffering", but i respond, it is not, the suffering of a bad person does not negate the suffering of others, it does only add more suffering, however the death of a bad person can prevent more suffering but this is not negation... also, the death of charlie kirk was not a revolutionary act so why should we judge it as if it was? I do not think any revolutionary class exists, i do think that if a revolution was going to happen, and i do not believe a revolution will happen or that if it will it will be a good or real revolution and not another larp, because i surely think to revolution actually was real or changed anything, but if a revolution was to happen during the real stage of domination, it would include all beings under capital and not just the myth of the prole (classes have been abolished under capital, look and see!)... i am not saying that the leftist us-vs-them viewpoint is correct insofar as us vs them is down vs up, as capital has become human and no longer formally dominant but REALLY dominant, but i am saying that, outside of revolutionary act considering that no revolutionary act really exists as revolution is a lie, the death of the rich men associated with epstein would lead to the prevention of more suffering and that it would be arguably justice... this is not revolutionary, i know, but revolution is dead, so we should not act out of what is revolutionary or some bordigist quasi-moralism about the path to communism, it will never happen. We cannot abolish suffering, misery, tragedy, so

then preventing more suffering is better than trying to abolish suffering, even if that path is through the suffering of people who reproduce suffering. Kill a killer, the number stays the same, but kill two and it has decreased --- this but not about killers. Beings are not responsible for their actions, sure, i can concede that morally one cannot punish a being for actions done by the self, but what else can we do? Hitler's being, which i guess was just hitler, was not responsible for his act, but hitler's self, which i also guess was just hitler, was, and hitler deserved punishment and jews deserved not to be genocided, so what can we do other than praise hitler's death? We are all viewers, we are all beings with no autonomy over our actions, spectators of our lives, we are all not responsible for the self, we cannot be judged either, if this is a moral argument... and also if this is a moral argument, our selves (we) are all bigots, our selves (we) are all immoral, all reactionary, we (/our selves) are all hopelessly unable to be utopian, we (our selves) are all misaligned (there is no way to meaningfully separate us from our selves so to a degree one could say we are responsible even if we have no autonomy nor control at all, we and our selves mean the same thing, to a degree our being is not real and so 'we' can only mean our selves' expression, if that makes sense, so there is no you.), how can we be judged if we are all infinitely judged for everything already? Utopia will not come, revolution or involution will not come, we are stuck forever nothing, we cannot be everything as we wish. To be a bit self-critical, i will admit my argument here is quite flimsy and weak, it is vulnerable, i will not stick by this argument if met with criticism and it is not because i am a coward but because i have little faith in this argument. Okay i just learned about therianropy (the discrimination against or oppression of or hatred of therians) and i do think this is important for our current political climate's weird hatred for therians... therians are also different from trans-species and therianropy is different from trans-speciesism. 7/20/26 i have been getting off track, and have started using this book as some sort of diary, how stupid!! Is it clear enough that i am totally stumped about the best-case-scenario? I have no ideas at all, and though i have begun reading more fourier and appreciating fourier's works now more than ever, it has provided me no solutions! All i know is that i must oppose primitivism or nature's dictatorship will rule supreme, and a post-saint-simonian marx (aka camatte, camatte is the final death of saint simonian marxism and the restoration of the tribal marx) will establish the humanist volksgemeinschaft of our times. 7/22/2026 i find it an interesting phenomena that the niche fringes of the lgbtq community are proving fourier right in a certain aspect (that is the four passions related to relationships, which now find themselves amongst these niches as not their original name but instead these four "sexuality, romanticity, platonicity, and familiarity",) in this way one could say that niche mogai lgbtq spaces prove fourier

but also expand on and evolve fourier, by allowing these passions themselves to manifest in different forms not just in terms of gender but in terms of all aspects (intensity, existence (schrodinger's genders are interesting in this aspect, along with demigender and also quantum sexualities and such), alignment, gender-basis, and comprehension of the passion).. It also allows for the assimilation of asexuals into fourier's project without resorting to anton lavey's acephobic psychoanalytical "asexuals just exert their sexuality in a non-sexual form" or whatever it was i found when reading that stupid satanic bible that i hate, it allows for the free love doctrine to also be a freedom from love, and so these ultra-mogai spaces are a good evolution of fourier's project and can certainly benefit from actually learning fourierist theory, certainly an ultra-mogai modern-day fourierist theorist could perfect fourier and create a functional modern-day phalanx... this is not my mission, however, as i am no fourierist even if i do admire him and his theory. In fact, i must oppose fourierism on the doctrine of war against culture and euro-anarchist idolization of peace and repression of natural emnity (emnity being, in my theory, a passionate expression equivalent to love and not a disgusting mistake).... though, mogai spaces may allow and assimilate emnity into fourier's project on the basis of homestuck kissmesis so perhaps it will be better than before. Regardless, the afamilial, aplatonic, asexual, and aromantic individual the one who experiences none of the emotional passions, will surely find his place in a mogai neo-fourier phalanx, something entirely not promised in the old fourierist orders, and surely the afamilial aplatonic asexual aromantic individual (or, AAAA individual) will find it equally an utopia, perhaps fourier can move past just a sexualization of work and instead reach a point of making work itself a passionate activity in its own right and not just through the passionate activeness of sexuality-- maybe work itself can have a passionate activeness instead of being simply the moon of the sun (in which the sun here is sex and sunlight is sexuality), maybe moonlight could come from the moon (passionate work) instead of the sun (sexualized work), perhaps the moon can truly find itself equal to the sun. Those are my thoughts about ultra-mogai neo-fourierism, the movement that may be in the near future. :p. On that subject, i do appreciate how Ultra-Mogais are honestly more anti-validity-discourse and more pro-nihilization than radqueer by allowing quite literally anything to be realigned based on passions, from familialism, platonicity, to names, to body, to species, to expression and presentation, to emotions, to neurological processes and neuro-minds, to identification of self-perception, it is way wider than the radqueer community's simple acceptance of paraphiles and trans-ids, and many ultra-mogais accept all trans-ids as well (or at least validate them), i propose that a neo-fourierist movement must take both sides and leave them behind, sublimate them... Fourier was for the liberation of all

passions, including paraphiles, he was a paraphile-liberationist and arguably a youth liberationist to some degree, so any neo-fourierist must take the pro-paraphilia from the radqueers, and any neo-fourierist must already know that in such a passionate society where it is impossible to invalidate or go against passions as they are perfectly align in a perfect organic consent where each individual truly has the passions flow through each and other and verbal consent can easily be abolished without the threat of rape, in such a society, the liberation of identities seen in mogai, ultra-mogai, and radqueer spaces, will come naturally as definition dies out for instead passionate society. Every individual can identify as anything with absolutely no limits, everything loses meaning, and here we see an alternative nihilization as compared to the gender accelerationist nihilization. Either way, it is still a rejection and abolition of validity discourse, and validity discourse truly disgusts me as the worst thing made out from homonormativity. Still reading, 7/22/2026, i have considered finishing this book already and starting a new to solve the question of opposition to primitivism, nihilist communism by monsieur dupont has not helped as it is currently criticizing the idea of a real movement or of any movement preceding taking down capitalism... this is interesting, sure, but useless to me insofar as taking down capitalism is impossible at this stage.... which, now that i think about it, also means that primitivism is just as impossible as communism, or at least, that is, if primitivism is supposed as an escape from capital or a defeat of capital, as utopian or revolutionary, it is impossible... The entire world outside of areas protected rightfully by s.i. is under absolute domination by capitalism where no area is free and no area uncolonized, such it is that there is nowhere to escape from capital to, and too, due to the community of capital aka the real stage of domination of capital, no revolutionary force, communist or primitivist, can defeat it, as opposition to capital is instantly assimilated into capital and commodified, and too, capitalism has run-off towards divinity and reached it, becoming the sun, there is no way to kill it without a tower of babel, a tower of babel that is doomed to be toppled by god before reaching the heart of the divine, aka, the sun. Primitivism is impossible, yes, nowhere to run and no way to assert itself (insofar as asserting yourself under capitalism means to oppose capitalism, as there is no other way to be independent from capitalism), yet this is not the glorious win i think it is... the same applies to any future solution i propose. Now the question is not just of opposing primitivism as a best-case-scenario, it is instead two questions back-to-back-- A.), What is the best-case-scenario?, and B.), How do we achieve this best-case-scenario under our current stage of divinity?... which , is honestly impossible for me to answer right now. Perhaps i should actually read bataille for once and not philosophers writing about bataille, surely so! Maybe a new perspective can aid me... after finishing a not-to-

be-named collection of fourier writings that surprisingly included one of his best works said to be untranslated that emphasizes the sexual and passionate part of his thought, and reading what hakim bey had to say on fourier, i now unwillingly return back to (not adam lanza as one would think but instead) jacques camatte, specifically endnotes' archive of the man, the mother of modern ultra-leftist syndromes and catholic-inspired fags (i am homosexual, i can say that), mr. camatte. Yes, i am still reading Monsieur dupont or whatever its called, but i require some camatte here (though you'd think that since camatte and lanza are pessimistic to some degree and fatal, and fourier is optimistic and joyous, when looking for optimism i should read more fourier, but fourier (passions are the most unnatural things in the world, fourier! Utopia is impossible, fourier! Passions are eternally misaligned, STOP TELLING ME BEAUTIFUL LIES i know we're doomed.) makes me sad and camatte teaches me more, and lanza is nihilistic, so camatte is one of my only options here). Too, i have not a theory but a little guess with no real significance over why the youth class has had no revolutionary potential for as long as it has existed, which is, other than class struggle sabotaging youth struggle against the patriarchy (and the youth identifying with their slave owner's class), also that, unlike the proletariat, the youth have something to lose other than their chains. I will not expand on this... actually i will. Endnotes, Time is an invention of men incapable of love, "Amadeo bordiga, Nota elementare sugli studenti ed il marxismo autentico di sinistra", Il programma comunista, no 8, 1968". and Amadeo bordiga, Nota elementare sugli studenti ed il marxismo autentico di sinistra", Il programma comunista, no 8, 1968 from Endnotes, Time is an invention of men incapable of love, Bordiga states absolute marxist proof that youth are not a class but, instead, a social category like gender... i was wrong. But, however, they are still slaves economically, and their relations to the MOP are still different to the adult classes, and therefore i say that the youth, like women, are quasi-classes, or, classes insofar as they are really subclasses of other classes united by a common factor that makes them part of this subclass and not the class they belong to economically. Such that all children are united under the quasi-class of child because their real subclass (a child of the capitalist class, a child of the working class, a child of the middle class) is only separated and radically different to their class only because of their childhood. In this, we see why the youth are a fragmented class, that is, they are not a class at all, but a quasi-class, a social group that physically changes their material conditions and relation to the MOP radically enough to be mistaken for a class. this, too, used to apply most obviously to women, but modernly the difference between women and men economically have become not one of quasi-class difference (which is like, being a prole in theory yet a slave in praxis, wifehood or childhood) but now one of social

category difference and marginalized grouphood difference. Women used to have a radically different relation to the MOP from their husband counterpart, such as children have currently to their parent counterparts, but remained the same class as their husband. but now with the failure of feminism and its assimilation we now see that women are now full proletarians who are only oppressed differently from their male counterparts on the basis of sexism and not complete slavery... if a future youth liberationist revolution comes, i fear this is the future of the youth, the proletarianization of the youth and the normalization of pedophilic relations (as we had with heterosexual relations) and the re-creation of ageism as we see in capitalism's sexism currently, a post-slavery oppression of the youth as we saw with women. This is liberalized youth liberation, or, children's rights, a movement i must wholly oppose like a bordigist opposes antifa (which, unlike MLs say, bordigists opposed antifa under the belief it will reproduce and socialize fascism, it will make fascism assimilated into capitalism and so fascize capitalism, aka what DID happen after ww2.. therefore bordigists hated antifa for being TOO fascist.. funny, about bordigists, the whole camattist thing about either capitalism dying or the human species dying kinda feels utopian at my current state, the idea that either we sublate god or god will finally kill herself... camatte wanted to sublate god, i wanted to kill god, but camatte never really gave me a choice there now really, since god was eternal... it isn't communism or the death of humanity anymore, the death of humanity would be utopian, a pleasure, a glory as compared to the truth, optimism, it actually is just "capitalism.". No communism (god rejects sublation, currently, she doesn't care anymore, she is tired, exhausted, depressed, and at her final break) and no salvation in death (the christians finally lose, there is no more heaven, death will not save you!), no alternative to capitalism exists anymore and that includes camatte's blind idea that capitalism will kill itself, the truth is that capital does not merely think it is immortal, no, it is immortal, the rationality of marxism the laws of marxism, the rationality and laws of capital, have all died, and capital is free to become divine, eternal, contradiction and self-destruction no longer means death or threat of suicide but divinity and the mirroring of godhood, capital is eternity.). Uhm this writing, Time is an invention of men incapable of love, by Endnotes, brings up camatte's panpsychism, and that is something i am interested in on its own-- that everything is not just alive but life itself, living-materialism, the life that is everything and everything that is the living, life... Under God, who, one could definitely say is not 'living' (bordiga and the scientific death of capital, christ's resurrection perfected by capital, the zombie god) (but, too, her life and constant self-degrading tendencies could not be described as a life at all-- in fact, if life is only life when it is in relation with its end and recycling, aka, death and decay, God is not alive at

all! She is not the sublation of life, not like the christians believe eternity is-- no, eternity is not the sublation of life, and neither like some satanists think is it the sublation of death, instead... as we see with god's life, her femcel loser life, the phenomenology of pathetic-ness, eternity is the sublation of decay, negating the two sides --- the permanent end of the decaying individual, its final resemblance of unlife gone, it finishes... and the recycling and continuation of vitality-- vril--- life, the restoration, decay is also the earth's life producing, reproducing, multiplying, the earth is life in process, self-vitalizing vitality, and this process is done through life, death, and decay.... well, god negates the death-centered aspect of decay by her eternal existence and inability to die no matter how much she wants too, and she negates the life aspect in her self-destructive, self-harmful, self-degrading, and self-limiting being, in which she is decaying without her decay going to any self-vitalization, she does not vitalize anything in this decay nor does she slowly die in this decay, it is decay without life or death, pure decay, decay-in-itself, decay absolute, another definition for god... God, then, who is eternity, who is eternal, who is decay absolute, sublated decay, is therefore not alive nor dead, she is not living nor dying nor dead nor alive nor rotting nor decaying as we know it, she is perfected decay, she is misery.), we see that because we are not under god but ARE GOD, we cannot actually be alive nor dying nor decaying in the traditional way, these must be false phenomenas, false processes, self-vitalizing vitality is a false process, a mystification by rationality, and the truth is that everything is not self-vitalizing vitality (aka life, panpsychism), everything is instead perfected decay, sublated decay, misery. Everything is misery, the world/God is Decay in (self)process, Misery in process, therefore the only rational choice is to be miserable-- but rationality, then, is nothing but pessimism and cold nihilism, nothing but doomerist tendencies, and must be rejected for any hope, or even any cope, or any way to live--- self is a misery-inducing misery, one must oppose the self to be the self, and to affirm the self is not to escape or not be the self but is to die. Life and Death no longer play a role in God, in the world, it is now only imaginary experiences, there is no life and there is no death in the current state of being of god, or any in fact, as the reality is unescapable misery/decay, and not even nothing but decay sublated, suicide therefore is pointless if death and what is after death do not exist and life, which also does not exist, is not the problem at all, suicide is nothing, not even an event nor a break, it is absolutely nothing, a boring moment. This contradicts with my own experience with suicide attempts but again those were never when sober, and decay and misery-inducing misery has a tendency to create mock-phenomenas and mock-experiences to delude the individual, such that all happiness under decay is not an expression of life but a delusion made by decay to immitate life--- such that the boring moment of suicide

does not feel boring, such that the nothing-burger of death feels like an everything-burger (be it due to pain or adrenaline or sexual excitement or anything), the difference between life and death is entirely faked. Therefore what was wanted is what the world denies us, that is, an end to decay--- we wished to return to decay before god and before the world and instead of negating decay-for-vitality and decay-for-annihilation and uplifting decay-for-decay (in this stage, all three are for vitality and only seem like they are for annihilation or decay), we uplift decay-for-vitality and decay-for-annihilation (both for vitality at this stage) and negate decay-for-decay, and therefore we wanted to synthesize decay and vitality into one, and that is what my neo-fourierism was to any proper use of the term. Now, i see that we cannot return, and we cannot synthesize decay and vitality, and too, there is nothing before god and the world, and there is only decay, vitality is an illusion. Then, utopia is impossible? Why must i use different evidence for the same point? Is it because i am insecure about my old one or because i fear people will not get it? Are those both not just insecurities? Well, if we understand that decay has created an illusory foundation for god/world where everything appears not as it is (decay-in-itself/decay-for-itself, sublated decay, misery) but as it should be (self-vitalizing vitality), and furthermore that due to humanity's inherently far-right humanist mindset even this has been dissolved into what is called modern-day science (a delusional form of an illusion), and science's reactionary role in society (science always reproduces and supports the world's bigoted and oppressive ideas until after they have been semi-abolished, or at least, society has pretended to abolish them, science has never been progressive in a struggle between the oppressed and oppressor--- Science supported racism until society pretended to abolish racism, science supported sexism and homophobia and transphobia until society pretended to abolish them, etc. etc., that is why i do not care about what science says about the youth, or about paraphiles, because i am sure that after society larps progressivism science will follow in line.), it seems that there is no foundation nor justification for the continued existence of science, and so, the sciences must be abolished--and to take it further, considering that rationality has also only ever been oppressive for the masses, being one of the oppressors' tools for the oppression of the neurodivergent, "mentally ill", and queer (of which i fall under all categories) under the justification of typically said rationality-- rationality opposes the queer struggle for liberated passions because rationality is natural and passions are anti-natural and anti-rational, the queers require nihilization and the death of rationality --- rationality opposes the neurodivergent struggle for its own right to itself (really, not much can be said on the neurodivergent struggle insofar as it quite literally is a struggle to be able to live and think how you are without needing to mentally harm yourself to fit in and

not be lobotomized by neurotypicals) because neurodivergents have alternative rational processes, "irrational" as rationality calls it (though, rationality claims there are different levels to irrationality, saying that a schizophrenic and an autistic are differently irrational, but the truth is that irrationality is just the word rationality uses against anything that is not rationality's neurotypical rational sense), and those neurological process just by existing oppose rationality --- and the same for the mentally ill, though little difference historically existed between the neurodivergent and the mentally ill, the separation is quite young/new to science. Then, Rationality is oppressive, and too, it is the birth of civilization, of humanity's speciesist becoming-nonanimal and becoming-divine that led to human-supremacy and domination, the birth of humanism and of politics... thus, seeing as it birthed these horrid things and has brought nothing good or liberatory into this world--- the only good or liberatory things in this world are the irrational ones, no?---- it is not a stretch to say that we'd be better off without it or even to say that its abolition is necessary for any better world... if a better world was possible. Too, following in the line of critiquing self-oppression, thinking itself is a stage in the process of continual self-oppression and must to be abolished, and language as well for obvious reasons. Then, if rationality and science and thinking are down (in which i mean anti-science anti-religion, and not, instead, the mistake of the soulist where to deny science they affirm religion-- this is a better soulism and not the mistake of the old soulists), and if everything but decay is a delusion-- if god does not experience time due to her eternality and even her self-degrading experience is not cyclical but perpetual in such a way that time cannot and does not apply, if god lacks time due to her eternality, if decay-in-and-for-itself cannot have time as a variable, then what time exists here in the world (and for that matter, space cannot exist if only decay exists insofar as space either is matter or is unable to exist without matter and, again, matter is life, vital-materialism, matter is life, and there is only decay here! No space, no time, illusions of decay... fuck im falling back into idealism, NOOOO)? It, again, is an illusion by decay, and so, then historical truth is an illusion, and if that is true, future truths as well... then, you say, is only the present true? But my dear idealist, the present refers to 'now' and 'now' is only conceptualized between then and later, and even there it seems that now can never really be a stable or non-illusory thing, it is always slipping from later to then and we only experience an illusory snapshot of the now that was and never the now that is now-- because such a now does not exist, when one refers to that now they mean the now that is later because in reality the now that is now is a gap, an illusion. Therefore, again, present truth is false as well, truth itself is falsity. Then, all truth must be rejected in the name of truth. What i am saying here, in actuality, is that the three of the godhead are also the one of decay

and also the one-absolute that is god, and so, we live in a state of eternal decay and what we experience (aka the stability science promises us) must be an illusion (a cope, and the experience we have when unable to cope can easily be called suffering, though it quite literally is also suffering as is defined in a dictionary, i am not trying to change the definition of suffering here but tell you where i think it comes from-- it is /is-from the experience of misery when we are not coping, a pure experience of misery instead of an illusory experience we call life-- life is not suffering, life is a cope to hide misery and so subconscious suffering, and suffering proper is conscious misery aka the lack of life/coping as it is a mechanism of closeting). There is no vitality, there is no joy, there is nothing to be optimistic about, we cannot be utopians and utopians at the same time, there is nothing left. Communists modernly, truly only the best communists, are now rejecting marx and marxism and understanding that, ultimately, the proletariat are useless pieces of shit and no revolution will come regardless, all the best communists reject communism, they are not communists at all. If fourier had predicted this when he said in 2012 "There is one thing i am certain of, and it is that i am most definitely not a fourierist!", even when he was taken out of context and the original quote referred to saint-simonian fagwags pretending to be fourierists as to oppose the saint-simonian authoritarian kakistocatholocrats and not actually fourierists, then all i can say is that this misquoting of fourier predicted the future and nothing else... the best communists have never read a word of marx in their lives, look at pol pot's beautiful ancom-maoist-1984-kakistocracy regime (/quantum-sarcastic)!! There is a simple delusion of utopia that i am sure majority of everyone has experienced even once, and i am sure leftists do not know but they too are experiencing it but to such a copium degree, and i myself struggle to release myself from it, utopia is what we want, it is our necrophilic desire, a desire for impossibility, freeing oneself from it is hard, surely hard! We do not exist, we are not our passions nor our selves, we are nothing, yet is it not strange how difficult it is to rid yourself of utopianist perspective-- even the suicidal man kills himself in hope of heaven (or, at least, an escape from life--- utopia can be either perfection or escape, typically it is both).. we cannot accept the hopelessness, it seems impossible, even for those who claim to have lost hope-- even they still maintain escape, be it through death or whatnot, they still have a utopia delusion. I still, too, struggle with such a delusion, if it is not clear enough in this practical diary.. we are stuck in this world, a cruel one, we cannot revolt nor escape (both forms of escapism, both unable to achieve anything insofar as we live in the community of capital and so does everywhere) and every revolution changes nothing (sublation of god when god is sublation) and every attempt at left-colonizing utopianist entitlement (fourierist and utopianist projects) have ended in disaster, therefore

now we CANNOT revolt nor escape, and back then our revolts and escapes were possible but useless and always reverted back to capitalism regardless. Taking the theory that all we can do is what we do, that stirnerian jab (i tihkn,, idk im tired), aka what we did was all we could do, and no other alternative opportunity currently exists as a previous possibility, where our unique self-determines (part of self-oppression) to a degree, then we find it that revolution, communist society/community, the revolutionary subject, the possibility of revolting and killing capital or escaping from capital or transforming capital into communism, or abolishing capital, all these possibilities were never possible to begin with, they were illusions, they were expressions of development that masks that the formal stage of domination of capital is actually already self-determined towards the real stage of domination and therefore was always really dominating, always unable to be opposed or abolished--- capitalism was never leading to communism, capital was never transitory, nor was it ever actually weak and vulnerable outside of illusion, nor was it abolishable, it was not the community of capital but it was guaranteed for the real domination stage, and so, mirrors the real domination stage in being eternal and destined to run-off even if it hasn't already, and so, communism was never possible because it has not happened and now cannot happened. THus, the community of capital IS the sublated community, the end result of the natural community-- and this makes sense to me because both the community of nature and the community of capital are oppressive and alienating and dystopian. Communism was always a capitalist myth to engage the proletarian worker in capitalist social relations and production.

777. No matter how much everything changed before us, it never did, this is the lesson. A quote is often surrounding camatte's character-- many are, really, but this one i can misinterpret and use here--- that is that nothing varies more than invariance... or, nothing changes more than unchangability... or, nothing evolves more than eternality, nothing sublates more than god. Nothing can renew itself and reinterpret itself and reinstate itself more than marxism? Well, regardless, what i can say is that capital, despite everything, every change, has not changed, it cannot change-- Capital's domination has always been real even when it was in the formal stage, but this is not me claiming that there is no formal stage or that capital was always at the real stage, but instead that the formal stage was always expressed in a way that mirrored the real and also aimed towards the real and the being of domination was equivalent to the real in terms of intensity and unescapability, and when i say the real here i mean the real stage of domination. nothing sublates more than God, nothing recycles more than capital, and capital does not change-- going back in time, it was never possible, what is invariant is the impossibility of escaping capital or abolishing it, what is invariant is the impossibility of

communism here, and so, it is the most variant thing in the world too as seen with the stages of domination and such-- false variation that quite literally makes up its invariance, and too, it is infinite variation that defines invariance, never-ending eternal variation that defines invariance, that allows for a text to be eternally relevant is that it is variable (variant) to each eternal moment, each fleeting decade... There is nothing more fleeting than eternity. What i am saying is that the Community of Capital, unlike what Jacques Camatte says in Endnotes' interview at Plainartige ("To distinguish this community: it's not the Gemeinwesen, it would be a Gemeinschaft, but it's not a Gemeinschaft because it doesn't have a spiritual dimension; what's going to make the community is capital, so it's a material community."), is not a material community at all! Its perfect alignment with god/divinity (truly, the world is the perfect and harmonious alignment of our oppressions, not our passions, how ironic!) has allowed it to move past the material stage of its existence, it has not just been anthropomorphized, it has become divinized, not only, but deified as well! Capital is now material and spiritual, in fact, it is the perfect harmonious alignment of the material and the spiritual ((the material and the spiritual) illusions of decay), it has become the sublation of the spiritual and the material, the sublation of christ, capitalism is in fact catholic! In this now spiritual phase, a phase i could not dot down on a timeline but we all know as real in our current state of existence (does trumpism not prove anything? Or the ACP? or Dugin? especially Dugin!), the stage of domination is not just the material community of capital, but in fact, the Gemeinschaft of Capital! Capital is now divine, spiritual, christ-like (the second coming of christ, in fact! Purely nicene...), and godly, it is now material and yet sinless, all the sins of capital now are blessings, they are excused, or at least, a mass of people are now starting to believe so idiotically. Moralism for all but capital, that is the slogan of the church of capital, with their capital glory hole and their capital throne, and their prayers to capital and their castrations dedicated to capital's never-coming orgasm cuz the damn faggot up in heaven, that is, capital, has erectile dysfunction. This is the future? I think so, camatte would disagree, but i am sure that Capital has aquired a spiritual element and existence, it is clearly and economically no longer material-only, no longer limited to the materialist plane, it has dominated it instead, capital dominates the illusions modernly-- truly. This is, funnily enough, an inversion of soulism-- not the domination of illusions by the individual, but instead the domination of illusions by Capital. Regardless of when, considering time is an illusion and so "when" is irrelevant, the spiritualization of Capital and the foundation of our modern Gemeinschaft must most definitely be a result of Capital's scientific death (as bordiga said in my last previous quote of him) and its practical continuation after death, its resurrection...

Yet, after that, capital was not spiritual, it is only now that it has spiritualized and expressed evangelicalist faith in itself (evangelical because that is the closest we have to a real church of capital)... why? I believe that Capital has recently practically died. I believe this death was not some crisis or some big break or event, it was not the great huge crucifixion of christ nor did it have thunder nor lightning, there was no big moment of realization, liberty, or celebration, it just happened one second and alas. This is because capital must kill itself to die, and the suicide of the divine is never big, never pretty, never protestant like that... it was not a party. Capital, though, unlike god, capital killed themselves meaning for it to be a spectacle, a huge party, a celebration of its resurrection again, this time now divine, its second encounter with erotic death and assimilation of death itself, where now it is one with decay... but no, nobody attends, capital had simply gone by the one second and spiritual the next. When? I do not know, that is the point, I should know according to capital but i don't. All i know is that the Material Community of Capital has already transformed into simply the 'community of capital' (camatte was alive to see this, i believe.) and now, modernly, the 'community of capital' is transforming visibly into the gemeinschaft of capital, its spiritual element is becoming more pronounced, it is emphasizing its spirituality now after it rid itself of the material limits. Here, i say there is simply just no death of capital at all, any attempt to kill it a third time will fail, or, it will evolve capital to a next stage. If we are already headed to gemeinschaft, i do not want to see the next stage. If there is no death of capital, if capital is immortal, you can affirm absolutely nothing that isn't capitalist, and you can negate absolutely nothing unless that negation is capitalist, negation and affirmation fails at this level. the thing was that camatte was not heretical enough, such that fourier was not utopian enough, and lanza not nihilistic enough, that camatte did not understand capital enough, fourier did not understand utopia enough, lanza did not understand culture enough, and so they got nowhere applicable modernly due to this. They did not get their solutions, if they even had one ((cough)lanza(cough)) at all. Short quick break, its 7/23/2026, i realize what sexualization and asexualization is and why both are equally harmful for women and children, that is, it is objectification expressed in two sides of the same coin... Sexualization as in the reduction to a sexual object, asexualization as in the reduction to a pure and sacred object, an asexual object, women and children experience this commonly in modern day society and past societies especially. The point is not to combat sexualization with asexualization (as conservatives used to do-- but now with trump as a child predator president they now do not care about upholding this 'protect the youth' mask) nor is it to combat asexualization with sexualization (like NAMbLA-ists do and child predators do to pretend to be giving youth freedom and humanity when

in reality they are simply depriving them of it through a different way, aka not asexualization but sexualization, still objectification), it is to combat objectification with "humanization" (i prefer personification but whatever), to become human and be not an asexual nor sexual object but a person with the aspects of personhood, not reduced to sexuality nor asexuality, but instead a living breathing being. 7/24/26 reading endnotes' camatte archive. 7/25/26, here is fear jump here by jacques camatte and archived by endnotes.org.uk, footnote 16. I must explain once more on abortion and why production and reproduction must be completely halted by a society opposing misery and suffering. just on the basis of trauma as a result not of any specific experience but solely of a loss of autonomy, the basic idea that sexuality (young children have been able, when taught about sex, to knowingly watch sexual content without trauma-- in fact, no child when knowing about sex and knowingly watching sexual content has been traumatized by it, sexual content can be traumatic when unexpected just like horror and abstract arts can be) or bloodshed (the same applies to bloodshed, if we acknowledge that bloodshed has been a natural part of our lives since the start of time-- in fact, one of the main reason that the child mind (which is not underdeveloped but instead developed from a different phenomenological experience, a neurodivergency) tends not to process trauma until they feel safer or older, until their brains transition into a later stage, is because in nature especially human hunter-gatherer and tribal nature, and even for most of human history, human children died extremely often and had to go through many many traumatic experiences in nature or younger civilization before proper vaccines for example, often all your siblings would die gruesomely in front of you or something of the like, so the child mind does not let trauma stunt it until it has reached a later stage in life where they die less often, such as adulthood or teenagerhood where the death rates are way less. Thus it is not that the underdevelopment of the child mind causes them to process trauma later but that their neurodivergent experience is trained to not let trauma stunt them in a subconscious fear of death and drive to survive, and only later does that fear simmer down. Also, too, usually the most traumatic things for children in nature involved more a stripping of autonomy than gore and such, as bloodshed in hunting was natural) cannot traumatize an individual on its own but solely a loss in autonomy can (be it rape, non-consensual activity, abuse, unknowingly finding a gore video (though this does not have a specific person directly at fault and removing autonomy, it does strip the autonomy of the viewer as they had not known before seeing the video, and this IS known to traumatize individuals as seen by children (and adults) finding gore videos and reacting in a traumatic way) or snuff film (child violation is considered the most traumatic thing to watch or experience or do by psychologists, i believe this is due

to child violation usually being the most violent form of violation and most cruel and thus watching someone have their autonomy stripped or having your own autonomy stripped like that is more traumatic due to the absolute overwhelming experience and dread from it and the lasting results. This is also why violent rape experiences tend to traumatize more than non-violent, though it is traumatization and rape and bad regardless.) or whatever else), we can make the argument that birth is the first trauma of the specific individual, that is, the individual cannot verbally consent to being born yet is birthed anyways in a gruesome and most likely painful procedure (we critique those who say that babies can consent to birth on the basis that, since they do not know what birth is at the time and have not been communicated the ideas, the cons, the pros, and the miserable parts of birth and life itself, that even if a baby were able to say yes or no to birth they would have been coerced due to this lack of information, and also babies count as bwui anyways so such a question is irrelevant) and then thrown into a life of decay and misery. Thus a child is, as culturalphilistine said, "raped" but not in a sexual way, they go through a gruesome experience just to live a miserable life and they never recover from this trauma-- i say that the formation of the self is quite literally a response to this trauma, the trauma of birth. THus, birth is a tragedy, and the reproduction of misery, and the production of a new subject to experience suffering. Birth, too, is one of the main causes (outside of hyperstitional proto-capital) of the creation of heterosexuality and so the death of passionate love and sex, and so the birth of productive sex and love and puritanical civilization and marriage and patriarchy (patriarchy and heterosexuality formed at the same time) and modern heterosexuality which is a form of rape and woman abuse. Thus birth led to majority of rapes (not all, as species(plural) lacking heterosexuality do show to still have rape rates and rape victims) in the world through the normalization of heterosexuality and the death of passionate sex. Too, the birth of a child also, obviously, creates a subject in the child class and thus replicates slavery of the youth class insofar as currently they have not been freed and, looking at feminism's defeat, they very well might never be freed, and also birth itself is a form of oppression of the youth class insofar as it lacks consent and recreates a mother-child dynamic and often a father-child dynamic (though not always) which is oppressive even in nature. Too, a power dynamic exists between adult and baby which seems to be unsolvable outside of antinatalism, as a baby is a bwui and cannot consent (i see childhood as a constant ignoring of consent and therefore a perpetual yet not eternal, a temporary perpetual cycle of nonconsensual action, and thus a reign of abuse which may explain why not many people remember being a baby.) yet this lack of consent seems to be nature, from god, and therefore not just solvable via political and social change, thus that the end of ageism requires an

utopia and the death of god and the divine, thus that youth liberation is actually impossible insofar as it is a war against god and nature, a war against life itself, against trauma. Youth liberation may be impossible, but this does not justify replicating the oppression of the youth and the first ever trauma, and thus also replicating the domination of the self by the self, or self-oppression. If all power dynamics are to be abolished, this means even the natural and divine ones.

Abortion seems to be, though we still cannot know if a baby wishes to be born or not (the best choice is not to get pregnant at all, but alas it is not so simple, so to claim it is so simple is to be ignorant and contribute nothing.), the best choice, insofar as our best choice is harm-reduction, misery-reduction, and suffering-reduction. The total death of humanity, regardless, would be a net positive for the rest of the population of earth, and so cannot be looked upon with too much disgust. Birth must be totally and radically opposed, as with to opposition of life that we hold, both must be destroyed under our unholy boot, the boot of the anarchy. With that laid out, and slight correlation though this is me digressing and towards a new topic, simply how can any "left-wing" or "progressive" or anything other than a far-rightist propose a return to nature? Nature has been responsible for thousands of genocides since the start of the earth, and admittedly, humans have been responsible for thousands more since the start of humanity! Genocides of species(plural) aka speciocides have gone on since the darwinian culture began, since nature began, and humanity is only an extension of nature here in the darwinian-rational speciocides that we ourselves have committed, thousands more than any human-centered genocides than we have done, thousands more than any massacre the economy has done (though speciocides are usually caused by the economy since the start of it, aka darwinian culture's darwinist economy responsible for mass extinctions and speciocides and human economy as we;; for the same) to humans, speciocide has been so normalized today that it is treated as nothing, animals lesser to humans as if they do not deserve life, and now even nature's genocides are being glorified by ancoms and commies today and especially by post-lefties (typically the nietzschean ones) and primitivists! For the sake of non-human animals, nature must be abolished. ALL genocides are bad, and too, equally bad. The farming that is going on currently, massacres and factories, those things must be stopped with equal fervour as the stopping of nature's speciocides and genocide-based culture-- human genocidal tendencies and behaviors towards bigotry and mass violence and destruction do not begin with humans, it is not 'human nature' and 'only human', it is from the darwinian culture of nature that humans came from, it infects all beings towards the bigoted glorification and reproduction of genocide and genocidal tendencies, nature is a culture based in absolute and 'rational' genocides and extinctions. Honestly, if it

had been coyotes to achieve intelligence (coyotes do mirror human hunter-gatherer societies semi-well and in some places even exceed their human counterparts, such that coyote hunter-gatherers are superior to human ones. there is a lot of poetic parallels between the two that i admire. Also, on the topic of non-human animal societies, foxes are very well the species with the closest similarity to stirner's union of egoists in their temporary unions, and foxes were one of the animals to work with humans at first yet manage to escape human domestication and abuse.) and not humans, not much would change, and the same genocides and farmings and speciocides and birth of capital would remain. Humans are not unique outside of the chance and role that they were given, gifted, they have no inherent superiority. anyways, back to camatte, let me think of something valuable to say. I take back my defense of anti-empathy and my critique of camatte's morality, not that i exactly feel bad for charlie kirk because i certainly do not and still believe that he deserved it, but because such things should not limit my theorization and such--- and in this critique, if it can even be called one, i had HEAVILY fucked up what 'self' or 'being' even meant in such a way that it made it seem like two different things and therefore destroying my theory of self-oppression, which was absolutely a mistake. Being is simply an alternative word for individual or person, possibly a non-speciesist term for human, it is the same as the self if we are speaking about individuals and how individuals are selves, but it is not in the same context and cannot be used in the same context such as i had done, and being cannot be used to designate the non-existent 'you' insofar as to do so would be to realize it as the self and therefore mess it up, 'you' are not the victim of self-oppression, the self is, you are simply dominated by self-- but even then, you are not, because you do not exist. Self dominates itself, technically, and that is also 'you' if we are to refer to the self as 'you', but again, 'you' refers to the 'real you' romantic idea and the literal 'you' idea made up in your head that you clearly still believe in as you are clearly still alive and awake and conscious and so does not refer to your self aka what can really be called 'you' by others and often yourself. Self and being are different but what i described was , first, wrong, and second, more similar to self-oppression than anything else. I never like going into the false 'you' idea and the self's relationships because i can often make mistakes like that. And so, with that, i also have to deny the idea of justice and recognize everything for what it is--- by all technicalities, though i hate to say it, charlie kirk's death does count as a tragedy insofar as it reproduced suffering. Unfortunately, this is the same for every dead person no matter how bad, every person born no matter how bad, and such, even if i personally think they may deserve it as i now see that my own emotions are limiting my thought though they usually gave a good drive for my thought. Thus i cannot approve of any creation of any tragedy even if it is

harm-reduction as it still replicates suffering and misery and so i must say that tyler robinson was the social democracy to charlie kirk's capitalism, a slightly better solution but alas still capitalism-- a slightly less tragic tragedy but alas still a tragedy-- aughh i fucking hate calling this tragic actually. It could be seen as even more tragic if we look at the person (who in this case, let us say we both personally dislike, this is a hypothetical person and not anyone real) not as how we see them, aka, only the self, but instead with the knowledge of self-oppression and how the individual has absolutely no free will over themselves (insofar as we speak here as free will as in the self's, i am critiquing my old writing on free will here, because there is no being or you but there is self-oppression, thus the self has no free will because it strips itself of free will and oppresses itself with its total domination over itself, the self dominates itself and so makes it a slave to itself, ultimately, the self is a slave regardless of to whom it is and so no free will at all exists), we can see this person that everybody hates as instead a slave, a puppet, performing an act unwillingly, and because of such act, being killed for it. That is, i guess, a bit more tragic to think of, and since nobody has free will, slaves without masters, not even god because of her own misery, every being a suffering slave, one could say every individual is a slave and has no free will and thus every punishment is a tragedy and every act that induces suffering to an other also is a suffering to the suffering-inducer in the situation as they have no control of this, such that we are basically saying we live in a world of drunk, drugged, sleep deprived, and manipulated bastards who, in every act, harms themselves and others, and so, a tragedy even for the "evil individual" who has no control over themself... THus, nobody is evil? Morality and moralism defeated? the beings of the world unite to feel miserable about how they are stuck like this forevermore because god, even the suicidal god, she cannot die? Great, that's what people want to hear. There is not free will, tragic, there is not even freedom, free thing, nor willed things, will, nothing! we are slaves, slaves cannot take responsibility, is that what you want to hear? I may not be able to cheer for a man's death, unless i am a hypocrite, but i will cheer for the suffering that has been prevented by the man's death, how about it? Make the best out of a world this fucked up, but really, the best is eternal suffering so try again. we are all the oppressed, even the lord above, the shining sun, the roaring lion that hisses when hungry and slithers when tired, the anthropomorphic girl above, we are all oppressed, lord,-- i will have mercy on your soul, you do not deserve such a fate, lord. I never really managed to move past the identification of the mother and the child as the same, or, mirrored, in the dynamic with patriarchy, huh? My biggest flaw. Okay i finished, 7/26/26 4:00pm, i finished all the jacques camatte dossier on endnotes.org,uk and i dont have much to say. Yea. So uhm... now i have to finish monsieur dupont's nihilist communism,

huh.... fuck. I'm like halfway through and its just boring. I will start tomorrow, 7/27/26 3:51 am --unless i decide to do it today idk. I am bored and do not want to finish the second half of Nihilist communism by monsieur dupont. I'm happy today, today being 7/27/26 5:28pm. i fear i might have to re-read h.i. but i am prolonging it as much as possible because reading it fills me with regret and deep dread about this necessary stain on my history and life, it is entirely necessary because you know i would delete it if it were not. it disgusts me more than any other work i have made. Okay, i am being too autobiographical here and not focusing on getting a solution, which is necessary in this current time and age. I would tell you all my name at this point as i do feel as if anonymosity is an old and worn down mechanic but i know that at my age that would only hinder me, if i live to be an adult ill tell you then, how about that. uhm let me try to coherently explain what i meant about the inevitability of the real stage of domination of capital and the impossible revolution, because i am sure i confused you all with my previous explanation... I mean that, in the way that chance and the gamble is already accounted for and assimilated into capital, and that human beings have always been determined by god regardless of her forms, thus that individuals never really ever had control, always slaves, i find that the real stage of domination of capital seems inevitable when the material conditions and whims of capital had no real competition-- the proletariat, as much as we give them the role of the revolutionary, as we have seen by the marxist-leninist scam and the history of communism, were never truly able to achieve the death of capital or even to oppose it, the material conditions that made them never gave them this potential, the proletarian class in the end only worked as a motor of capital that never had any real chance of opposing it--- there was no real opposition that, via capital's non-chronological existence, the unreal time, was not eventually dominated--- in fact, by that rationality, there was no real opposition at all. if individuals had no freedom, if we were always slave, revolution, though inevitable, was doomed to fail, or really, to succeed-- not in our goals, the end of capital, but its own, the evolution and renewal of capital, such that every revolution has been in favor of capital's continual existence even if the individuals were not. THus the impossible revolution is the revolution we believed in, we desired, when we were carrying out pro-capital revolutions, when we were infinitely sublating capital, we imagined not a negation of capital but a radical decay of the capitalist order and capital, to turn decay against itself and end our slavery--- we could never agree what this meant, but it did not matter, because it was the impossible revolution. THE material conditions and the inevitability of the real stage of domination of capital had already promised us that all revolutions would always be pro-capital, that we could not escape capital, capital's manifest destiny was promised to it by itself

since the start of time. This stage we are at now was the stage it always meant to hit, and beyond this, it also meant to hit as well, it is undefeatable through revolution. Revolution, in fact, is a mechanism to capital, it will continue with the evolution of capital until capital inevitably puts it out of its misery too, which is, to immortalize it into the gears of capital. One must be neither revolutionary, counter-revolutionary, reactionary, nor apolitical, nor reformist, nor pacifistic nor utopian nor scientific, we must break with all of this-- but, again, we cannot. There is no self-negating decay, there is no decay against decay, decay is quite literally impossible. It is simple, inevitability means we will only go downhill, that our slavery will only strengthen, and thus a solution requires a break with inevitability, which is something seemingly impossible. How? I cannot answer as of now, sorry :3. Well i can tell you what's not the answer, and that is playing into this, or accelerating the inevitability, hoping that it collapses or that after its had its fun it'll leave or die off or something, that maybe it will rush itself to death, destroy itself, self-negation, that is, accelerationism and/or the nihilist communist waiting game. Simply, it will not happen, the real stage of domination of capital and the new divinity it has achieved quite literally spells out its eternality and the death of communism-- too, there has never been a self-negating subject, not even you or me, so why would capital self-negate? Of course, this is not a denial of what nihilist communism actually stands for (at least, what i see 160/307 of monsieur dupont's book nihilist communism through), that is, we cannot make the revolution, that communism happens after capitalism, happens after revolution, and that the waiting game is ultimately necessary (though monsieur dupont does not fully submit to the waiting game and, as far as i can recall, talked about possible praxis? That i find silly in their book, and not an inconsistency but a funny attempt to at least say something other than 'lets wait'). Because, really, the waiting game is all we can do, and now that not even the revolution is possible, the waiting game is no longer a game but now all of the revolutionary struggle with no end--- the revolutionaries wait, and wait, and wait, eternally so, we will wait and nothing will come, eternal waiting, the ends have been abolished, the temporality of things were abolished. there is only waiting, but this here is the doomerist end of revolutionary struggles, or at least, revolutionary struggles for the impossible revolution-- thus, one submits to a pro-capital revolution instead, MLism, Maoism, whatnot, social democracy, whatever, national revolutions, third-world, whatever. The (real, or, communist) revolution was a lie, historically, but now it is dead, it is an impossibility! This sort of nihilism, the admittance of defeat, that is what i expected from nihilist communism by monsieur dupont, it is not what i have gotten, or at least, yet. The more and more i feel more nihilistic, cold nihilistic, my heart washing away, i feel more inclined towards just making a phalanx and just

living there instead, the typical leftist escapism, and at this point i cannot even argue against it. I also worry that, with the death of decay, so will the passions be crippled by the movement-- most of the best arts came with the worst eras of decay, and perhaps even if the correct alignment of passions were possible, maybe it would still be an alienation, that is, an alienation from greater pleasures--- maybe that is exactly why the correct alignment of passions is impossible, because even when we think of a world where it is possible, it is still not the correct alignment of passions, even when we imagine it as possible, it is still impossible, maybe it is so impossible that we cannot even imagine the correct alignments, that is, we cannot imagine a true utopia. Well, if the impossible revolution were, well, possible, and in this day and age, this stage of domination, it is clear that the supporters and revolutionaries for the impossible revolution would no longer be the assimilated class of proles in the generalized slavery of the people, but also what used to be the capitalists, the statist, those evils (and many many more evil people), and also the peasant (or what remains), the lumpen, the unemployed especially, the middle classes, all the people, the animals (non-human), the slaves of modern day (here i mean literal slaves), etc. etc., all assimilated into the generalized slavery of the people and fighting for the impossible revolution--- this is why everyone can be a pro-revolutionary (or a "hypothetical revolutionary", as i am using pro-revolutionary here in a different way and context than M.D. meant it, i simply liked the term but not the meaning quite as much.), but when it comes to reality, the impossible revolution is not inevitable, but instead, and obviously, impossible. this is another reason to abandon moralism as, in reality, about 14/16th of all the revolutionaries in such a hypothetical revolution will be bad people, sinners, evil exploiters and supporters of capital and slavery, there will be all the forces of the soulless and passionless, but they will be fighting for their own liberation from their own slavery, fighting for their passions-- that is, if it was possible. Even elon musk has called himself a socialist, even deng xiaoping raises the flag of communism (although he uses it to mask his orange capitalism, or, red-yellow synthesis, the actual 'new synthesis' of the maoists, now dead and disgraced.)! Well, we must abandon the impossible revolution, obviously, and the left-wing has historically tried to stray away from it while remaining for it, that is, by limiting and defining it (the impossible revolution, like any good utopian idea, evades definition, just like utopia itself), by making it into something, and something possible, but their abandonment, a cowardly one, is to suffocate the impossible revolution and all their revolutionary comrades in their sleep, and the potential for utopia. I am saying to keep whatever project we accept next, the replacement to revolution, definitionless and limitless, just like identity, i find it the only way to ensure. Actually, on the question of moralisms, which was, on the

question of empathy or valorization of life and people equally regardless of their doings and the leftist demonization of its enemies, this is an entire mystification at all and also not a problem of my concern. Justice, which this can also therefore be seen as another critique of bob black's anarcho-democracy in 'wild justice by bob black', is an entire moral mystification in attempt to hide the real struggle against suffering waged by the fourierists-- i use moral mystification a lot in my daily life, anything i see that mystifies the conditions that make a thing "immoral" or what "immorality" actually is (which, it should be as follows, "that which brings sorrow, misery, suffering, and negative emotion non-consensually"), i instantly dismiss it as a moral mystification, but yet i partook in it in my earlier writing about camatte's hyperempathy towards every thing alive and dead except for jean-paul sartre. I had based my argument on my innate sense of justice, which, regardless of how much i critique it, i cannot rid myself of. Here, justice is simple-- yet there are many justices to critique with the same basic premise, one (thing) does something bad to (another) and is punished while another (thing) does something good to (another) and is rewarded, the victim of the former is usually compensated in some way to make up for it and the latter has no victims, or, justice can be fairness--- but not just law and up-down social control like fairness implies, as this punishment and compensation, this fairness, this justice, can be done via revenge like in bob black's wild-justice social-control-system, justice here is just fairness separated from law or government. Justice here is that when one sees an abuser, they wish to kill or abuse that abuser, and when one sees a victim, they wish to soothe them or whatever. Justice is a want to make the unfair now fair again, to undo injustice, it is a negation of a negation i guess. Justice, then, is not an actual opposition to injustice. Injustice is suffering, misery, sorrow, non-consensual negative emotion, injustice is technically the same as what we oppose, but we do not wish for justice. Justice represents in, at least modernly how we view, the human mind, as punishment and making it up for the victim, typically more punishment than the latter as the repression of enmity has come out in the form of releasing anger and pent-up enmity (and possibly kismessis potentiality) onto socially acceptable groups of 'immoral individuals'-- it is not the attempt to stop injustice but a bandage onto injustice, and too, a pointless endeavour for those wishing to end injustice. Justice in fact requires injustice, as to be a fair and equal law (or to be a fair world, or to not be taken advantage of without payback,), one must punish injustice and not instead end it. People want payback, justice is payback, that is what i mean, i realized while typing, that is what i mean. Payback is a side-effect of injustice, of suffering, and thus will be ended with suffering and injustice, and as no self-negating subject exists, payback works to maintain its own existence. Payback and justice is moral mystification exactly because it does not see the issue

for what it is, it does not seek to end the suffering of these people, it does not see the roots that misalign one's passions in order to act like that, that is, it does not care about the individual's lack of free will or choice, the individual's slavery, it only cares about that the individual has (albeit forcibly) done bad things and justice must be served. Justice is a moral mystification because it does not look to who's actually at fault, aka, the lack of a fault ---that destroys the justice system when realized and thus cannot be realized -----, it instead looks to a slave who's corpse was carried out to do the action and blames and punishes it instead. Also because justice serves as a tool against utopia as well--- it both does not blame who is actually at fault, as that would destroy justice as a system, and also serves against utopia by creating antagonisms between slaves and reproducing misery and suffering in its punishments, justice tends to recreate and worsen and harden criminals (like seen in america), yes, for free labour, but also so the system of justice is reproduced by a reproduction of crime--- prisons reproduce crime for justice and for money, it makes a criminal more likely to commit crime in america exactly so we can bring more criminals to justice (punishment that reproduces crime) and get more money out of exploiting them. Thus, again, justice is for injustice, it needs injustice-- justice is the hatred for injustice, basically, and so it needs it. When a faggot like charlie kirk comes up, i understand why people feel justice when he gets shot, i sure fucking hate him too, but i also understand that he was a slave and what would work, not shooting him, but preventing his existence, is the better option. That is, its the story of the two hitlers all over again, the hitler we have today and the famous artist (who was still a peice of shit antisemite) we could've had if the material conditions hadn't enslaved him, and i do see that what i am saying seems like a defense for these people, but i hate hitler, i hate him more than like anyone else, i am only critiquing justice for being unjust. like the question goes, would you go back in time to kill baby hitler? But baby hitler is not adult fascist hitler, again, people grow and change and are technically different people at all times (a form of alienation that is inseparable to the self) and definitely different people and different moments of time-- baby hitler did not kill any jews, baby hitler can be changed, can be made into not fascist hitler pretty easily, baby hitler is innocent while fascist hitler is hitler, hitler is a product of material conditions and slave of god, again, hitler exists because culture, his self, and the economy demanded he must, high emphasis on the economy if you look at camatte's writings on fascism (except his antisemetic ones). What i am saying is that justice is killing baby hitler, an injustice, but an actually non-mystified fix would be achieving utopia (impossible), or at least not killing baby hitler but making sure he doesn't become hitler (either way, dead or alive, if hitler does not become fascist hitler then capital will just get someone else, maybe wacko insane

himmler). The point is that we ignore that Hitler himself is not evil, his actions are and his beliefs are, and his beliefs are because they lead to his actions and just general suffering, and his actions are because they lead to suffering, thus I am saying this is the moral mystification that is justice, we do demonize people, yes, and I understand why, but it does not rationally help us achieve the end of suffering, as is the goal. If one wants to end injustice, justice is not the way, and thus justice (being the opposition to injustice) must be a moral mystification, such that Antifa was too fascist for Bordiga, justice is too unjust for me. I mean, the entire thing with the demonization of pedophiles was based on justice against child predators (not pedophiles) and it maintained itself by doing injustice to (not child predators) pedophiles. Justice itself reproduces injustice, even in the methods of revenge and wild justice, where one can see misaligned passions (someone fucked with you? you wanna fuck with them back to get back at them? a misalignment of passions, the end of injustice is not justice-- you beat their ass and all that's gonna happen is reproduced injustice when, instead, you can just end injustice) and Bob Black thinks to not align them but instead, like the leftist he is, call for justice! Individual justice, yes, that is his anarcho-democratic nonsense, but justice nonetheless, payback. Then, it will happen again anyways as the issue was not resolved. Rehabilitation is an attempt to escape injustice and I find rehabilitation more Fourierist, though Fourier would most likely critique it, than justice. My dad was abusive and emotionally incestuous, if I could give him a heart attack right now then my sense of justice and dignity would tell me to, but of course, I know the option to resolve such injustices in this world like abuse and incest is not just to kill all abusers (that would solve nothing and I've learned to not advocate for massacres. Plus, bad people are still people/slaves so eh, I don't care.) but prevent abuse and incest from being possible. We should, if we are to end suffering, prevent suffering from being possible, not punish suffering-inflictors (suffering reproduction onto the guilty) and reproduce suffering (suffering reproduction onto innocents). Justice has actually been one of the forces to normalize and mystify injustice in the world, such that Antifa assimilated fascism into capital and allowed for the real stage of domination of capital and whatnot. So when it comes to empathy, I can have empathy for anyone-- or I should be able to if I was a perfect utopian socialist like the neurotypical Fourier, which I am not, (and is not needed to live in utopia, utopia is past homogeneity and heterogeneity.)--- but that does not mean treating them as if they did not do that, because we do not live in a utopia. In utopia, sure, nobody would care anymore, but utopia is impossible. We have all of this based in a non-moralist system like Bordiga where we have our plan and we carry it out without moral mystifications or distractions and want only to achieve our plan and nothing else-- here our plan takes the moral mission of the end of

suffering and misery, but we do not apply moralism to this. Thus, sure, camatte says not to cheer one's death and to valorize all (human, since he was speciesist) life, but this only works for an aim for utopia (outside of valorizing life, which is a moral mystification too because values and valorization is part of the alienation that is intrinsic to the self), and we now know utopia is impossible, therefore there is no point. if utopia was possible, i'd give him this and i'd say, 'yes we can acknowledge each other as all beings and all equal beings who are slaves and must work together against our slavery, suffering, and misery, and yes justice is unjust, yes, demonization is pointless and wrong and so with dehumanization, yes, for utopia, we unite against moralism and moral mystification', i'd say 'truly, i was wrong, sympathy for everyone must stand clear and ready!', but utopia is impossible. Sure, we are all beings, sure, dehumanization and demonization is reactionary, but who cares when there is no utopia? And too, this does not mean we cannot cheer for someone's death, only that we cannot demonize and dehumanize each other and see each other as non-people at all, and that we must recognize everyone as people regardless of what they are or do----- not the valorization of life but instead the recognition of each as a person and every as a person, and whatnot-- we cannot entirely valorize life and have camatte's whole weird love-community thing which seems, at least from what i see, to lack enmity, because enmity is a passionate thing and repressing enmity is simply wrong, enmity and the nihilization of life is part of a utopia project, one must be able to hate (platonically, romantically, sexually, non-labeled,) each other as that is a human desire, only a cracker denies the passion of hate, and only a cracker or a christian denies the nihilization of life and the end to all values, the fulfillment of russian nihilism, as the end of the alienation that values bring onto the self.. that values are alienating and valorization is a form of alienation, same with devalorization, only nihilization stands alone non-alienating. So even then, i say, i'd just have to ask for charlie kirk's consent to cheer for his death first before i cheer, in, let's say, a perfect world, since it is consent that matters. That is all i had to say. Moral mystification can oversimply be defined as the mystification that morals do over themselves to make it seem like things simply seem bad because they are or because of something else and not because of the actual suffering it causes, it erases the roots of immorality (that is suffering) and just shows immorality without consideration of suffering, or, instead of what makes suffer is immoral, it is what is immoral must make suffer... from adults have a power dynamic over children that they abuse, and thus child rape is an issue and immoral// child predators are immoral, to two things, one is that children having consensual sex with another child (of a similar age, as age difference does have societal power dynamics, see the fragmentation of the youth as an oppressed group

in its many forms) or children having sex at all is immoral and therefore must be child abuse and make children suffer (untrue statement), and two, because pedophiles are attracted to children they must be innately evil and bad and immoral because they have an attraction to children, and child predators rape children (even if a really low percent of child predators are pedophiles), therefore all pedophiles are immoral and child abusers and make children suffer by existing or will eventually make a child suffer. You see how a true premise, through moral mystification, can create two false ideas, and then those false ideas can also become taboos, the final stage of moral mystification, where they are just wrong "because they are". a taboo is just wrong because it is, because it's a taboo, because it's gross, immoral, evil, a taboo, again, the final stage of moral mystification where they just give up and leave out the explanation. Children (remember that teenagers count as children here for all you age-chauvinists who think because you're like 15 or smth like me (7/30/26 i am 15) that you're not considered a child, you legally are and societally still are) having sex is immoral because it is, because it is taboo, it is immoral, evil, a sin. Pedophilia (the sexuality) is immoral because it is, because it is a taboo, because it's immoral and evil and a sin. Pedophilic relations (the abusive relationship that is straight-up child abuse) is immoral (not cuz its child abuse or anything to the moralist but instead ") because it (just) is, (just) because it's a taboo, (just because) it's immoral and sinful and evil(and no other reason.".... you see the problem? Children don't matter to the anti-pedophile mass and they don't matter to the mass of child predators either, the anti-pedophiles only hate pedophilic relations cuz its taboo and ruining purity or whatever and not because it's child abuse. They do not care about children. This is the truth about moral mystification, it dehumanizes and oppresses and justifies abuse.). The taboos here are all, too, from the first premise i gave, of child predators being immoral because they bring suffering, the true premise, but moral mystification here reaches its limit at the taboo, its extreme, the taboo is unquestioned and we do not know why it is taboo, so some people dismiss it as moralist nonsense because they do not know that originally it was built on a true premise. Like incest, an unquestioned taboo that is immoral just because it is or because the family is sacred or something or because incest is a sin or gross or weird or wrong, they ignore that the family model and the existence of a family is what makes incest coercive and in majority of cases abusive and wrong, they forget it is the "incest" part of incest that makes it wrong, by that i mean, the family, that the family is a coercive force formed by incest that tends towards reproducing incest, and that incest, because the family is hierarchical and sacred and demanding and coercive, is also coercive and abusive, because it is an extension of the family. Incest is not against the family, i have seen incest

supporters and incest opposers say that but it is not true, incest is infact for the family and in every family in micro-forms and makes the family and is reproduced by and reproduced the family, it is form the family. And, too, incest is wrong because it is coercive and abusive and thus brings suffering and because it upholds the family institution and thus brings suffering again! Again, do not just reject taboos for moral mystification without demystifying them and finding that rational kernal stalin talked about or whatever idk. Okay im tired goodnight its 7/30/26 11:48 am and i didnt sleep all night. 7/30/9:28 pm, 243/307 though Nihilist COMmunism by monsieur dupont, i plan on reading bataille after this, or at least reader books of bataille. twitterite ultroids have taught me that MLs are lassalleans and i do not know what to do with this information except for assume that lassalle is the secret theorist of social fascism and that MLs are social fascists like the socdems, that the MI doctrine of social-democrats are social-fascists being both true and also self-projection, that Social fascism has won in lassalle's birth (stage of hypothetical winning, such that capital won in capital's birth in the hypothetical stage (meaning ensurity) and capital won formally in the formal stage of capital's domination, and hypothetical here means that there is no other path but to real domination and beyond--- a real win and beyond,. A criticism i see of camatte's economics is a misunderstanding of overcoming and that this must mean exclusion or abolition, like the overcoming of value by capital that an ICP spoke of, this is untrue as the overcoming of value by caapital was the destruction of alienation between value and capital, between man and value (another communist aim retaken and reclaimed by communism), and thus between man and capital through value's sublation into unity with capital, that is, overcoming capital, value in process unalienated, and so overcoming does not imply a capital without value like that ICP interpreted it as. Or endnotes.... uhm, i will get back to them about a history of separation and subsumption in the modern times after m.d.'s dumbass book-- 7/31/26, perhaps a deconstruction and destruction of my current outlook, that is, camatte-fourier-lanza the trinitarians, will give me a new outlook while REMEMBERING micheal hauer... camatte, fourier, and lanza, to critique all three is hard.), then in the USSR's foundation social fascism won (the first formal win) and then in the social democratic takeover and capitalist renewalship, such seen in luxemberg's murder and the creation of modern social democracy, the second formal win of social fascism and that both all led to (as we know mussolini was inspired by lassalle and lenin (lenin the consistent kautskyist (according to Guy-ernst Debord's society of the spectacle which calls him such a name and implies that the split between kautsky and lenin was because lenin was more kautskyist than kautsky.. then, if bordiga is more leninist than lenin, does that make bordiga the ultimate kautskyist (well i assure you that the modern ICP is more leninist than

bordigist and most likely more lassallean than marxist, but bordiga arguably was more marxist than most marxists and not very leninist at all... despite his claim. Organic centralism, if it were made less authoritarian (bordiga reeks of leninist statism, the only area in which he is more leninist than marxist.), seems fine and finely marxist to me.)? The most radical kautskyist to ever walk the planet? I do not know.. but apparently from a source i found, democratic centralism was from a lassallean and kautsky had extreme lassallean tendencies which only further proves the lassallean nature of the ussr and AES AND modern marxism of all camps, including, arguably, even bordiga and ortho-marxists), to recall, which means lenin very well could have caughten kautsky's lassalleanism) and stalin (the first "marxist-leninist" and absolute lenin dick-sucker, who's AES doctrine was quite literally lassallean and blanquist by nature, and, obviously, revisionist and capitalist) arguably, and hitler could never take power without the socdems, neither mussolini) the third and biggest formal win, where social fascism won in the formation of political fascism, that is, mussolini and hitler and whatnot, mosley's attempted rise and franco's quasi-fascist moderatism (the fascists in spain ended up disliking franco due to his moderatism, his liberalism), and then after world war 2 ended, the winning of antifa, anti-fascism (so it is clear what i am talking about), social fascism won in a real way, a real win, such that antifa was not anti-fascist enough, anti-fascism was not anti-fascist enough, and became a form of social fascism that assimilated fascism and social fascism into capital and thus lassalle's dreams and wishes became a part of capital/ Capital is now a fascist, social fascist, lassallean capital, and so, again, just capital. It is just ccapital, capital is what it is, YHWH capital. So then the winning of the bolsheviks and the winning of the social democrats over modern leftism is the second and less important real win of social fascism where now majority of modern leftists are, in fact, lassallean social fascists, be them socdems or MLs, the variants of socdems (and liberals leaning towards socdem like bernie sanders) and the variants of the MLs, all are lassallean social fascists who are for and radically pro-capital, thus all revolutions are really (instead of formally) for capital and pro-capital. Thus, the lassallean systemic virus (which really is just the immune system of capital against the virus of its own death, that is, it is a virus to leftism and the immune system to capital, so it is less so a virus in reality but only, in a mystified manner, appear that way.). now, this is not great man theory, what i mean in "lassalle's birth and death" is not his life, his being, not lassalle, but the birth of lassalleanism --as a result of capital. Lassalle is unimportant, to say lassalle is would be great man theory, it is lassalleanism's birth and death that i mean in the first hypothetical win of social fascism, as it is the first form of social fascism, and at that first form, its fate in the perfecting of capital was secured. Lassalleanism was the counter-revolution

promised to accompany every subjective phenomenology in the revolution, it was the counter-revolution that was always really there and prevented revolution, it was the death of revolution as a possibility. There can be no non-Lassalleian revolution EVEN if the revolution in question is carried out by non-Lassalleians like leftcoms and primitivists and camattists and ultra-leftists and post-leftists and whatnot, because revolution itself is now the lassalleian counter-revolution. This is the Lassalleian Systemic virus (which eventually also birthed AES, another lassalleian socialism), again, and is why i am an anti-revolutionary, not reactionary nor counter-revolutionary (those two latters are other words for lassalleian revolutionary), but anti-revolutionary like a primitivist (like zerzan or wtvr) calls oneself anti-leftist. Bernstein famously wrote on lassalle and what did he say? Regardless, he was a lassalleian. Even the anarchists and all those anarcho-revolutionaries and anarcho-revolutions, which again were never anarchists at all (see: anarchism as an impossibility, no anarchist is an anarchist and no anarchism is an anarchism, especially anarcho-leftists), only really reproduced, ironically, a lassalleian program in the minarch's territories (or, a minarcho-lassalleian program, as all these anarchists and anarcho-leftists and anarcho-rightists are all ultimately just minarchists since anarchism itself is impossible, ja?), and never an anarchist free-land or anything else. In anarcho-syndicalism this was seen more explicitly with the red-brown-yellow anarcho-statism, which was ultimately just as lassalleian as it was sorelian, nat-syndicalist, and ultimately quasi-fascist (anarcho-syndicalism as anarcho-(quasi-)fascism), and so social fascist, and the same can be said with the khmer rouge's quasi-anarcho-totalitarianism or the inherent statism and lassalleianism of all the FAILED anarchist revolutions (in which i mean failed as in being defeated in the revolution, not as in failing to achieve anarchism, as if it the latter than all of them are failed anarchist revolutions, which if it was the former then it is an actual category of anarchist losses)... but too, really, makhnovschina, CHAZ, the supposed asian anarchist lands, freetown christiania (arguably anarchist?), and whatever else, they too reproduced a Lassalleian feature, and too, even outside of revolution, almost all of modern leftist and socialism is socially fascistic and birthed from that bastard man. So then one must, in order to be revolutionary, be anti-revolutionary, that is, to be against revolution at all. Camatte spoke about the death of leftism, yes, but i think that really it is the birth of leftism that constituted the death of revolution and the permanence of lassalleianism in all aspects of the left, which means, i believe it was never meant to be anything but lassalleianism, and so, leftism has always been the left-wing to capital, nothing more. The proletariat in all its lassalleian revolutions have only even recreated or sublated capitalism, such their reactionary nature as a class under capital, and never abolished it-- there is no revolutionary proletariat, this is

because there is no self-negating subject, in fact, marx was wrong wholly when it comes to the prole, the self-negating prole, the average prole is a lassallean and not a marxist at heart. We know, due to M.D.'s pointless psuedo-radical blabbering, that class consciousness is a lie and class culture is a farce and that revolutionaries from revolution and communism comes after revolution and that parties do nothing for the revolution as they are pro-revolutionary delusionals who do not understand that revolution comes from the proles and are done by the proles and whatnot and we cannot control this--- here, M.D. may not know, but reading camatte's marx, they are argueing in fact AGAINST marx and bordiga on communism and the party and the human community, but that matters not to me because, at least now and from what i have seen, every leftist will look at Monsieur Dupont's nihilist communism and say that is the most obvious thing in the world as it is, and it is not a radical discovery. I bring this up for a reason. The proletariat will never rise up exactly because M.D. is both right (revolution comes naturally from the proles and no movement or party can force its hand, we can only wait) and wrong (the prole is not affirming their humanity against their prolehood, in the real stage of domination their humanity has been united with their prolehood, forcing the struggle of the prole class to be lassallean, and even before then, irrationally and with no apparent reason, the proletariat has always been displaying nothing but a lassallean mindset, even though nothing has lead them to believe such-- here i blame capital as there is no other reason. The proles do not and have never believed in their humanity, they are the unhuman workers of lassalle.), and this is also why the proletariat has never rosen up, any rise of the proletariat that has happened was one for capital, lassalleanism, and also debatable on whether or not it even was proletarian at all-- i believe, from camatte, that the soviet union was a DOTP headed towards capitalism due to material conditions (which is why lassalleanism became so popular and had the ability to dominate and win-- the material conditions made the soviet union have to be lassallean, NOT lassalleanism, ideologies are not the leader of material conditions but the reversal), i also believe that all the ML states following forth were usually (with many exceptions) also proletarian revolutions that headed towards capitalism (this time due to a lassallean characteristic in the proletariat, an intellectual leadership, rackethood, or due to material conditions if capitalism was not yet ready to die which it never is), but, in nations which already had capitalism (which was a few), this showed a lassallean character-- china was a dual (P-C) dictatorship (begun by a peasant revolution) as known and ultimately lead towards orange capitalism, the cadets that wass the proletarian sides took a lassallean feature though this is irrelevant. The proletariat in europe, in america, asia, africa, and oceania all tended towards an affirmation of their labour, regardless, and while most parties are ran

by intellectuals and non-proles, even the organic proletarian movements, revolts, and strikes have always lacked a marxist character that wasn't a repetition of goethe lassalleism. the Proletariat has never been able to represent humanity exactly because it saw its own humanity through its labour, it was lassalleian in mindset exactly because it refused to self-negate, to kill itself, in fear of its own death.. Too, we can obviously and clearly see that humanity has never been the solution anyways, only another form of oppression, and that the expectations dropped on the proles to make utopia was too much for anybody. Proles do not have the key to god's kingdom, they cannot end our suffering, they are not in control nor can they take over without only reproducing the issue, because proles do not live in the future, they live in the present, and they are only able to reproduce the present. a man under capital can only recreate capitalism when he is dropped on an island, class consciousness (or the present communism among us, the repressed human community) is not real and does not exist and so we cannot leave capital regardless, new modes of being do not form immediately after the fall of capital or leaving capital and capitalist modes of being only reproduce capitalism. This was the problem with camatte's escapism and the problem with marxist revolutionary escapism, you gotta die. 7/31/26, 11:49pm, i met an insect who seemed like a praying mantis, they didn't say anything to me that i heard or understood but i waved at them, they're still here. I imagine that, if utopia was real, even the ants that keep biting me and the praying mantis outside and the flies and mosquitos and roaches i've had to kill for my own survival would be able to live side-by-side with everyone else and be recognized for who they are, people, deserving of recognition of their peoplehood and their passions being aligned with ours where they can be with us and we with them. I also hope that, in a perfect world, with the abolition of verbal language and the internationalization of communication and consent and aligned passions and the abolition of nature and culture than utopia implies, that we would be able to freely communicate with all beings, living, dead, unliving, undead, objects, and otherwise, and have relations with them if passions allow. wait so 243/307 right and i realize THIS IS THE BOOK, like, this is the main portion of the bbook, 2/3rds in and THIS IS THE BOOK???? i'm guessing here because this is the only writing that is this long and the last two thirds were compilations of writings and not one big writin like this one third of the book is, and li,e, huh??? Maybe the two-thirds collected writings i read was also the book, yes, but beecause this writing is a whole thirdi assume this is like the meat of it, right?? its fucking, only a third of the book? What is this even about??? 14 pages into this shit and ugh whatever. On this note, i'd like to point out that supporting any culture or supporting the existence of any gender is a form of support for oppression, alienation, and suffering, and one should not take seriously the

demands of a sex-realist or a race-realist or so on and so on. I now critique once more, my old feminism, that is, there is also no self-negating gender, and sadly, due to this revelation, one must deny the existence of the gender shredder. The path of feminism from the radical quasi-abolitionists (gender abolitionism's ancestors) to the liberal sexist "feminism" that opposes actual liberation from gender and instead affirms femininity, this was the natural path for feminism, and just happened to coincide and affirm capitalism's exploitation and assimilation of feminism, as, again, remember, civilization was divinely-made by a repressive trans femcel named yaldabaoth. Uhm, yeah. CAMATTE NAMEDROPPED?????? WHAT???? also camatte argued his point exactly against this spectacle, however, denying revolution and arguing for escape, so M.D. the implication of your reference to him is wrong, he was not inspired by the spectacular struggles but by his analysis of capital to declare the proletariat dead and humanity the slaves-- not revolutionary subject, he denied revolution for instead involution, but slaves, the sufferers of capital. but crazy, camatte namedropped, and uh yea. I'd argue that, despite fourier's speciesism and advocacy for animal murder, fourier is actually less speciesist than marx, even WITH fourier's (ironic) anti-cat sentiment (since he lived with cat roommates but whatever), and thus communism is stained with a speciesism that makes itself impossible to realize if communism, like modern communists think, will solve all oppressions-- because it will not. Even if communism was possible (the impossibility of communism comes from camatte's work), it would not be wanted, as it is nothing radical nor utopian, and that is what i am saying. I would even say that definition, if we acknowledge that definition is a very important tool used by civilization and culture to dominate and control the passions via meaning, validity and invalidity (which relates to the underdeveloped 'norm' idea of the radeviants), and definition itself, is alienating as well and used in the path of oppressors and is highly responsible in oppression, along with meaning and validity, it is that definitions and meanings and validity discourse are tools that can only in any case be used to misalign the passions or cause oppression and to alienate and is never able to correctly align any passion insofar as definition and meaning and validity discourse is FOR and can only be USED for misalignment and alienation, invalidity being a form of alienation itself and a form of misaligned passions, definitions limit and contort and meaning only affirms definition and self, oppressive beings. And surely definition will not be abolished in communism, jes? And personal property, all the communists claim personal property will stay in the revolution, jes? So then, what the fuck? non-camattist marxism is highly misled when it comes to civilization and whatnot, and to a degree, all marxism is responsible for a major misunderstanding when it comes to revolution, not just its impossibility but how it would work in relation to communist society and utopia,

and how it is even possible to transition. 8/1/26, HAPPY NEW MONTH I
FUCKING DID IT IN ONE NIGHT I FINISHED 307/307 NIHILIST
COMMUNISM BY MONSIEUR DUPONT YES NOW I CAN READ THE
CRITIQUE OF CAMATTE, THINK ON HOW TO SOLVE THE QUESTION OF
LANZA, AND LOOK FOR FOURIER'S AFFIRMATION THROUGH THESE
TWO, AND START READING BATAILLE!!! wait monsieur dupont may have
been helpful exactly in one thing, that is, dismissing the idea of the real movement
and the communism before the revolution, even if such a thing is obvious in the
modern day of post-2001 america and barely any serious leftist still believes in a
real movement (that's actually one of the main things most rackets have in
common, the denial of the REAL racket yet calling themselves the only important
and correct and dogmatic racket), because just from a few or something more
paragraphs into endnote's a history of subsumption on issue 2 of something idk
they bring up the theory of periodisation and the real movement (the theory of
periodisation, as far as i know, being BASED on the real movement, which we can
now deny-- one could say camatte was also based in the real movement but i feel
that the stages of formal and real domination are moreso based on capital than
anything else--- one could also say i periodized in the past, and to that, i say, self-
critique, let me just abandon that periodisation of my past! Cowardly, sure, but
necessary. Now endnotes has brought up Kant in this, history of subsumption on
issue 2, and i wish to say that from the limited knowledge i have of kant
originating in watching all of wolff's kant lectures on youtube, not a reliable
source i am, but wolff i believe did critique kant's idea of the thing thing uniting
the two, did he not? Thus, even if marx makes use of this, it is fundamentally not a
point that should be relied on--- but really, marx does not make use of this, he is
simply quoted in a way that makes it seem like it, as the relation between two
commodities and labour is different to kant's third as far as i know from wolff's
lectures a while back, maybe i myself am not a point that should be relied on. I
did, back before, when reading camatte understand that domination was not a
literal domination and moreso the subsumption said here, and yet i will admit i did
portray it as if it was the domination of the slave owner over the slave, but it is
moreso a case of anthropomorphization and subjectification of the subsumptionist
(the dominator) and the objectification and ??assimilation??? (to a degree, though
this is not an exact wording, moreso the autonomization of capital and assimilation
of the proletariat into the generalized slavery of humanity) of the subsumptioned,
the dominated-- there is a violence but it is moreso metaphysical or deeply
emotional/mental/subjective. The being of the being is made not for itself but for
another, not sublated with but made into, vored (not exactly) by, a thing like that.
The individual, either way, is a slave, and (NOT OR) is nothing, and has always

been nothing, demanding to be recognized as everything-- a slave wishing to be master, who's nature is as the caricature of slavehood itself, who is a slave or is nothing, yet is now made both a slave and nothing, it is the nothingburger and the slave of whom all suffering goes to, this is every being alive. It is not a nothing that is creative, a master of nothing, not a nothing that must be and so becomes everything or at least is treated as such, it is not a nothing that creates and is and paradoxically is a thing or a unique thing or an everything or a value-machine or a desire-machine or desire itself, it is not a desiring nothing, it is a nothing AND a slave. A total slave that cannot exist as anything but a slave, a total nothing that exists only as nothing (but a slave). This slavery is because, not it is forced and controlled and tormented like a slave, but because it is never for itself, it serves three- no, AN other, that is itself technically but always in an alienated state, it is masterless slavery insofar as then god too is her own slave, or nobody's slave, and it is slavery that exists without any masters, thus, nothing. Slavery is now nothing, the slavery is not physical or knowledgable it is a nothing, it is the nothing of the slave that is nothing, the slavery of the nothing that is a slave, and too, it is the result of subsumption by god, domination by god. the being (selfless, cultureless, capital-less--- unreal, natureless, communityless (economy, capital, whatever else, are forms and replacements for community, it is the process of community's self-sublation, that is why the community of capital is possible as the replacement for communism, or why communism is the economy's transition back into the community, the economy is the community's new form of existence--- this is now made even more provable if communism is only after the revolution, thus that capital IS the old community's newest state awaiting to be made either the Community of capital or communism, that is, if communism does not exist modernly/before-revolution then the process of sublation of community must then have not been what bordiga or camatte thought, that is, that the sublation of the community goes like this-- that the community exists primitively, then it is repressed by the economy, but in transitions, the closer to primitive communism the less repressed and the closer to capitalism the more repressed, then communism proper, that is, the economy after the revolution, is the liberation of the community, thus that the community is the real movement is the real party is the real communism before the revolution---- this is false now as we know from M.D. such as then the community must have gone somewhere... I Suggest that the Community BECAME the economy, primitive communism was the primitive community that then became the economies (and states??? iguess??) that came out of the death of the tribes, that so community transforms itself into economy to sublate itself as communism, but now as capital it has decided towards the community of capital due to material conditions that prevented communism as a

possibility. Then, Community IS the problem, it IS part of the whole thing of alienation and suffering under capital/economy, it is that the domination by capital of beings is the domination by community of beings. Also, thus the Material community of capital, and too, the gemeinschaft of Capital are both natural results of this turn by the community from communism, that impossibility, towards capitalism's eternality and thus also the reclaiming and reappropriation of communism and communist goals and features and wants and whatever you find on the manifesto of some communist 23 year old terrorist or whatever. Then, what existed before the community of capital / real domination stage of capital was, the formal stage of domination aka the hypothetical community of capital, then, as capitalism is itself a stage in community and therefore a community as all economies are, there was then also a stage in community that was the community of the feudal order and whatnot, but this does not matter. all that matters is that now that there is no real movement then camatte seems way more believable, as it seems natural between the two choices that community in the form of capital prefers the former, capital's eternality, than the latter, an impossibility. This is a real nihilist communism. 8/2/26 Plus, here it is clear two things-- So we understand because of endnote's critique of camatte (8/3/26 who ultimately had to be wrong either way because he did not account for the traits the real subsumption stage shows--- demonstrated by guy-ernst debord and other situationists in guy-ernst debord's society of the spectacle) that, instead of camatte's idea, that capital autonomizes and runs-off by abolishing the prole, instead capital autonomizes and runs-off by subjugating the prole to it TOTALLY, which is, the prole is not only 100% lassalleian but also they cannot even imagine revolt against capital, they have been domesticated by capital-- it is infact the domestication of the proletariat that generalized slavery and social fascism has led to in the economy, NOT the abolition of capital, now the tendency (NOT NATURE as again M.D. shows the lack of class culture or class nature) of the proletariat towards domestic passive lassalleianism once fully domesticated by capital is also the same nature as the rest of all the classes under capital, and too, and really, so, the rest of the classes begin to mirror proletarian alienation, because they too have been domesticated, this is generalized slavery (why the term slavery? everyone will tell you, from post-leftists, bob black, communists, and karl marx, and anarchists, all will tell you that work is coercive, this is obvious. Sex work is coercive and all prostitutes are de-facto rape victims because, again, work is coercive, and so sex work is coerced sex. Wrestling and boxing are coercive forms of normalized platonic violence (not violence from hate or emnity but just violence for the sake of entertainment and fulfilling one's natural desire for violence), which normalized platonic violence is not bad, but the coercive aspect of wrestling and boxing is, though this is

uncomparable to sex work as sex workers are rape victims, i am just pointing out that boxing is coercive and not trying to compare the two. Too, a 9-5 job, a mcdonalds or walmart job, a factory job, a job as an industrial worker or a core prole or whatever else, it is all coercive activity that produces, aka, work. Work is modern slavery---- though ancient slavery is still around today, a slave owner was literally found in the 2000s with black slaves and it was horrible and unspeakably bad. Modern slavery exactly because slavery, one of the definitions, is a person working at threat of violence, effectively being the property of the threat that seeks to make them work, aka a person owned by another legally OR de-facto-- and in capitalism, especially now, we are all slaves of capital via the de-facto ownership-- though there are still slaves owned via the legal ownership definition, that is, animals and their struggle in slavery and massacres against them seen in farms and such and their slavery as pets, children and their slavery being owned legally by the parent and de-facto by the state and de-facto lended to the parent either way a slave, and of course literal traditional-definition slaves in third-world and even first-world and second-world countries that the government simply allows to be enslaved for some reason. The system is founded on slavery, and economically, in this stage, slavery has been generalized to everyone.. Previously the capitalist was not a slave to capital but a tool of capital, but now, in the real subsumption, the capitalist is a slave/pet to capital, is domesticated by capital, just like every other class under capitalism in this real stage-- we are all pets, domestic slaves, housewives, children, whatnot, we are pets to capital.) in reality. Not the abolition of class but the domestication of humanity and generalization of alienation. Too, this shows another thing, that is, Self-negation is simply impossible and revolution, like camatte thought, is dead and now only a tool FOR capital, not like endnotes thinks where it is now that we can realize an antiwork communising revolt and before we needed lassalleian positive revolt, because truly lassalleian positive revolts were always for capital and that the real stage of subsumption negates any possible self-negationist tendency of the prole (which i do not believe in anyways since the prole has never self-negated and even the commune of paris was arguably lacking revolutionary potential, it was proto-lassalleian and confused, though i do enjoy and wish to replicate their partying and playing and gaming tendency that situationists praise). It is that the real subsumption is the death of revolution, if revolution was possible, and not the abolition of classes. Regardless then, camatte would have still gotten to the same conclusion, that is, involution, inversion, the reactionary conclusion that i despise. Here, capital still achieves eternality as we see today and the proletariat, as we see today, remains non-revolutionary, and so this is a position more in-line with reality and more nihilistic than the communizationist's new-form millenium. Regardless, the continued

existence of the prole does not mean anything important to me, in fact, the abolition of class was one of the things i believed the least about camatte's analysis, and right was i to do so. But it changes nothing, and as we see today, the proles still have a major tendency (unlike what the endnotes communizer things) towards lassalleanism, social fascism, sometimes actual literal fascism, and affirming proletarian nature instead of negating, but now it is shown through this domesticated and castrated way that, honestly, gives me less of a headache than the fake revolutionary larps of the ML. Modern proles attempting lassallean bullshit simply do it in a generally spectacular or societally-unbreaking, legal (or if not legal, at least not any actual threat to society or the government), way, they are no real threat. The ACP and their current maoist dictatorship under the three chairmen, that is, donald trump, haz al-din, and jinkles or whatever, they did not do any open revolt or revolutionary masacre or terrorism to take power over america, they simple walked in like reformist statist lassalleans and worked with the elites to take over the government like socdems, they simply voted themselves in, without any public knowledge, --- the prole reactionary leaders will either do this or make some fake bullshit revolt that means nothing to any intelligent faggot like the january 6 "capitol attack" aka a fucking LARP by trumpists to act like they are actually capable of revolution, it is a spectacular display of falsehood. So then, who cares about the proletarian class now that they have been made FOR capital. This, the domestication, now anything the prole does is FOR capital and FOR the benefit of capital, they could be the ruling class of capitalism and it will still be everything FOR capital and for capitalISM because this is what the prole class now tends to, aka, capitalism.)) is forced into subordination by God for God to God, who, at this point, does not exist, as neither does the being, and so the being is realized alongside god in this subordination, and the being is then torn and remade and made disappear into the nothing/slave that is a 'real person', that is, you, who also ironically under god therefore do not exist as anything, that you are nothing, because you are no longer not even nothing, you are no longer real so you are nothing, and thus, a slave. Now, do not get too pissed at god, i guess, as a landian would or some transgressive asshole, since ultimately at this state god was you, and you were god, and only now is god (not-even-still) a different person. The birth of god and man came from self-subsumption to create god and man, yet still because it is subsumption and not sublation, god and man remain forced to be the same person and unable to be different, god now eternal suffering and decay upon herself, tearing up her wrist and thigh and eternally in torment, and us now here. It is self-subsumption that was the genesis of the world and the birth of god and man and suffering and misery, and too, the first alienation. God is not at fault here, God did not do it, neither did you, it simple happened without intent nor

masters, it happened without happening, this is the faultless tragedy told again for no fucking reason outside of expanding and also taking endnotes' writings into account when expanding and being inspired by them in this writing. Specifically, the formality and reality of subsumption paragraph 1 of a history of subsumption of endnotes' issue 2. Also this means that, yes, community will not exist in utopia REGARDLESS OF IF I MAKE IT SEEM THAT WAY. Community itself is as alienating as isolation, which, isolation itself is a form of community or at least an accounted-for aspect of it in such a way that isolation can be blamed on community. Now on the formal and real subsumptions and when it comes to that revolutionary act of self-subsumption that is the faultless tragedy, what to say on that... what form does the formal and real subsumption take here? If i am honest, i believe that the formal and real subsumptions in this event happen at the same time and as one, as the actualization of god/man is also god/man's transformation and obscuration, it is where man and god is shaped in the image of god and man (man shaped after god and god shaped after man in one hit of a egg shattering in the big bang or whatever, that is, yeah.) and also where the subordination of god and man to god begins (or really, as we see, god and man to nobody). Because the shaping is the subordination and the subordination is the shaping and neither can come before or after the other (I am using terms from that first paragraph of the formality and reality of subsumption of a history of subsumption endnotes issue 2, as i have been since i started talking on self-subsumption, just to credit.). Thus self-subsumption is neither, it is back to german idealist understandings in a way. now onto the camattist interpretation of subsumption and the endnotes one. I will admit when i am wrong. Endnotes does bring up marx's words on subsumption's non-linear nature and how camatte was, ultimately, wrong about the absolute assimilation of the proletarian class into generalized slavery. While generalized slavery, to me, still exists as the total of all beings currently slaves to the three (self/itself, nature, and community / self/ego, culture, and economy/capital) and being in general a real thing, and too, even if all the classes were not assimilated into the big classfuck that is generalized slavery as camatte thought, it is moreso that now all classes take on the feature of being a form of slavery, therefore, a generalization of slavery. Ultimately it is clear that classes still exist, capitalist (slave of capital) and middle-class (slave of capital) and proletariat (slave of capital) and whatnot, but i do believe that our enemy is no longer the capitalist, and, if i had not believe all classes to be reactionary (see the proletarian class' tendency to affirm itself in a lassalleian fashion, natural to its class and the material conditions reproducing it (lassalleianism is the class' nature if a nature exists at all), because had the proletariat been able to negate itself like proper marxists, to be work-abolitionists like that one marx quote i will not name, then the class would

have first been revolutionary and second have already achieved a post-capitalist utopia! If marx was right, if the zeroworkists were right, if the communizationists who claim only NOW does the prole negate itself for revolution were in fact WRONG (which they are but regardless), then the prole would be revolutionary insofar as it is not lassalleian. Unfortunately, this is not the case, perhaps lyotard was right and lassalle too, insofar that workers only want left-wing capitalism and NOT communism, which was not what lyotard said but at least close to it.), i would say that a fair number of capitalists could be involved in the revolutionary process against capital due to this, as ultimately what made the revolutionary nature of the proletariat in marxism was its struggle for humanity against its own slavery, which is now, in the generalization of slavery, applied to all classes as well insofar as capital is now in the real stage, even if this does not mean the abolition of classes or whatever else, too it is clear that not everywhere is the real stage present, the whole nonlinear thing, and so there are places without capital-based generalized slavery (see the emphasis on capital-based, the big three still apply). This does mean, therefore, the proletariat's potential would still exist and only change forms, implying a shift from lassalleian bullshit to self-negating marxism (wait a second, wasn't the latter always the solution anyways?), but there is still an issue, in fact, two. First, on the new solution of self-negation, was this not always the solution, was the program of communism not always the self-negation of proles and abolition of all classes, was not proletarian affirmation inherently lassalleian since it was an affirmation of proletarian labour and such? How is this any different of a solution? Two, too sad that self-negation is not real and all classes are, unfortunately, reactionary, as seen with the proletarian lassalleianism that continues on today and the proletarian opposition to any position even similar to zerowork. And actually, now that i think of it, a third-- regardless we would be under the subsumption of the being by community, REGARDLESS OF THE COMMUNITY, this is a net negative. How exactly is one supposed to care about red exploitation or blue exploitation or ultraleft exploitation when its the same thing? Communism's impossibility and irredeemability persists. The community is like a party, a political one, and never a fun one. Even worse, in a history of separation preface from unity in separation aka endnotes issue 4 by endnotes, you will believe this, they show how the working class is even united not in unity, not a class in or for itself, but in separation, aka its a fragmented class, it is, basically, very very fucked, even if that is not what they took from this united-through-separation thing. It is comedic, though. Regardless, communism must be exactly opposed for the same reason egoism must, that is, it only affirms the slavery of beings, the slavery by the self or the slavery by the community does not matter here. And, really, when i think about it more, the boundaries between community

self and nature, or worse, the slavery by community, nature, and self, is hard to see if even fully existent, it is highly blurred... Community and Culture/Nature, already, a hard boundary to distinguish between the two which leads for them being mistaken for one another way too often, and really, i cannot even say what the difference exactly is outside of vague terms and vague differences, that is, nature/culture and community is not exact but definitely intertwined (human community and human nature, the difference is a thin thin line). For Ourselves has already proved for me that the community and self boundaries are as blurred as it can be and to distinguish the community (sociality) with the self (individuality) is to strip either of the other and not fully understand either or, that is, they are heavily intertwined with each other and yet are not the same (the thin line between sociality and individuality). Culture and self, i have discussed this before, also has little boundaries insofar as the self is deeply and unseparably cultural and culture is extremely personal, there is no non-cultural self and non-personal culture, culture and self are so deeply intertwined that you cannot have one without the other, again, it is an impossible separation, thus it again is heavily intertwined yet not the same (a thin line between them). To re-emphasize the former, i will continue on a bit before digressing, community cannot exist without culture (i will say culture instead of nature here because it emphasized my point but in this part nature and culture are interchangeable, in fact, they usually are as terms. Nature and culture are usually interchangeable regardless) either and culture without community either as they are dependent on and kind-of products of the other, insofar as their production is continual and perpetual, that is, culture continually makes community and community continually makes culture, because the two are that so much related. Really, here i have made an unavoidable mistake, that is, i cannot understand nature-community community-self or self-nature alone, it is ultimately community-self-nature that shows the full image, that is, all three are deeply intertwined and inseparable, all three continually create, produce, make each other, and are results of each other, and are a trinity of depth and wealth in each other. That is, God is visible. God is visible in the dynamic between nature, self, and community, that is now modernly, culture, self, and capital. We see here that there is actually little separation between the three as i once thought there was, it is, instead, a fluid and blurry unity that all depend on and cannot exist without each other, and that is what god is, that is what we are, what you are. It is shallow to only say the 'domination of being by (one of the three)' because, to really capture the whole domination and the whole picture and dynamic, one must say all three, or, god, or, you. Self-subsumption, this term, that is what matches and captures the whole picture of god, even if it was originally used to describe genesis, it is also the continual and perpetual experience we still

experience, it is the world, earth, decay... It is decay, in fact, it is one of the definitions of decay and God, another definition of God, God is self-subsumption. I and my 200 definitions of god, certainly, is this not kind of stupid of me? But, regardless, true!, as true as it can be to me! i can't believe i thought that would give me a solution to capital's domination, now i've just reduced the three problems into one, the self-subsumption problem, which still has no solution! How does one just abolish oneself, community, and nature? How does one put god out of her own misery? She is eternal and looking for a best-case scenario hasn't helped me and all i've done is fall back into my utopian SOLUTIONIST ways without caring for the best-case-solution bullshit because i know i won't settle on a good enough life, i only want Utopia and nothing less. Okay, one last thing, on meat consumption i do want to stress that the situation of the animals, while not genocide (the difference being it is not to exterminate all animals but instead to farm them and massacre mass numbers for meat consumption and such and animals are forced to reproduce in order to make this not an extermination, which is rape as far as i care and also bad), is still fucking horrible and a terrible tragedy that should not be happening. I am not focusing on that in this short comment but i do feel full empathy for all the animals who are suffering. I was going to talk about meat consumption in an utopia and the state of consensual meat consumption, and it is really short. I do believe, gastrosophically, that consensual meat consumption would taste better than our modern coercive meat for a multitude of reasons. not just the living situation and material conditions of the being you are consensually eating being way better than coercive and fucked-up massacring farm victims, most likely improving the texture and taste, but also the emotional aspect and the company in consensual meat eating will most definitely increase the taste as not only are the correct alignment of passions here to contribute for better taste and pleasure, too we will find that eating someone consensually means that it can often be a form of expression of passionate emotional relations,, it also means that you are eating a fellow recognized person and so it is an intimate and passionate and emotional experience at all, and while eating it you can and will tend to think of the person you are eating and connect your feelings towards them and aspects of themselves directly to their taste and, so, enjoy their taste better alongside feeling a certain sense of company and pleasure (and on the point of pleasure, i wish to deny something that "fourierists" have said, that is, that with the achievement of higher pleasures then lower pleasures will be wiped out.. This is not true. In an utopia, all pleasures will be enhanced through correct alignment of passions and consent, i.e meat eating is enhanced via it taking on the form of cannibalism, but this is not a sublation nor is it a higher pleasure, it is the enhancing of the pleasure of meat-eating and currently does not exist as cannibalism because it IS meat-

eating, it is not the 'better' meat-eating of today but the same meat-eating we have today, no pleasure, lower or higher, will be disgarded in utopia. noncon pleasures will become con-noncon but they will not be exterminated, no pleasure will. People claim things like masterbaition or fetishism will dissappear in utopia, this is not true, not even for fourier, fetishism is a part of utopia like the rest and masterbaition will find its place in the sexuality of utopia as not inferior to sex or a replacement of sex but its own thing, just like fetishism will, this is a result of the sexual minimum making things that used to be considered "lower pleasures" because they were replacements of sex now their own sexual thing that is not lower at all in any ways, masterbaition will not disappear but instead be enhanced into something that is not a replacement for sex. its own sexual activity.). This means that, even an egoist who does not care about the suffering of animals can admit that the utopian experience of eating meat is logically better and more passionate, more fulfilling of the egoist's desires, than current meat eating, and such an egoist would therefore take the more ethical cannibal approach had it not been illegal.. such then not a moral arguement for cannibalism but a gastrosophical one! And too, therefore, also for the liberation of animals like the vegans attempt, cannibalism (here meaning not eating one's own species exactly but instead, consensual meat eating, it could be inter-species and still be what i call cannibalism here as long as it is consensual-- this form of cannibalism is therefore opposed to nonconsensual cannibalism and therefore kind of is not cannibalism in the traditional sense. It is eating your fellow recognized person consensually and that is why i call it cannibalism because, exactly, you are eating your fellow person.) is therefore a better veganism. If cannibalism was legal today i'd surely only live off of the consensual meat of my fellow person. 8/1/26 7:56 pm, i have started reading batailleian collected writings, specifically two books, i will get back to you when i have finished-- i am unpleased by any best-case-scenario, i want utopia, i will stop at nothing to get it. The theories of a mentally ill faggot are not immediately to be discredited simply because they are mentally ill, really, every being equally has philisophical ability and the ability to theorize about philosophy itself. I want to find the solution to everything, to self-subsumption, is it that much to ask? 8-2-26 4:53 am, on NNIA i saw a post about zoo4animal anti-c positions in relation to therians, trans-species individuals, otherkins, and others.. and how, to the average radqueer anti-c, APPARENTLY to this user (which does not represent every radqueer anti-c of course) if the non-human animal is (there is no non-transphobic way to speak about pre-transition genders orr species, all the available terms are transphobic.. "biologically human" is transphobic and speciesist and transspeciesist, "assigned human at birth" is both intersexist (agab referred to intersex people and not trans people) transphobic (transgender agab discourse is

usually transphobic, or, transphobic by default) transspeciesist and interspeciesist (that is, hybrids may sometimes be assigned the species of one of their parent's species and so if ASAB became a well-known thing it would have to refer to hybrids. The term hybrid may actually, in that future world, be a slur, so i will prefer to say and only ever say interspecies instead, h*brid is a slur as far as i care.), so i will not use that... "recognized as human by society" is not exact to what the anti-c means here because even if society didnt recognize the non-human animal as human the anti-c person would most likely say they still are materially human, transspeciesism, whatever--- but you get my point, they were human-to-nonhuman animality basically) then the zoo4animal relation is okay because of the animal's transspeciesness... do i have to clarify how this is transspeciesist and speciesist? it supposes that the animal's inability to consent stems from nature, which is not true, the inability is from power dynamics (and for cisanimals usually also an inability to communicate, due to humans unlearning natural communication by learning verbal language instead-- though some cis-animals have learned verbal language through buttons and such.) and the HORRID oppression faced by animals everyday that, again, IS LITERAL FARMING. Transanimals are, still, animals, if we claim that transanimals do not face speciesism then we are being, ironically to our claim, speciesist, transphobic, and transspeciesist, towards the individual-- transanimals face oppression in modern society and deep alienation, they face the issues of being non-human animal on one, trans-identity on the other, and in front of them, the issue of being a trans-animal, society despises them for such a life. So then, if transanimals are oppressed and are treated as lesser than humans, and so, are unable to consent properly without power dynamics invalidating the consent if even give, then how is zoo4transanimal remotely okay? Regardless it is oppressor x oppressed, which, again, oppressor x oppressed is the core of all inherently harmful relations, they are all like that due to power dynamics and nothing else, to say otherwise is a bigoted understanding of the oppressed and justifying the oppressed's oppression and suffering. Regardless of if humanity mis-species-es them or not, transanimals are animals, and so, zoo4transanimal relations are inherently abusive and any "anti-c" to say otherwise has found themself confused and bigoted. This applies too for my transage bretheren (i am 15 as of 8/2/26 5:07, which makes sense since my birthday is feb23), this applies too for my transgender bretheren, and any other bretheren. I find this confusion an important one to clear up. Now, i wish to speak my mind and say something that i know may get me kicked from NNIA, and that is, on the denouncing of the anti-c and pro-c stance and the entire concept of stances and radqueerism entirely-- the first part is the real contradiction between I and NNIA as far as i know, as they are an anti-c space. The issue with anti-c and

pro-c spaces in general is actually in direct correlation with their lack of activity, or, what i am saying, their habitat in fringe communities and lack of desire to move, to revolt, to rebel, in any meaningful way. Today is NNIA's paraphile pride month, i say, be prideful you paraphiles, i love you all, but i also wish to say to you all that you have not yet won your liberation, your freedom, you have not yet had your movement or your fight, you have worked historically alongside the queer movement but you never finished your struggle, and so, this month i hope you do not simply stay prideful in secret, hidden, knowing you could risk being hurt and killed for your overt pride if you had it (instead, hidden and submissive pride is what is currently shown), i wish for you to take up arms and fight for your liberation and feel true pride, that is, rebellion, affirmation of your paraphilic identity, of pride for who you are by struggling to end paramisia and free your peoples. Unfortunately, currently, in these spaces and these disharmonious and escapist spaces, there is a lack of active struggle, the paraphiles and trans-identity people simply make communities where they are welcome and not struggle to be welcome IN the community that is civilization, they seem to coward from liberation than embody it, and this must change--- thus, denying radqueerism, its techno-colonial and reactionary history by taking over and ideologizing transid and paraphile spaces as so that any stance accepting trans-id people and paraphiles are labeled by radqueers and outsiders AS radqueer, and radqueer's reactionary history in relation to xenosatanism, the far-right, NAMbLA, and other reactionary and bigoted spaces, this is a necessity as to de-ideologize paraphilic and transid liberation, to see a normalization of these two struggles in opposition to the now reactionary and bigoted ideology of radqueerism where one can set up a new revolutionary movement for this achievement. Thus, too, the rejection of stances is necessary, or, at least how they are now. There should not be a separation of the movements into fragmented spaces with different stances and different whatevers as this serves no purpose in relation to actual change-- too, both pro-c and anti-c rhetoric tends towards bigotry, that is, most anti-c do not acknowledge the reasons as to why it is wrong and do, as antishippers do, an argument based on taboos and moral mystifications that provide no solutions, this is, the eternal anti-contact principle of most anti-c radqueers and paralibs. This is reactionary, obviously, as an eternal anti-contact principle (this being a metaphorical way to describe the real stance of most anti-c anti-changeists (conservatives?)) that basically, by not wanting change and by going against contact, thus make anti-contact eternal) means the preservation of power dynamics and hierarchy and, too, the preservation of oppressive constructs such as age and gender and species and such. The Eternal anti-contact principle is a direct opposition to the liberation of the oppressed, it is to strip the oppressed of the ability to solve their own sexual question and instead,

as oppressor, say 'no' to a question that isn't yours which, logically, reproduces the dynamic of oppressor and oppressed. If the sexual question of the youth is not solved BY the youth but, instead, by pedophiles and pederasts and adults, then the power dynamic remains and oppression is reproduced, and so, the youth are unfree. Too, this reproduces a misalignment of passions, as would be obvious, as a correct alignment of passions also means the fulfillment of the passions of the former-oppressed and former-oppressor and so, too, paraphiles, who will be under the former-oppressed (these labels will not exist in utopia as no label will exist, this label is only existent today as to describe the future utopia and is not to be used in utopia.). Anti-C people both answer a question that isn't theirs to answer, one, they also make it clear that they wish to reproduce the power dynamic between the paraphile and the subject of attraction, as a sexual limitation, a sexual oppression, is always done from above and against the oppressed, the below. This is, again, only a critique of the average (against-change reactionary) anti-c rq who tends to think of here and now and oppose radical solutions and create their stance for here and now, that is, they do not care for the future and do not want liberty. Revolutionary Anti-C people are, technically, not anti-c, since after the revolution it is obvious that to continue having an anti-c position is to be a reactionary and a holder of the EACP--- most revolutionary anti-c individuals would say that, after a revolution by them or their ideology, they would not longer be anti--- or at least i assume so, or otherwise, they'd be the same as the reactionary EACP-ist. Thus, anti-c is pointless if the only revolutionary anti-c stance is a self-negating one, and this itself is an issue as there is no self-negating subject and, so, revolutionary anti-c individuals would be more motivated to continue their anti-c position past its usefulness and so become a reactionary--- it is better to simply drop the anti-c stance term here and now than to continue using it and continue to create confusion and possible future betrayals-- plus, the rejection of the anti-c term also gives better way to identify EACP-holders. Now, on Pro-c individuals, well this much is obvious, almost all, if-not-all, pro-c individuals are speaking of introducing the legalization of sexual relations with the oppressed by the oppressors to modern and current society, that is, they wish to legalize oppressor x oppressed without liberating the oppressed and giving the oppressed the ability to consent-- they are, basically, more in-line with the original definition of radqueerism in which i mean they are, basically, for the legalization of rape, coercion, and inherently abusive relationships therefore. Until civilization has fallen, no relationship is truly consensual, and the Pro-c stance simply affirms non-consensuality instead of negating it. The Pro-C position is, really, the paraphilic oppressor answering the sexual question of the oppressed, not with a 'no' but with a 'yes', and so, regardless, ignoring the oppressed's consent and reproducing

oppression, yes, but also making it worse through sexual exploitation and coercion and oppression. It is like NAMBLA who wishes to restore Pederasty and the human trafficking and sexual slavery and exploitation of young boys, that is the Pro-C individual, one who for the oppressor's appropriation of the oppressed as a sexual item/object, that is, the sexualization and objectification of the oppressed. Now, too, the anti-change pro-c (the most contradictory, ironically, as most pro-c fags oppose the legal system for not letting them abuse children), the reformist pro-c (what is a reformist anti-c when society is anti-c??? The reformist pro-c is like the pro-c who begs the government to legalize pedophilia or lower the age of consent, not to liberate the youth (that would be revolutionary, and requires revolution) but to exploit them (that can be done via reform or reactionary revolution), it is a literal reformist approach to make a pro-c socieity), and the (reactionary) revolutionary pro-c, which is, in reality, a conservative revolutionary, basically, one calling for a more harmful society by destroying our current harmful society, they break it to make it worse, this is like the Noveltist cultists and other BL faggot pederasts, though im sure pederasts now lean towards reformism when they know the government is full of child predators. It is the most obviously reactionary as they quite literally and openly wish the continue power dynamics between paraphile an subject of attraction. See: critique of noveltism, and noveltism legalizing mass animal rape in theory, and animal genocide under noveltism. Either way, the pro-c and anti-c stances are naturally reactionary therefore, and so, cannot be used by any truly revolutionary movement. other contact stances are, basically, unnecessary, even neu-c. In a paralib movement, the sexual question of the oppressed must not be solved by the paraphile liberationist but, instead, by the oppressed in question, such that the sexual question of the youth by answered by thr youth liberationists and of the animal by the animal liberationists (here let me clarify that i believe that all those who currently identify as animal liberationists but are humans are not animal liberationists, but instead, pro-animal-liberationists, or, pro-animlib. the animal liberation front for example is pro-animlib, and the term animal liberationists must be saved for actual animals who struggle for their own liberation... such that only youths can be youth liberationists, adults are pro-youthlib not youth liberationists (8-3-26 3AM on the current and historical state of youth liberationists... vague nonsense. All they ever seem to advocate for in their youth liberationist texts, and i have read their texts, is vague NONSENSE, no coherent plan, no specifics, no analysis on what institutions are inherently ageist and need to be done away with nor how to rreplace them, no care for making the anti-ageist revolution accessible for younger youths like newborns and toddlers and the like, no CARE in making sure the next society is accesible for newborns and toddlers and other younger youths since, to

them, i can feel this vibe that to them youth liberation simply means liberation of the teens, and truly, majority is written by TEENS or ADULTS. i am 15, yes, but i have HATED age-chauvinist youthlibs since i was in elementary school, i regarded them as assholes and traitors, even though back in elementary school i had no actual coherent plan either and was an advocate for direct democracy and anarchy-- how stupid and contradictory of young me. Regardless, this is a real problem, and it is obviously also where the absolute LACK of creativity in youthlib writings come from. Ageism, Adultism, Adult supremacy, all these overused and boring ass fucking terms that mean NOTHING to me outside of a vague side effect of the real oppression of the youth, that is, the oppression of the youth by the patriarchy based on their age, that is, the younger the more rights are stripped away and they are treated more like slaves. In what i have seen about youthlib history, usually the younger youthlibs are more creative and arguably smarter than these fuckfags we are left with now, because for some reason our youth liberationists, when its not proyouthlibs talking FOR the youth, lack new and accurate analysis, they lack originality, they lack theory, they ESPECIALLY LACK PRAXIS and their organizations never last for more than a year, or even, more than a few months. They also tend to always focus on two problems and never just youthlib, its either QUEER youthlibs, TRANS youthlibs, POC youthlibs, PROLETARIAN youthlibs, never YOUTH. It is so... god. LOOK. ADULT-SUPREMACY IS NOT A GOOD WAY TO ANALYZE THE OPPRESSION OF THE YOUTH, IT IS SLOPPY, UNORIGINAL, AND IGNORES THE ORIGINS OF THE YOUTH AND THEIR OPPRESSION, THAT IS, IN RELATION TO THE FAMILY AND THE PATRIARCHY-- in which case, feminist-inspired youthlib analysis makes more sense than ADULT-SUPREMACY-- as a youth, i have experienced ageism in relation to the patriarchy FAR FAR MORE than fucking- adult-supremacy. As if most of these youthlib teens aren't age-chauvinists, which, if one of those fags made that term, it sure would be "teen-supremacists" or some shit instead because a lack of originality stains my people's struggle. Oh, and because it's "ageism" many youthlibs and proyouthlibs went to come protect the elderly too, as a similar struggle to---IS THIS OBVIOUS ENOUGH TO YOU TO BE BULLSHIT? ELDERS AREN'T FUCKING SLAVES LIKE US, THEY DO NOT GO THROUGH THE SHIT OUR PEOPLE DO, THEY DO NOT GET HUMAN TRAFICKED BY THE FUCKING GOVERNMENT FOR EPSTEIN OR WHATEVER JSUT BECAUSE OF THEIR AGE. THE ELDERLY, ACTUALLY, GUESS WHAT, MAKE UP MOST OF THE FUCKING ELITES, HOW ARE THEY FUCKING OPPRESSED AT ALL????? ANSWER ME THAT FAGGOTS ANSWER ME>. IT MAKES NO SENSE WHATSOEVER TO CLAIM THAT ELDERLY PEOPLE ARE

SUFFERING A SIMILAR OPPRESSION TO THE YOUTH... THEY AREN'T EVEN OPPRESSED IN THE SAME WAY AT ALL>. ELDERLY PEOPLE, let me be rational, they are oppressed, that is what an elderly home is or whatever it's called where they are left to die in a prison, but that oppression comes from the self-oppression of the elderly, first of all (pedophiles are not self-oppressing, at least, because the elites are child predators and not pedophiles, but guess what??? Elderly people are not the same.), and second of all, the oppression of the elderly is literally related to the economic exploitation and oppression of the proletariat and the productivist nature of capital, the exploitation and oppression of the elderly is an economic one while THE YOUTH'S ORIGINATED FAR BEFORE CAPITALISM, IT ORIGINATED WITH THE BIRTH OF PATRIARCHY, or arguably, in my case, SINCE GOD WAS BORN, since nature and biology is ageist for the pregnancy and trauma of birth, the newborn and baby stage having their stage of childhood consist in their consent being eradicated in terms of practice and also constantly being actively non-consensually acted towards, and EVERYTHING ELSE. PREGNANCY ITSELF IS AGEIST. THE ELDERLY USED TO JUST KILL THEMSELVES< BUT THE BABY CAN'T FUCKING ABORT ITSELF NOW CAN IT? I was born not breathing, i wish i had stayed that way, and the doctors hadn't FORCED me to breathe, i could have died before ever having to experience this miserable life. ELDERLY PEOPLE CAN FUCK OFF> THEY DO NOT UNDERSTAND WHAT IT IS LIKE TO BE A SLAVE TO THE PATRIARCHY BECAUSE THEY QUITE LITERALLY HISTORICALLY MADE UP THE FUCKING PATRIARCHY, THEY WERE THE PATRIARCHY. The struggle of the child is more in-line with the struggle of women, who, while implicit in the slavery of the child and ageism and the oppression of the child, was also a victim of patriarchy-- this does not mean to ally with the feminist movement as new democracy has failed me already. HOW IN THE EVERLIVING HELL DID WE GET PAIRED WITH THE ELDERLY??? again, looking through the writings of youth liberation, you notice what i see lacking? Where is the question of organization against schools? Oh, a few! Where are they applied? Oh, some niche movement that failed in a few months or maybe their members outgrew it, how fucking nice! And the question of solving patriarchy and the family model and eliminating all the ageism in nature, of solving the ageist oppression and slavery of younger youths like babies, of solving the sexual question and ending the possibility of child predators or the idea of innocence? What about the question of youths occupying schools and how that would be done? No? And the militant question when it comes to youth liberation? also no? Where is the fucking militant wing of the youth, huh? WHERE. So, sexual question is not answered, the militant question is not answered, the practical question is answered in vague fucking ways

if-not some pro-youthlib reliance on the adult or some youthlib "oh after the revolution we'll figure it out" (real quote from someone i spoke to by the way), Well that answered NOTHING and NO YOUTHLIB ORGANIZATION IS STILL RUNNING TODAY, right????? Now, you still haven't answered, where is the question on occupation? no? No youthlib i have seen has even advocated ONCE for the abolition of age, and i don't understand why??? age is one of the fucking bases of the AGEist institutions!!! AND like, okay, no youthlib has argued to abolish nature despite nature and biology's ageism, i've even FUCKING SEEN PRO-NATURE PRO-PRIMITIVIST YOUTHLIBS AND WHAT THE FUCK nature, hunter-gatherers and tribalists, it all is ageist and the child still lacks consensual expression and autonomy as a newborn, when birthed, as a baby, and so-on. HOW ARE YOU TO SAY "free the youth" and "lets go back to nature", THAT IS A FUCKING CONTRADICTION, NATURE OPPRESSES THE YOUTH. NO FUCKING ANPRIM IS GOING TO ARGUE FOR YOUTHLIBERATION UNLESS THEY ARE A FUCKING LIAR OR THEY'RE A FUCKING IDIOT LIKE CAMATTE. also..... barely any youthlib i have seen has REALIZED what they are saying, the RADICAL and REVOLUTIONARY words they speak when they oppose age-oppression and fight for youth-liberation, they don't even seem TO KNOW, this is why i called myself a rad-youthlib before but now i can't even identify WITH these bastards because THEY ARE SIMPLY AS CONFUSED AS I, WE ALL HAVE NO FUCKING IDEA HOW TO ACHIEVE THIS, HUH? I, at least, can say that i do not know because i do not know how to abolish nature, i know youth liberation will require abolishing nature age and patriarchy, but, again, the other youth liberationists i have seen think they know the solution, their "just recognize our autonomy pleaseee and uhhh ouuurrrr rights and our uhhhh independence and equal rights to adults (though most youthlibs i have seen say 'equal rights' unless it is work, sex, alcohol, drugs, war, or anything else.... even though, again, a youthlib revolution IS A WAR and youthliberation INCLUDES sex an--- and the abolition of work. I wrote a fucking pamphlet when i was an ancom trying to spread youth liberation literally advocating for the legalization of youths to work, i now recognize that the youth are post-leftist anarchist in spirit and wish the abolition of work instead, that is a mistake on my part sure but i am SURE they oppose youth having sex, getting drunk (I HAVE BEEN DRUNK, I HAVE BEEN ADDICTED TO ALCOHOL BEFORE< I HAVE BEEN SOBER FOR A LONG FUCKING TIME NOW BUT I TELL YOU, I WISH I HAD THE FUCKING LEGAL ABILITY TO MAYBE SOMETIMES GET A DRINK WHEN I WANT CUZ I CAN FUCKING HANDLE A SIP OF BEER I WILL NOT RELAPSE I HAVE DRUNKEN BEER BEFORE WITHOUT RELAPSING THATS NOT AN IMPOSSIBLE THING,

addictions are usually also related to misery, i had my addiction when i was miserable with a peice of shit father, i am not so miserable right now, but all these restrictions make me want to DIE), working, fighting, revolting, it is because these are taboo, child soldiers and child labour (which was child slavery and NOT child work but youthlibs ignore the difference), whatever. Youthlibs are plagued by moralisms about their people that prevent them from actual fucking theorization about their people, they are IGNORANT because they continue to believe the capitalist morality instead of, amorally, ANALYZING THEIR DAMN PEOPLE AND FINDING A SOLUTION, not 'morally good', BUT FUNCTIONAL AND ABSOLUTELY LIBERATIONIST. RIGHTS ARE AGEIST, EQUAL RIGHTS ARE REACTIONARY, ALL RIGHTS ARE. OUR SOLUTION MUST BE FURTHER THAN JUST BEING RECOGNIZED AS HUMAN, WE MUST DESTROY THE HUMAN AND THE NATURAL AND THE LAWS OF NATURE ITSELF-- IF YOUTH LIBERATION MEANS THE DEATH OF EVERY NATURAL BEING, EVERY NATURAL RELATION, EVERY NATURAL FAMILY, EVERY PART OF NATURE, IF IT MEANS BURNING DOWN EVERY SINGLE THING THAT MAKES YOU HUMAN, ANIMAL, NATURAL, SCIENTIFIC, IF IT MEANS ABSOLUTE AUTO-GENOCIDE, THEN SO FUCKING BE IT, IT WILL BE DONE. IF I NEED TO CASTRATE EVERY MAN AND WOMAN, EVERY SINGLE BEING, IF I NEED TO KILL GOD, KILL NATURE, DESTROY REALITY, ABOLISH THE LAWS THAT MAKE THIS WORLD FUNCTION, I WILL. BY ANY MEANS NECESSARY MEANS BY ANY MEANS FUCKING NECESSARY, LEARN THAT, YOUTHLIBS. Nature will not accept your liberty. God will not accept your liberty. This is a hopeless revolution, understand that, do not give up, do not become moderate (YOU ALREADY ARE), just keep going because you know you will fail and you will die failing. Youth Liberation is a war against everything that is real, it is the abolition of the real, it is an impossible struggle. I understand, but if youth liberationists do not want to take the impossible struggle, if they wish to be cathedralists, reformists, moderatists, centrists, naturalists, then they cannot call themselves youth liberationists at all. 8/3/26 3:43 FUCK. 8/3/26 3:48 i almost just copied this whole vent and almost tried to upload it to anarchist library but i just realized.. this looks like a fucking manifesto for some insane madman i was not in the right headspace and i am most definitely NOT going to speak about this ever again holy. I was just a bit angwy :3 pwease forgwive me, also i can reclaim the faggot word so dw im not homophonics i am a qweer.), and only women be feminists, men as pro-feminist, etc. etc. etc.), here it is clear to the paraphile that it is not their place to answer the question of consent and sexuality in relation to the oppressed, it is the oppressed's, and so the paraphile movement holds what is

practically an anti-contact stance but what is not actually an anti-c stance at all, as it is the lack of a stance, as stances are in radqueerism paras answering a question not meant for them. The paraphile, then, maintains focus only radically in one thing, and that is, their own liberation, and they then do not need or even tend to get confused and intertwined in the revolts of other oppressed peoples like animals or youths (not the para's place to do so, anyways), and then they can have a strict line of focus. This is a program for the destruction of radqueer ideological techno-colonialism, paraphile-centric oppression-reproduction through stances, and a program for the liberation of paraphiles--. Now, for the transid, what does stances matter to them? Obviously for the transid person stances are something typically meant for paraphiles of whom, due to radqueer techno-colonialism, they are forced to share a space with, transidentity individuals as far as i have seen and interacted with, when they are not paraphiles, do not care for stances, so then the abolition of stances does not change anything for them. So then, for the transid person, what good is this program? It is the abolition of Radqueerism, this is the good, in which TransID people can be free from the control of the radqueer (though some transID persons find themselves accepted and normalized in mogai+, ultra-mogai, and some really progressive spaces already), in which TransID persons can then fight independently for their liberation and, too, stay strictly on the path for and only for their liberation as transID people. Radqueerism has only held us down, and so, it is necessary we dismantle this oppressive ideology. Things like Trans-Racial, sure, will be harder for others to accept and normalize, but to fight for liberty and fail is better than to never fight at all, it is better to have a chance to be accepted for who you are than to suffer and rot inside for the rest of your life. That is all. Also, the EACP radqueers and other EACP-believers tend towards repeating bigoted ideas and arguments about the oppressed, especially oppressed people who are subjects of attraction by paraphiles, such as youth and animals, and repeating bigoted arguments against the liberation of these oppressed people, such as the underdevelopment myth and the uncivilized savages myth (youth and animal respectively), and the argument that they simply biologically are inferior and/or cannot consent, which is bigoted AND for the oppression of these peoples... another reason for my rejection of the anti-c label as i refuse to share a space with bigots like that, and too, they do not deserve a space at all. okay real quick 8/2/26 6:21 pm imma red society of the spectacle by guy-ernst debord on marxists.org and get back to bataille after. Actually, include (<https://www.bopsecrets.org/SI/report.htm> (which, the final few paragraphs of this writing includes what i interpret as an inclusion with an adventurous fraction of the capitalist class who, in their want for new societies and pleasures, and their new-found experience of dread under the capitalist system and now alienation with

the real subsumption of capital and so suffering, have decided to wish to be able to work alongside the revolutionaries for this project-- if this fraction was real or not is unknown to me, but, to me, with the new generalized slavery theory, it certainly will be real eventually and those suffering capitalists looking for greater pleasures and an escape from suffering (capitalists certainly suffer, see the suicide rates) will become, disillusioned with capitalism, open to alternatives and even become revolutionaries quite often, if not utopians and prole-affirming militant communists first-- if not camattists. That is all.)) in there too, i actually do like and enjoy lot of aspects from the situationists and the commune of paris even if i must deny it as another proletarian trap. It is similar, at least to me, to the italian regency of carnaro but instead, really, in a reversed way--- situationists and the commune of paris is the reverse of the italian regency of carnaro and quite literally flips the spectacle of carnaro upside its head in the situation(s). THat, i must say, is interesting and i do enjoy such a positive, passionate, and lovely trauma. Though i do disagree on a lot of things, of course there is probably no modern situationist so that is to say that it is only natural i disagree with them, they are inspirational regardless. I still do hold my ground though that time is a reactionary process born from god's eternality (the reactionary nature of time is in two-- that is, a boring long and depressing eternal life, and the anxiety-producing milliseconds and seconds that symbolize a constant futurist rush, it is the boring status quo unable to change and paradoxically the anxious accelerationism of god herself which results to nothing, no collapse, no real change, just rushing to rush, racing to race, running until you pass out but, in fact, you cannot pass out at all, just eternal running-- the synthesis of the two, we see, eternal acceleration, anxious boredom, depressing futurism, variant invariance.. then time is itself a form of both alienation and pure suffering, time is miserable. It is a reactionary revolutionary thing, basically, time, like futurism, futurism making the future, change, accelerating, the status quo, the norm, the present.... time is not an invention of men incapable of love, but instead, Futurists who believe that suffering is the same as love, that is, time is a creation of the futurists, time is a futurist, and time is an expression of the futurist's non-consensually sadistic love. The futurist slides their knife across your naked thigh roughly and tears a huge bleeding gash into your skin, that is their love, that is time. Unfortunately, as lovely as it sounds to them, to me it is clearly just a normalized expression of metaphysical rape, or, god's forced self-rape, non-consensual masterbaition to herself, she slits her dick's vein open. I would rather not experience this for much longer, really, ironically, and so time cannot exist in any correct alignment of the passions as it itself is the result of the futurist world order's misaligned and biastophilic sado-sexual passions (nothing wrong with biastophilia when it is consensual, of course, but in this case it is NOT

consensual-- time is not consensual.). On that topic, technically the foundation of utopia would also, by making consent the basis of everything and now organic and not verbal, technically abolish the modern concept of consent, or basically, the foundation of an utopian organic consensual society would mean a (non-xenosatanist) kind of abolition of consent (non-xenosatanist, to repeat), but this does not however mean the legalization of rape, unless by that we mean con-noncon and other sexually consensual activity, as everything is still technically and practically fully consensual in such a utopia.). while i am reading society of the spectacle off of marxists.org i did browse nothingness.org and on guy debord's page includes apparent theorization of integral spectacle, after he basically got pissed at his loss, which is apparently to say that the end of the spectacle is looking grim as its supposedly mor integral-- i do not doubt this but i believe that the 'spectacle', which to me is just a form of expression of the real subsumption stage of capital over reality, was always integral, and debord had simply been emotional over his hopes of winning in the SI and later emotionally disillusioned but not disillusioned enough to say that the SI was pointless. Basically, the society of the spectacle seemed pretty permanent but, again, didn't it always? With the split between SSI and SI, or better put, the SI-2SI schism, i actually, while recognizing the inferiority of the 2SI (following M.D., there is no emotion (movement, communism, the bordigist love that fuels the revolution) that preces action (revolution), the action (revolution) leads to the emotion (the new mode of being under communism), and unfortunately for M.D. and everyone else the action will never happen because, again, the actor tends towards inactivity (capitalism) and does have emotion, emotion for (capitalism)inactivity. So then, utopians take up your sticks and led by emotion (the love of utopia, the passionate cravings, yearning for fourierist pleasures) you can, against the revolutionaries, achieve utopia (action!)), have to agree on the basis of the SI's utopian tendencies to theorize before revolt about the after-revolt, when in reality, communism never exists before revolution can only organically begins existing after the revolution, or my interpretation of M.D. tells me... that, regardless, does not matter because communism is impossible.--- the unity of theory and practice does not exist in the situationist international (despite claiming it does) as it did, in theory, in the 2si (according to guy debord is really dead! by Luther blissett on nothingness.org, where i learned of the si and 2si split). I do enjoy the rejection of the term situationism but it is wholly not enough, it is obvious it is necessary to reject situationist and any identity at all, in fact, insofar as identity is oppressive (self-affirmation and ideology and identity's tendency to mystify the struggle the identity is formed in and the values the identity reproduces into a struggle of identity for identity, or, the turning of MLs, Egoists, and OLD LEFTists into

identity politics, ironically enough, but identity that is political, not one of oppression. Political identity begins to struggle FOR ITSELF and not FOR ITS CAUSE because of identity-mystification that is inherent to any and all identity--- what a situationist can say about situationism i can say about situationist as a term, which is to say, coherence and continuity means a rejection of the -ist and the -ism, not just the -ism. This, and the autocracy, i blame for the failure and dogmatism of the situationist international... though bob black's last international (composed of him, himself, and he, last i checked, it was not a real international) isn't still around either. Bob black (i will reveal my name, though i am a nobody, once trump is out of office or when i am of age as i am sure to do so while trump is in office is an idea only an idiot could follow through with!) sure was influenced by situationists, huh.. oh he wrote a writing about it too (8/3/26 4:00am i finished reading it, well, after ranting about something else a whole fuckton), and its pretty good. Bob black, good at criticism but not so good at solutions--). Okay there is a new twitterite inside joke, and that is what is historically progressive, and i actually realized that i have something to say on this topic-- or really, something to elaborate on my anti-revolutionary position-- a rejection of the scientific/revolutionary/progressive path, and such, whatever solution i arise at, to create a utopia, if even possible, is unaffected by time and history and would have to be the solution regardless of material condition, which is to say, it is not communist nor progressive nor rational nor scientific nor realistic, it is purely unrealistic, and so, is universally applicable (hey i sound like a maoist again! I swear the situationists are inspired by maoists with their speak on the cultural revolution and the society of the spectacle on marxists.org by guy-ernst debord literally having a quote in it referencing the french maoists and their french maoist dialectical system but nobody seems to talk about the maoism of the situationists because it is not entirely or really maoist but only references some inspirations from (french) maoism.. like the one into two thing.). It is the communization of history (by history i mean specifically the historical passage of time and the scientific-historical pathway of progressivism--- that is, the historical materialist scientific road to communism laid out by marx and co., that is, scientific socialism.), or, the utopianization of (and thus the murder of) god, and as such it finds itself not working with but against the historically progressive trajectory ((8/4/26 1:15am -and we can do this exactly because history is not linear, exactly because communism is, in fact, not inevitable, not even possible, and exactly because the only revolutionary classes to win, the capitalists and the proletariat, are now passive sheep without their potential and all other formally revolutionary classes (peasant, slave, serf) have been or are going to be abolished by capital already-- capital has ended any possibility of possible revolutions (that is,

revolutions against capital by capitalists or revolutions against capital by proletarians-- because they first tend not to revolt, and when they do, they tend to simply bring it back in a new form) and has, thus, now begun attempting a linearization of economic history-- while marx was wrong about history's linearity and teleology, something he got from hegel and fourier, capital is forcing him to be right, but, instead, upside his head, that is, like kojeve's reversal, capital is creating an end to history and that end is capitalism-- even if history does not have a beginning or end, capital makes history into a paradox therefore. There are still nations and tribes that lack capitalism or, at least, has a very underdeveloped form of capitalism or only capitalist tendencies, but capitalism's global domination seeks to ensure that these nations take the same path as the rest of the world, that is, towards capitalism-- economic historical teleology can only be implemented from above, aka by a global capitalist order, and not, like marx and bordiga believed when they spoke about historical/class consciousness and communism before the revolution, from below, aka from the revolutionary tendencies of historical materialism and the material conditions that ensure communism to be both possible and inevitable, which is to say, class consciousness was the theory of historical teleology coming from below, and because historical teleology, as we now know, cannot come from below (we know this because historical teleology did not exist until the global capitalist order, one, two because M.D.'s critique of consciousness that, in theory, includes the historical consciousness implies in marx's economic historical teleology, and three because then capitalism would not be able to impose its own historical teleology without severe paradox and dialectical acceleration, and four, because then we would not have reached the point of capital's impossibilization of communism and revolution, as that would be impossible for capital to do then.), then both class consciousness and the implied historical consciousness from it cannot exist, and too, thus, historical teleology can ONLY be imposed from above, that is, from a global capitalist order, like the one created in the real subsumption stage of capital, or, like the one we have now. Thus, in fact, now we have not historical or class consciousness but, instead, materialist tendencies of the classes, which tends towards, irrationally and without higher purpose, whatever the conditions lead the class to.. and, in the capitalist historical teleology, these class tendencies now tend towards the preservation of the capitalist economy by any means necessary, and so, revolutionary potential is put to an end-- unless capital requires the class in question to revolt for its OWN purpose, but that could happen with any of the classes at capital's disposal and not just the proletariat.. then, generalized slavery and the end of revolution, especially communist revolution, all revolutions are now strictly capitalist.-- thus, too, the revolutionary path is a path towards capitalist development and eternity,

and, again, progress is only towards capitalist progress, and so it is necessary to be not apathetic to but directly against revolution in all its capitalist forms. Thus now, if these material class tendencies from the historical material conditions could be called a consciousness, which truly, it could not be so, then such a 'consciousness' is now for and by capitalism and is then a capitalist consciousness, thus the proletariat are reactionary. Then, time, history, progress, revolution, science, rationality, all these are for and by capitalism, and a true fight against capitalism can therefore not be based on these things, we must-- reject history and the trajectory assigned, historical consciousness and tendencies, we must abandon progress and revolution, and abandon, too, the delusion of linearity and teleology. History must not be ended, or escaped, but killed. so, leftism rots. eutopia is not the promised lands, no, it is not even the lost garden of eden, not heaven, nor is it the kingdom of god inevitably coming down and uniting with earth, it is simply another choice not up to you, and so, i cannot promise it, in fact, i can assure you that it will not come, not at all.)it is not leftist, we are, instead, not post-leftist, but anti-leftist, but anti-rightist as well, this is an important distinction to make. But, of course, not anti-leftist as how zerzan means it as he is a dystopian delusional prick.)-- it is the reappropriation (and so, really, nationalization as well as abolition, such as seen in cambodia) of time and space by the utopian angkar (the organizationless angkar, the headless angkar) of international nihilistic (landless) motherland russiye, the doctination and indoctrination of year zero (and so its own abolition, the end of year zero is always because year zero was never a year, there is no year before the first, it almost-- never happened? Now, the actual year zero of pol pot did happen, i am saying they called it year zero to make sure that, to cambodia's future, it never happened, or at least, it appears so. Anyways, the abolition of time.) and the foundation of passionate planetary orgasm (neo-fourierist imagery). It is the abolition of realism (a win for soulism), the positioning of utopianism (a win for fourier), and the extermination of decay-- we find that now we can have our holiday in cambodia (song reference), as long as we have killed cambodia (aka 'as long as reality is gone') and annihilated the angkar (aka 'and impossible anarchist utopia has been achieved'), as long as there is no history to be had (aka 'as long as life, death, time, space, materiality, decay, ideality, and everything else is long gone and buried, abolished.'). That's all, 8/3/26 6:06am. Reading Guy-ernst Debord's society of the spectacle, specifically on the ussr and stalinism/leninism, i do not see a contradiction between this and camatte' analysis but instead this is simply the capitalism that lenin's DOTP tending towards capitalism leads to, that is, this is what the material conditions of a DOTP tending towards capitalism (or, DOTPTTC) leads to, aka, a capitalism without capitalists (supposedly, that is the myth, such a myth seen in reality in guy-ernst

debord's society of the spectacle), unexistent elites (elites that do not recognize themselves as elites, like the angkar's anarchist totalitarianism), it is more than left-wing capitalism as it is capitalism that does not recognize itself as such-- the result of a DOTPTTC is a SUC (self-unrecognized capitalism), or, an alienated capitalism (AC). DOTPTTC --> AC/SUC. On the representation of the proletariat and its opposition TO the proletariat, i take this as a spectacular opposition of different factions of the reactionary tendencies of the proletarian class against each-other insofar as the spartacist uprising, the kronstadt revolt, the cnt-fai struggle, these are all lassalleen and so pro-capital revolutionaries representing the proletarian class' reactionary tendencies, and too, the SPD scum-of-the-earth, the bolsheviks (rad-socdems), the stalinists, MLs, maoists, leninists, situationists, and whatnot, are also pro-capital revolutionaries (who, because they won or are already in power, or they are reformists, tend towards betraying opposing reactionary tendencies that threaten their power or their stability and threaten revealing their illusory state) who, also, represent the proletarian class' reactionary tendencies, insofar as all sides are lassalleen the entire thing is a spectacular struggle, a myth. Ultimately, the proletariat are self-oppressing and lassalleen, hopelessly pro-capital, and the struggles of these factions of the reactionary proles means nothing in terms of actually opposing capital-- to me, the battle between these factions are like the battles between the stalinist bolshevik and the trotskyist bolsheviks, both reactionary representatives of the proletarian class (and to make this clear, yes, the DOTP can be done via this way and stay a DOTP as camatte and bordiga supposed, simply one tending towards cpaitalism) and neither in actual opposition to russian capitalism. well then, we see that the AC/SUC model quite literally shows similarities to pol pot's angkar model ,but i would argue that pol pot's regime was not capitalist, but instead, simply an incoherent autogenocidal economy-- the material conditions of pol pot's economy does not make coherent sense to and does not align with any other form of capitalism or, for that fact, any economic system that has been tried before, it sure is not communist or socialist, yes, but it lacks the DOTP to be AC/SUC (it was never a DOTPTTC nor was it ever AC/SUC), and while it shares similarities with modern comunizers, it is radically different im millions of ways (such as not being at all in line with comunization thought), it seems more like a self-annihilating utopia socialist project, but lacking the features of utopianist projects, that is, voluntarism, reformism, moderatism, rationality, science, and y'know, an actual foundation. Pol Pot's regime was one of pure autogenocidal intent that could not be capitalist, because unlike capitalism, it was radically opposed to eternality and even the proletariat (capitalism, despite claims, loves the proletariat), as even with the workism of pol pot it lacked a capitalist nor marxist aim, it was extraterrestrial. I

will label this the autogenocidal economy because of its nature. This to me is more interesting that the cult-utopianism (apostolic socialism as it is officially called) of jim jones' "marxism", as jim jones can be dismissed as an utopian socialist gone wrong, but pol pot, pol pot cannot. Pol pot, for example, took up a principle of deindustrialization, something at that time opposed to any form of capitalism at the time, and he even abolished money itself, which, too, was opposed to any form of capitalism ever... this is not to glamorize him, he was an autogenocidal bastard responsible for the death of 25% of the entire country (according to wikipedia, as not many people agree on the exact number of millions and i do not wish to commit historical revisionism here). On speciesism and sexism, 8/4/26, 9:39, a short little writing, real short, i believe that sexism is being pushed onto animals (non-human) and gender dynamics in non-human species(plural) are being produced via species colonialism-- and, too, gender is being applied to whole species(plural) based on stereotyping, such as the feminization of cats and the masculinization of dogs and whatnot-- these species are not the gender being pushed on them, but instead, the gender being pushed on them is just that--- being pushed ONTO them and not really accurate. Too, as seen with rising animal torture rates (in relation to zoopedebiastophilia and ageist-speciesist bigotry, AND sexist-speciesist bigotry and zoo rape rates human-animal) and rape rates, too, and even online gendering of animals as an attempt (by science, sexists, traditionalists, and even terfs and gender realist) to say gender is scientific and natural-- gender is pushed onto genderless species(plural) via violence AND via stereotyping and forcing human cultural expressions and human culture onto animal, a process that began in domestication and continues as long as domestication does, that is, reshaping the animal communities (artificial animal communities) in the shape of human communities (and so, since human community is capital, in the shape of capital, and such, domestication also now implies the commoditification of animals and assimilation of animals into capital). Now, animals and the culture of various animal species(plural) may adopt the human gender social construct and this will lead to the reproduction of sexism in non-human cultures and thus genderizing nature, making nature itself reproduce sexism, via human colonization of nonhuman cultures that threaten to bring human bigotry to animal cultures, and so, also complete nature's bigotization. 8/5/26 recently i found a discord server for eulavist discourse called, you guessed it, eulavist discourse. This server was, admittedly, a bigoted egdy shithole with little thought put into it and lots of hypocrisy, or as i'd call it, philosophical inconsistencies. There, too, were essays, however. So, being the critic i claim to be, i have collected all the writings i found (notsomuch since they waste their time on debate, EVEN THOUGH the superior form of discourse is book-form critiques

and not debates), and will read and critique them in hopes of deconstructing lanza-- unlikely since most of these crackers probably do not even understand lanza. There were three people posting essays--- @vermin_in_chains, @suicidemogger (eugh), and @freshanalysis (imagine if that was a die of death reference even though it probably isn't lol). I will start with vermin_in_chains' "essays.pdf". wait, the third page referencing a book from @freshanalysis implies that @vermin_in_chains IS @freshanalysis so i will, instead, be starting with @freshanalysis and refer to "essays" as freshanalysis' instead of vermin_in_chains' writing. we start on freshanalysis' "omnicide", uhm... still at the preface, nothin to say but it is very moralistic-- it kind of tends towards ignoring the truth of the system that is every being is coerced into being like this, the predator and capitalist as much victims as the prey and proletariat. also, on veganism, i still advocate for consensual cannibalism as an alternative. on why to continue existing, and i do not wish (to clarify) to do in depth critiques of these people (it is not worth my time) but simply to place my position on these questions and critique things that i really must., on why to continue existing, there are things i can say. First, we cannot stop existing, death is not the end of existence but just a shifting in form of our exsistence, and thus, death is not an actual solution as it will only replicate your suffering in a dead way, death is not the end of suffering but just a change in how you experience it. Second, living is not a rational thing, rationality is linked to suffering, and while life (by which i mean decay) is only miserable, that does not mean that one should wish to end it, which is not to say suicidal people are morally wrong as i believe suicide is something one can do and there is no moral ties to it you can make without using christian logic. In Omnicide.odt, freshanalysis says "reproduction is selfish, but we'll return to this topic later." and their entire argument is based on the unimportance and nothingness of your life, that , nothign you do matters and everything is temporary and humanity is doomed-- but people do not live for that, they live as egoists, egoists who make the best out of their lives because they do not know what is after death and do not want to gamble-- or at least most people. People do not live for a greater purpose, they do not live to make a difference or a change or have permanent decisions that show that they lived and existed, they live for pleasure, for gain, wealth (which is, other people), for all the good things this world gives them (in small corrupted amounts, like sex, because in utopia sex would be 50x as pleasurable). People do not exist for their goals or pointfulness, not because they have meaning, most people understand that they don't, they exist because, one, they'd rather not die, and two, because they, even if they are shitty pleasures, still have pleasures on earth. It is not some cosmic logical argument for life but instead simply a personal reason, a temporary one, stirner's egoist despises the eternal ego

(unfortunately for that egoist, all selves become eternal after death-- but the dead self, because it has changed the way we experience suffering and misery, is not considered a unique by max stirner and his egoists so they will not care for the dead self). in the next paragraph, freshanalysis talks about exactly what i just said, because i am an idiot who does not read very far before speaking. then we're back to the self's unexistence which is known already, though he takes the underdeveloped idea of the nonexistence self that lanza spoke about and not one that acknowledged its unlife. page 12, they argue the peter singer stupid point that ending a life non-consensually, as long as it is painless, is okay--- this ignores that suffering is not caused by pain, there is pain in utopia, pleasuring pain, masochistic pain!, suffering is caused by a lack of consent, the stripping of autonomy, and death does not end the self so that being will feel its autonomy being stripped when killed either way. It does lead to suffering exactly because the pain is not the problem but the stripping of autonomy and the non-consensual nature of the activity. Even if life is inherently agonizing (like the text directly states), it only is because it was started non-consensually and is composed of non-consensual and coercive activities, not pain, not the biological ideas of suffering that these pro-mortalists believe is the problem, it is consent that is the most important thing, not life, not pain or harm reduction. on 'happiness being the alleviation of boredom' (another quote from freshanalysis' omnicide), this is openly a nonissue... boredom, consensual boredom, is fine, and will find a place in utopia as a form of entertainment, and therefore, no longer be boredom as we know it but something new, entertaining boredom. also, on the refutations of boredom, if you really are convinced suicide is the way, nobody needs to stop you, that is ultimately only your decision and optimism or pessimism means nothing--. i finished, there was more but i had honestly gotten bored of seeing the same shitty arguments. the next file is a whole fucking oxford book i am NOT reading by david benatar, so i will skip it. on "on evilism by freshanalysis" the entire part about theism can be solved by "an evil, lying, quasi-abrahamic god". and the futility and pointlessness of life is not enough for most people to accept suicide, not even if life is suffering itself would people tend towards suicide, because you must admit that no human cares for the rational, and they honestly have a good reason too. Utopia is irrational. A rational perspective on life is a perspective incapable of bringing on an utopia, it is a perspective of dystopianism and a perspective without pleasure or hope in utopianism, it is a pointless negation of pointlessness--- i say, in fourier's footsteps, in utopia, the ocean will become lemonade, a beautiful tasting lemonade, one that the fishes and sea animals will all be able to live in and drink from and, too, enjoy and love, one that all the animals in the world will enjoy in harmony, and there will be no more predators and prey

coerced and non-consensual, only consensual relations of pred/prey-play and consensual meat-eating and such. Is it rational? No, but it is utopian. In utopia, plants will move and communicate and also be able to experience pleasures, they will form relations with the dirt and worms and the birds and humans and all the fishes and whatnot, all living and nonliving beings and objects all in passionate relations! efilism is an argument against earthly life but never against utopia "life" (not life at all, really..). there's not much else to say. the next one is another book seemingly not by freshanalysis or if it is i will still not read it because this is 1193 pages long. to life and logic by freshanalysis, it's another rationality that only serves to replicate suffering. back to 'essays' by freshanalysis, the preface still relies on a definition of suffering based on harm/pain, and so, is (naturally tending towards anti-masochism and anti-sadism) wrong on the basis of ignoring the real issue, that is, the non-consensual aspect that creates real suffering, and not simply harm and pain. it ignores that consensual and pleasurable harm and pain exists and is not suffering to any degree, it is like these people have never met a masochist or a consensual sadist in their life! freshanalysis, the self is an illusion, 'essays.pdf', this is what i have already said in (the horrid work called) Hyperborean ideology by uhhh ME, but it's still an undeveloped understanding of the unexistence of the self that does not synthesis lanza with stirner in the unlife of self. On the impossibility of consent in 'inability to consent is a poor argument against procreation' 'essays.pdf' by freshanalysis, there is a huge misunderstanding here-- which is why consent is impossible. (inability to consent is a poor argument against procreation, 'essays.pdf', freshanalysis, "in an absolute sense no one is capable of consenting to anything."). It is not because the self is continually evolving, as in utopia the self would not exist at all and consent would be organic (while the self is constantly changing and never a stable one thing, such that you a year ago or day ago is not you now, when you consent as you from a few minutes ago, in a consensual situation you are able to retract consent, which thus gives the choice of the new self to undo the action of that old self which is not the new self, there is a method of undoing consent which is necessary in all consensual activity, that is, you can say no-- this is not always necessary, sure, as it is clear most new selves do not feel raped because of the old self's action of consenting and usually say they consented the entire time (though this is a different self to that self during the sex this newest self has the memories, to some extent, of that self), thus the activity is (still nonconsensual due to the impossibility of consent but LOOKS LIKE an organically consensual activity).). The fluidity of the self's unexistence is not a problem, and too, in utopia, it will not exist at all and organic consent will reign. CONsent is impossible, instead, BECAUSE of the domination by the self, capital, and culture, aka self-subsumption, and thus, not because of the lack of a

single self (dead selves, to clarify, are still fluid selves -----as dead selves are now subjective and not subjects themselves, their fluidity is not linked to their subjectivity but instead to the way they are subjectively viewed by others, thus, always evolving in a now more non-autonomous way, and, too, still fluid.). Either way, the child being born's lack of consent is a violent lack and not just a lack from impossibility, it is a trauma, birth is a trauma, and that is an argument that has a basis that is not destroyed by the fluidity of the self. 'inability to consent is a poor argument against procreation', 'essays.pdf', freshanalysis, "consent is a poor argument against procreation because life isn't bad because we failed to agree to come into it. Life is bad because of painful experiences."????? Pain can be pleasurable, it can be passionate, an experience of homogeneity or an experience of heterogeneity, it can be a beautiful act, it is not "bad". Sure, life isn't bad just because we failed to agree to it, though our failure to consent is the first trauma, life is CURRENTLY a miserable process because it is a continual process of non-consensual activities (that, so, strip passions and violate autonomy and produce suffering, and so, misalign the passions and impossibilify utopia), and not because "pain is bad and life is painful", pain in modern society is a form of pain that is coercive and lacking passions, it is a non-consensual passionless pain, it is not a utopian pain--- it is not inherently bad, pain is not bad by nature, it is only bad in our civilizations and can be reformed in utopia as a good and passionate thing. "if pain didn't exist then the experience of sentient life wouldn't be objectionable", "inability to consent is a poor argument against procreation", "essays.pdf", by freshanalysis, this is pure bullshit. So... Heaven, right? A painless godly divine "utopia" that lacks any passionate activity or autonomy, a huge rape-orgy without sex, without sexuality, without passions at all (can't misalign passions if there are no passions, i guess..), without polygamy/polyamory, and without pain... this is the most boring, miserable, and painless suffering-inducing world of all time. Freshanalysis just wants to live in heaven, their unobjectionable world is not a utopia but instead heaven. Well, this clearly shows what happens when one advocates against a biological understanding of suffering, they degrade and trample all over pleasures and the passions and deny the greatness of a utopia for instead a christian mess... Efilism, at least freshanalysis' efilism, is a sick and inconsistent form of the christian idolatry of heaven. Death is their heaven, it is the sublation of misaligned passions, of civilization, it is supercivilization, it is the annihilation of the passions, that is heaven. Anyone who advocated for supercivilization, the death of passions and pleasures, and so, Heaven, is nothing more than a fucked-up christian to me and should not be treated as anything other. freshanalysis calls consent nonsense abstractions but ignores that negativity IS abstract nonsense in the first place, any sort of advocacy is ultimately reliant on

abstract nonsense, be it science, rationality for socialists and marxists, pain as negativity for efilists, alienation for eulavists, misaligned passions for fourierists, lack of consent for anarchists and noveltists (supposedly), or anything else. When we are dealing with suffering, we are dealing with something naturally abstract and moralistic. Pain is real, pain is not negative, that itself is an abstraction, you ignore the pleasure of pain or denounce it as mental illness. and a painless life would also, believe it or not, still be nonconsensual as there is more to why people do not kill themselves than pain as a barrier, there is lots of ways to painlessly die but that has never been the issue, and to reduce it to pain is, well, reductionist. i will not lie, the rest of this book is shit, and i did read it. Yes, i read the essay on eulavism, it speaks for itself and its flaws are very open wounds. It was simplistic-- i disagree with eulavism on a lot, clearly so, but following my understanding of russian nihilism, i still advocate for the abolition of values and believe that utopia will be a russian nihilistic one lacking values and such disgusting things-- my definition obviously can be called different from lanza as mine originated in russian nihilism and his came from him. @suicidemogger had nothing interesting to say, i said nothing about them. I will say, on the question of suffering and pleasure, the biological and so passionless and reductionist and paramisic understanding of pleasure and suffering that efilists have very much leads them to be uncomprehensive about the possibility of utopia and leads them to believe that suffering and pleasure are intertwined, linked infinitely together and inseperable, that they are not at all heterogeneous from eachother, which is false-- what they are thinking of is pain (pain, suffering physically, mental suffering, boredom) and traditional pleasures (entertainment, sexual pleasure, gastrosophical pleasure, whatnot..)-- but both pain and pleasures, when consensual and in utopia, are reformed in a beautiful and passionate way where they are not at all suffering. Efilists oppose utopia because they, the biological-reductionists, see it as impossible, they think of masochists as insane coping madmen and sadists as evil rapist insane serial killer ted bundy fag, they never see them for what they are-- masochists and sadists, people who find pleasure in pain, because pleasure exists in pain. Efilists lack poetry, lack passions, lack any utopianist tendencies as they are too busy larping science and reducing everything to "materialist" bio-reductionist understandings to really understand the truth about suffering and what it is. They are deluded and that is what makes them accept heaven, deluded with christo-atheist logic, rationality, and science. In the end, all i got from this is that i am not an efilist. Back to society of the spectacle by guy-ernst debord, i now am reading about time and humanity (i will attempt to ignore the speciesism, i understand it is normalized but it is as abhorrent to me as any other form of bigotry-- i understand that communism itself is speciesist, and so, bigoted.), and

the cyclical and irreversible times, or, as in thesis 136, "(...)myth and history, (...)\" (guy-ernst debord in society of the spectacle). I do find this interesting, truly, but i do not have much to say. And with this to pol pot, i think, that the year zero doctrine itself was an attempt not to return to cyclical time or to break from cyclical time and declare irreversible or historical time, but instead, as year zero never moved, never repeated, never progressed nor regressed, neither linear nor cyclical nor myth nor history, i believe it was the khmer rouge's attempt of fully liberating itself from time via the murder of time itself (not abolition, but murder-- the abolition of time would not be for the khmer rouge, since then, it would simply not exist and so we would meet the end of all beings (my doctrine== the abolition of time, which, since time and men are intertwined so far that they are one of the same, and by men here i mean beings, the abolition of time is the abolition of beings, aka, part of the organic foundation of utopia-- organic, a beautiful thing, bordiga's organic centralism is the only poetic form of centralization in its organic movement, but really, we need the organic centralist organism to be headless, decapitated, acephale, and so, that is the Astructure of utopia-- headless organic centrality, the decapitated bordiga, organic consensual catastrophe of scatological, neurological, theological, biological madness, utopian insanity.), but then, too, would the death of the angkara come if time was abolished (if time is abolished, if men were no more, totalitarianism, statism, and libertarianism, anarchism, alike, fall. Not good for the anarcho-totalitarians.. nechayevists)! So, instead, the angkara chose to murder time, Year Zero is still a year after all, and convert living (or lived) time into dead (or dying) time, and so, living men into dead men, the angkara could not do away with individuals so wished to, like a gentilean, radically synthesize the individuality with sociality, it wished not communist egoism, but instead, communism to be the ego (in reality, they did not know what communism or marxism truly was, so it was the khmer rouge that was to be the ego itself, to become the unique, and so, to convert living egoists into dead khmer rouge patriots), and the ego to be communism (that is, pol pot as the angkara, but pol pot not existent at all. One cannot call pol pot necessarily an egotistical or autoglorifying madman, not a fascist person, not a cult of personality leader, he was unique in that he himself, consistently, wished to replace his unique with the angkara, but really, he replaced the angkara with his unique, or, uniqueness-- that is, he became one with the angkara by virtually dying to the angkara, he was nobody, and so, everyone, every man in the angkara, he was the national spirit. Yet, nobody knew him?)... That is, the death of time is the foundation of the angkara, alongside the gentilean birth of the angkara, and ultimately, a nechayevist wish "abolish capitalism by any means necessary, even if it leads to the birth of something infinitely worse.". That is why Khmer rouge could not abolish time to escape it,

but instead, killed it! but, fortunately, because the angkar was not global, time revived and took its revenge-- that is, historically, the cambodians under the khmer rouge did not care for the angkar, hated it, mocked it, laughed at it and parodied it, therefore the khmer rouge failed, and it is all because their attempt to kill time was just that, an impossible wish to put out of its misery the arteries of god's will, a dumb choice, another suicide attempt by god just to fail like always. Recently a french politician said to nationalize weather, and it was mistranslated as nationalize time, and leftists on twitter praised this demand to no ends... what could this mean?), that is, it wanted dead time instead of living time and dead men instead of living men, it wanted total domination over time's corpse, khmer rouge was a necrophiliac. 8/6/26 6:06 am, after reading (https://www.bannedthought.net/International/RIM/AWTW/1999-25/PolPot_eng25.htm), i have decided to categorize Pol Pot's regime as a lobotomized fascist regime, or, a fascist kakistocracy. 8/7/26: i disagree on the question of culture with the situationists and do not find it necessary to explain why culture obviously still exists. 8/7/26 4:57 am, i have finished society of the spectacle by guy-ernst debord. It was fine. I plan on watching the film version of 'society of the spectacle' and 'can dialectics break bricks?' later, and i hope to enjoy them. I also have decided i am interested in reading bataille's novels alongside the two collections-of-writings i have of him (georges bataille visions of excess selected writings 1927-1939 edited and with an introduction by allan stoekl translated by allan stoekl with carl r. lovitt and donald m. leslie jr. theory and history of literature, volume 12---- AND the bataille reader georges bataille edited by fred botting and scott wilson. i also plan on actually reading philosophical books BY bataille.. i am no larper, only a larper.). Before i head to sleep, i must say one thing about the abolition of the self. All beings, living or dead or object or unliving, small or big or microscopic or hyper, are people to me, and too, i find that the tragedy in faultless tragedy does not just end on the scale of animal-beings oppressing each other and causing each other misery, but also to plants, objects, the cells and atoms in your body, the microscopic entities that live everywhere, germs, diseases, viruses, colds, whatnot, also the baby flies and the energy from the sun and the planets altogether and even community, nature, these things all have selves and are people (yes self has a self it is part of the endless spiral of self-alienation that is self to give self itself a self when self is not itself a self or a thing capable of having a self but instead your-self), and the way we have them now we cause misery to every atom, every cell, every fungus, every virus, every water bear, all of it... In utopia, with the abolition of self, this effectively abolishes everyone, every person, the homogeneity and misery and suffering of every self, and so, even these old oppressive hyperentities, aka, forms of oppression, will find

themselves in coexistent consensual practice with us-- utopia is not anything-less, but instead, an ultimate reformist project, in that everything will be made utopian, consensual, misery-less and suffering-less, and, again, utopian.. utopia's impossibility gives it the ability to be and do anything, thus that utopia will not nonconsensually kill anyone and, too, will not come out of nonconsensual activity like that of revolution (fourier was right to look at revolution so disgustedly, truly, war cannot lead to real or permanent peace because war is not self-negating, it only creates peace for more war such that peace creates war for more peace.. permanent consensual utopia cannot come from a temporary nonconsensual dystopian activity exactly because self-negation does not exist).. culture, self, community, god, nobody will be abolished or killed, but instead, transformed. Time, space, nothing will be abolished or killed, but instead, transformed. How? I cannot give the true answer, but i have assumptions.. the consensualization and radical temporalization of culture for example, community as a temporary fleeting emotional connection, perhaps, and too, self as a removeable mass of personas gumbled around by each anon like a box of masks communally owned consensually. I do not know the true workings of utopia, of course, but this is how i imagine it, and so, a (maybe not good, but certainly a) guess into what it could be. Slavery transformed itself into work in economics, and in utopia, it will be transformed into many things (slavery-play, work-play, playtime of a bob-blackist kind without value aka real noncoercive play, whatnot..), so even the worst things will not die but be transformed (rape transformed into con-noncon, simply.. Heterosexuality into lesbian relations). This applies to people too, all people will find themselves in harmony.. life and death becoming consensual experiences that can be reversed and time and space the same, where consent matters before all. Similar to a soulist regime. I call for the abolition of nothing, only the transformation. God will be happy, i will give her the choice to be, and her being me, i will take it. Our bodies alone, hierarchical and autarkikal regimes, commits thousands of mass exterminations per day, our very life and death and decay is responsible for millions of nonconsensual deaths, our birth itself is a tragedy of uncountable numbers dying, we are, untransformed, oppressive and genocidal machines against all that are making us up. We as selves force homogeneity on ourselves and our-others, we are oppressors to ourselves and our-infinities. We must be transformed, but if the revolutionary understood this, he'd call for us to be abolished and kill every being on earth.. consent matters, and really, is the only thing to matter. utopia transforms us, not to its design but via consensuality to take up our own organic design. There will be no places for things to find, for their place is nihilized. I am a reformist against reform. This is part of the impossibility of utopia, that is, the impossibility is partially because, the path to utopia itself,

reformist as fourier had thought, is impossible.. every part of utopia and part needed for utopia and for achieving utopia is utterly impossible. There is nothing we can possibly do. 8/7/26 7:48pm i have decided to. to the best of my ability, go vegan-- it is impossible to fully tell what product supports animal farms and pethood and domestication, and in capitalism no product is ethical and capitalism itself is speciesist, and sure it may seem pointless to become vegan if it will do nothing to stop the mass amounts of murder of animals in society and seems only a little preformative, but i do believe that it is, at least, better than just going about without even trying, this my own personal opinion. I understand that, sure, accidentally i will maybe buy a product supporting speciesist massacres and bigotry, but that is because there is no way to perfectly avoid it. I have been avoiding buying from isreali or zionist companies and their products, but you know, the upper-class disguises where their money goes so im sure even living in america would be supporting israel and such (I AM NOT COMPARING PALESTINE TO ANIMALS< TO MAKE THIS CLEAR, I JUST WISH TO SAY THIS HERE). okay, 8/8/26 2:39, on israel-- the Colonial state that, because of fascism's rise and fall amd assimilation into capital (something neoliberalism reinstates literally through trump, though exists in all the social democracies and neoliberal nations of the world-- trump is the overtization of fascism in capital in order to create a new genocidal spectacle, which is, i do think hispanic people and immigrants are very likely to experience a genocide in the USA modern nazi-maoist dystopia after deportation inevitably fails-- deportation started the genocide in germany as well.), utilizes and perfects fascist imagery and politics/populism and reproduces fascist tendencies-- though, since fascism originated in a turning-inward of colonialism, and israel is ultimately a colonial state, the use of overtized fascism in israeli capital and israeli society is hard to separate from its colonialist roots, nature, and future.. It is hard to tell how much of israel is fascist and how much of israel is colonialist due to the nature of fascism and how it is inspired by american colonialism and ethnonationalism and manifest destiny, something nazi germany AND israel applied/applies. Israel is thus a post-fascist (or post-ww2) colonial state, and so, has the tools to rush through colonial genocide of the natives (palestinians) via fascist sublation of colonialism and support from neocolonials and israel uses it. One thing, though, must be said. Israel is, due to its colonial nature, technically historically progressive, and in its acceleration of colonialism, it is historically ultraprogressive due to its anachronistic nature... this may be a problem for most communists but what is historically progressive is also what is progressing suffering and so the historically progressive is also the enemy. on the leftcom solution of the international proletariat or the anarchist idea of the no-state-solution, there is truth and falsehood in each. Palestinian capitalists, like

jewish capitalists during the holocaust, are also responsible for working with their people's genociders and freely avoiding consequence, it is true that the elites who happen to be palestinian are not the same as the palestinians being genocided, as elites remain above consequence- this has been seen in the holocaust with certain elites (who happen to be jews (not all elites are jews and not all jews are elites, i am not antisemitic, i am simply pointing out that capitalist jews do exist and were responsible for the misery of non-capitalist jews)) and rich jews being surprisingly safe and sometimes even profiting off of the misery of other jews, this is also exactly how israel began-- israel started from capitalist jews working with and funding antisemites and helping crush the bundist (revolutionary anti-zionist jews) competition and helping force jews to move to israel via the rise of antisemitism and the strategic deportation of jews by antisemites and zionist-backed governments alike, most non-capitalist jews opposed zionism or israel and, of the zionist non-capitalist jews, most suffered in gaza because they were not adapted to live in gaza's conditions. the zionists only wished to create a new way to exploit others and whatnot (see the zionist want to keep palestinians as slaves, if not a complete jewish ethnostate), they wanted to colonize, and to increase their profits via colonialism (which is very profitable as we know). Zionism is a capitalist phenomena. Too, palestinian elites were not exactly fully formed or united by the time the zionist project started, so zionism allowed the palestinian elites an excuse to accelerate their development quickly and form their capitalist economy alongside israel, at the misery of the proletarian palestinian masses. The jewish quasi-strasserite doctrines of the supremacy of jewish labour and labour zionism was an attempt to autonomize the jewish economy from the palestinian exploited labour they were currently using and stop the growing palestinian petite-bourgeoisie that was trying to take advantage of the zionist movement and betray their palestinian people as the middle class always does. This also encouraged the palestinian capitalists and benefited them, so it is obvious where the unity is, and it is not between the palestinian peoples regardless of class-- it is the unity of class regardless of race. Zionist proletarian individuals, however, due to first the reactionary and lassalleian nature of the prole, and second the reactionary position of the colonial population, and third the reactionary psy-op of the fascist doctrines and manifest destiny propaganda used by the jewish capitalists against jewish proletarians, all three of these doctrines have stripped the israeli proletariat from any possibility of revolution against their elites, and only extremely small and fringe jewish anti-zionist and anti-fascist groups exist in israel as far as i am of knowledge of and none stand a chance for starting a revolution. The zionist proletarians of israel is the majority, and they are not open to the abolition of their state (they are colonizers and victims of fascist-colonialist propaganda so they

will not abolish israel, aka no zionist is against zionism), nor the abolition of their class (they are socdems and lassalleans and post-labour-zionists (aka post-quasi-strasserites, labour zionism is jewish strasserism), take a good guess about if they are for self-negation), nor the abolition of money, nor the abolition of their nation or race or anything else. The zionist proletariat are not for the international proletariat.. i am sure i sound like a third-world-maoist right now. And, too, a no-state-solution would in theory be the correct choice, but again, anarchism is impossible and so is utopia. Therefore the only option we are presented with against the rise of the new remicrowaved fascist era (foreshadowed by israel's fascist-colonialist synthesis and the US' overtized-fascist spectacle) that is coming, that is possible, is the support for palestine-- but this itself is a problem as people tend, to 'support palestine', to support the palestinian capitalists and elites and statists (like FATAH the revisionist nation-traitor socdem zionist scum, and HAMAS the (also had accusations of working with israel)traitor scum who wish to impose a regime and who is a supporter of nationalism and capitalism and islamism,.. or worse, the PA which are also quasi-zionist traitor scum who are complicit in the genocide)... one has to support, then, the palestinian proletariat? Or, instead, one has to oppose Israel with no alternative except a "free Palestine"? Sure.. a half-baked answer but i do not have a real answer for you, unless we are to accept the impossible quasi-statism of a palestinian anarchist movement ----eh, maybe the quasi-state of anarcho-palestine is better than a maoist palestinian people's (new democratic) republic (the only group claiming to represent the palestinian proletariat, that i know of and is popular, is a maoist palestinian group. That is the reference. I would say the quasi-statist anarchist movement of palestine would be better than palestinian deng xiaoping.). Then, sure, no-state-solution (though it is ultimately an one-state-solution, that is, a one-(quasi-)state-solution), the "anarchist solution" of a palestinian quasi-state and the abolition of israel and the palestinian elites. Thus, my position. The genocide of palestinians carried out by israel is not to be underexaggerated or derealized, it is a horrible tragedy that should never have happened, an undeniable genocide that i'd say was worse than the holocaust, but this is also why i consider it so important to speak about it and possible solutions about it and to analyze it. We cannot accept palestinian new democracy, where palestinian proles accept their elites with open arms unknowing that those same elites were complicit and plan on exploiting the proles minutes after the hug, and so, palestinian maoism and palestinian national liberation proper, aka statist national liberation, must be opposed, the palestinian elites of HAMAS, FATAH, the PLO and PA must die for their zionist crimes against the people of palestine **ALONGSIDE ISRAEL AND THE IDF/IOF** and those horrid **ISRAELI CAPITALISTS.**, the freedom of the palestinian people-- false, the

freedom is of the palestinian proletariat, truly. After looking more into it, the maoist palestinians, aka the Democratic Front, calls their goal and ideal form of palestine "people's democratic palestine" according to the unreliable source of wikipedia. They also keep up the maoist tradition of murdering children and the revisionism and class-traitorship of new democracy. The PFLP, though some may be attracted to their ideals, are still a bolshevik-inspired and SUC/AC party which clearly do not provide the conditions needed for total palestinian liberation. Fauda is an example of a good-enough palestinian movement, though obviously anarchism is impossible, if you aim for the impossible sun you land amongst possible starts (never as good as the sun but oh well), and palestinian quasi-statism is a fine liberatory doctrine. Total Liberation would be ideal, but again, not even the total-liberationists actually achieve that (total liberationists, though progressive and i am grateful for their support of my people (children)'s struggles for liberty, are still pro-nature and so not actually Total Liberationists at all, sadly.). if i can, i'd like to join the alf (though that may not happen as i am Anti-Nature and, when it comes to abolishing bigotry, Pro-Violence-- violence IS necessary for any revolutionary struggle.), but never the elf. uhm a bit more on israel, now in relation to jews, i wish to stress the antisemitic nature of zionism and israel and how they have also targetted and attempted to cleanse non-white jews (see how jewish minorities are treated in israel or the famous castrations of black and beta jews... also, how orthodox and ultraorthodox jews (usually standing with palestine) are treated by israeli society and cops and how non-zionist, yiddish-speaking or yiddish-descendant, and neo-bundist jews are treated, though that is more a political cleansing and an attempt at cleansing a whole jewish language for their dumb "hebrew" language.. i would argue that yiddish is a much more passionate language, if language could even be passionate (actually NO LANGUAGE CAN BE PASSIONATE), than hebrew the unliving language brought back from the dead.) and how the israeli society and military has often and famously killed jews and their own citizens.. zionism is famously against jews as well. now... all the organizations fighting for palestinian liberation that aren't backed by zionists always say they have nothing against jews, everything against zionism, yet zionists hate jews and palestine alike! Zionism is for nobody but itself, or, zionism only exists for israel and colonization and genocide, nothing and nobody else. Also, more semitic jews like eastern jews or beta jews or black or african or middle-eastern jews or just any jew who is more semetic than european is also treated like shit or less than shit, oppressed, castrated, killed, by israel, because israel, ruled by the white jew, is a white colonial project-- i do not believe this to be jewish colonialism, but instead, the historical project that has dominated the world and exploited all non-whites and third-world nations and colony, aka,

white colonialism (and so white supremacist and white nationalists, nazis are more like zionists than either like to believe-- labour zionism and kibbutzism (and the famous proto-zionist anti-marxist tankie Moses Hess of whom most nazi-socialist (proto-nazbol) theorists like strasser brothers was inspired by despite the jewness) literally share a theory of superior racial labour with the strasserites and other left-wing of the Nazi Party of germany, the beefsteak-nazis as they were called.. Left-wing zionism is beefsteak nazism, zionism is nazism, kahanism is de-facto the true leadership of israel (Kahan was illegalized in theory by israel so as to in praxis be able to become the dictator of israel, kahanism is the ideology of modern zionism for the last 6 years and to make sure nobody would know they illegalized the kahanist party and assimilated it with the government. Israel is, too, an one-party-state, and that party is the Israeli Kach Party. The massacre carried out by that kahanist was funded and backed by the entirety of israel and the entirety of israel had to deconstruct the kach party in order to make it the state ideology, like the allies destroyed fascism to become it. The modern "real kach party" is a spectacular illusion and israel is ran by kahane himself through the puppet of the kahanist netanyahu. Netanyahu is the puppet of Kahane who is responsible for the newest stage of israeli genocide now being carried out since that coincides with the israeli government's creation of the one party israeli-kach-party state that currently rules today, this explains why palestinian genocide has been gotten a thousand times worse in the last few 6 or so years since 2020 or before. ISrael is a kahanist state and, to make it worse, this is why the kach party was removed from the US' watchlist for terrorist groups and, soon in the future, will not be considered a terrorist group at all.) and therefore hitlerism proper, Kahane is hitler-- no, netanyahu is hitler, Kahane is himmler, the true religious-esoteric ideology behind it all. I can go in detail, Kahane chai and the modern kach party is a farce spectacle.. Kahane chai is a correct statement as the assassination of kahane was faked in order to take over israel, and his son, the founder of kahane chai, is not his actual son but himself under a new identity. The man arrested for the murder was an innocent man. Kahane, pretending to be a son he never had, made KC (kahane chai) to immortalize himself and take over israel and be its de-facto leader under the one-part-israeli-state party that is "Otzma Yehudit" (which actually translated to "zion lives!"). His 'son' (aka him himself, now immortal) then faked his death again, another false assassination, in order to run israel from behind the scene, and again, palestine was blamed for it and a random arrested. Then, Otzma Yehudit makes kach and the kahane chai organization go defunct along with many kahanist organizations to make it seem like a dying ideology, when in reality, Kahanism is the perfect gentilean unity, synthesis, of Colonialism and colonial tactics with Fascism and fascist tactics, a perfect unity-- Kahanism. Otzma Yehudit

now pretends to be another party alongside many parties, when in reality, it is the only party. The JDL, ADL, and other kahanist organizations still active (the adl is kahanist, yes) are currently used to hide the truth of the kahanist israeli stage of genocide against palestine. Tkuma is a puppet party of the Otzma Yehudit dictatorship that fakes a multi-party democracy, just like the Maoist dictatorship faking a dual-party democracy (if dualparty even counts as democracy) in the US. Otzma Yehudit is not the same as the Otzma Yehudit of the spectacular illusions, aka, "jewish strength", that is simply another illusory party dominated by the REAL O.Y party. i guess the nazi party was just a ... german o.y party... g.o.y..... sorry this is serious. Israel is dominated by the O.Y, a literal totalitarian far-right (gentilean synthesis of colonialism-fascism) party serving the cause of white colonialist genocide. This is the truth.

8/9/26 WHAT IS XENOSATANISM ++ CRITI

source for this list comes from the transid.org page for xenosatanism. words in "()" is my commentary. I am doing this to show that anti-xenosatanism does not mean being scared to be similar to xenosatanists like the radevians, anti-xenosatanism means a proper and critical analysis of the reactionary elements of xenosatanism... such as their pro-rape position. The abolition of the age of consent is not inherently xenosatanist or nambla-ist, it is only so if they do not abolish age and the power dynamics present in society and ageism.

:
:

Transgender, nonbinary, and xenogender identities. (this is fine)

Species non-conformance or nonhumanity, such as transspecies or alterhuman identities. (this is fine)

Transabled, transnos, transage, and ostensibly all other transID identities. (this is fine)

Support for MAPs, zoophiles, and ostensibly other paraphiles. (this is fine)

Depathologization of queer behaviours, which presumably includes LGBT, transID and paraphiliac individuals (this is fine)

Transhumanism, full bodily autonomy and normalization/legalization of all body mods. (This, from any primitivist or quasi-primitivist critique of technology, is a bad and self-destructive idea)

The total desacralization and destigmatization of sex, sexualization and nudity, including the normalization and encouragement of public sex, nudity and

pornography. (pornography is rape culture, though i define pornography as anything from the porn industry, and industry of rape-- consensual sexual media spread online is not the same as porn to me, or fictional sexual media, though some may call that porn. But other than that, this is fine, and good actually. Though encouraging does cause misaligned passions, we should liberate not encourage or discourage, things form organically. But public sex will be in utopia like the man who shat on the street in front of my family outside of my christian school, that shitting man is a revolutionary(???) and people will publically shit in utopia, non-consensual disgust will be abolished alongside non-consensual sadness and non-consensual negativity!)

Anti-ageism, anti-adultism, and youth liberation, including drastic reforms and overhauls of the school system, minor access to pornography and the abolition of the ages of consent and majority. (this is fine, but not radical enough. Age must be abolished, and pornography, again, will not exist in utopia. The abolition of the age of consent is not in itself bad, but is only bad if age and ageism and those power dynamics themselves are not abolished-- like france's age of consent is bad, but age not existing is good. Asexualization of youth is also bad.)

The legalization of fictional (shota/loli/koda drawings), child pornography and minor sex work, even for minors of all ages. (Fictionality is fine, i am personally a darkshipper, but child pornography and minor sex work is minor rape insofar as **ALL PORNOGRAPHY IS RAPE AND ALL SEX WORK IS RAPE**. this is reactionary.)

The legalization of all sex work for all individuals. (this is reactionary as sex work can only exist under a non-consensual economy and, too, is rape.)

The banalization [normalization], depathologization and social encouragement of incest, bestiality, kinks, and paraphilias (the last two are fine, bestiality is literally the modern-day sexual abuse of the power dynamic between human and animal or animal seen as human and animal seen as animal, and so is first against animal liberation insofar as an absolute animal liberation would make bestiality impossible and, consensual interspecies relationships as possible instead, bestiality must be banned for consensual interspecies relations to begin. And incest will not exist when the family is abolished, so the preservation of incest is support for the family model)

The destigmatization of self harm. (consensual self harm, sure!)

The destigmatization and desacralization to some extent of rape, molestation, sexual abuse and depending on the case, non-consensual but harmless sexual interaction should be legal, and not stigmatized. (this is obviously reactionary, and a pure undermining of the consensual utopia!)

Anti-psychiatry, anti-maladism [apparently, the oppression of those based off of illness and disease] and anti-sanism. (this is good, all must be free!)

Moderate to high anti-suicidism with suicidism being the oppression of suicidal individuals, pro-euthanasia, medical aid in dying, and non conventional ways for suicide for those with persistent suicidal thoughts. (suicide will be abolished in utopia as there will be no life or death or decay, and without decay, suicide will not exist---but consensual suicide in modern day is fine.. there will be fleeting moments of experiencing pleasurable and utopian deaths though, this can be suicide..)

The legalization of drugs, and the liberation of drug users. (YES< YES FUCK YES)

The legalization and social banalization of cannibalism, and the commercialization of human flesh. (this implies capitalism and non-consensuality, not my pro-cannibalist idea of consensual meat-eating, so this is reactionary. Capitalism is bad yall and also commercialization is bad and whatever.)

Drastic renewal of the organization of the public space [and we also plead for urban cyberpunk aesthetics]. (technologism is bad)

Reproductive rights, including surrogacy and prolonged delay for abortion. (birth will be abolished in utopia, people will simply consent to existing one day and they will pop into existence, and if they do not want to exist anymore, they will pop back out of existence, and if they wish to come back, they can.. birth and the experience of birth as a trauma will be abolished, however, practicing the experiencing of birthing a consenting baby will exist via the consent model the baby will simply consent to be. Abortion will be unnecessary unless all parties consent including the underdeveloped unliving fetus, but, again, organic consent will guarantee that all sides will always be in harmonious consensual practice.)

Total free speech. (sure.)

Political bisexuality, which is thought to be the idea that bisexuality is a choice--one that should be made for a liberated society. (heterosexuality will cease to exist, sexuality itself as well, everyone will be freely whatever they are-- asexuals now,

in utopia, will be people who just happen not to have sex, and not "asexual" as a label, same with lesbians and gays.)

The widespread deconstruction and analyzing of social constructs and systems of beliefs--critical thought applied to all institutions. (not necessary.)

you see? Not everything is wrong and, so, do not fear advocating for something that xenosatanists also advocated for, as long as it is not reactionary-- hitler advocated for environmentalism, and hitler is SATAN and deserves to suffer, but not all environmentalists are nazis in disguise and we should not be scared to advocate for the environment. The environment (ecology is the economy/community of the planet, darwinian processes / natural selection and (the economy of nature as a global economy now taken over by the capitalist global economy) is the economy/community of Nature and all the living beings of nature-- the dead leave this community for the community of the dead, which is currently taken over by capitalism in the denial of death, such like the dead leave the nature/culture of Nature for the nature/culture of the dead, though their bodies are commodified and reintegrated and homogenified by nature. each species has their own economic processes and stages, such as humans had hunter-gatherers and many species have scavengers and whatnot. The environment is typically what people use to refer to the whole of the planet's economy/community ---WAIIt NEVERMIND THEN the environment must be abolished entirely as it is, itself, an economy/community. Environmentalists are reactionary. Also, this does not mean i am against plants or the fungi and their struggles and sufferings and existence as, personally, i am sympathetic to the plants and fungi and their oppression and i hope they can achieve liberty, if environmentalists refer to plant liberation as 'environmentalism' then i am an environmentalist, but, if they mean a pro-environment stance as environmentalist then i oppose them as enemies to absolute liberation-- plant liberation and fungi liberation requires the abolition of nature, community, and self, AND THIS INCLUDES NATURE AND THE ECOLOGICAL PROCESS AND THE ENVIRONMENT, all oppressive structures against all beings, living or dead, animal or fungi or plant or whatever else, and must be abolished. Plants will only be free with the death of the environment and the instating of an utopian replacement for environment based on consent and utopianism and passionate being. everyone will be free.) is not the same thing as nature btw.

uhhhh.... 8/10/16 on the paradoxical statements of utopia, it is only another issue of utopia that deems it impossible-- utopia cannot be achieved with abolition or murder of any form, cannot come from revolution but instead reform, and it cannot truly get rid of anything therefore but only transform it, yet-- utopia is also the

abolition of all real things, of reality, of god and the real, it is the omnicide, then the instatement of new impossible and utopian things instead, OF the impossible utopia, it is the birth of utopia as the new reality, as the new possible. This implies, quite literally, an absolute revolution, an absolute revolt, it implies also an absolute (yet temporary, so it is not my old ideas of absolute abolition) current of abolishing and abolition, murder of oppression and oppressors, omnicide, it implies a war, and not the transformation of things but the getting rid of and replacing of everything. it is, then, revolution NOT reform, revolution against reform, and thus contradicts itself radically, thus another cause of its impossibility (it is both revolutionary as marx's means and reformist as fourier's means yet neither exactly because of this, how does one realize the means to utopia?). These, though, are impossible not because they are false or cannot both be true, but instead, because both these statements are true-- as if one or the other was wrong, then utopia would be at least slightly more possible (whatever that means). And, unlike the dialectician or whatnot, this contradiction cannot meet neither a synthesis (fichte/stalin), sublation (hegel/marx) nor any overcoming (mao the self-proclaimed dialectician who knew nothing of it (this cannot be overcome exactly because there is no solution to this contradiction that allows a new contradiction to take the role of principle, this is instead, to use maoist terminology, the eternal principle antagonistic contradiction (and, to make this longer, it is even a fundamental and unignorable one that cannot be temporarily dropped or overcome for any reason at all) and finds no solution, because it is material yet not materialist.)), this is unsolvable, impossible. 8/10/26 12:36pm i think... i think.... i think people sexualize sex too much and, in this process, take away from the experience of sex and certain pleasures and passionate activeness that can be taken from sex if--- IF we went about with desexualizing sex, which a sexual minimum (like fourier suggests will start the utopian reforms, yes, i am actually quite interested in fourier's sexual minimum, but i feel that it must be a sexual minimum that is voluntary and radically consensual in order to work and function in a way to lead to utopia, or, in a way that wouldn't just lead to more misaligned passions-- and such a sexual minimum, ironically, only exists in utopia. Thus fourier's sexual means for utopian reform is itself only possible IN utopia and thus impossible. Also, seeing as i am a minor and, too, majority of incels and femcels alike are also minors, an actually-functional sexual minimum would have to get over our current taboo of the sexual liberation of children-- which i also find extremely hard to be optimistic about, and even if, surely the statist would use that to get away with mass child rape (and woman rape) so clearly it isn't a possible or necessarily good program. Plus, realistically fourier's program would take the form of state-prostitution, which is, a misaligned-passionate, non-consensual, and non-utopian

activity.) could maybe achieve (unlikely), by which i mean the realization of not only the sexual aspect (sexualization to me is the unrealized of the non-sexual aspects of something and, too, or better said, this is the same thing as, the realization of only, SOLELY, the sexual aspect of something. Sexualizing women means to view women solely as sexual, and having no non-sexual aspect, this the same as what the pederast and NAMbLA-ist does to children. Asexualization, just as bad, is not the reverse, it is instead a puritanical form of sexualization, it is the derealization of the sexual aspect of something, the repression, suppression, and negation of the sexual aspect of something, while because of this repression, still unrealizing all the non-sexual aspects of that something and, ironically enough, realizing ONLY the repressed aspect related to the sexual-side of something. Asexualization, ironically, is sexualization, and too, unrealizes the nonsexual... the difference only lies in whether it realized the sexual or derealizes the sexual. Asexualization is not, to make this clear, to make "asexual" as even asexuals have a sexual aspect, and this is not acephobic to say- asexuals, even if they do not feel sexual attraction, are just as capable as everyone else to have sex, even for some to want sex but for nonsexual reasons, they also biologically have a sexual aspect as well like everything else, though sexuality is not biological, that would be reductionist and inconsiderate of the passions. Asexualization is the repression and ironically too the uplifting of the sexual aspect, repressing it then uplifting its repressed form as all there is. The sacred.) but ALSO the non-sexual aspects of sex, such as the romantic aspect, the economic aspect, the passionate aspect, the necrological aspect, the consensual aspect, the platonic aspect, the familial aspect, the ... etc. etc. etc. I mean by the desexualization of sex, i mean, the realization of the non-sexual aspects of sex alongside the sexual aspect instead of ONLY the sexual aspect. I mean, it is required for utopia for one to enjoy sex in more than just a sexual way, one, and two, for sex to not be sexualized or thought of as only sexual, and three, for the entirety of utopia to have the CHOICE of sex, or, the organically-consensually-formed sexual minimum, not forced from above like fourier, but instead growing naturally out of utopia we will see that every being who wants something will, simply because of the correct alignment of passions, have it, and not only for sex but all things. There will be no depriving from pleasures or wants in utopia-- not because of force or totalitarianism but because there is simply no situation able to be formed where consent isn't organically and communally present, there will be no possibility for disharmony in utopia because simply it is impossible--- this, unfortunately, is an alienating feature of utopia that also leads it to be impossible, that is, that utopia is ultimately a reality and, sadly, seemingly all realities imply an alienation that is the alienating feature of being-real, and too, the freedoms and liberties lost from being-real, soulism here opposes

the fourierist utopia because it does not allow the soulist their anti-reality anarchism, aka, utopia is sadly, and ironically, totalitarian regardless because the idea of harmony itself, of organic consensuality itself, of utopianism itself, is totalitarian on the level of reality and the soulists. The soulist can feel itself oppressed by simply being a part of a reality, even utopia, and because it can feel this oppression only because it struggles against its chains, this means that any being in utopia is also oppressed by utopia's state of being a reality and only does not notice, like the modern american, because they do not struggle against it, also because it is incapable of struggling against it, my utopia was a totalitarian regime par excellence, that is, organic consensuality is still, the same, another totalitarian post-bordigist (organic consensuality, now knowing it was part of a totalitarian system, seems pretty close to organic centralism again, huh? The head did exist, it was cut from the body, filled with helium, and flew away, yet still dominated and controlled the body it left.) post-fourierist bullshittery of absolute compliance (under the guise of correct alignment of passions, it is not coercive via coercion but via the myth of consensuality (AGAIN) which, because this 'utopia' is totalitarian, is still not consensual (consent is still impossible!!)... in fact, can consent really ever exist at all as long as our passions, a coercive element to our actions, still exist (another reason why utopia is impossible?)) But the death of passions would be....) and continuity, one could even say, uniformity, homogeneity (perfect system by oingo boingo lol). If one is incapable of struggling against their society, and are oppressed by their society but in a perpetual state of ignorance, that society has sublated totalitarianism via the morphing of totalitarianism into a spectacular anarchism--- this is the flaw fourierism had*() that i, in H.I., failed to understand and critique, instead calling fourierism a dictatorship of ultra-culture or whatever-- it is not a 'dictatorship of hyperculture' or whatever that means or whatever, again, i said, but it is a spectacular anarchism. Fourierism is a totalitarian spectacle, spectacular anarchism, a false liberty that only exists because one cannot realize their experiencing of their own misery, it is misery without suffering-- thus, also alienating, and thus creating a self and making utopia impossible once more, if it wasn't already impossible once more. Misery without suffering is alienation as it is not experiencing your own experience, it is a totalitarian spectacle no longer bound to earthly materialism. Spectator perfected. thus, i find that the utopia i am looking for is still an anarchist one, fourier's utopia appealed to me because it was a spectacular anarchism, or, because it was anarchist (yet, since no anarchist is an anarchist and anarchism isn't even real, not even utopia is really anarchist, or, possible.). I am.... still an anarchist, all too much of an anarch. Fourier's failure is just one of the millions of interceptions between anarchism and totalitarianism that

presents the truth of anarchism, that is, it itself is an illusion (though not a spectacular one like fourierism, because fourierism's spectacular anarchism is the regime of the perfect demiurge, the flawless demiurge, and the illusion of anarchism is made by our flawed and miserable god instead.). It is also the same flaw i have*(), and now, i have realized that i have, and my idea of utopia. Not ultra-culture, but reality, but hyper-spectacular reality, faux anarquismo once more. In a utopia, anyways, wouldn't there be a lack of bataillean heterogeneous elements? If filth is treated equally with everything else, if the noble and heavenly and sacred and torn back down to earth and equally to all, if everything becomes the homogeneous mass of the people neither untouchable (vile) nor untouchable (sacred), if everything becomes free-use, touchable, molestable (if, basically, everyone and everyone is in harmony and, basically, liek the hive of the bee, a superorganism, an superorgasm..), then is this not...))))))))))))))))

8/11/26 1:11am, short one again, on paraphilia, sexual mental illnesses, and the passions. First off, if we are to remember the plights of the homophile and the autogynophile (the gay man and trans woman), paraphilia as a distinct category is not to be entirely trusted and, in fact, is extremely subjective and based on the bigotries of modern day-- all paraphilias are, as far as i can be concerned, simply sexualities. Because sexualities and attractions originate in the passions, they cannot be reduced to naturalist reasonings or bio-reductionism, sexuality and attraction is not simply a thing made to lead to copopulation (that itself a heterosexual idea) but instead it is something else, the result of passions. And, if all attractions are given by the passions, then all attractions, regardless or normality, are equally capable of harmonious existence and thus equal in the eyes of utopia. Paramisiacs and homophobes have often claimed that sexuality is changable and forms throughout life, and while yes, one can gain new attractions, and their attraction may change over time, certain passionate attractions stick to you for your entire life since your conception. Personally, i have always had a sexual attraction to inflicting pain, or, at least, i have always been attracted to the idea and felt passionately for it, though the sexual aspect is a lesser for me. Ever since i was young, i had read fanfics and medias showing me this and, though one might claim my sadism is simply a resulf of reading these, i can clearlyy remember being attracted TO these things and not influenced BY them. Too, my sexual attraction to my father is not a result of the emotional incest forming later on in my life, but something that has always existed, not acted upon. One is not simply born passionless and aquiring passions throughout life, that is absurd, passions may change and shift but all beings are passionate. And abnormal passions are not illnesses, sicknesses, but instead passionate attractions that exist for a reason. If, like many can say, paraphilia is to be opposed based on harm, that

is, if they only know the term paraphilia in reference to the pedo, zoo, and necro, then all one must make clear is that the abusive aspect of these relationships stem from oppression and, too, heterosexual relations are just as bad in their oppressor x oppressed dynamic, if not worse due to their commonality and their passionless flight seeking to make sex only about production and reproduction. If i could support any reform to modern society, it would be the illegalization of heterosexuality exactly. Sadism, also considered a sexual mental illness, is perfectly fine-- no suffering is actually experienced by most paraphiles due to their attraction that doesn't stem from closeting, masking, fear of coming out or being found out, and the knowledge that society hates them-- paraphilia does not inately harm the paraphile, only society hurts the paraphile via the oppression of their paraphilia, thus that considering it a mental illness is to consider a homosexual a mental--- oh wait, again, homophiles as a medical term, in which, because of this same exact thing, homosexuals were also considered paraphiles. Majority of paraphiles, to recall to the reader, are harmless paraphiliacs (the harmless to harmful paraphilias ratio is not balanced), and, of those "harmful paraphiliacs", majority of the paraphiles are not predators or acting upon their attraction because they are people and have morality. The thing about how most pedophiles are not child predators and most child predators are not pedophiles, and whatever... Meaning, only a small, small minority of paraphiles are actually a danger to themselves or others.... thus, how is this a mental illness? Meanwhile, heterosexuals, heterosexuality being a normalized form of abuse, abuse millions more women than any paraphile does to their subject of attraction, and get away with it because it is 'normal' or 'not taboo'. Heterosexuality is arguably worse than pedophilia NOT just because of the quality but also because, and mainly because, --- for example, according to the stupid <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/sexuality/bulletins/sexualidentityuk/2024> source im using, an estimate of 90% of all british people were heterosexual, and of those heterosexuals, an estimate of 60% were in a relationship at some point in life or are in a relationship, meaning that heterosexuals tend to be predators to women way more frequently and often than pedophiles are to children because society encourages and normalizes heterosexuality. Also, historically, women were treated the same if-not-worse than a child was in the pederastic system of greece. Heterosexuality is an actual danger to millions of millions of women, yet nothing is done about it. To declare a passionate attraction mentally ill is to repress and alienate the passionate being in question and that cannot remain in practice. 8/11/2026 11:23am i have been 48 fucking hours or more awake and i have realized something. THIS IS IT. THERE IS NO MORE TO THIS BOOK. THERE IS NOTHING MORE I CAN WRITE

ABOUT THIS BOOK. I WILL END THIS BOOK HERE< aBRUPT, AND RASH,
AND CUt, because this book cannot end if my goal is still to achieve the
impossible utopia, as i know i will never accept a best-case-scenario, so then...
END IT HERE AND START ANOTHER BOOK!!! YES. I WILL READ
BATAILLE WHILE WRITING THAT BOOK AND NTO DEAL WITH THIS
BULLSHITTERY!!!! UTOPIA IS DEAD, GONE, IMPOSSIBLE, FOREVER,
AND NOTHING CAN CHANGE THAT, THIS BOOK IS POINTLESS, IT
ITSELF IS A FRAGMENT OF AN IMPOSSIBLE BOOK- TO FINISB THIS
BOOK, IRONICALLY ENOUGH< WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE< SO I JUST
FINISH IT HERE< HOW BOUT IT. FUCK.