

The following is a thread on the Leftist internet forum RevLeft, which died forever in 2017. Among the usual shite were a number of extremely interesting threads, many of which, regrettably, are now lost, or at least lurking somewhere out of reach on the internet.

The following is one such interesting thread, posted in August 2016. What begins as an innocent question (does abolishing property mean abolishing pet ownership too?) spirals into a blistering attack against superstition, ecology-fetishism, anthropomorphism, and general bullshit uncritically held assumptions that Leftists often hold.

This thread is unusual for Leftists standards in that the main contributor is *against* the usually casually-assumed tenets of Leftist activism: animal-rights/welfare and ecology.

It is, in my opinion, one of the finest obliterations of flimsy Leftist presumptions that I have ever seen, not to mention a challenging and at points inspiring read. And it cements 'Rafiq' as among the sharpest minds on the Left. (wherever he is).

The online forum thread is available here:

<https://www.revleft.space/vb/threads/195850-Does-the-abolishment-of-private-property-extend-to-pet-ownership/page2>

though it seems to be missing it's first page.

Names of contributors appear above their post.

Text which is being replied to will appear against a yellow background.

My notes are in purple.

I have tidied up the thread somewhat, and corrected some of the worse spelling/grammar mistakes.

Enjoy.

Jingo7



timekept

Junior Revolutionary

Join Date Jun 2016
Location DC Metro Area
Posts 2

Does the abolishment of private property extend to pet ownership?

Just what it says on the tin. At current I own a lovely cat who essentially acts as an emotional support animal for me, and I was wondering whether an anarchist/communist society would frown upon pet ownership, or perhaps if domesticated animals like cats and dogs would be "owned" (taken care of) by the community in which they live?

Sinister Cultural Marxist

Senior Revolutionary **Committed User**

Join Date Feb 2011
Posts 3,000

Originally posted by **timekept**

Just what it says on the tin. At current I own a lovely cat who essentially acts as an emotional support animal for me, and I was wondering whether an ancom society would frown upon pet ownership, or perhaps if domesticated animals like cats and dogs would be "owned" (taken care of) by the community in which they live?

People won't frown upon having pets. I can't think of any Leftist movement which struggled against such things except the Red Guard in China. The notion of pets as property can be seen as problematic from an animal rights perspective, but cats and dogs want to live with us. As for an individual being an owner or caretaker, there's nothing more wrong in that than an individual owning a toothbrush or the mattress they sleep on.



A Revolutionary Tool

Reactionary Scum **Committed User**

Join Date Jul 2009
Location California
Posts 1,772

I don't think domesticated animals will be a huge issue to address except for in the realm of maybe human entertainment. Will we have SeaWorld owning and profiting off of whales? No, I don't think so.

Things like puppy farms where people breed animals for the purpose of selling them at exorbitant prices would be abolished if I had my say, no more designer animals for sale.



LeftistsAreRadical

Anti-Social Anti-Fascist

Join Date Jun 2016
Location Oregon (until 20 July)
Posts 60

Private property = means of production
Personal property = your phone, your clothes, your pets, etc
Private property ≠ personal property

GLF

Banned **Supporter**

Join Date Oct 2014
Location USA unfortunately
Posts 303

Not only does it NOT extend to pet ownership, but it doesn't extend to anything in your home or vicinity. The only thing that will be "seized" is the means of production from the capitalist class. Large chunks of land or homes that are ridiculously large for one family will be seized, this is true. But their personal possessions belong to them.

People act like commies want to take all their shit. It's the capitalists that want to do that, not the communists.



(A)

is for Anarchy!

Join Date Jun 2014
Location Canada
Posts 871

A Workers state (Liberal socialism/Statist Communists) I believe retains the use of Property so Personal Property such as pets may be retained. However the choice would be up to the authority (Communist party/politicians) and how they wanted society to function.

Less Liberal Socialists society (Anarchist/libertarian communists) would not/should not retain the existence of property in any form as there would be no authority to maintain its existence. Some would argue for Animal Liberation from ownership in the same way we would argue for humans to be Liberated from being owned. This would be a point of contention I imagine as there are a lot of people

who would not want to give up raising cattle and eating meat so I believe it will be up to society and its community's to work out. That being said pets would most likely continue to be kept; maybe not owned in the conventional sense but kept I am sure.



Rafiq

Supporter
Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

It does indeed apply to all kinds of ownership. The Communists seek the abolition of private property as such.

What, however, are the implications of the abolition of every and all kinds of ownership?

That one owns nothing, that 'ownership' in fact as a word becomes purely colloquial and in reference to an individual's particular USE of an object for whatever period of time, whether it is until this individual is dead or otherwise.

The Communists destroy any and all kinds of ownership, for the Communists this notion becomes redundant, for what does humanity own vis a vis to? Nature? God? Wherein not only private property but the private individual as such ceases to exist, what can it MEAN to "own" if not only TO USE? Without this juxtaposition to the other, ownership ceases to mean anything.

One no longer "owns" even their own clothing - instead, they wear them, or even the paper they use to wipe their ass - instead, they use it to wipe. Objects cease to be meaningful outside of their utility. Only man endures as meaningful in and of himself.

That is not to say that the products of man's labour, or the objects he uses, escape him, escape the world of man as soon as they materialize. That is not to say, in other words, that they cease to externalize the inner essence of man. The products of man's labour for the Communists are now forged in his image, are reminders to him of his own mastery of the outside world, his inner-essence. And these products cement like iron the unbreakable unity of all men, of the universality of this new order.

It is not that all individuals like a pious community of monks forsake ownership in the vein of humbling themselves to god. It is that their ownership is in a sense a given, therefore becomes redundant, because no longer do any men own vis a vis other men. At the same time, those objects they would otherwise own become testament to the endurance and strength of the new order, they become finally mere semblances, vanishing apparitions of man's wider conquest of all nature and his expansion to all corners of space, i.e. they are recognized as disposable and useful only in the context of a now infinite conquest of nature, of an infinite revolutionizing of the means of production that never ends.

To possess anxiety over the idea that in this hypothetical context another person may steal, may deprive you of your use of an object, is to betray that one has failed to grasp the most basic and elementary understanding of the essence of Communism.

That is, it is this anxiety itself (over the other) which is the root cause of actual theft in the first place. If you wish to insist on that anxiety, do yourself a favour and admit that you insist that Communism is impossible, forget about such silly questions (of ownership in a future society) and enjoy your life, for you have already admitted that you insist such a future society cannot exist in the first place.



sans-culotte

Marxist

Join Date Aug 2016
Location Painesville, Ohio
Posts 30

Originally posted by **Rafiq**

To possess anxiety over the idea that in this hypothetical context another person may steal, may deprive you of your use of an object, is to betray that one has failed to grasp the most basic and elementary understanding of the essence of Communism.

That is, it is this anxiety itself (over the other) which is the root cause of actual theft in the first place. If you wish to insist on that anxiety, do yourself a favour and admit that you insist that Communism is impossible, forget about such silly questions (of ownership in a future society) and enjoy your life, for you have already admitted that you insist such a future society cannot exist in the first place.

I think that your post was an excellent reply until we get to this point I have quoted above. I think you're being a bit harsh since the question isn't similar to asking about an iPhone and there's a great deal of emotional attachment to one's animals.

To, Timekempt, I would say this: I have a dog and a cat that I love very much as well, but as a communist I don't view them as my property. Instead, we are partners who have chosen each other to experience life together with. Sure, I feel that they're almost like my children, but an emotional connection to a dog or cat is natural and the domestication of dogs and cats will well continue into the communist world.



Rafiq

Supporter
Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

Holy shit, honestly, users should actually read through the forum before even thinking to join or post. You should know by now that this disgusting shit belongs in the dustbin of the website along with the rest of it, this disgusting ecologist trash. As I said, no matter how, no matter the circumstances, no matter where it rears its head and no matter how innocent the forms, if there is any duty I have on

this forum it is to smash, destroy, expel any and all sorts of ecologism, of pseudo-scientific assertions of the animalization and ecologization of man, this putrid, anti-democratic *filth*.

In droves these ecologist scum, these peddlers of reactionary garbage, of evolutionary psychology and other such abominations, they won't fucking stop from coming on this forum and insisting on what is 'natural' and what is not. You know this perfectly characterizes the passive-aggressive male hipster subject of today. That's all they fucking do. They come and remind us of the master's injunction, of our limitations. Think of it like the 'hysterical' woman who is going on and on about something, and her male counterpart telling her 'how it really is', i.e. 'well, that's all very fine, but you should remember, this is how it is and how it must be'. That is the role the reactionary pseudo-leftist ecologists, the 'i Fucking Love Science' leftists who manage to crawl their way onto the forum are. They are here to remind us of the 'truth' of expert knowledge, that we ought to humble ourselves for the big Other.

The aristocratic-masculine subject of the 21st century does this, except they don't take responsibility for themselves, they consign this responsibility unto the unknown, to some big Other - in this case, to *nature*. The male subject of the 21st century, he is a 'nice guy', he is a 'nice, sensitive guy', who is just saying 'hey, you know what, that's nature! That's mother nature, bro! it's *natural*, it's beyond any of our power, so just deal with it!' We are at a level of alienation Marx could not even have imagined today.

It is natural, you so diligently, almost righteously proclaim. "Enough of this nonsense, it is *natural*". And so it is. And so the world returns to peace, and so the sun will rise in the morning and rest in the night, and it will go on, things, bless us, *will go on*.

Originally posted by **sans-culottes**

isn't similar to asking about an iPhone and there's a great deal of emotional attachment to one's animals.

The stupidity is actually shocking. To one's animals. What? What the fuck are you talking about, to one's animals? Like where do they get this shit, "I fucking love science"? To one's animals? The absurdity is actually baffling. The barren truth of the animalization of man is revealed: As though one's animals are the living proof of one's own animality, i.e. as though animality alone elicits the imaginary and alleged animality of man. "One's animals", the logic follows, "Elicit a great deal of emotional attachment because they remind humans of their own animality". If anything this demonstrates the actual proof that humans are nothing like animals and have no animality, the notion of animality as ascribed to humans is an abstract perversity with no actual basis in humanity, because if any fucking mammal (I will give you the benefit of the doubt of not thinking we are 'hard wired' to start crying over dead cockroaches) is a substitute for this 'animal' that '*naturally*' elicits emotional attachment, why is this only true for humans? You are telling me that a grizzly bear and a wolf are naturally predisposed to get along? **You are telling me that a lion and a wildebeest are the best of friends? You are telling me that a dog naturally elicits an 'emotional attachment' on part of the hungry hippopotamus, or what?** The outrageous stupidity of your thinking is that you admit as a human perversion the grouping of all mammals together as being capable of eliciting an 'emotional attachment' (purportedly '*naturally*') by humans, and you don't even think to admit that the reason for this is because in a perverse way individuals project certain characteristics onto animals WHICH IS STRICTLY NOT NATURAL AT ALL, which furthermore doesn't even need to ever be explained in a natural way but can be explained in a very simple and rational way, i.e. that such animals may remind individuals of something strictly human.

I should just fucking say it: THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS so-called "emotions". It is a meaningless, superstitious and purely ideological fucking word used to designate various modes of thinking, various attitudes that one should want to exempt from the critical and conscious use of reason. There are no 'feelings' which are outside of rationality, instead, some 'feelings' you - like a slave, exempt from your own conscious use of reason. They still, however, follow a rationality, they in other words are still meaningful, they are existing for a reason, and that reason is **not** natural anymore than it is divine. The way the fucking word nature is thrown around is purely superstitious. It is purely a category of superstition to think that something you have to go out of your FUCKING way to exempt from the conscious use of reason is 'natural'. Such barbarism never ceases to be a source of depression - that

this stupidity is among leftists is simply unforgivable and unacceptable.

As if there is no reason as to why one has a so-called 'emotional attachment' to their pet. First and foremost, what should be made clear is that there is no such thing as being 'unemotional'. there is no such FUCKING thing as not having an emotional attachment to an object. When you wipe your ass, with toilet paper, you too have an emotional attachment to your paper in a sense. To be unemotional is impossible, because *emotions* as such don't even exist in the first place - every and all kinds of human activity are marked with the intensity of humanness, are marked with human subjectivity and the fundamental experience of being a subject, there is no way of being around that, so for instance, the idiot who says they are not being emotional, who has a clam and blank face, is in a sense in a 'different emotional state' just as much as a hysterical, screaming and crying baby. It's so FUCKING stupid how people play these games talking about "Well, it's highly emotional". Excuse FUCKING me? It's 'emotional', and that is supposed to tell us that it is natural? When one is brought to tears by Beethoven's masterpieces, when the architect is overcome with an immense feeling of pride in his great sculpture, you are telling me these are responses that were selected for 150,000 years ago? Are you stupid, or what? So-called EMOTIONS are RATIONAL, they follow a rationality and are elicited for actual reasons that relate to actual, active, subjects, god forbid. **No one fucking cries when they see Syrian refugees dying in the water because it is natural, they cry and shed tears because they see an actual tragedy in relation to the universality of human practice, they cry in the vein of witnessing actual, world-shaking injustices, things that are irreducible to the barren spiritual wasteland that is nature.**

The intensity of the human experience is that THE VERY EMPIRICAL WORLD THAT IS REPRESENTED IN THE FIRST PLACE becomes precarious and is SHAKEN, in other words, a genuine human 'emotion' is that IT CANNOT be reduced to anything natural, because it shakes the foundation of any and all kinds of representations of the natural world in the first place, it SHAKES the very foundations of the ethical imperative and injunction to reduce it to something natural, human subjectivity is irreducible and shakes the very foundations of what can be perceived to be the entire universe, because the world of man is irreducible to nature, it alone is the only arbiter of meaning by which nature becomes meaningful, it alone is the only medium by which nature can find absolution, meaning, so to reduce it to the barren objects which are objects for subjects alone is so fucking absurd and disgusting it cannot even be exaggerated: **To say the world of man is natural, is to enslave man not simply to nature but to man himself, to keep this world of man static and unchanging, insofar as it becomes *reduced* to its own objects of representation.**

The disgusting bloodsuckers tell us this or that is natural, they tell us, that out of their 'empathy' do they sympathize with the damned of the world: Ladies and gentlemen, he who uses the word 'empathy' in this ecologist sense should be carried off to the guillotine immediately! Only the aristocrats of the 21st century, and their mouthpieces speak of 'empathy', whereas the Communist speaks of SOLIDARITY, speaks of the ENNOBLING, of the EMPOWERMENT and the ELECTRIFICATION of the AGENCY of the subject to whom they have *solidarity* with. The damned of the world don't need your fucking empathy, they need you to get up and fight, out of **duty**, out of solidarity! We do not say it is natural to have solidarity, we say we have solidarity OUT OF DUTY, not nature, but DUTY. That which FORCES us to have solidarity IS OUR OWN ethical practice, **the weight of what we recognize as OUR OWN ethical injunction, which we take responsibility for and which we would rather choose death before disavowing.** It is not nature that forces us to attack injustices, for NOTHING outside of ourselves forces us to do it - NOTHING outside of ourselves FORCES us, we are forced BY ourselves, BY the universality we relate to, BY our own commitment to the cause of Communism and ethical duty.

But let us play the devil's advocate. Individuals do in fact have an 'emotional connection' to their iPhone, just like they do all objects. So what you mean to say is not that individuals lack an emotional attachment to their iPhone, like they do with dogs, what you are trying to cover up is your own ideological and perverse elevation of your pet, your fucking animal, into being like a subject. It is not a coincidence that we live in a day and age wherein both animals as well as purely digitalised representations, such as cartoons, are treated like people, are accorded the same relation. It is because we live in the most intense period of alienation wherein individuals themselves are reduced to

being animals, and the difference between the individual and society's *representation* of individuals (i.e. by the university discourse) is narrower and narrower. What does it mean? This obsession of things which resemble subjects but which are not actually subjects, relates to an increased hyper-estrangement of man from himself. Žižek tells us that the prevailing rationality of today is coffee without caffeine. He should add, it is also: Humanity without humanity, the superficial aspects of humanity without the actual subjectivity that is human, the appearance of a subject without its agency. Why is this? Because today, man is increasingly revoked of his own subjectivity, is at every turn subject to domestication by the university discourse and by capital, so that the only aspects of man which remain, of man's essence that is, are those aspects which can be commodified, which can be in other words estranged from him. This is why we live in a society of animal-fetishisation: MAN HIMSELF is denied of his ESSENCE, so the superficial aspects of himself that can be estranged from himself, which border along the contours of his actual essence and cogito, are abstracted and conflated with man himself. **What dark times are ahead!** Even the word humanism today denotes and carries the meaning of a disgusting misanthropy, of the animalization of man as the human species, *just like any other*. (As a side note: Humanism today can only be inherited by trans-humanism, i.e. so that all of the superficial aspects of humanity are destroyed, and all that remains is the pure, irreducible subjectivity).

Sorry, no one is going to scold you for having a pet or for doing all of the normal motions of having one, but we will scold you if you attempt to *justify it* as though it is inevitable or natural, as anything more than "Whatever, I know very well that it is a stupid object no different from a machine, but fuck it, I'll pretend anyway". This is a far more respectable position than actually trying to tell us that it is natural to think your fucking dog actually is a human subject who secretly cares about you. **Your dog doesn't fucking care about you or anything else, it is a biological MACHINE, it elicits human-friendly responses because those physiological responses were selected over the course of when humans domesticated them.** In other words, your dog is literally just as meaningful as a rock - it IS an object, it only seems otherwise because it again is able to have certain responses elicited from it that were selected for during the process of domestication, but that doesn't mean it understands those responses, thinks they are meaningful, because it doesn't understand or think anything, it is literally like a fucking machine, a robot. If humans were to create a robot that in the same way elicits certain responses by human interaction, there wouldn't be a difference as far as the 'emotional' attachment to it than a dog.

Humans on the other hand are active agents, they have agency, meaning, they aren't products of the mere physiological elicitation of responses, but are the willful creators of the elicitations in the first place, in other words, man can fashion any old stupid animal in his image all he wants, but the active, creative entity is man himself and always will be, a dog for instance could only ever be a mere snapshot, a caricature, which doesn't 'keep up' with man. Hence dogs have no history, outside of how people have historically *used them*. Dogs could never have created iphones, because in a sense they are no more human than an iphone is.

Dogs didn't domesticate humans, the reverse is true. Please, sit the fuck down and tell me HOW IT IS FUCKING NATURAL when DOGS and CATS didn't even FUCKING exist as pets until way after humans existed? Were humans hard-wired to domesticate dogs at the outset that which humanity entered into existence? Why do I have to ask such questions for you, why can't you just FUCKING think critically on your own and spare us all of the effort of doing it for you? Why do you INSIST on saying things like this, that "It's natural"? WHY? Tell us, WHY you find it necessary!

Instead, we are partners who have chosen each other to experience life together with.

I see, you are *partners*. Like a Disney movie, how cute. It is the fantasy-land of Pokémon, no?

Except someone should tell the stupid animal who isn't partaking in this fantasy, this dog who is actually only by your side not for any actual reason as such but because it is physiologically conditioned to elicit certain responses in relation to certain physiological stimuli. Of course, in our philistine, proto-Fascistic age, certain scum (probably yourself included) would insist that this holds true for man as well. The difference of course is that the absurdity of this notion is that - if it is true that humans are animals, just like a stupid dog, why is it that humans must enunciate consciously and with the use of reason their alleged 'animality'? Why is it in other words that humans can know this,

are they also physiologically conditioned to know? What is that space which allows them to do this, to abstract some aspect of themselves and be 'in the know' about it? The disgusting philistine will get on his knees, "Oh spare me, how can I know! Is it the soul? Is it god?", and they will retreat into their new age fuckery. "I fucking love science" indeed.

You don't get what a fucking clown you look like when you talk about this or that being natural. Do you know how stupid you look? The POSITION YOU ASSUME, the SUBJECT you ASSUME, the AGENCY you assume, is some alien, inhuman, abstract rational being who knows 'the truth' about humans and what is 'natural' about them. WHAT FUCKING PERSPECTIVE OR POINT OF VIEW ARE YOU TAKING WHICH ALLOWS YOU TO ABSTRACT YOURSELF FROM YOUR OWN HUMANITY AND HUMANNESSE? Once upon a time, the bourgeois ideologues were honest enough to admit that this perspective is none other than God's, and that men are forever humble to it. Nowadays, with pseudo-scientific jargon, they purport this to be pure, abstract, 'unbiased' scientific thinking, i.e. the thinking of objects in and of themselves and at the expense of the subjective position, practice, that is thinking in the first place. Holy shit.

There is no difference from a non-human animal and any old object. A rock is just as meaningful as an animal in and of themselves. All are necessarily objects which relate strictly to human practice. We have been over this so many fucking times on this website, honestly, every possible argument has already been brought up here. But yet you insist on saying this shit, lazily, like a loose-handed philistine who can't contain their stupidity, because you lack the decency of even being aware that this position of yours is controversial. You don't even think to ask whether this idea of 'naturalness' can be questioned or not, it's not even up for critical thinking, you blindly assume it is a given and just go as follows from there.

You want to go into this? Fine, we can go into this. If the 'connection' you feel to your pet is natural, so too is racism natural, so too is war natural, so too is rape natural, and so too is just about every and all human activity natural - and what do you know, what a happy coincidence, the present order of things as it exists is then natural. BY THE SAME FUCKING REASONING YOU ARE EMPLOYING, why don't you admit that capitalism is natural? You cannot pick and choose which experiences of spiritual intensity that escape symbolization are natural or not. You can't fucking pick and choose what is, and what isn't natural. That's the end of story.

but an emotional connection to a dog or cat is natural

Holy shit, kill me. Literally kill me. I am so sick of these motherfuckers, the postmodern subject, who calmly takes a distance from their rabid, disgusting injunctions, i.e. the postmodern subject who rather than assumes the position of the master who says 'that's it', points to bare, dead 'facts' as means of signification, of 'that's it'. WHO says it's FUCKING natural? God? WHO decided this, that it is 'natural'? Certainly not men, who by your own admission are bound by nature, are enslaved by it, feel and exist as meagre humans only as stupid fucking animals in your mind. I can't believe what kind of disgusting fucking crocodile can talk about this or that feeling of intensity being 'natural'. These scum are incapable of love, these are the types of predators who at every turn attempt to de-sensitize and above all domesticate the intensity of the subjective experience to being 'natural', so that, insofar as they represent their own relation to their 'loved ones', their family, or their beloved, they will do so in an ecologist way... "Well, we mammals are hard-wired for this..." and so on, thereby proving that they are incapable of genuine love, are in fact even thinking that it is dangerous, they are like crocodiles who now subject even the most elementary experience of being a subject to the big Other, ultimately, to CAPITAL.

That is the function of the master. The master that is the master of university discourse cuts the process of what in psychoanalysis we might call hystericisation of knowledge, of a kind of incessant and ruthless criticism wherein every single thing is critiqued, that unquenchable and unhappy thirst for knowledge which is restless and which is ever-enduring (the basic *modus operandi* of any genuine Communist), **they attempt to cut this process short, with their 'that's it'**. In our postmodern epoch, what does 'that's it' mean? The injunction of *enough, that's it*, today takes the form of *don't worry, relax, and enjoy*. Such is the nature of our consumerist and hedonistic epoch. The old master used to say: Forget about it, that's it, *because I said so*. This doesn't happen today: No one takes the

form of this old traditional master, today, it's all about, *it is this way because it must be, because it is natural*. At the very least this older master found some accountability in an individual. Now, the domination and enslavement of men is the most acute, the most exaggerated and severe than it ever has in all of human history.

Today, the injunction is, *don't worry, it's natural, that's just how it is and how it always has been, and we are powerless before it*. This perfectly characterizes the present epoch of barbarism: The master discursive message of that's it, which used to find some accountability in an authoritarian subject who prolonged further questions and who ruled by their own power alone which they took some accountability for, now finds no accountability in any individual, and they shift the blame to the big Other. To a certain extent this was always true, but at the very least with the old, traditional master confrontation with this big Other was prolonged, so there was some room for ambiguity... Now, the old master is dead, and the master discourse as well as the university discourse converge, so that today, **the means by which individuals are dominated, is by means of the fucking coward, the ever-elusive postmodern subject, who shrugs their arms and tells us, it's natural.** Honestly shut the fuck up. I know what you are thinking, even if secretly. "These crazy leftists, let me tell them, this is natural, so let it be!" - NO, NOTHING is going to FUCKING escape our craziness, YOU shut the fuck up and stop trying to protect your precious world from our ruthless criticism, for insofar as we Communists exist, we are going to rip it apart *in every possible way!* Don't you dare attempt to cut this 'craziness' short with your *bullshit* about 'nature'. Neither nature or god is going to save you. If you think Communism is scary, which for the petty bourgeois ideologues it is, kindly fuck off because this is not the place for you. **Stop trying to find comfort and stop trying to avoid confrontation with this ultimate, terrorizing and horrifying nature of Communism: IT IS scary, either own it, or leave.**

The abject absurdity of the notion that an 'emotional connection to a dog or cat is natural' is literally sickening. In times of revolution, saying such a thing would be enough to warrant an individual to be designated not only as a counter-revolutionary but also *as literally a fascist*. You have an 'emotional connection' to cats and dogs not because it is natural but because they remind you of a semblance of people, of having a connection to actual people which you lack, **and finally of in a perverse way being pure objects of your projection, i.e. 'people' who don't 'talk back' or resist being the objects of your fantasy.**

the domestication of dogs and cats will well continue into the communist world.

Your notion of Communism is a perversity, it is a fantasy, it is nothing more than the world as it exists today minus or plus a few quantitative attributes, it is capitalism without capitalism, it is you wanting your cake and eating it too. It is as Marx knew a snapshot of capitalism without the ugly shadows. You want capitalism without that which makes it necessary, you want your normal life guaranteed by the big Other without those 'bad' aspects.

Well into the Communist world, all life will cease to exist, in other words, only two outcomes are possible: Either man will fully conquer all kinds of biological life by means of bio-engineering, which he already to an extent is on the road to doing today (and therefore, to oppose this scientific pursuit in and of itself is reactionary), or, biological life will cease to exist and man will 'upload' his essence as man into machines, i.e. what we are generally acquainted with as trans-humanism, i.e. man will be able to replicate processes otherwise only biological by means of nano-technology, a highly sophisticated computerization, not only becomes the mastery of biological life as such but its perfection even at the atomic level. This is the only possible conclusion of Communism, this is the only possible logical conclusion of Communism, it is the overcoming of the Promethean shame, that men are born rather than *manufactured*.

Man did not choose his body, his stupid and ugly natural body, he inherited it from the animal kingdom. At the outset that which history began, that which humanity entered into existence from the animal kingdom, it found itself stuck with its physical, biological bodies, with the humiliating shame of having to urinate, defecate, having to take care and maintain our bodies in all sorts of ways. With Communism, for the first time it becomes possible that man's physiological existence which is pre-discursive, pre-symbolic can be conformed to his cogito, his logos, his subjectivity, so that nothing escapes the symbolic order, the world of man, not even man's own body (And all of those

physiological processes which sustain the symbolic order which is irreducible to them, are merely replicated artificially). *Pure subjectivity* emerges, shameless and true, survives the highest conquests of the frontiers of nature.

In such a world, and I am talking about *well into this world*, well after the social antagonism is obsolete, insofar as we can conjecture about it **there is no room for stupid animals, animals would cease to exist, those functions previously occupied by animals would either be functions which are no longer necessary (buttressing the alienation of life in capitalism, that is the companionship of a dog or cat), or taken over by machines (i.e. animals as they are concerned in production)**. Not only would dogs and cats cease to exist, it is likely that all biological life *as it presently exists* would cease to exist. All that would remain is the essence of man, which is irreducible to biological processes, which in fact subsumes those processes.



sans-culotte

Marxist

Join Date Aug 2016
Location Painesville, Ohio
Posts 30

Rafiq, all I can say to you is that there is much fury in you. I am astonished that you would call me a proto-fascist and insist that I be one of the first to the guillotine. Your idea of the communist world is a warped one. Your disregard for other forms of life is disturbing and I reject categorically your vision of the future. Sure, I may have been incorrect in saying the domestication of animals is natural, but this polemic of yours was unnecessary and counter-productive. We are comrades and not enemies. I have spent the last 9 years of my life as a Marxist and should the need arise I would give my life for what I believe in. If you'd like to have a genuine conversation and not an exchange of polemics I'd be happy to continue this dialogue.

GLF

Banned **Supporter**

Join Date Oct 2014
Location USA unfortunately
Posts 303

Okay, things have taken a turn for the absurd.

Let's please stop the dick measuring and posturing for just two minutes please. The person asking the question wants to know whether the abolishment of private property extends to pet ownership. It's the current capitalist concept of ownership that will be abolished under communism, not the idea of personal possessions. People make it out like a true communist society would consist of a bunch of naked people going around screwing each other freely, with no family and no possessions and that's just ridiculous. "No state" does not imply "no government", and "no private property" does not imply "no personal possessions". It's the capitalist conception of these things, and consumerism, that is the problem. A lot of communists like to joke around and stuff but the truth is that people who come here take you guys seriously.

I for one am not trying to turn social norms on their head. I am trying to fight the way capitalists define, employ and exploit those norms in their maintenance of capitalism and the bourgeois state.



Rafiq

Supporter الاشتراكية هي المطرقة التي نست

Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

Again, I'm so fucking sick of the mass and rampant stupidity on Revleft. I know how this works. Every-time I leave the forum for a week, we get this fucking epidemic of filth. And people, because they do not want to think critically, **INSIST ON FUCKING FORCING MY HEAD TO EXPLODE**, that I have to type **SO MUCH AND FUCKING HOLD THEIR HAND IN EXPLAINING SO MUCH** all because they don't want to **FUCKING** get off their ass and think critically. I am literally so **SICK** of this **SHIT**, getting into a **FUCKING** lecture of having to explain the essence of Communism and Marxism **IN ITS ENTIRETY**, to go into all of this **SHIT**, all because some fucking idiot doesn't want to keep their mouth shut and accept the full and complete consequences of what they say.

And the worst fucking part is that I have to keep doing it! I **HAVE TO**, out of duty alone, keep doing this **SHIT**, so these **STUPID** fucking people will keep responding and I will keep having to waste time on them, well fuck me, someone actually find me and kill me, put me out of my misery, there is nothing which is invoking of more anger and frustration than this, because the sheer depth of their ignorance, their casual and lazy philistinism, where there is literally a thousand different layers of stupidity, of wrongness, and that you have to go to such lengths to just give a picture of a fraction of what is wrong with what people say. Like shit, this is so *fucking* exhausting. I am not kidding or exaggerating when I say we are literally dealing with probably thousands if not more layers of actual, abject stupidity here. These petty bourgeois ideologues, these rodents, like children, they keep on coming and they don't stop.

I'll just have to keep at it.

Originally posted by **sans-culottes**

Your idea of the communist world is a warped one. Your disregard for other forms of life is disturbing and I reject categorically your vision of the future.

And nobody actually cares what you proclaim to categorically reject or accept. You ought say the same thing of the abolition of private property in general, of in other words Communism in general and it would not make an iota of a difference: You fail to justify, by the conscious use of reason, your ethical opposition, you instead choose to insist on your superstitions and therefore you admit you are an enemy ideologue. You fail to actually think things through, to think critically, and think things in terms of their highest conclusion...

You are a petty bourgeois ideologue and out of this pathetic, frankly reactionary and romantic sentimentality you fear the actual and true implications of the overthrow of the existing order. **YOU CANNOT HAVE YOUR CAKE AND EAT IT TOO**. For you Communism is a fantasy, plain and simple, it is the 'good' of capitalism minus 'the bad'. What you fail to understand is that the overthrow of capitalism entails just that - both what you perceive the 'good' and the 'bad' are sublated, because both are conditions of the other's existence. You fail to actually think things through critically: So stupid are you, that you have convinced yourself that the prevailing sense of normality, of comfort, of faith and guarantee in a big Other, can survive the overthrow of the prevailing order.

Finally, dear child, as it concerns "other forms of life" (I literally just vomited in my mouth, holy fuck), we have been over this thousands of times on this forum, you are free to use the search engine, we have been over anything, from arguments about how Rafiq's assertion that 'other forms of life' are not sacred and in fact just as meaningful as a rock is actually secretly a reflection of Rafiq's own sociopathic disposition towards human life (i.e. psych. 101 wisdom), to the argument that 'other forms of life' are actually qualitatively 'human', but just in a quantitative sense are of 'lesser' intelligence. We have literally been over it all.

What a beautiful Disney-like narrative of the world you have, *other forms of life*, excuse me while I *laugh myself to death*. "Other forms of life", strange, such an image evokes science-fiction fantasies, like star trek, a universe wherein there is a plurality, a diversity of different 'forms of life', so that a fucking hermit-crab is like the Klingon or whatever. Or perhaps we might imagine this in the vein of new-age trash, like James Cameron's avatar, i.e. where all life is magically connected, i.e. that there is some kind of meaning to *biological life* in and of itself even in its pre-discursive being, in other words, a kind of animism. Sorry, that juvenile SHIT isn't going to pass off here. **You can sit here and try to explain to me all you want that the death of a cockroach is any different from me smashing a rock, or computer, on the ground and breaking it in half, but you will be hard-pressed to find an example of someone on this forum who brought up the same argument who was not thoroughly crushed.** You can argue that a cockroach is not the same as a beautiful animal like a lion, but that's a completely arbitrary and frankly quantitative distinction: Why is a cockroach less of a 'form of life' than a lion? Again, all the arguments have already been used before... "Because lions are more like people than cockroaches, because lions are more intelligent", all arguments that were addressed and crushed long ago.

Originally posted by **Location C**

t's the current capitalist concept of ownership that will be abolished under communism, not the idea of personal possessions.

And thus, our master, the returner of sanity and normality admits all the madness, has graced us with the revelation that the problem is the current *concept* of ownership, that, bless us, *the idea* of personal possessions will remain. What does our resident master, our "Okay guys, let's return to sanity, let's let things go on normally", what does he admit in this revelation? That for him, he fails to distinguish the object of representation *from* its representation, and he therefore admits that in his conception of Communism THERE IS SOMETHING HE IS FUNDAMENTALLY ACTUALLY LEAVING OUT, and it is the *wholeness* of human practice, and not in any trivial sense: The wholeness of human practice wherein one not only knows that god is dead, but that god himself knows he is dead, where all aspects of life, even those you reserve and exempt as sacred, are subject to critique, are *actually* transformed. You assert that the idea of personal possessions endure, only because you want to proclaim yourself a person who *believes* they should endure in practice. And why? Because you possess fear and anxiety over the other, who you suspect wants to deprive you of your humanity, deprive you of your enjoyment and life essence. You find it NECESSARY to, in this comforting way, re-assure everyone that, god bless us, "Oh yeah, personal possessions remain", the function of doing this is that you guarantee this suspicion and anxiety over the other, that it will not be suspended but that it will endure. The same fears and anxieties which reproduce capitalism in the first place, in other words.

It is one thing to proclaim the defeat of private property in your own head, the concept of ownership and private property defeated, it is another thing all together for the big Other to know it too, for the big Other to *also* be aware that private property is defeated... That is when it is 'scary'. You secretly rely on a sense of guarantee that your 'Communism' is in vain, it only serves to absolve you of the guilt you yourself feel in the present order and frankly the inconsistency of bourgeois ethics.

Had you actually read my post, you would understand that all private property is abolished, and not only the concept of it, but it itself, in its wholeness, is abolished, is overthrown, any and all kinds of private property disappear, including 'personal possessions', which one no longer owns but uses, and furthermore, the rationality that underlies their use is consciously understood as universal. This is for the reason that in a post-capitalist society, man's estrangement ceases to be produced in the products of his labour, he therefore doesn't have to fucking own anything because for the first time in history he is actually capable of *owning himself*, i.e. taking full and complete responsibility for himself as a

subject, for the universality he relates his particular subjectivity to. People no longer have 'things' for the sake of it, all personal possessions again become fluid, temporary, and only within the context of an incessant conquest of nature, not for any arbitrary reason, but because if capitalism is indeed overthrown, all that remains, the only antagonism which remains, is the one between man and nature. Nothing else, if all superstitions are indeed disavowed, could sustain the new society - it would only exist by this rationality.

What you fail to understand which was the underlying point of my previous post is that private individuals, not only private property, cease to exist - people do not want things any longer for 'private' reasons, but for reasons that relate to the universal prerogatives of the Communist order. In capitalism, this is just as much true, but people do not know it - they insist otherwise - in capitalism, people do not want things because they exist in a vacuum, they want things because of the relationship between the thing and the universality of human practice, they want things in other words to cope with life in capitalism. **Personal possessions in the last instance are desired not in and of themselves for 'private' reasons but for reasons that relate to the individuals' situation and position, immersion in the capitalist mode of production.** Pure utility does not exist in capitalism, abstracted from the utility of the reproduction of capitalism. All things are useful because they are useful in reproducing the prevailing order, and that is it, that is the only actual standard of use. A post capitalist society, would take full and actual conscious responsibility for its universal prerogatives and therefore personal possessions could not exist as such, as forms of ownership - thing would be used in relation to universal standards of use, for actual reasons, i.e. which are universal.

a bunch of naked people going around screwing each other freely, with no family and no possessions and that's just ridiculous. "No state" does not imply "no government", and "no private property" does not imply "no personal possessions".

And here we have it, the perverse fantasy of the bourgeois subject: If there is no god, then man is doomed to sheer, utter, pure irrationality and chaos. What you fail to understand is that irrationality lies only in he who asserts extra-human conditions of rationality, i.e. who asserts that the conditions of rationality are in other words unknowable, sacred, and should not be touched, lest we be consumed. There is so much fucking stupidity here I don't even know where to start, holy shit. First and foremost, you conflate the destruction of the family, property, the state, government, with arbitrariness and randomness. Yet every fucking idiot who understands the actual meaning, as far as Marx was concerned, of for instance the abolition of the state, it is that - it is not because the 'freedom' which is not tolerated by the state is unleashed, it is because men and women no longer require a state, no longer require a 'government' to rule over themselves, no longer require a master to discipline themselves where they take their own lives by their own hands, where they in other words exercise the highest self-discipline and fulfilment of ethical duty by their own free, individual dispositions. The first abject fucking stupidity is to think that freedom and arbitrariness coincide, when the reality is that freedom coincides with the highest self-dictatorship, for the space that guarantees people arbitrariness is a space, a 'wobble room' only allowed and guaranteed by a master which otherwise performs of them the injunction of fulfilling ethical duty, which in societies where there exists a class antagonism (i.e. all societies before Communism) exists insofar as the interests of the ruling class are not immanently the interests of all of the classes existing in society. Your perverse fantasy of a bunch of naked people running around, and furthermore your even more unforgivable, fucking IDIOTIC association of this image with the gradual destruction of government and family as such, just goes to show what a piss-poor, juvenile and child-like failure to understand the most basic and elementary point of Communism.

Let's get fucking down to it, shall we? **THE ONLY BASIS BY WHICH ONE CAN ASSERT THAT THE FAMILY, GOVERNMENT, OR "PROPERTY" WOULD NECESSARILY CONTINUE TO EXIST, is if one asserts it is INEVITABLE and NECESSARY.** In other words, that these things are NATURAL. Please just admit, openly, that you think the family, the governance of men by other men, and property are

natural, so we can proceed from there to expose you as a reactionary ideologue before everyone. Admit it. Admit you think something outside of the subjectivity, cogito, logos of men and women necessitates the persistence of the family, governance over men by men, and property, whether that is god or nature. Admit it so we can crush you more thoroughly and precisely.

I literally can't believe I'm fucking reading this shit on Revleft, like holy shit, the voice of sanity, the one who comes here to tell us 'how things are', and 'how it is', i.e. "Come on guys, you're getting a bit crazy here". Yes, we are, and we will consume *you* too! Again, do you fucking think your god is going to save you? Do you think nature is going to save you? Do these things give you a sense of safety or comfort? You know why we despise you, Location C? Because you are quite comfortable with the prevailing order of things and therefore possess the elementary experience of normality, meanwhile, for the actual damned of the Earth, life is a never-ending trauma. You are scared of the uprooting and destruction of normal, good, philistine ways of living, the qualified psychosis which is normality, for the same reason that the capitalist is scared of the abolition of private property: All of the primordial demons which underlie its existence, you fear are going to be unleashed by its abolition.

The damned of the Earth cannot, and fail to be normal, just as they fail to own property. This petty bourgeois ideologue articulates this not as the failure of normality or the reign of property, but as the result of a certain intruding excess that can be wished away. Just as the proletarian finds freedom not in the ownership of property but the abolition of private property as such, so too does the spiritual proletarian, the everlasting traumatic subject for whom life is a never-ending nightmare, finds freedom in the abolition of normality itself, finds freedom only insofar as freedom is not free, only insofar as they now take full responsibility for all aspects of life, under their control. This philistine piece of shit, this petty bourgeois ideologue, is so comfortable and content with his precious normality, like a pathetic creature, "Oh, don't worry, we're all in the same boat here, I don't want to touch that shit, I don't want to risk affecting it" - no, sorry, NO ONE is winking back at you, we are not in the same boat, you filthy petty bourgeois scum, you are an enemy ideologue and a reactionary as far as you cling to these.

Normality DIES in Communism, and the anxiety of freedom remains as indefinite, as ever-lasting, because human society ceases to be static and only now exists in the conquest of its ever incessant conquest of nature and internal revolutionizing of the means of production. Life is never taken for granted, nothing is any longer considered 'normal', instead, the very raw contingency, the very exact and precise conditions of existence of human ethical activity, MEN AND WOMEN ALONE now take full and complete responsibility for - **no longer are their lives guaranteed by external processes, now, for the first time, the lives of men and women belong to men and women alone.**

Damn us, it is *ridiculous* that god, or the big Other, dies with Communism, surely *the bad idea* of him dies, but that he actually dies in *practice*? Ridiculous, ridiculous! It is *ridiculous* that at the outset of the destruction of the basis of any and all private property, of the family, of the state, that this would actually in the practical sense go on with and entail the abolition of private property, the family, and the state, in their actual *practical expression*. "No state, doesn't mean no government", bless you dear, of course it doesn't. Government? That's normal! It's *the bad idea* of government, the state, which we want to exorcise from the good. And the family, bless us, it is not the family we seek to abolish, but *the bad idea* of the family. We want our cake and we want to eat it too. We want our coffee, but without caffeine, we want beer, yes, but without alcohol.

And why end it there? We don't want to abolish capitalism, silly, it is the *bad* capitalism we want abolished, it is *crony capitalism* we want to get rid of, capitalism, markets, these are all well and fine and natural!

The fact of the matter is that for all of the pretence to authority, to speaking for the master, you talk out of your ass and don't have the slightest fucking idea of what you are talking about, or what you are getting yourself into, when you speak of Communism. The fact of the matter is that one is met

with actual shock, really (which there is no shortage of in this thread), not only out of the abject FUCKING stupidity of your baseless assertions, but the fact that you actually keep up the appearance of speaking by some authority, i.e. "Oh, come on guys, that's *ridiculous*". Ridiculous, is it? No, what is ridiculous is that you want your fucking cake and you want to eat it to, what is ridiculous is that you actually fail to take responsibility for and appreciate the over-reaching implications of the actual overthrow of the existing order, WHAT IS SO FUCKING RIDICULOUS IS THAT YOU TAKE OF THE PRESENT ORDER OF THINGS SO MUCH FOR GRANTED THAT YOU ASSUME WHAT YOU EXPERIENCE AS NORMALITY WILL SIMPLY AND SMOOTHLY GO ON EVEN AT THE OUTSET OF A FUNDAMENTAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE ACTUAL BASIS OF HUMAN LIFE AND PRACTICE, THAT is what is FUCKING ridiculous, THAT is what is *fucking* mind-boggling to the point of actual depression.

This petty bourgeois ideologue, this rodent, tells us, explains to us, that we needn't fear or possess anxiety about the future, for life will go on as it is, without the bad aspects. Again, what you describe IS NOTHING MORE than society as it presently exists, without what you perceive to be the 'bad aspects', it is nothing more than a snapshot present day de-industrialized and increasingly digitized capitalism, *minus the shadows*. You fear the actual death of god and assume that at the outset of a Communist society, the question of prolonging confrontation with him, will endure, i.e. god's death will be prolonged, and the ambiguity of life will go on, and history's actual absolution will be prolonged.

It's the capitalist conception of these things, and consumerism, that is the problem.

God bless us! If only we are able to abolish the 'capitalist' *conception* of these things, and, as good, Catholic, ethical subjects, consumerism along with it, that all of the antagonisms and ills of the present order will follow suite in being *wished away*. The fact of the matter is that for the Communist there is no 'problem' that can be abstracted, the entire human mode of practice is constituted by its primordial deadlock or 'problem', THE WHOLE THING is a 'problem', is the product of a problem, a deadlock, you cannot abstract something, the image of something, from the wider context of its self-becoming, of its movement, of its place in the basic reproduction and functioning of capitalist society.

You argue against the capitalist conception of things. What are these THINGS you FUCKING dolt? Why don't you basically admit your real problem: "It's the capitalist conception of capitalism which is the problem, not capitalism itself". You declare in your head that you are an anti-capitalist, that you want to overthrow capitalism, and yet you continually prove to everyone that you believe in a big Other who doesn't agree with you.

I for one am not trying to turn social norms on their head.

You admit, you *fucking* coward, that **you want to have the moral satisfaction** of calling yourself a Communist without actually owning up to and taking responsibility for its full implications. You want to wish away the antagonisms of present day society without recognizing that the 'things' in question are solely constituted by their inner antagonisms: You cannot abstract 'the bad' from normality, it is a condition of the existence of what you experience as normality. If you are not ready to live without god, without any big Other or any sense of external guarantee, any external comfort, if you are not ready to embrace the anxiety of freedom, then you admit you are a bourgeois ideologue, and we have absolutely nothing to fucking say to you.

Social norms? In the naive, neoliberal universe, slavery and segregation in the United States were intruding excesses, not norms. And yet, THEY WERE fucking social norms, racism was SIMPLY normal, it was the status quo, and those who were fighting against it were indeed turning social norms on their head. What a frankly naive and disgusting fucking thing to say. Who are you to decide what constitutes a social norm and what doesn't? It is a social norm on many college campuses that woman are raped. You don't want to touch that though, I'm sure. You don't want to turn social norms on their head, so you articulate each and every social norm you arbitrarily oppose as an intruding excess upon the harmony and peace of social life.

You, for one, do not want to turn social norms on their head. Good for you, little rodent, go ahead and cower, take refuge. You literally, freely admit that you set for yourself a limitation that you don't want to touch, that you are scared of impacting, dealing with, **that you wish for things to 'continue as they are', minus the arbitrarily abstracted 'bad things'**. Meanwhile, the Communists live to

DESTROY the basic experience of normality as such, to shock the system, to terrorize it, to accentuate and direct antagonisms and anxieties, not run away from them, to crush any and all semblances of complacency and contentedness, to smash the existing order, to subsume EACH AND EVERY ASPECT OF LIFE under the conscious control of 'meagre' humans, who in your mind must humble themselves before god, as pathetic creatures unworthy of Holy Truth.

What is the motto of the Communist? *Épater la bourgeoisie!* We have no god, we have no big Other, we have nothing, no sense of guarantee in anything outside of ourselves. **If you are not ready to smash and destroy any and all sacreds, if you exempt a certain space of life from criticism as a sacred space not to be touched, critiqued, subject to conscious control, you proclaim yourself an enemy ideologue.**

In our beautiful pluralistic society, there is a pluralism of rodents, some of them cope with their petty bourgeois sentimentality more honestly by becoming fascists, others, like Location C, call themselves socialists, for whatever hand-picked arbitrary reason, as a cosmetic, perverse, consumerist identity. I mean, look at this motherfucker's profile picture, he literally openly declares it. For him socialism is just a 'preference', is located on a 'commonly shared and recognized' spectrum, a cosmetic appearance. God forbid someone actually takes their socialism seriously. God forbid it actually means something, affects actual life.

I am trying to fight the way capitalists define, employ and exploit those norms in their maintenance of capitalism and the bourgeois state.

Holy shit this motherfucker reads like an academic paper. This is stupid fucking phrase-mongering, this is the throwing around of pseudo-revolutionary jargon to disguise what is really the greatest servility, complacency with and toward the prevailing order. You are trying to fight the way capitalists define, employ and exploit those norms, as if those norms have an independent existence outside of the context of their immersion in the totality that is the prevailing mode of human practice in its entirety. Are you literally fucking stupid? Those NORMS are not natural, they are fully constituted only by their immersion in capitalism in the first place, what you perceive to be their 'bad representation', or 'bad expression' is an illusion - the same sense of philistine safety you find in normality is the same 'badness' that is also immanent to normality. You can't have your cake and eat it to, because in the end, what is even normality? All normality is, is that breath of fresh air that one's life is guaranteed by something else, all normality is, is a qualified psychosis, it is a sense of escape from the confrontation of the actual contingency of life, it is the sense of guarantee that so long as one is normal, one is fine, all is well.

This is literally so important, everyone, you better understand it: Perceiving the failures of normality as a product of some external intruder, rather than what is essentially immanent to normality itself, IS FASCISM, is no different from the logic of anti-semitism. The failure of normality, trauma, in other words, IS IMMANENT to normality itself. The sense of anxiety experienced upon one's failure to be normal, only exists because of the weight of normality in the first place, i.e. the fact that human activity is guaranteed by a big Other in the first place. if there is a point of Communism, it is that one lets go, one no longer needs to feel normal any longer, one no longer cares about normality, so that one takes full ethical responsibility whether or not god thinks it is normal.

For example, it is not normal to be an open racist. But what separates the communist for the liberal is that the Communist doesn't care whether it is normal, or fashionable, or not. We aren't afraid of looking mad, looking crazy, or looking abnormal. We STICK to our guns, we remain dedicated to our ethical duty, in this 'psychotic' sense, while the liberal, this philistine, relies on fear and hope in god's mercy in his rejection of racism and ethical engagement in general. We don't need a god, we Communists. We fulfil our ethical duty, we abide by the rationality of historical self-consciousness INDEPENDENTLY of how 'normal' or 'abnormal' it appears to god.

Ladies and gentlemen, READ his words. He tells us he wants to 'fight' the WAY the 'norms' are 'used' by the capitalist intruder, who otherwise disturbs the peace and 'goodness' of such 'norms'. Look how he uses the word capitalism, rather than describe the totality of the prevailing mode of human practice

and life itself, which is how Marx understood it, which is how every socialist understood it, capitalism is only a certain aspect of life that can be abstracted from it, so that there is 'capitalistic family' and there is the 'good family in general'. For this intellectual cockroach, like the rest of them, this disgusting piece of shit, this filth, who manages to crawl his way onto Revleft with a free pass just because he proclaims his allegiance to socialism, socialism is nothing more than the actual 'ethical' side of capitalism.

Your socialism, you fucking idiot, is no different in terms of its relation to capitalism than is, say, Catholicism. Your critique of capitalism, if we can call it that (which we cannot, in the Marxist sense of critique) is no different in terms of substance from the reactionary-romantic, conservative critique of capitalism. This is not a critique, it is the actual supplement, the necessary buttress and supplement, to capitalism. Marx already notes this in the Grundrisse quite well:

*It is as ridiculous to yearn for a return to that original fullness as it is to believe that with this complete emptiness history has come to a standstill. The bourgeois viewpoint **has never advanced beyond this antithesis between itself and this romantic viewpoint**, and therefore the latter will accompany it as legitimate antithesis up to its blessed end.)*

The emptiness Marx refers to, is precisely that 'bad' aspect of capitalism, which our resident Catholic moralists conflate with capitalism in its entirety (which INCLUDES its moralizing blowback!). The romantic critique of capitalism is the necessary supplement of capitalism, to ensure the basic goings and functioning of capitalism, to keep it in check. What the pseudo-socialists fail to understand of Marx, and of Communism more generally, is that quite to the contrary of Communism being an intensified expression of this romantic critique of capitalism (i.e. "Capitalism exploits mother nature, it exploits the family, what a tragedy that people lose a sense of wholeness, are cogs in a machine, have forgotten god, etc.) is in fact an intensified expression of the 'bad' side itself, i.e. in other words, Communism is not where man finds balance with nature or himself, it is where on the contrary his productive capacities are unleashed even more greatly, it is on the contrary where nature is 'exploited' even to a greater degree, it is where on the contrary the family ceases to even exist as such, **it is where god dies not only in nature but also in social relations**. Communism is not the taming of capitalism, it is its *aufhebung*. No longer is life taken for granted.

Nothing escapes ruthless criticism.



sans-culotte

Marxis

Comrade Rafiq, could you simply tone down the rhetoric and have a civil discussion. There's no need to condescend and insult other comrades in the class struggle. Again, I implore you, speak to us with respect and engage in a dialogue with us.



Originally posted by **sans-culottes**

Comrade Rafiq, could you simply tone down the rhetoric and have a civil discussion. There's no need to condescend and insult other comrades in the class struggle. Again, I implore you, speak to us with respect and engage in a dialogue with us.

If we are comrades in a shared class struggle, this would command a level of seriousness and responsibility with ones espoused positions that is not present here. Yet this is not the case.

Whoever attempts to cut the process of criticism short, with a 'that's it' is not a comrade but an enemy ideologue. This is frankly not the time or place to be loose with ones positions and to simply, casually, just shit things out. It is enough to anger one, that individuals are not overcome with such a great weight of anxiety and pressure, that out of duty they are in the process of learning. It is enough to anger one that people go on Revleft and use this platform to espouse their casual philistinisms of everyday life. There is literally Facebook, twitter, and the rest of it for that, for just saying things for the sake of it.

We are all, simply, *doomed* at this rate. I am so sick of people having such unfounded confidence so as to not care. You know, once upon a time, back in the day, it actually meant something to call oneself a Communist.

But never mind any of that. It is enough that, I simply made a rather simple and by my standards short post, and YOU had to fucking drag this into a discussion about 'other life forms' and so on. I'm so fucking sick of this. When I was new on Revleft, I used to be humble enough to give to the benefit of the doubt users that when they say things they have a reason for saying them, i.e. have already thought them out. Every other day on Revleft you have some smartass who wants to derail a discussion into something else, into a discussion about a thousand other different things, all because they stumble upon an idea or argument they are unfamiliar with.

It would be just as fucking stupid as if someone came on Revleft and, in the middle of a discussion on neo-feudalism, were to quite my post and say "HAH! That presupposes the transformation problem as not actually a problem! That presupposes Marx's theory of value!", unaware that some of us have actually dedicated quite a lot of time and energy dealing with these questions and problems, they simply blindly assume we are at their pacing of stupidity and thus have to derail discussions into a thousand other different things just out of the sheer depth of their own wilful ignorance and stupidity. It's so tiring. Why can't new users be humble and instead of espousing their special-snowflake opinion, ask why someone arrives at the conclusion that they do, when they clearly don't know or can't understand why themselves?



sans-culotte

Marxist

Originally posted by **Rafiq**

If we are comrades in a shared class struggle, this would command a level of seriousness and responsibility with ones espoused positions that is not present here. Yet this is not the case.

Whoever attempts to cut the process of criticism short, with a 'that's it' is not a comrade but an enemy ideologue. This is frankly not the time or place to be loose with ones positions and to simply, casually, just shit things out. It is enough to anger one, that individuals are not overcome with such a great weight of anxiety and pressure, that out of duty they are in the process of learning. It is enough to anger one that people go on revleft and use this platform to espouse their casual philistinisms of everyday life. There is literally facebook, twitter, and the rest of it for that, for just saying things for the sake of it.

We are all, simply, *doomed*. At this rate. I am so sick of people having such unfounded confidence so as to not care. You know, once upon a time, back in the day, it actually meant something to call oneself a Communist.

If you disagree with me, that's fine. I welcome disagreement and will have a conversation about any philosophy or position. I don't take this movement any less serious than you. I do, however, treat all my comrades with respect and that extends even to you.

What I suggest isn't that we 'just shit things out'. I merely suggest we treat each other with mutual respect. Do you think you'll attract any workers with your vitriol? The fact of the matter is that we, as communists, will only succeed in the West by means of a United Front. From Maoists, to Transhumanists, to Trotskyists. This is exactly the time to be diplomatic and learn from each other. Yes, we must even talk with social democrats and win them over to our cause.

Rafiq, you're no Robespierre, you're just an angry person on the internet. Please show more respect for your fellow workers.



Rafiq

الاشتراكية هي المطرقة التي نست

Supporter

Admin

Join Date Aug 2010

Location Detroit, Michigan.

Posts 8,258

Originally posted by **sans-culottes**

Rafiq, you're no Robespierre, you're just an angry person on the internet..

And that is the point, you dolt, I am no Robespierre, and neither are any of you stand-ins for the great mass of working people.

Instead, you are all only intellectuals, and your significance does not, on this forum, extend beyond your

intellectualizing. Therefore Rafiq is going to treat you as an intellectual, and as above all an active ideologue, not a revolutionary agent, and certainly not a stand-in for working people who in fact are not intellectuals. We are concerning here the world of thought, and its relation to the world of practice as a whole, is only possible AFTER. What Revleft is, is the space of intellectualizing, of pure intellectualizing that is the springboard to empirical practice. Rafiq treats you with the same ruthlessness that he treats his own thoughts which he opposes.

In virtual space, there is no difference, there is no politeness, and there shouldn't be, because this is precisely virtual space. I am not working with you, I am not collaborating with you, I am literally a random person posting on a website, which you are too, therefore, YOU ARE going to be treated with ruthlessness, because you are only sharing that aspect of yourself which is critiqued. I've gone over this so many fucking times - an individual on an internet is not a whole individual, but merely an expression of certain positions and ideas. A whole individual, conversely, can be persuaded, perhaps, can be talked to, there are several nuances here. That is not so on the internet - **all people on the internet are abstract texts, ideas, thoughts, and sometimes images. That is it.** When you say something, it is what you write which is being critiqued, and that is it - the text you put forward. NO one cares about you, your grandma, or whatever, because I don't know you in real life, and probably never will. All I know is what you contribute by means of text, and what you contribute is philistine trash.

So no, ideologues of the class enemy should be treated with the utmost ruthlessness and severity here, because what the space of Revleft represents is purely a means of pure discussion and intellectualizing.

But thanks for contributing the same argument which literally dozens of people have espoused in the past and which I have always responded to in the same way. Thanks for literally taking out the time to express the fact that you literally think you are the first person to spew this stupid argument, "Oh, how do you think working people will receive this?" - we are nowhere close to that and I am not talking to working people, I am talking to YOU, an intellectual, one who is evidently a bourgeois ideologue.

All well and fine, because all intellectuals begin as bourgeois ideologues. Your problem is that you don't accept what you are, and don't see the need to ruthlessly critique yourself, as the rest of us did. If you did, you wouldn't have so, with such baseless confidence, polluted the forum with philistine drivel.

"The fact of the matter is that we, as communists, will only succeed in the West by means of a United Front. From Maoists, to Transhumanists, to Trotskyists"

By far the most stupid idea produced on Revleft, that all Communists need is more plurality. See what I mean about DERAILING THE FUCKING DISCUSSION into a THOUSAND different other topics? The plurality of identities, of consumer identities among self-proclaimed 'Communists' is not a reflection of the actual mass of working people, get that FUCKING idea out of your head. Leftists think they matter, but they don't, you are all completely and totally fucking irrelevant and 'uniting', which itself is impossible, is not going to change that. Again, past discussions on the matter are archived. They are available. We have all already dealt with precisely this topic. Newcomers come here with their arms flailing around thinking they are enlightening us all with new ideas, they are not.

Finally the unity of the various identities, which is just as meaningful as the unity of various fandoms of TV shows, is not even possible, because a Trotskyist is always going to see this 'unity' in a different way than a Maoist, and furthermore, the existence of Trotskyists and Maoists in any meaningful sense is obsolete (save for the Maoists of, for instance, India, i.e. those who are actual Maoists in practice). The

plurality of leftisms actually relates itself more generally to the fact that leftism today is nothing more than a fucking fad and an arbitrary cosmetic preference, WE DO NOT NEED A UNITED FRONT because the cumulative 'unity' of the left would amount to NOTHING.

Your head is literally so far up your ass, now we need to have an in depth lecture about THE FUCKING NATURE OF IDEOLOGY, THE NATURE OF THESE IDENTITIES, HOW AND WHY THEY ARE CONSTITUTED IN THE FIRST PLACE, all because again you won't SHUT your FUCKING mouth. Honestly, literally, just SHUT the FUCK UP. Do everyone this favour. If you want to be comradely, genuinely, then literally shut the fuck up and stop spewing your mouth. You don't know what you are getting yourself into. It's that simple.

A future Communist movement would probably not even consist of any self-proclaimed Communists of today. We don't need any of these petty bourgeois ideologues. If every single fucking self-proclaimed Communist dropped dead, sure, it would be a tragedy, but it wouldn't actually impact the prospects of a Communist movement as such. It really, truly, wouldn't. In fact what we need are not self-proclaimed socialists today but people who have the benefit of being unacquainted with socialism, who can have a fresh and clean start to actually being introduced to it, without all that excess filth. That's the barren truth of it.



sans-culotte

Marxist

Join Date Aug 2016
Location Painesville, Ohio
Posts 30

I am disappointed in our inability to communicate, Rafiq. Your approach to online discussion is unproductive and anti-social. I am sorry for you, Rafiq. Call me a philistine all you want, but you just paint yourself as a lone, impotent voice raging against camaraderie and civil discussion. Remember the words to The Internationale, let us be inspired by life and love.



Rafiq
Supporter
Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

Originally posted by **sans-culottes**

you just paint yourself as a lone, impotent voice raging against camaraderie and civil discussion.

We are not comrades, because no such movement exists. The preconditions for an actual Communist struggle, I assert, individuals like you and Location C obstruct. You do so by contributing to the mass obfuscation among intellectuals of what it means to be a Communist.

Remember the words to The Internationale, let us be inspired by life and love

Quit blaspheming our tradition. Those words were sung, not to make online intellectuals, or petty bourgeois consumerist subjects feel good about themselves, those words were sung reverberating with hope for and of the damned of the world, hope for the overcoming and overthrow of this world in its entirety. You shouldn't feel good about yourself. You should feel like a piece of shit, every single leftist should right now be feeling this way. It is a crime that leftists feel so comfortable, and it is frankly disgusting that you find refuge and peace in our tradition.

No one can have a civil discussion here because such a discussion has already existed numerous times over. That's it. I post only because I have to, out of the duty of defending the sense of my original post. I do not actually want to have a discussion with you, I am only interested in defending what I post, if you want to have a civil discussion, you would have the decency of PMing me, as it is well known on the forum that I am more than willing and happy to help out anyone who needs it.

Aurorus Ruber

Junior Revolutionary

Join Date Feb 2005
Location Greater St Louis
Posts 206

Originally posted by **Rafiq**

In such a world, and I am talking about *well into this world*, well after the social antagonism is obsolete, insofar as we can conjecture about it **there is no room for stupid animals, animals would cease to exist, those functions previously occupied by animals would either be functions which are no longer necessary (buttressing the alienation of life in capitalism, that is the companionship of a dog or cat), or taken over by machines (i.e. animals as they are concerned in production)**. Not only would dogs and cats cease to exist, it is likely that all biological life *as it presently exists* would cease to exist. All that would remain is the essence of man, which is irreducible to biological processes, which in fact subsumes those processes.

You mean that biological life would disappear from the earth altogether? Everything from flesh-and-blood humans to plants and animals in the wild down to microorganisms just gone? Just what would the earth even look like?



Rafiq

Supporter
Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

Originally posted by **Aurorus Ruber**

You mean that biological life would disappear from the earth altogether? Everything from flesh-and-blood humans to wilderness down to microorganisms just gone?

Eventually, yes. If not the overcoming of all biological processes as such (and replacing them with, for instance as it is with a computer, complex assemblages of metals,, electricity, - perhaps at a deeper atomic level - various complex nanotechnologies, and whatever), then at least, at the very least, their complete transformation by means of bio-engineering (so that no biological life that was not engineered would exist). I do not conjecture about details. All I say is that *all* frontiers will be subsumed.

This is a very basic, and modest conclusion of a socially self-conscious society. The reactionary, romantic sentimentality of present day society dies with capital.

Just what would the earth even look like?

A world, in every nook-and-cranny of its existence, fashioned in man's image.

GLF

Banned **Supporter**

Join Date Oct 2014
Location USA unfortunately
Posts 303

I do not consider myself an intellectual, Rafiq. I am merely a simple human being with simple ideas, and I aspire to nothing greater than to call myself a fellow worker. My socialism is tangible, and lucid; I am not the least bit interested in philosophizing communism, nor vain appeals to a hodgepodge of metaphysical mumbo-jumbo. I feel that your long drawn out rants are quite far fetched and amount to little more than pseudo-intellectual ego stroking at best, and the ravings of a lunatic at worst.

Aurorus Ruber

Junior Revolutionary

Join Date Feb 2005
Location Greater St Louis
Posts 206

Originally posted by **Rafiq**

Eventually, yes. If not the overcoming of all biological processes as such (and replacing them with, for instance as it is with a computer, complex assemblages of metals,, electricity, - perhaps at a deeper atomic level - various complex nanotechnologies, and whatever), then at least, at the very least, their complete transformation by means of bio-engineering (so that no biological life that was not engineered would exist). I do not conjecture about details. All I say is that all frontiers will be subsumed.

This is a very basic, and modest conclusion of a socially self-conscious society. The reactionary, romantic sentimentality of present day society dies with capital.

I see then. I must admit, though, that it seems strange to hear this viewpoint from a communist. Most of the technofuturist types I have read about (like Silicon Valley, Less Wrong, Mencius Moldbug to name some obvious examples) align themselves firmly with the right, as libertarians, neo-reactionaries, and so forth. Whereas most left wingers I have met seem indifferent or antagonistic to transhumanism and such.



Rafiq

Supporter
Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

Originally posted by **Location C**

I do not consider myself an intellectual, Rafiq. I am merely a simple human being with simple ideas, and I aspire to nothing greater than to call myself a fellow worker.

A mere simple human being with simple ideas, and nothing more than a simple worker, he asserts. And by doing so he defames not only the legacy of worker-intellectuals like Prodhoun and Bebel, he insults all workers. We have been over this before. It's so funny how on Revleft virtually every controversy is an old one. A mere worker he sais. You revive controversies which were long dealt with, several times over, and I even believe quite recently. The hypocrisy, absurdity and cowardice of this 'position' has long been exposed and dealt with not only here, but among the best of our tradition, from Marx to Lenin. The most immediate thing of myself I can quote was from *Our Materialism*, where I said:

Originally Posted by **Rafiq from 'Our Materialism'**

And so it is with the history of all kinds of thought, from mathematics to natural science. For Chrisk it should come as a surprise to us, that in conditions of life wherein there existed the definite and superstitiously reproduced division of labour, the division of labour which at the outset was not an act wrought from mere contemplation but was forceful and coercive in nature, that the contemplative means by which the existing conditions of life were reproduced, against sustained by violence and superstition, necessarily were deemed of greater worth than that the various direct labourers, whose unity with the thoughtful (superstitious) reproduction of the order of things, with thought, was facilitated by the whip and by means of violence. Yet Chrisk does not want to take the implications – the real implications of this to its highest conclusions: Communism is necessarily the dissemination of 'philosophy', or this same thought, to the broad masses as whole in unity with their real empirical activity. For the Communists a person cleaning garbage on the streets, can and will embody the universality of the society in which he belongs in his activity in the same way a revered and talented engineer will.

The stupidity of the initial assertion – that the notion that reality can be accessed through thought alone as a ruling class prejudice ignores that it is not as though labourers possessed any means whatsoever by which reality could be accessed or represented in their labouring – in precapitalist societies, it is not that it was the prejudice of the ruling classes that 'thought alone' can access reality, but that they were the only ones who could access to reality to begin with. It is not as though they said: "Accessing reality by direct physical means, is the business of the slave" – for them the slave had no access to an understanding of reality whatsoever. And since the industrial revolution such a view is emphatically stupid: considering that there is no better empiricist than the industrial capitalist, who by no means accesses reality through 'thought' at all, but through the active, industrial manipulation of nature. In a sense, a labourer in a slave society reproduces society only in a 'mechanical' way, if we only look at his labour (rather than the various means by which his slavery is reproduced for his own consciousness). What reproduces that slavery, again, is the collective superstition of society as a whole, the superstition towards the social, whose course of development up until now – up until we Communists – was arbitrary and occurred always by the chaos of the forces of production. This superstition reflects in society's praxis, it is not that society's practice exists at

the expense of the consciousness of its constituents, but that these exist alongside each other. Nothing except superstition reproduced the past societies – including as it concerned their relation to nature – and this superstition in turn informed their real empirical activity which by itself, in the mechanical sense is nothing (i.e. the act of doing labour – is nothing without what this labour means, labour exists congruent with thought).

The idiocy here is like saying that the sword was used to justify slavery. Yes. But the slaves do not free themselves by despising the sword in the immediate sense, but by taking up the sword against their masters. What you fail to understand is that slaves – labourers – were never autonomous robots but their slavery reflected in their consciousness in ways they actively were forced to relate to, even in their own heads, spiritually. To have equipped slaves with philosophy, labourers that is, would be disastrous for slavery. The great slave rebellions, even when they were spontaneous, had always been led by those religiously inspired slaves like Nat Turner. The effect of the missionaries, for example, on colonized people had always went to turn around against the colonizers themselves – Christian consciousness weaponized the 'mere labourers' and with it came the expectations of the European Christian for living, and so on. .

Philosophy is nothing more than an extended elaboration of thought. That is the point, and it was none other than Marx who pointed this out, who might I add elaborated that the ruling classes do not engage in the mental labour of the philosopher, instead the philosophers were that 'passive side' of the ruling class, to add insult to injury to the notion that mental labour is necessarily synonymous with the interests of the ruling class. Indeed, few great upheavals in history wherein a vision of an alternative world was implicit in them, were not accompanied by these same 'mental labourers' who were previously the mouthpieces of the status quo, 'gone mad' – from Thomas Muntzer's rebellion to religiously inspired slave rebellions.

Finally the audience should not the hypocrisy: How many ordinary working people engage in the kind of shit-mongering Chrisk does? How many of them read Wittgenstein? How many of them are for the polite and proper thinking that Chrisk asserts for us? That is because ultimately, Chrisk, and the rest of those like him, want us only to think insofar as the reproduction of the existing order of things allows for thought. And because working people, by merit of being working people, cannot think beyond that which is allowed for the reproduction of their conditions as working people, we are told that we intellectuals are 'elitist' for thinking that reality can be accessed by thought alone.

Insofar as working people should like to master their real conditions of life, rather than reproduce them as they are, what was previously reserved only for the 'elites' must now be disseminated among the 'ragged masses' themselves. To paraphrase Lassalle – for the first time in history, what the Socialists must accomplish is the dissemination of scientific consciousness among the broad masses as a whole, a task which has never been completed or done before throughout history. To insist upon the notion that working people are inevitably incapable of 'accessing their reality' through thought is to reproduce the same conditions that we Socialists seek to overthrow.

To insist upon the inevitable ignorance of working people, to treat them rather than active agents who can actively conceive their real conditions – as 'doers' rather than 'thinkers' is to identify yourself as a class enemy.

This was after a very large and prolonged assault against the pseudo-materialist counter-position of 'thought' and 'da real reality', that thought and intellectual controversies are just as much part of the wholeness of human practice as empirical, 'doing'. This pathetic excuse of "Oh, I'm just a worker" is literally the oldest one in the book. And it is not going to hold for a second. There is no such thing as a simple human being with simple ideas. Insofar as you engage on Revleft, YOU ARE A FUCKING INTELLECTUAL, and NOTHING more than that. You are only a worker *incidentally* - when you claim "I am no intellectual", you admit two things: That one, you choose to be stupid, and two, you allow some big Other to intellectualize and think for you, because thinking and intellectualizing is an unavoidable, it is the necessary supplement of the actual mode of human practice in its entirety, without it, there is no plain 'being a worker'.

The difference is that no worker says "I am a stupid person who doesn't think". Insofar as they do not think, it is because they deny themselves this confidence, just as the capitalist does.

My socialism is tangible, and lucid; I am not the least bit interested in philosophizing communism,

In other words, your socialism is superficial, and derives from what is ready-made in ruling ideology, and that on top of all of that, you refuse to take full and complete responsibility for it. We know. The question is, what new message do you attempt to give off here? You want to call yourself a Communist, but you want to absolve yourself of the responsibility of actually understanding what that means. Instead you probably delude yourself into think such a Communist movement is already in existence and that you merely are partaking in it, in practice. You fail to understand... Right now, in 2016, THERE IS NO SUCH THING as 'Communism' outside of its philosophic relevance. The passage between philosophic and practical is a passage that is only possible after philosophy gets its house in order, which it has not.

You have no notion of Communism, or socialism. It is that simple. For that reason you will never have the vitality, strength, endurance or will to ever be able to partake in or better yet be at the vanguard of a future Communist movement. There is nothing you describe of my posts, which cannot also and equally hold true for the entirety of Marx's works, which are far more profound and even indecipherable to the ordinary person.

In addition it is the highpoint of actual laughable stupidity that you disguise your bourgeois-philistinism with a righteous-workerist attitude. **The position you take, which amounts to the exact same position of the university discourse STEM enthusiasts, analytical philosophers, and in general anglo-saxon empiricist philistines in their critique of 'continental mumbo jumbo', is actually literally the ruling class position.**

...and the ravings of a lunatic at worst.

That feeling of sanity you have, which you juxtapose my lunacy to, is nothing more than a qualified psychosis, just as much if not far more of one, and in addition, it is the expression of your complacency within the existing order.

It's so fucking stupid. As of now, it is only by intellectual means that you could elevate the identity of being a worker into being essential and meaningful. Why are you a worker, rather than an American, a Christian, a white man, (or whatever is interchangeable with these two)? It is only by intellectual means. And thus, by intellectual means, like a fucking clown, you make pretence to the notion that you can absolve yourself of responsibility, you can attack 'intellectualizing' only because you have taken your fundamentally intellectual positions as a given and as self-evident.



Rafiq

Supporter الاشتراكية هي المطرقة التي نسبت

Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

Originally posted by **Aurorus Ruber**

I see then. I must admit, though, that it seems strange to hear this viewpoint from a communist. Most of the technofuturist types I have read about (like Silicon Valley, Less Wrong, Mencius Moldbug to name some obvious examples) align themselves firmly with the right, as libertarians, neo-reactionaries, and so forth. Whereas most left wingers I have met seem indifferent or antagonistic to transhumanism and such.

I am well aware. There is a good reason for it too, and I use Nick Land as an example: In present society this future is inevitability. But in present day society what it is is the high-point, the culmination, and absolute *materialization* of alienation. There are two possible futures: The Landian future of man's enslavement by the machines, the materialization of the alien power that estranges man's essence in capital, or a future in which the essence of man, his pure subjectivity, enslaves and masters machines. The complete, in other words, destruction of man in his creative capacity, wherein the final stage of capitalism, of capital, is the destruction of man's historical essence itself, i.e. where capital literally like an external entity subsumes him not only in his head, but now in actuality. A very complex topic I cannot get into now.

It may seem like it, but the perverse romantic futurism of Silicon Valley is not in any real way *avant-garde*. It is a sham, because it will always, insofar as capitalism exists, be buttressed romantically and they know that.

For all of their nonsense, the fact of the matter is that only with the overthrow of capitalism can the virtual be unleashed, can the romantic over-layer which hides it, be shattered. Think of it like an image - someone projecting a landscape of beautiful green grass and meadows by raw, virtual, 'fake' means. What Communism is, is the destruction of this beautiful green grass in favour of the beauty of the virtual machine itself, the coding, etc. itself. The reactionary futurists know very well the necessity of this beautiful green grass and consider themselves in the know, about the fact that it is just an illusion to sedate the masses. But they are not in the know. They too in a sense believe in it.

It would be an even greater danger for Communists to retreat from taking an avant-garde position on technologies, than for Communists in the 30s to have renounced the advances in industry and mechanization.

[GLF](#)

Banned **Supporter**

Join Date Oct 2014
Location USA unfortunately
Posts 303

Verbose. Obtrusive. Way out in left field. Far fetched. Bombastic. Full of shit.

Just a few descriptors that spring to mind. Carry on.

Aurorus Ruber

Junior Revolutionary

Join Date Feb 2005
Location Greater St Louis
Posts 206

Originally posted by **Rafiq**

A world, in every nook-and-cranny of its existence, fashioned in man's image.

But what makes this goal of refashioning the world in our own image or eliminating biological life from the earth so desirable in the first place?



Rafiq

Supporter الاشتراكية هي المطرفة التي نست

Admin

Join Date Aug 2010

Location Detroit, Michigan.

Posts 8,258

Originally posted by **Aurorus Ruber**

But what makes this goal of refashioning the world in our own image or eliminating biological life from the earth so desirable in the first place?

It is not a question of its desirability, because it is not a question of some arbitrary choice. It is the inevitable and only possible conclusion of historical self-consciousness and the rationality it entails, which of course and which by now I hope many are familiar with, as the dialectic.

Let me frankly put it this way. Men and women must actively reproduce their existence. They do this through transforming, in whatever way, the world of nature to their needs (which are historical, even if they share the same necessity of their physiological sustenance, whatever they are). For men and women to set limitations upon knowing, and therefore transforming, the natural world, this is only possible by means of superstition. It must be thought of in terms of the limitations of possibility men and women set for themselves: Communism is nothing more than the infinite overcoming of the contingent (temporary) impossibilities of men and women's life-practice.

If there are absolutely no superstitions in a Communist society, what remains is knowledge of the empirical world and knowledge of the world of man. And that's it. By posing the question "why do this?", as though it is some arbitrary proposal, you fail to understand that the infinite overcoming of all natural limitations to the world of man, including biological life, **is a necessity of even retaining the homeostasis of a socially self-conscious society**, in other words, even for a socially self-conscious, Communist society to remain constant as an actual, unified society, a socially self-conscious order, it must constantly be traversing and conquering natural processes.

This is because the separation between the world of man and the world of nature is not actually 'separate' in a supernatural sense, i.e. men and women only exist within the context of course of their sensuous relation to an actually existing physical world which they make sense of by subsuming it through the rationality that is their life practice, so social self-consciousness is necessarily consciousness not only of the social dimension but also its practical relation to natural processes. This consciousness must necessarily be consciousness of the absolute and contingent limitations of the practice of this human society in its relation to nature, and insofar as it conceives those limitations as contingent, i.e. non-inevitable, they are only temporary limitations.

You might ask why they have to be perceived as contingent, rather than inevitable. Well, ask yourself this, a basic question: "What makes this an inevitable limitation?" - and you will find that the only thing which makes it inevitable is superstition, that it violates divine laws. It is superstitious ideology, where one doesn't even have to admit to thinking so, to thinking there is a god and so on - it is purely an ideological, subconscious, fear.

Also, you are mistaken in your use of words. This is not a goal. The refashioning of the world in man's image is not a goal but a process, it does not ever end, even if it might end with the planet Earth, by that point we would already be in the process of expanding outward. I emphasize this because we are not dealing with goals here but the actual mode of practice of a socially self-conscious society, which only exists in the context of its overcoming of every and all limitations to it. If such a society is not overcoming limitations, then it must set limitations for itself superstitiously, otherwise, the fact that one CAN empirically do this, CAN fashion the world in man's image and destroy any and all dependence on biological processes (hypothetically speaking, again), is enough.

Finally, you might ask "That one can do something, does not mean that one ought to". For instance, in such a society, we could also eat children, all sorts of depravities, empirically speaking, could be possible. Yet for this society to be socially self-conscious, in fact, such things would not be possible, by its conditions of existence; it wouldn't even be a 'can', because in such acts we are not dealing with the overcoming of empirical limitations as such, but entanglements and acts which designate the existence of a persisting social antagonism. This much must be emphasized: With social self-consciousness, the world of man becomes 'psychotically' separated from the world of nature, in the sense that we are dealing now with humanity's collective solipsism (that only IT, in the sense of pure subjectivity, can now infinitely persist existing), so that, to do things, depravities for instance, which possess only symbolic significance (i.e. mutilations of people, cruelties, all things which are feared owing to the social antagonism), would be impossible - the symbolic order is now secreted and reproduced solely through the infinite subsuming of natural processes. What ends in the final and logical conclusion of a Communist society, are 'binding rituals' as such. I mean it when I say: The final conclusion of a Communist society, i.e. the ultimate conclusion in terms of the destruction of the social antagonism permanently, is a society constituted by individuals who in an 'autonomous' sense but at the same time insofar as they are in coordination with the universality they constitute, expend their highest productive powers as individuals. In that sense, there is an 'aloneness' to the experience of individuals in the new order, i.e. men and women are unified not through superstitious or fetishistic rituals but through their common *practice*, through free association, unified only by the fact that they are all equally but also individually looking in the same direction.

This is why Engels tells us: The government over men eventually disappears, and now there is only *the administration of things*.

There is no middle ground here and there is no way around this. A society wherein men and women simply subsist off of what is readily available in nature, the hunter-gatherer societies, necessitated the greatest superstitious animism. You can't have one without the other. A communist society would necessarily be a moving society, one that is constantly and always traversing the natural world. The great absurdity of today, for instance, is that we possess vast knowledge of the cosmos and yet are still, humiliatingly, confined to our planet.

This is because, finally, antagonisms would necessarily persist in a Communist world. Wherein there no longer exists the social antagonism, there persists, as Engels recognizes, an antagonism between the natural world and the world of man. This is an irreducible antagonism which cannot be escaped. It's not really even hard to think about. Ask yourself a basic, stupid and naive question. "What would be necessary, in order to deal with the problems that we encounter in our interaction with the natural world?" - okay, perhaps you can muster up some kind of plan. But it is only temporary, because for the very basic and simple reason of this irreducibility of the world of man, and its separation from the world of nature, those problems will be never ending, and they can only be infinitely over-come. It isn't hard to understand.

Finally, In a pathological sense, any and all sentimentalities with regard to nature, the fact that one may find the notion repulsive, the fact that one is scared of this idea, is enough. Nevermind the technical details of its possibility - we aren't dealing with some purely rational discourse here. I remember in a previous thread where this exact thing was discussed, all users attempted to put forward their utterly pathological fears, their utterly pathological SPIRITUAL aversion to the notion, they attempted to portray this as a purely rational, technical problem, i.e. "Well, we would all go extinct" and so on. Don't be dishonest with yourself. I am so of that kind of behavior. This has nothing to do with any technical issues of conquering natural processes, it has to do with a deep seated, utterly reactionary romantic sentimentality with regard to nature which really disguises. This is how it works - one doesn't admit to their romantic sentimentality but ideologically articulates it as a very sensible, rational conclusion of knowledge itself.

We have been over this, the real meaning of this sentimentality, how and why it is reactionary and why "Nature is the last refuge of the bourgeoisie". **I implore everyone to read through this shitstorm of a thread because I devoted all possible energy to expend on this forum in that thread on the matter.** [Editor's note: referenced thread no longer exists, sadly.]

The crime of nature, the crime of the cute little and beautiful animals, the crime of the nice green grass and those beautiful trees, and finally the crime and shame of men and women's own bodies, is that they do not owe their existence to men and women's will. They were not designed by the symbolic, they are not testament to men and women's creative powers. Man's Promethean shame is that he is born rather than manufactured. They do not conform to man's rationality, they exist independently of him. Insofar as there is a world which exists independently of man, in the new Communist order man exists to subsume and conform this world to his practice.

Aurorus Ruber

Junior Revolutionary

Join Date Feb 2005
Location Greater St Louis
Posts 206

Originally Posted by **Rafiq**

The crime of nature, the crime of the cute little and beautiful animals, the crime of the nice green grass and those beautiful trees, and finally the crime and shame of men and women's own bodies, is that they do not owe their existence to men and women's will. They were not designed by the symbolic, they are not testament to men and women's creative powers. Man's Promethean shame is that he is born rather than manufactured. They do not conform to man's rationality, they exist independently of him. Insofar as there is a world which exists independently of man, in the new Communist order man exists to subsume and conform this world to his practice.

But what makes the fact that they don't owe their existence to our will or creative powers such a terrible crime in the first place? I think almost everyone, whether communist or not, would find the concept of eliminating all flora and fauna besides humans rather absurd and indeed perverse. Quite honestly it sounds like senseless destruction for no productive end.



Rafiq

Supporter
Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

Originally Posted by **Aurorus Ruber**

But what makes the fact that they don't owe their existence to our will or creative powers such a terrible crime in the first place?

Ugh. Holy shit.

If you actually managed to read not only the above post, but the linked thread, you would not only find your answer but recognize that your question, or the presuppositions of the question, are false in the first place. The crime is that they are objectively limitations to human practice, and it is that simple if you actually expend two seconds thinking about it. Not so, you just want to run your fingers through the keyboard and remind us all of how deeply horrified you are by all of this. Nature is the last refuge of the bourgeoisie. I have known this for so long. Any fucking idiot can call themselves a Communist, but you really get to know the kind of person they are, that is, their real ideological grounding, not when you discuss abstract questions of 'classless, moneyless societies' but when you

introduce topics such as, religion, and nature. This is what really brings out the true essence of a person's self-proclaimed identity. Nature is the last refuge of the bourgeoisie, it is the last refuge by which one can find some basis of gaurutnee that no matter what, god will survive all of this and everything will be fine, that there is some, special domain that has not been tainted by 'meager' men. This basic, disgusting misanthropy. Sickening.

Do you actually just want me to repeat myself, or can you manage to use your mouse to scroll up a few inches and read yourself?

I think almost everyone, whether communist or not, would find the concept of eliminating all flora and fauna besides humans rather absurd and indeed perverse. Quite honestly it sounds like senseless destruction for no productive end.

Okay, I don't give a fuck about 'everyone'. That is because there is no such fucking thing as this everyone - if you were to isolate any one of these individuals who constitute this 'everyone', they would say the same fucking thing, that 'everyone' would find it repulsive. I am so sick of this shifting the blame upon the other, the whole point of Communism is that this other no longer exists, i.e. that men and women take responsibility themselves for their superstitions (and in the process, disavow them).

'Senseless destruction for no productive end' - perhaps if our standards of 'production' are reproducing your reactionary, romantic sentimentalities, in other words the romantic sentimentalities which Marx knew full well are inherently the reflexive blow-back of the capitalist profit-drive, this would indeed hold true. The only perversity is that you think that somehow, your philistine sentimentality, your beautiful normality, your present sense of comfort, and guarantee in the big Other would survive the actual overthrow of the existing order. The only perversity is your notion of Communism, which is effectively just capitalism without capitalism, it is having your cake and eating it too. Sorry, no, that's not how this works. Again, 'humans' in the superficial sense of the 'human specimen' also are destroyed, there is nothing arbitrary about this, all that remains is pure subjectivity, in other words, all that remains is the historically self-conscious order, the essence of humanity survives the complete subordination and transformation of the empirical world, a process which goes on ceaselessly, which does not end. Again, think. Antagonisms with the natural world have always existed, but have thus far always been articulated superstitiously. It is not just a matter of surviving either, it is the dialectic development of man's actual life-practice, his abilities, which set for himself a standard which he goes on to build off of and then set a new standard and etc. etc. etc. - this is something which does not end. Above all the antagonism between man and nature is not a matter of man surviving but above all maintaining the pursuit of his ethical duty and the symbolic order. This can only be done, insofar as the social antagonism no longer exists, through now a pure and unbridled expanse of man's productive abilities.

This 'debacle' you have chosen for yourself here, has nothing to do with the conscious use of reason, it has nothing to do with any sort of controversies that can be discernible at the level of thought, but relates again to a deep rooted ideological sentimentality, you can try to articulate and sell this off as "Wow, you're being so unreasonable" all you want, but you know it is a lie. You know damned fucking well that for reasons you cannot actually represent in words you find the image of the destruction of your beautiful nature absolutely repulsive and horrifying. And it is enough to invoke suspicion NOT that you possess this deep rooted anxiety and fear, which I am sure every Communist did at some point in their development, but the fact that you actively refuse to think about it critically - that you are comfortable in your philistine sentimentality, comfortable in not subjecting it to critique.

That is why you should be regarded with suspicion here. Now go ahead, repeat practically every argument, every possible argument which has already been repeated in the linked thread. Go ahead. Honestly, just stop and think for a second, would you?

I mean it is literally so fucking stupid. You elevate what is an incidental result of the movement of a historically self-conscious order, which would likely be the complete re-fashioning of the planet to man's image, to actually be its positive goal, just because YOU FIND IT SO HORRIFYING.

In other words, you are actually trying to misrepresent the argument as saying: "In this new Communist order, we will directly kill off all the fluffy animals' for the sake of it", this abject stupidity, and frank dishonesty. You fail to understand that your fluffy animals, their existence, is not a given. They exist only because the ecosystems and environments that enable their persistence themselves persist. One doesn't have to go out of their way to destroy them, on the contrary one would have to go out of their way to positively elevate them into being some kind of sacred to preserve for its own sake, because their annihilation is scary and how dare humans think they have the right to destroy god's creation (often guised as a utilitarian argument as a necessity of man's survival, SEE THE LINKED THREAD).

This shit literally comes up every 4 months. It's always the same thing too. So obnoxious.

Aurorus Ruber

Junior Revolutionary

Join Date Feb 2005
Location Greater St Louis
Posts 206

I hope you appreciate just how alien and unfamiliar everything you are describing sounds to me. I have never encountered anyone else on the Left with such intense hostility to the natural world or criticism of ecology. Indeed it has always seemed to me that respect for the natural world was one of cornerstones of left wing thought (as compared to the right with its disdain for environmentalism) making your position incredibly unorthodox to say the least. And suffice to say, your notion of abolishing the natural world completely seems quite unlike anything I have encountered before, except perhaps among the singularitarian crowd.



Rafiq

Supporter
Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

Originally Posted by **Aurorus Ruber**

I hope you appreciate just how alien and unfamiliar everything you are describing sounds to me. I have never encountered anyone else on the Left with such intense hostility to the natural world or criticism of ecology. Indeed it has always seemed to me that respect for the natural world was one of cornerstones of left wing thought

Again, read through the linked thread and you will understand that this is historically not the case. That is to say, the romantic sentimentality that is among the Left today with regard to nature is actually inherently reactionary, and goes hand in hand with an emergent anti-modern and anti-enlightenment left. It is a total betrayal of the Left as it existed. There are two possibilities here: Either at the very best, the 21st century Left is still stuck in a kind of infantile Rousseauist stage, or

what we identify as the 'Left' does not actually exist, but must always contain the inertia of a critique of society by buttressing it with reactionary sentiment... In likelihood we are dealing with a combination of both.

But anyway, no. Historically speaking this romanticism of nature and the natural world has always been not only the staple-mark of the right but the reactionary right. This is why contemporary readers are taken aback when they find how Tolkein's reactionary politics went hand in hand with his romanticization of nature. The romanticization of nature has been reactionary since the days of English romanticism and the reaction towards the French revolution. Ecologism, on the other hand, seeking a return to an organic whole, was the staple-mark of fascism. You should bare in mind the fact that the Nazis were avid 'environmentalists', for instance, and Front National, as well as the emerging 'Nipsters' of Europe today adopts similar rhetoric. Of course, you had the Italian futurists, just as today you have the reactionary 'accelerationists', but as I believe I touched upon before, they are not actually sincere - that is to say, even here there remains reactionary romanticism toward 'the natural', just in a different way.

Again, practically all of this was covered in the linked thread. The only 'right-wing' aversion to nature, which is not really an aversion to nature at all, is the cynical, establishment neo-liberal right which only recently emerged. And this is strictly for cynical, literally cynical reasons as it concerns the immediate pursuit of profit.

Aurorus Ruber

Junior Revolutionary

Join Date Feb 2005
Location Greater St Louis
Posts 206

So you believe the current prevalence of environmental considerations in the contemporary left is a historical anomaly and reflects the decay of left wing thought? And that despite the seeming hegemony of green thinking in the modern left, we should not consider it a legitimate development but rather a sign of how far the left has declined?



sans-culotte

Marxist

Join Date Aug 2016
Location Painesville, Ohio
Posts 30

Comrade Rafiq, I can't help but see your vision of a Communist future as being utterly dystopian. Your seeming hatred of the natural world seems to speak of an internal existential crisis, the kicking and screaming that every person experiences when confronted with the Void. You must keep in mind that entropic death awaits the universe as a whole and this need to destroy isn't befitting of the human race.

Instead of your desolate future, I see one in which the new Communist Humanity will emerge triumphant and rise to the challenge of the stars. We will go forward with all of the advantages of genetic engineering and colonize not just the galaxy, but the entire universe. Not only will nature survive, it will thrive in this Communist universe. We will become the true wardens of creation and will

be filled with hearts of compassion and minds of wisdom. I hate to say it, comrade, but your rhetoric seems more in line at a Libertarian convention than in any revolutionary Marxist setting.

Full Metal Bolshevik

Junior Revolutionary

Join Date Dec 2013

Location Portugal

Posts 278

Originally Posted by **sans-culotte**

Comrade Rafiq, I can't help but see your vision of a Communist future as being utterly dystopian. Your seeming hatred of the natural world seems to speak of an internal existential crisis, the kicking and screaming that every person experiences when confronted with the Void. You must keep in mind that entropic death awaits the universe as a whole and this need to destroy isn't befitting of the human race.

Instead of your desolate future, I see one in which the new Communist Humanity will emerge triumphant and rise to the challenge of the stars. We will go forward with all of the advantages of genetic engineering and colonize not just the galaxy, but the entire universe. Not only will nature survive, it will thrive in this Communist universe. We will become the true wardens of creation and will be filled with hearts of compassion and minds of wisdom. I hate to say it, comrade, but your rhetoric seems more in line at a Libertarian convention than in any revolutionary Marxist setting.

I don't think it's about wanting to destroy nature out of hate, it's about demystifying it and subjecting it to human practice, nature shouldn't stand in our way. Nature is only important so far it benefits us, if we find ways to progress further why shouldn't we do it? Out of 'respect' for a thing?

If your problem is aesthetic just create artificial pretty things :-)



sans-culotte

Marxist

Join Date Aug 2016

Location Painesville, Ohio

Posts 30

Originally Posted by **Full Metal Bolshevik**

I don't think it's about wanting to destroy nature out of hate, it's about demystifying it and subjecting it to human practice, nature shouldn't stand in our way. Nature is only important so far it benefits us, if we find ways to progress further why shouldn't we do it? Out of 'respect' for a thing?

Nature is what has created us and every creature on Earth has as much right to exist as any other. Knowing there is no inherent meaning in the life and that there is no omniscient Creator to watch over us, we must take it upon ourselves to guard Life. Obviously, the cockroach, the ant, or the fly is more a nuisance and I won't shed a tear at killing any individual, but the eco-system must be protected. I will not stand for any vision like Comrade Rafiq's from coming to pass. I would honestly die for natural

life and will defend it until my dying breath. I am no luddite, but I respect that from which we sprang and I will always stand up for the rights of nature.

If your problem is aesthetic just create artificial pretty things :-)

If I wanted to live in a plastic world I would have never become a Communist.



[Rafiq](#)

Supporter
Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

Originally Posted by **Aurorus Ruber**

So you believe the current prevalence of environmental considerations in the contemporary left is a historical anomaly and reflects the decay of left wing thought? And that despite the seeming hegemony of green thinking in the modern left, we should not consider it a legitimate development but rather a sign of how far the left has declined?

Read the thread I linked, again, it is all there. The problem is not the 'environmental considerations' as such but how they are articulated and registered ideologically. There is an ecological crisis, but this crisis is registered romantically as saving nature from humanity, rather than the other way around.

Literally all of this was covered in that thread. People, please do not waste my time. I need to expend it on more pressing matters and concerns. My position on this matter, as elaborated as thoroughly as possible, is readily available in the thread and if you have questions or concerns about it, ask them only after you are absolutely certain it wasn't already addressed.

Each and every time one of you does this, my resentment for you grows deeper and deeper. It takes a lot to treat you with any sort of respect or decency when you pull this fucking shit.

My god, someone actually kill me. I was so glad when a few days ago I thought this thread was fucking buried and I could continue focusing on my text, and now we get this SHIT. Why do users on this fucking forum want to waste my time so often?

And no, I am not being an arrogant asshole. No, sorry, no - because I AM humble. I don't fucking call up those I read, and demand them to conform themselves to my ignorance, I READ THEM thoroughly and I understand them thoroughly, I TAKE the extra mile of humbling myself toward notions, ideas, I am unfamiliar with and I absorb as much as possible before I even think about opening my fucking mouth. But people on this forum, for some reason, just love running their mouths for no reason, of deriving definitive conclusions when they are utterly lost and totally ignorant. I put a great deal of care into everything I say, so it is not me who is asserting myself over others, but the reverse. These lazy philistines who consign faith into their big Other, they just want to casually TYPE SHIT, and go "Wah, whatever", they want to leave all of the actual detailed work for me, so basically I have to serve as the clean-up crew to people who want to shit all over the ground, when there is literally a bathroom around the corner. Have the fucking modesty of recognizing your limitations, because no,

you are not a beautiful precious snowflake, the fact that you spontaneously arbitrarily came to the conclusions you did is not because you are special nor is it because god whispered these ideas in your ear, it is testament to YOUR OWN immersion into the actual social order, as an ideological subject. You are not fucking special.

If I became a Marxist through doing this, I would have never actually become a Marxist. People don't want to fucking critique themselves and their own STUPID fucking ideas which they derive ready-made from the sentimentalities from any hollywood movie, because they think that their Marxism is THEIR journey alone, they think this is just about THEM, they think that their own natural and spontaneous genius is responsible for them. Sorry to say, you are not special, no one is special, to be a Communist one must LEARN, they must engage in self-discipline, YOU WERE NOT BORN THIS WAY AND THERE IS NOTHING SPECIAL ABOUT WHICH MAKES YOUR POSITIONS ANYTHING LESS THAN THE READY-MADE POSITIONS OF BOURGEOIS SOCIETY. Get. It. In. Your. Fucking. Head.

Before you do this, honestly leave me the fuck alone. Like yes, I will respond, yes I won't let this filth get its last word, but I am imploring you to stop out of basic decency. Just fucking stop. No one cares about your stupid ego, it means nothing. We all, those of us who are knowledgeable, think less of you when you keep spewing this garbage. You are commanding of far more respect if you modestly accept that as it concerns Marxism, as it concerns Communism, both philosophically and theoretically you are very immature and have a lot of learning to do - this is a respectable position. What is not respectable is running your mouth like this and talking out of your ass, and in the process disrespecting and dismissing the represented positions of others who actually take a great deal of their time to FUCKING EXPLAIN IT TO YOU ALL. Like shit.

Like I know how you all are fucking thinking. "Blah blah blah he's just saying things whatever, I'm going to reaffirm the same SHIT that was already thoroughly covered". Just fucking stop, shut the fuck up, and read. It's literally that simple.

Originally Posted by **sans-culotte**

I can't help but see your vision of a Communist future as being utterly dystopian. Your seeming hatred of the natural world seems to speak of an internal existential crisis, the kicking and screaming that every person experiences when confronted with the Void.

Honestly, stop. It's not even cute - stop talking out of your ass. Frankly, I will give you the benefit of the doubt and assume you are simply projecting.

Frankly it is not very 'comradely' for you to talk out of your ass, to derive such a conclusion when you have devoted absolutely no time whatsoever to a position which has been thoroughly elaborated and whose actual meaning in relation to what Communism actually is has been expounded upon in such great detail. You accuse my position as being the product of "kicking and screaming" and yet it is completely fucking rock solid, you accuse it of being some kind of hysterical response to a deadlock and to a certain uncertainty but you are in no fucking position to say this when you haven't even taken the time upon yourself to understand it. Of course, we can't expect that, because understanding it also involves confronting your own demons head on, that is, confronting your own sentimentalities head on and understanding them critically, which you are apparently not willing to do. You want to think that you are some special snowflake - listen, the sentimentality you espouse is recurrent in practically every Disney movie. Just stop.

Do not push your limits. Don't blatantly flail your arms around and completely dismiss and disrespect my posts and still expect to be treated with any amount of decency. You are clearly struggling, that much is apparent, so you must assume that everyone else is struggling in the same way. The fact of the matter is that the emotional anxiety derived from visions of the conquering of nature ISN'T FUCKING PRESENT FOR EVERY OTHER PERSON, because not everyone, dear sans, is a petty bourgeois ideologue who still possesses such reactionary and romantic sentimentalities. I remember

when I was a child and I possessed those same kinds of sentimentalities, just as I remember what it was like to at first abandon any belief in a god.

Just as it is naturally assumed for the priest that the atheism of a subject actually entails that they are secretly angry with god, resent him, and want to get back at him - but none the less deep down still believe in him, you idiotically assume the same thing holds for the disavowal of any and all big Others including nature. Well no, I am not a 12 year old kid, my position is perfectly consistent with the rationality of historical self-consciousness, because IT IS the rationality of historical self-consciousness in practice and applied. Repeat after me: YOUR GOD DOES NOT SURVIVE COMMUNISM. Your fear is no different from the fear of the bloodsuckers who fear that the abolition of private property is the end of the world.

You sans, among others, see such a future as dystopian, pathologically, and thus come to the conclusion that for Rafiq to be espousing it, he too must secretly see it in a dystopian way and thus is just trying to be angsty or edgy. The fact of the matter is that you talk out of your ass: For let me be quite frank - what absolutely survives all of this is, yes, to be naive, love. What survives even the destruction of man's own physical body, what survives even humanity's ascendance into machines, is love in the pure sense of what love actually is, which is radical incompleteness, and to love objects, such as nature or animals, is a perversity and it is no different from pedophilia in the pathological sense, it is to love a thing which cannot return it. What we consider love, in this spiritual sense, ascends far beyond the confines of men and women's own bodies, and ascends into the highest machinic organization. I am not espousing some kind of edgy fucking position, I am a Communist, which you are not (yet, at least, perhaps there is hope, but you have not done anything to prove it to us).

But nature must die in two senses, as I said. It must die in the physical sense of, actually conquering these processes, but that will likely take a long time and will be done cautiously and carefully. The most important death of nature, is the ideological notion of nature, the very mechanism by which one possesses a certain sensitivity toward it so that they perceive its destruction in a dystopian way, THIS nature, this abject SUPERSTITION, must die, as a precondition for any Communist consciousness, it must be eradicated, faith in the big Other must be replaced with faith only in the new Communist order alone. What must die is the superstition by which meaning is projected upon nature when there is none. This is what must die. Nature is not evil, nor is it good. It is meaningless, it was not intentionally designed or willed.

Frankly I talked about this quite thoroughly. We know very well why there is such a possessed sensitivity toward sacred nature. And it is because nature represents the last domain of consigning the ideological designation of the social as (though to be) materialized externally. Nature is actually the high-point of real alienation materialized, it is the means by which the unknowability and spontaneity that is really immanent to capitalist society is externalized outward, i.e. in other words, THE SAME ANXIETY ABOUT "TOTALITARIANISM" AND A COMMUNIST SOCIETY AS BEING A SOCIETY WHEREIN ALL ASPECTS OF LIFE MEN AND WOMEN NOW ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR, WHERE NO BIG OTHER SURVIVES, IS THE SAME ANXIETY ABOUT DYSTOPIA WHICH UNDERLIES NATURE.

You are horrified by the destruction of nature because you are misanthropic. Instead of deriving pride, instead of finding hope, instead of finding dignity and wholeness from man's labor, through the products of man's labor, through the 'meagerly' man made, you find a sense of authenticity in natural processes. This pathological misanthropy derives from the misanthropy of present day society, because that which is man-made and 'plastic', reminds you of the actual alienation of human society itself. But you are a reactionary, as Marx understood, for the simple reason that you wish to take a step backwards and assume a primordial sense of authenticity which you see in nature. The reality is that nature is just as plastic, the only difference is that it is fucking meaningless, it is not evil, or good, it is meaningless, it is pure chaotic meaninglessness, but you find a sense of authenticity in it because you see in it a refuge from the ills of present day society - in this sense, rather than fighting through the contradictions immanent to the world of man, you wish to run away from it, you wish to reproduce

its basic, founding, primordial misanthropy. If you are not prepared to see 'god's great creations' crushed triumphantly under the rubble of the art of the new order, of man's practice, you are ABJECTLY a reactionary misanthrope. Marx's humanism, not the humanism of the reactionary ecologists which renders man to be just another species to be conserved, THIS humanism survives the death of man's physical body and biological processes. Because that human element for Marx is not the biological man, it is the irreducible aspect, the spiritual-historical aspect.

You have the fucking gall to attempt to paint my position as pathological when you know very FUCKING well that your sensitivity as it concerns natural processes IS UTTERLY pathological and cannot even properly be, consistently, represented fully in words. You have the nerve to do this - you have the nerve when it is abundantly clear that your FEAR of the destruction of nature is really a FEAR that what is really your own refuge from alien, inhuman processes, will lead to you being powerless before such processes. Your fear is no different from the fear of living without a god, a fear which I detect is still present for you. Honestly, if you are actually sincere about being a Communist like you said you were, then have the modesty to shut up and learn. Otherwise, this is a passing stage in your development you are using to alleviate other problems.

This disgusting, putrid and reactionary leftover shitstain of English romanticism, will be mercilessly crushed, destroyed, and eradicated by the Communists!

Obviously, the cockroach, the ant, or the fly is more a nuisance and I won't shed a tear at killing any individual, but the eco-system must be protected

Do you all see this fucking bullshit? The sheer INCONSISTENCY here - this is a TOTALLY arbitrary position! Why ought the fucking ecosystem, why ought 'life' be protected, if you aren't going to protect the cockroach, huh? Such infuriating bullshit. "The ecosystem must be protected!" - you loudly proclaim this SHIT only because this phrase would be accepted in any hollywood movie or any mainstream sentiment on the matter, but you don't actually understand or know why. You fail to understand that life is just as meaningless as a fucking rock, biological processes are not magical nor are they divine, they are purely fucking machinic, there is no meaning to them whatsoever. You reduce man to biological processes and thus you deny his historical essence as man, and this is why you display the same misanthropic-reactionary sentiment as any Fascist, that we must 'humble' ourselves to the big Other, to the not-All, to nature, to the unknowable. You present us a fucking narrative straight out of some fantasy-fiction, about 'humanity taking up the mantle of protecting all life' BUT THIS IS A TOTALLY ARBITRARY position, there is no conscious use of reason here, you are expressing this IMAGE, this pure FICTION, this NARRATIVE, in order to buttress your frankly irrational sentiments and reactionary-romantic sensitivities on the matter.

You want your cake and you want to fucking eat it too. You want to preserve your bourgeois sensitivities, you want to safeguard your UTTER CELEBRATION OF POWERLESSNESS in the guise of triumphant power, your idiocy is that you paint us a picture wherein we "triumphantly, proudly fight for our slavery!" and it is so clownish. Honestly, you are under so much layers of bullshit it is even hard to have hope for you.

Nature is what has created us

Where is nature? Can I talk to him or her?

Can you actually just stop, and admit that the word 'nature' for you is actually a word for god?

You must keep in mind that entropic death awaits the universe as a whole and this need to destroy isn't befitting of the human race.

And thus, for a bourgeois, reactionary-romantic ideologue, transforming and conforming every and all physical processes which are within the vicinity of man's practice actually amounts to the end of the entire universe. See, why do you fucking talk out of your ass, when you clearly have no notion of what is being said, in relation to Communism, in relation to the dialectic, why do you talk out of your ass and assume that your own limitations are everyone else's limitations? Because it is apparent you don't actually care about learning in this instance and just want to explain to everyone how deeply all of this upsets you. But I am more than aware of how upsetting and frankly horrifying the prospect of destroying - even on meager Earth, 'spontaneous' virgin processes untainted by man, but I have continually stressed that what this actually is, is not an anxiety about nature in and of itself but an anxiety about the death of god, about Communism, about nothing outside of men and women as guaranteeing them. I have stressed that nature is the last refuge of the bourgeoisie and in it does the ideological consciousness and sentiment which reproduces the existing order survive.

The fact of the matter is that the universe will never come to an end (even if 'our universe' as they call it did, which is a flimsy notion itself), there will always be a delay between the world of nature, the world of meaninglessness and spontaneity, and the world of man which registers and represents it in its head. Instead what will be infinite is the infinite transformation and conquering of all natural processes and their conformity to the world of man, so that all that survives what is in the vicinity of the new Communist order as it traverses the cosmos is the pure human subjectivity, the pure essence of man which is not his stupid body which he inherited from the apes, but the social-symbolic order. The universe does not come to an end, that is the entire fucking point, but don't you dare, in this reactionary animistic way assume this is because man 'respects' nature or 'respects' the universe. We recognize nature and the universe to be utterly meaningless. All that survives is the infinitude of man's conquest of nature, the contradiction between the finitude of man and the infinitude of the universe infinitely being overcome and then reproduced. This is all that survives the Communist order.

Instead of your desolate future, I see one in which the new Communist Humanity will emerge triumphant and rise to the challenge of the stars. We will go forward with all of the advantages of genetic engineering and colonize not just the galaxy, but the entire universe. Not only will nature survive, it will thrive...

I say this in the most comradely manner. And I implore you. This is the only genuine, sincere advice I could give you for your own sake: Take a break from revleft. I know exactly where you are at. You need to sort all of that through. Take a break from revleft, and fill your head with knowledge, learn. Out of necessity. You sent me a PM and I assumed you were sincere, so I am going to give you the benefit of not utterly ripping you apart in every possible way. Okay? Take a break, learn to be modest like we all have had to have been, and learn. Stop talking, and start listening. Start reading. Start self-critiquing. This is not easy business. This is the only advice I have for you, I am going to give you the benefit of the doubt that these utterly pathological positions you derive out of pure hopelessness and confusion.

Aurorus Ruber

Junior Revolutionary

Join Date Feb 2005
Location Greater St Louis
Posts 206

Originally Posted by **Rafiq**

Where is nature? Can I talk to him or her?

Can you actually just stop, and admit that the word 'nature' for you is actually a word for god?

I think they mean that we evolved through natural processes and therefore we owe our existence to the natural world. Whether you like to consider it or not, we are fundamentally animals, only a few million years removed from other apes. We are not simply disembodied minds governed by pure reason but rather organic bodies shaped by evolution, sharing much of our genetic heritage, biological processes, and physiological needs with other lifeforms. It sounds to me like you find this notion rather disturbing and dream of escape from fleshly existence in all its irrationality and animalism.

The fact of the matter is that the universe will never come to an end (even if 'our universe' as they call it did, which is a flimsy notion itself), there will always be a delay between the world of nature, the world of meaninglessness and spontaneity, and the world of man which registers and represents it in its head. Instead what will be infinite is the infinite transformation and conquering of all natural processes and their conformity to the world of man, so that all that survives what is in the vicinity of the new Communist order as it traverses the cosmos is the pure human subjectivity, the pure essence of man which is not his stupid body which he inherited from the apes, but the social-symbolic order. The universe does not come to an end, that is the entire fucking point, but do you you dare in this reactionary animistic way assume this is because man 'respects' nature or 'respects' the universe. We recognize nature and the universe to be utterly meaningless. All that survives is the infinitude of man's conquest of nature, the contradiction between the finitude of man and the infinitude of the universe infinitely being overcome and then reproduced. This is all that survives the Communist order.

From what I have read on cosmology and such, many scientists believe the universe will end in heat death after many trillions of years of expansion, decay of matter, and diffusion of energy, etc. Unless you believe that communism can conquer the second law of thermodynamics on a cosmic scale, the heat death seems unavoidable in the long run.



[sans-culotte](#)

Marxist

Join Date Aug 2016
Location Painesville, Ohio
Posts 30

Originally Posted by **Rafiq**

I say this in the most comradely manner. And I implore you. This is the only genuine, sincere advise I could give you for your own sake: Take a break from revleft. I know exactly where you are at. You need to sort all of that through. Take a break from revleft, and fill your head with knowledge, learn. Out of necessity. You sent me a PM and I assumed you were sincere, so i am going to give you the benefit of not utterly ripping you apart in every possible way. Okay? Take a break, learn to be modest like we all have had to have been, and learn. Stop talking, and start listening. Start reading. Start self-critiquing. This is not easy business. This is the only advice I have for you, I am going to give you the benefit of the doubt that these utterly pathological positions you derive out of pure hopelessness and confusion.

I say to you in the most comradely manner possible, I fear for your mental health. You attack me with vitriol and you have no reason to. I will not continue any manner of dialogue because you refuse to respect a fellow human being. I PM'd you about this previously, DO NOT treat me like I'm some fucking moron without feelings and without dignity.

I pity you, Rafiq.



[Alet](#)

[Join Date Apr 2015](#)

[Posts 209](#)

Originally Posted by **sans-culotte**

I say to you in the most comradely manner possible, I fear for your mental health. You attack me with vitriol and you have no reason to. I will not continue any manner of dialogue because you refuse to respect a fellow human being. I PM'd you about this previously, DO NOT treat me like I'm some fucking moron without feelings and without dignity. I pity you, Rafiq.

Seriously, please just fucking try to even understand what is being said instead of reducing the statements to arbitrary insults and mere anger directed against you, personally. At this point, your posts are just embarrassing. You respond as though you were in a position to actually critique the points at hand, but believe me, you are not even aware of the quantity of matters and controversies you are not considering. There is simply way too much you are taking for granted here, and in fact, I had the exact same argument with Location C: If you are truly serious about becoming a Communist (and no, you are not yet one - whether you want to identify with the (reactionary) practical implications of your positions, is irrelevant), not only should you stop conceiving the attacks as attacks directed against you as an individual and instead as ones directed against your reactionary position (a charge which, up to this point, you have failed to reject properly, i.e. in an intellectual manner), most importantly, you should begin to recognize that you are in absolutely no position to participate in this discussion. Not out of any sort of personal characteristics which are inevitable, I mean this in the very same way I was talking to Location C: Until you are ready to engage in ruthless self-criticism, ruthless in the sense of being ready to commit moral suicide in order to find new hope, you should stay away from RevLeft, because some people on this board want to defend certain political standards. And I mean literally committing moral suicide, I among several others know very well what you are presently thinking and feeling. In fact, if one reads the linked thread, I was going through the exact same (moral/ethical) controversy regarding nature and man's relation to it. Instead of avoiding the controversy at hand (by pitying Rafiq and referring to his mental health) and - thus - avoiding the confrontation with this ideological struggle, you should actually question and criticize your spontaneous reaction.



[sans-culotte](#)

Marxist

[Join Date Aug 2016](#)
[Location Painesville, Ohio](#)
[Posts 30](#)

I understand entirely what is being said, but I will not tolerate being spoken to in this way. I will be addressed civilly, or not at all. Despite your inflated sense of self importance, you are very mistaken on my being a communist. I've spent over ten years of my life studying Marxism, but I will not engage in this childish and insulting bickering.

I would be more than happy to debate, on intellectual merits, what is being said with someone who has a modicum of respect. Otherwise, you are nothing but a frustrated child lashing out at unknown

strangers on the internet. This is why I pity those like Rafiq and yourself. Cool off the vitriol and talk to people like they're fucking people.



[Alet](#)

[Join Date Apr 2015](#)

[Posts 209](#)

You didn't even understand my post because if you did, we wouldn't get this ridiculous "you are very mistaken, I've been studying Marxism for over 10 years" and so on. Or maybe you simply - for any arbitrary reason you don't want to share with us - chose to ignore that I quite explicitly said: "If you are truly serious about becoming a Communist (and no, you are not yet one - whether you want to identify with the (reactionary) practical implications of your positions, is irrelevant)". You clearly don't even have the slightest notion of what it means to be a Communist in our present context. Most self-proclaimed "communists" don't - including those who have spent years "studying Marxism". This is simply because the radical Left finds itself in a deep ideological crisis today, environmentalism being a symptom of this. One does not become a Marxist simply by "studying Marxism", that is reading Marxist literature and that's it. I'm sorry, but the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and so on don't directly provide the answers an inclined Communist is looking for with regard to controversies that are unique to our present predicament, owing to the fact that we are living in an entirely different historical context. It's incredibly naive to think that it's enough to read Marx in order to critique capitalism (i.e. especially present-day capitalism) in its wholeness, as though this is a matter of empirically collecting statements made a hundred years ago. It's one thing to read Marx and understand his statements superficially, on the level of grammar and so on. It's another thing to understand the implicit meaning, which did not have to be stressed in Marx's historical context, in order to understand Marxism spiritually and emotionally, in order to relate his statements to a greater totality, which is constitutive of one's practical life activity in the present. Until one has committed moral suicide, literally killed his bourgeois consciousness, one has not really felt Communism.

This is frankly not possible by "studying Marxism" alone because this is solely a matter of the present and one's practical relation to it. "Studying Marxism" as such doesn't actually mean anything in a society wherein any idiot can call himself a Marxist and, at the same time, be the most disgusting kind of reactionary. It doesn't mean anything in a historical context, wherein Marxism has become susceptible to severe, vulgar misinterpretations. One can be a "Marxist" and believe in a God. One can be a "Marxist" and reject violence. One can be a "Marxist" and advocate evolutionary psychology. One can be a "Marxist" and argue that humanity is yet not ready for Communism. And so on. Today, there are more self-proclaimed Marxists which are not Marxists at all than actually inclined ones, this is what you simply don't respect. It's not enough to refer to the years one spent studying because this is not what essentially qualifies being a practical Communist. Becoming a Communist, again, entails ruthless self-criticism so one can take a position with regard to present controversies. It entails necessarily the recognition of the contingency and meaninglessness of nature, it entails the honesty of conceiving criticism, even if combined with insults, not as directed against one personally but against one's position, irreducible to oneself.

But instead, you give us this "I don't allow this"-attitude, an attitude which is in fact utterly alien to the Marxist tradition, as one should have recognized after 10 years of studying Marxism. As though Marx, Engels, Lenin etc. had any iota of respect for outright reactionaries - I'm sorry, but precisely zero Communists agree with you. Your personal sentiments are irrelevant for the actual intellectual controversy at hand and someone who claims to have been studying Marxism for over 10 years must have skipped a lot to think that Marxists actually cared about the personal well-being of their intellectual enemies. Furthermore, and this is the real capital crime of this attitude, you simply avoid the discussion, claiming you are above this "bickering". But everyone realizes how dishonest you are: You're engaging in a controversy which is miles ahead of your current intellectual position, and in

order to not recognize this, you avoid being confronted with justified accusations by saying such cringeworthy things such as: "I will be addressed civilly, or not at all." But everyone knows, if you had been addressed "civilly", you would have insisted on your ignorance in another way, e.g. by saying that it's "just your opinion" and so on. You don't get to choose your criticism, you either address it thoroughly and justify yourself to it or you should stay away from it entirely.

It's disgusting, this passive-aggressive "I pity those like you", this arrogant "I am above all this childish shit" etc. No, you do not entirely understand what is being said, for if you did, you would have logged out already. You are in no position to be arrogant, this is what you refuse to understand. With this attitude, how can one be not angry with you?



[Rafiq](#)

Supporter
Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

Originally Posted by **Aurorus Ruber**

I think they mean that we evolved through natural processes and therefore we owe our existence to the natural world. Whether you like to consider it or not, we are fundamentally animals, only a few million years removed from other apes. We are not simply disembodied minds governed by pure reason but rather organic bodies shaped by evolution, sharing much of our genetic heritage, biological processes, and physiological needs with other lifeforms.

You have been here since 2005 you abject fucking idiot, you are going to tell me you are not trolling when you say this shit? Holy fuck, holy fuck guys, literally come find me and blow my FUCKING brains out, I have to deal with another naive, abjectly STUPID motherfucker, going through the exact same motions of 'debate' only to have them finally shut the fuck up and accept the abjectly stupid fucking notion that humans are - get this everyone, not only animals, but 'fundamentally animals'. You would actually, DARE fucking bring this up? Do you even know what you are getting yourself into? Do you even know how deeply you've fucked up when you say SHIT like this? Do you even know how much I have dedicated on this forum, do you even know how much I have dedicated already to completely destroying this SHIT? Are you literally trying to give me a fucking heart attack when you repeat and spew this discussing pop-science, national geographic BULLSHIT? I don't even fucking know where to begin, literally, we are dealing with an overload of stupidity where you can't even tell if it is a joke or not, you can't even tell if it is literally trolling or this is actually a sign that I should literally just kill myself out of frustration - on top of ALL THE SHIT I AM ALREADY FUCKING WORKING ON, NOW I HAVE TO DEDICATE SO MUCH FUCKING TIME DEALING WITH ANOTHER ONE OF THESE MOTHERFUCKERS, HOLY FUCKING SHIT, PUT A BULLET IN MY BRAIN, FUCK!

You know what, FUCK YOU. I am not going to repeat myself anymore on this fucking forum, I have devoted so much. Here is part 1 of a tiny, tiny fraction on the matter. Enjoy what is a tiny fucking fraction of what I have devoted to the matter, and no, I didn't choose this because it was the best one, I chose it because it was literally for me the first thing I clicked when I searched for posts I made on the matter:

[Editor's note: For the rest of this post, Rafiq block-quotes from his own post from a different thread. This is presumably because it is relevant to the controversy in this thread, and because Rafiq had actually written a lot about biological determinism, ecology-fetishism, anti-feminism etc., much of which covers similar ground. So he's not crazy when he is raging about having to argue the same argument over and over against people who

think they've come to a unique and special conclusion, but have in fact only stumbled upon 'ready-made bourgeois sentimentalities' such as from any Hollywood movie.]

You claim women have a "vested interest" in submitting to men for biological purposes. All of us, at least if we are adults - understand what this submissiveness means (something often expressed subtly in the intricacies of behavior which signify power). We will, however, get to that later.

First, let us give some background and explore the nature of such a mode of thinking, hardly unique to Major K. - perhaps, the innocent and spontaneous inclination of the masses today rather than religion is to conceive the world of human relations as the world of animal relations - the spiritual animal kingdom, as Hegel stated, which is purely an object of human imagination, has now replaced the domain of human spirit. In our so-called post-modern epoch, it is fashionable to easily answer all the difficult existential, and ontological questions (without being able to critique our mode of life itself) with the animalization of the human species. In some of the first human societies, humans assumed specific characteristics of animals, in a supernatural sense, through the wearing of their pelts, remnants of their dead bodies, and so on. Often times humans assumed the role of animals in order to reproduce the human conditions of production and life (In Africa, and forgive my ignorance of wear, some members of the tribe would do this to intimidate their chief, or call him out on bad behavior in the middle of the night). It would seem in our societies this practice has found new expression, only our ancestors were perhaps more modest than to justify this behavior with pretenses to 'science'. Because of the traumatic developments of modernization, there is no room for religious narratives in the high intellectual spheres for an "ontological" understanding of human existence. Bourgeois ideologues facilitated the embedding of a narrative of human existence that is irreducible to any of the "data" compiled. We know this because it has just as easily gained immense popularity as far as ordinary people (who are not religious) go, who have not seen any of the "data" and could care less about it. There is something pathologically distinct about evolutionary psychology that is simply not up for dismissal as being reducible to a few ideologues - it is but the mere expression of a wider ideological current that is deeply ingrained in our society, which finds expression from "animal rights" a Singer, a revived fascination with "nature", and the obsessions with what Zizek calls survivalism (from the Walking Dead to an obsession with post-apocalyptic settings, narrativizing phenomena as matters of "survival" and so on). We can call this phenomena, ecological fetishism, or the ideology of ecology - the new opium of the masses. One could say that for a time, positivism was not a reactionary development, but an achievement of bourgeois thought. Now here me out: The reason for this is because the bourgeois ideologues had finally decided that they will simply not concern themselves with extra-natural matters, that it is "unapproachable". They modestly confined themselves to the natural sciences - which were indeed scientific insofar as they gravitated away from the social (geology, even biology, physics, etc.). We know the aggrandous failure positivism was - and today, so degenerate, so corrupt and disgusting has the philosophical and intellectual waste-land that is the thought-apparatus of society that metaphysics has been reintroduced as a "science" - evolutionary psychology is NOTHING MORE than metaphysics, and approximation of findings in the natural sciences to the social. Marxists are anti-meta physicians, we understand the social domain as sufficient unto-itself, we understand it scientifically as a category of its own, irreducible to biological processes. The social, the space of inter-subjectivity dictates the actions of man, not the trivialities of biology which are either vestigial, or have been fully subordinate to social, productive processes. The precise nature of the control we have over our limbs, hands, legs (expressed in a way NO BETTER than dancing! What is dancing if not one's conformity to the social sphere?), the consciousness itself which allows fucking idiots like Major K to tell us these are all "evolutionary" processes even though he can't justify biologically why he is able to say that in the first place, and so on. This subservience to the social is most acutely represented by the helpless, irrationally crying nature of the baby when it leaves the womb - no other animal enters the Earth like this. And this "helplessness", this crying when one enters the world stays with you for the rest of your fucking life. The survival of humans after this catastrophe (which is what some neuroscientists call it!) depended no longer on autonomous biological processes which were bound by an ecology, but by the social domain - by the mode of production, the means by which man transforms the world around him. This is coordinated SOCIALLY, not biologically - you must LEARN EVERY SINGLE THING that constitutes the basis of the human experience, and these "things" will vary across historic epochs.

With the demise of the worker's movement and the banishment of Marxism from the universities, sociobiology in the 1970's filled a gap where Marxism previously occupied, and what remains of the

humanities is arrogantly dismissed as "postmodernism". The greatest irony, however, is that there is nothing more postmodern than Evolutionary psychology/sociobiology. So let us first ask the question: Why is your argument that women have an innate, physiological propensity to "submitting" to men? Have you been met with some kind of empirical evidence of the physiological structures which make this inevitable in the brain, and if you have - would you mind showing this evidence to us? No, in reality, you have "chosen" this argument because it tells a story which you find most conformative to our present understanding of evolution - but this is patently wrong, and unscientific. Why? Because this is an ahistorical notion. If you're going to tell us there are innate physiological structures which make inevitable the "submissiveness" of women, THEN YOU NEED TO NOT ONLY LOCATE IT, BUT EXPLAIN TO US WHY THE CONTENT, OR EXPRESSION OF THIS "SUBMISSIVENESS" HAS GREATLY VARIED ACROSS HISTORIC EPOCHS AND DIFFERENT SOCIETIES. Something that is innate physiologically or ordained by biological processes is done so because it establishes some kind of ecological balance - a definite trajectory path of predictable behaviors. You cannot say that "Well, all of these societies have in common that women were submissive" because the connotations of submissiveness, how it was signified, how the behavior was expressed, and how it was articulated in the consciousness of those involved was ESSENTIALLY different. You cannot "abstract" behaviors here and call them essential characteristics, because something that is innate would not possibly be expressed in ways that are so varied and malleable across historic epochs.

Take a minute and think about what you're doing here - you're actually telling us that there's some magical THING inside women which their behavior is owed to. From absolutely zero evidence you say this - none! The manner in which you speak is so profoundly stupid it boggles the mind: "The species" you say - WHAT fucking species? Your species? Would you care to biologically justify why you're on Revleft.com sharing this great revelation with us? Are you, Major K., outside of the species, or are these inevitable behaviors - no doubt deriving from physical reflexes in your mind (which is ALL biological behavior in animals - pure proximity with their surroundings) reserved for the great "other" you call human - the masses who are too stupid to come to this realization. Why this revocation of inter-subjectivity? Let's not even go over the fact that on a statistical level, even if we play the devil's advocate and accept all of these unscientific presumptions, the notion does not make any fucking sense - this behavior couldn't have been "adapted" for because for how complex it is, there must have been a point where women had to make or break being dominant or submissive. But from what we understand of biology and genetic-level adaptations, this is simply impossible. What you fail to understand is that behind what would otherwise seem the "spontaneous" and "autonomous" behavior of willless animals, vast and complex ideological networks are at play here wherein these sexual processes are deeply ingrained into both the consciousness and subconsciousness of women (and men). No woman is actually "submissive" by nature - women have to LEARN to be submissive, but they remain fully constituted subjects and individuals - they, like slaves, even though in a state of "submission" as far as power relations go, must approximate this behavior by consciously articulating it in such a way that it is justified, deemed normal, better, and so on. So you don't even need any fucking "innate" biological processes because any FUCKING IDIOT WITH A RUDIMENTARY UNDERSTANDING OF PSYCHO-SEXUAL DEVELOPMENT CAN UNDERSTAND THAT THIS IS A DIMENSION WHICH IS ENTIRELY FACILITATED ON A SOCIAL LEVEL.

And that is the crux of the fucking problem here - for Evolutionary psychologists, the historical - the spiritual - the social, all of these categories are just as passive and ontologically unapproachable as a natural environment - if you actually look at the contents of their work, what these humans are adapting to is NOT simply an environment, but a mode of production. The problem, however, is that men and women themselves constitute this mode of production, this FIELD of being, it is not some kind of autonomous, magical force that is in the background, that which men and women CONFORM to - they make it themselves. Such is its ideological nature, and that is why I'm going to slam you with a basic question: What is the practical use of evolutionary psychology? Surely every natural science has a practical use, but tell me, WHAT PRACTICAL USE among ANYONE does evolutionary psychology have? Neuroscience, for example, has medicinal, pharmaceutical value and gives us some insight on how to manipulate neurological processes. So what is the practical insight of evolutionary psychology? What makes it INHERENTLY political, and NOT a natural science? The fact that the only practical use for evolutionary psychology is, and has always been reacting to and narrativizing phenomena which are either extra-biological or sufficiently unto themselves assume the role of dictating biological processes - the only practical use that evolutionary psychologists have given us is to use this "new-found information" to impact policy-making decisions at the level of government, or the university campus

(vis a vis rape), AND SO ON. THIS is what makes it a pseudo-science, largely, its role has been PURELY To perpetuate the existing order and to transform things which are answerable ONLY to the social dimension into naturally ordained inevitable truths. Its practical use? Cannon-fodder for the reaction when feminists fight for laws which on a formal level benefit women in some way. But most liberals won't dismiss evolutionary psychology because they are dismissed by it. Many Marxists will even say that "Well there is some truth to it". But one must be a RADICAL here and do the honorable thing (the historically honorable thing, because come the revolution, do you think this "science" would endure? It would be cast off into the dustbin of history, as phrenology was) and say ALL OF EVOLUTIONARY PSYCHOLOGY IS BULLSHIT. THERE IS NOT ONE CLAIM, OR "HYPOTHESIS" PRODUCED BY EVOLUTIONARY PSYCHOLOGY WHICH HAS A SHRED OF THE SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE NECESSARY TO SUPPORT IT. EVERY SINGLE CLAIM BY EVOLUTIONARY PSYCHOLOGISTS IS WHOLLY UNFOUNDED FROM A SCIENTIFIC PERSPECTIVE, IT IS 100% BULLSHIT! The ONLY adaptations as far as humans are concerned which actually matter are those which precisely destroyed any balanced relationship to nature - any kind of innate physiological structures which made humans bound by a single habitat, or ecology. What "selections" for example, account for swimming? Is the "aquatic ape" hypothesis to be taken seriously, after all? But back on the matter at hand:

Let's step back, ladies and gentlemen, and think for 5 minutes about this. No, I want you all to do this - sit back and think for 5 minutes about what Major K. said. Is this not shockingly stupid? Is this not the epitome of ridiculousness? What cack, what poisonous filth, what lunacy, degeneracy has befallen the "higher" forms of thought in the bourgeois intellectual apparatus! What IGNORANCE does it take to actually go on with your life and think to yourself "hmm, this is true, this actually explains the female gender in our society and why women are submissive". We are meant to say that women who are not submissive are "unattractive" because not being submissive (i.e. doing your motherly duty) is "unattractive". Let us ignore this unignorable tautological nonsense, let's just look at this at face value: How can the relationship between submission to men's will (the phallus, the signifier in-thought) and the propensity to be a "reliable mother" actually be properly established here? I mean, this shouldn't be the bulk of our arguments, but this is just too easy - there are innumerable primitive societies wherein men engage in similar tasks in raising and teaching children, there are innumerable primitive societies wherein women had more - if not just as much influence as far as immediate concerns of power for the society as men. Women in most of these societies, bear in mind, either provided an equal share or more of the sum-total caloric intake. So this connection is already an unfounded, unjustified one - why would women NEED to "submit" to men in order to raise their fucking kids? But nevermind this. How EXACTLY, in a way that is consistent with pretenses to innate predisposition, is this behavior or "submission" expressed? Is there a consistent way for women to submit to men, across historic epochs, that is not an abstraction? You claim it "makes sense for the survival of the species perspective". But what you don't fucking understand is that the survival of the human species and the survival of our present mode of production and conditions of life (which have not always existed) are not synonymous. Human survival has been reproduced and expressed in various different ways across history, human survival is the basis for human society - true - but no two human societies are alike unless their conditions of life and production are alike. Biological processes reproduce chemical processes - so too do social processes reproduce biological ones. The social is not subservient to the biological, the biological is to the social - which is why we can, and are beginning to develop new abilities to manipulate ourselves biologically while remaining human. This "ability" is not owed to any innate biological structures (even if they facilitate it), it is owed to the social dimension dictating how these biological processes are expressed.

So it is tautological, pointless and childish to claim that "this makes sense from a survival of the species perspective", solely because it make sense as far as the reproduction of the existing order - capitalism - goes. It's so cute how these evolutionary psychologists think that the sexual aroma of the bar, the nightclub or the concert are applicable to societies like tribal Afghanistan or pre-Communist Albania - where there wasn't (and still isn't, largely in Afghanistan) even room for men to select for this "submissiveness" as most marriages were arranged and - frankly - women were directly, through DIRECT violence, forced to be "submissive". This has been the case for most of human civilization, it is a rarity that men (or women) can just "pick" their mates whimsically, and in those historic instances wherein this was common, it hardly conforms to such silly narratives - I guess women have to be beaten into assuming roles and expressing behaviors which are innate, inevitable and "natural" anyway, though. Fucking idiot...

Of course, we can twist and turn this logic around as much as we want. There is no end to its malleability. Why wouldn't men's submissiveness be equally important for the survival of the species, because they needed to be "reliable" hunters who brought food for women? Why couldn't MEN be submissive, with penetration not signifying dominance but subservience to female will or desire? I can pull 1,000,000 scenarios out of my ass, kiddo, and all of them make "just as much" sense as yours. Do not tempt me either - I LITERALLY can do this.

To briefly delve into the ontological temptation of evolutionary psychology, no point is better encapsulated by Chomsky, in defense of his "Universal grammar" theory, itself which is not even testable - he claims that "Well of course there is a human nature, for infants already begin to process information in a way that resembles a language" (Compared to what? What does this actually mean? That infants are not kangaroos means that there are essential behavioral characteristics about humans in the same way it is for Kangaroos?). It stems from the basic ontological question of: "Why this, rather than that"? In attempting to understand the origins of humans, of human consciousness, this radical point of difference must be asserted - why do things follow in this way rather than another way?

But such question are just as ontologically ridiculous as asking "Why is the Lion not a whale, and a whale not a lion?" - it is a simple re-hashing of theology (and the ontological argument for the existence of god) under the guise of science. But as Marx stated, such questions are purely abstractions - take away the abstractions, and there are no such questions which can remain. Marx, speaking about the notion of a god and creation:

You will reply, however: I grant you this circular movement; now grant me the progress which drives me ever further until I ask: Who begot the first man, and nature as a whole? I can only answer you: Your question is itself a product of abstraction. Ask yourself how you arrived at that question. Ask yourself whether your question is not posed from a standpoint to which I cannot reply, because it is wrongly put. Ask yourself whether that progress as such exists for a reasonable mind. When you ask about the creation of nature and man, you are abstracting, in so doing, from man and nature. You postulate them as non-existent, and yet you want me to prove them to you as existing. Now I say to you: Give up your abstraction and you will also give up your question. Or if you want to hold on to your abstraction, then be consistent, and if you think of man and nature as non-existent, ||XI| then think of yourself as non-existent, for you too are surely nature and man. Don't think, don't ask me, for as soon as you think and ask, your abstraction from the existence of nature and man has no meaning. Or are you such an egotist that you conceive everything as nothing, and yet want yourself to exist?

You can reply: I do not want to postulate the nothingness of nature, etc. I ask you about its genesis, just as I ask the anatomist about the formation of bones, etc.

But since for the socialist man the entire so-called history of the world is nothing but the creation of man through human labor, nothing but the emergence of nature for man, so he has the visible, irrefutable proof of his birth through himself, of his genesis. Since the real existence of man and nature has become evident in practice, through sense experience, because man has thus become evident for man as the being of nature, and nature for man as the being of man, the question about an alien being, about a being above nature and man - a question which implies the admission of the unreality of nature and of man - has become impossible in practice.

What Marx is saying here is radically atheist. Marx is telling us that positing such ontological questions are abstractions from a definite, concrete and implicit presupposition that an axiomatic real already exists. One cannot "prove" non-existence without thinking they themselves do not exist - and likewise, one cannot "abstract" what we observe in the animal kingdom as the basis of human existence, because this is tautological: The consciousness that allows us to taxonomize, and analyze animals is NOT an expression of "God's eye view" - we humans taxonomize, and understand animals already in approximation to us. Marx said that the best way to understand the anatomy of an ape, is to understand the anatomy of a man - and again, this is a radically profound insight. The fact that we are invested with the power to consciously articulate the animal in such a way that we can manipulate it means that the physiological processes which make us similar to animals are trivialities of human consciousness which are just as malleable by it. Human consciousness, therefore, stems from a new dimension all-together: The social dimension of life. This is why those who speak of a "natural state"

are the greatest fools, whether leftists or rightsists - there is no "natural state", for every single human society had complex rituals, dances, narratives, mythologies, etc. to sustain its conditions of existence. Take this dimension away, and what is left is the helplessness of the wailing infant. Hegel took this even further when he spoke of "Africans" (which was rather progressive for it's time, because it rejected any racist-essentialist readings of Africans), which we can substitute for hunter-gatherers. For Hegel, this wasn't some kind of "pure state", it was a state of rupture wherein humans were coping with the traumatic effects of being expelled from the animal kingdom, possessed by a death drive . To quote Zizek:

In his anthropological writings, Kant emphasized that the human animal needs disciplinary pressure in order to tame an uncanny "unruliness" which seems to be inherent to human nature - a wild, unconstrained propensity to insist stubbornly on one's own will, cost what it may. It is on account of this "unruliness" that the human animal needs a Master to discipline him: discipline targets this "unruliness," not the animal nature in man.

In Hegel's Lectures on Philosophy of History, a similar role is played by the reference to "negroes": significantly, Hegel deals with "negroes" before history proper (which starts with ancient China), in the section entitled "The Natural Context or the Geographical Basis of World History": "negroes" stand there for the human spirit in its "state of nature," they are described as a kind of perverted, monstrous child, simultaneously naive and extremely corrupted, i.e. living in the pre-lapsarian state of innocence, and, precisely as such, the most cruel barbarians; part of nature and yet thoroughly denaturalized; ruthlessly manipulating nature through primitive sorcery, yet simultaneously terrified by the raging natural forces; mindlessly brave cowards...

During the pinnacle of bourgeois philosophy, German idealism, precisely those crazy aspects of man were what they used to DISTINGUISH from animals, which had a balanced relationship to nature, were predictable, knew their role, ETC. Whether this description from Hegel was true for Africans or not does not change the fact that it encapsulates a very basic feature of humans - actively responding to nature, being thrown into the thresher of the world with no "innate" properties to help them cope with it - a thoroughly helpless, wholly dependent (on the "master" or the social dimension) creature, like an infant.



[Rafiq](#)

Supporter الاشتراكية هي المطرقة التي نست

Admin

Join Date Aug 2010

Location Detroit, Michigan.

Posts 8,258

Originally Posted by **Aurorus Ruber**

We are not simply disembodied minds governed by pure reason.

The crass naivety is so fucking disgusting I am literally about to vomit, not even kidding, I feel like I'm going to gag. Every fucking few months these STUPID MOTHERFUCKERS COME ON REVLEFT AND "TELL US HOW IT IS" about "HUMAN NATURE" and so on. I am so FUCKING sick of these motherfuckers, I am so sick of how fucking ARROGANT and BASELESSLY confident they are in spewing this FILTH, this DISGUSTING filth. The fact that you say shit like this is alone to incriminate you as a Fascist, and I mean this, I say it, I mean it - in my bones - I do not level this in any trivial sense, anyone who claims humans are animals, are abjectly fascists and have identified with the neo-Fascism.

What a fucking idiot you are. "We are not simply disembodied minds governed by pure reason", THEN HOW, YOU FUCKING IDIOT, HAVE YOU MANAGED TO ABSTRACT YOURSELF FROM YOUR OWN HUMANITY TO THE POINT WHERE YOU DO MAKE PRETENSE TO BEING A DISEMBODIED MIND GOVERNED BY PURE REASON! WHAT FUCKING SPACE ARE YOU OCCUPYING, IF NOT A "DISEMBODIED MIND GOVERNED BY PURE REASON" THAT ENABLES YOU TO FUCKING ABSTRACT YOURSELF FROM YOUR HUMANITY AND TELL US ABOUT WHAT "HUMANS REALLY ARE", HUH, YOU STUPID SHIT? What fucking POSITION are you in to assume this OTHER this fucking GOD, who is apparently ABOVE humanity and can abstract himself from his own humanity just to tell us about what his own fucking nature is. You literally fail to understand what a STUPID thing it is to say "In the end, we are animals, in the end, we are the product of and are bound to nature" - you FUCKING IDIOT, IF THAT WAS TRUE, WHY WOULD IT BE NECESSARY TO ENUNCIATE IT, WHY WOULD IT NOT BE GUARANTEED BY THE SAME INEVITABLE MECHANISMS YOU PURPORT TO ENSLAVE HUMANITY TO NATURE? Do you even THINK before you talk shit, or what? Do you even think about what you say before you post it? Huh? These disgusting bourgeois ideologues tell us this and that about humanity's inevitable limitations, and yet, fail to understand that IF THESE WERE INEVITABLE LIMITATIONS, YOU WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO REGISTER AND ARTICULATE THEM AS LIMITATIONS, the fact that you can THINK and REPRESENT any purported limitation means one is already beyond it. Stupid shit tells us "We are fundamentally animals".

Are you literally, actually, plainly, stupid? Are you literally irredeemably fucking stupid? WHICH ANIMAL NEEDS to say "We are animals", which ANIMAL has a FUCKING idea in its head of such a thing called "the animal", huh? What is the IDEA of an animal? What enables and allows you to classify things as animals, rather than not? Do actual fucking animals care about that, or are they basically organic automata that don't actually give a fuck about anything but only act as a result of pure physical stimuli from certain interactions with their environs? Not only is the essence of humanity INDEED disembodied from the physicality that is the human body, not only can it exist independently of it (by means of trans-humanism), because it is historical, YOU ABOVE ALL NEED TO BLINDLY PRESUPPOSE THIS AS A FACT IN ORDER FOR YOU TO ARGUE TO THE CONTRARY. Because we all know what you are trying to fucking say, what dirty secret underlies all of this ecologist trash: The notion of an ALIEN ESSENCE that exists independently of man which back in the day they used to call GOD. You LITERALLY presuppose a god in order to abstract yourself from your humanity, and this is the dirty fucking secret you don't want to admit.

Your existence literally disgusts me, you, along with the rest of them, the Pinkers, and the peddlers of pseudo-scientific trash, I wish you all the worst, and not only that, come the revolution its victors will feast on your blood, I guarantee you that much, you disgusting fucking rodent. This is literally worth getting banned from Revleft on - I am so fucking sick of how this disgusting trash is just casually accepted here, any person who peddles this SHIT should immediately be banned and I am sorry, I cannot tolerate an environment wherein this is accepted, I cannot tolerate individuals who do this, simply, cannot fucking do it. This is literally an incomplete list of all the FUCKING times I have dealt with this SHIT, and I don't even think this covers the majority of how much text I have dedicated to this fucking matter:

<http://www.revleft.com/vb/threads/19...ary+psychology>

<http://www.revleft.com/vb/threads/19...ns+are+animals>

<http://www.revleft.com/vb/threads/19...ns+are+animals>

<http://www.revleft.com/vb/threads/19...ns+are+animals>

<http://www.revleft.com/vb/threads/19...ns+are+animals>

<http://www.revleft.com/vb/threads/19...ls#post2863632>

<http://www.revleft.com/vb/threads/19...ls#post2866257>

<http://www.revleft.com/vb/threads/19...ls#post2868931>

[Editor's note: The above links are defunct, they link to threads which no longer exist. When RevLeft forums ceased operating, a great many threads were sadly lost.]

Fucking idiot comes on Revleft and spews this shit, thinking that like him, Rafiq just talks out of his ass and hasn't already developed his position. You disgusting piece of shit. Fuck off back to National Geographic online, or "I fucking love science" and come back, won't you? You're literally fucking done on this forum, I promise, if I am not banned, you're done.

From what I have read on cosmology and such, many scientists believe the universe will end in heat death after many trillions of years of expansion, decay of matter, and diffusion of energy, etc..

Except I fully acknowledged that cosmologists have come to the conclusion that the observable universe is finite, however, as a materialist and a Communist, the point is that this still relies on a substrate of existence which is infinite, and that it is nothing short of an absurdity to call what we say in the traditional sense the universe, all that exists and all that is being, is finite. Now, of course, because you are likely a filthy empiricist, you will arrive at the conclusion that because the observable universe is finite, this must mean that as far as we are concerned all existence is finite, too. And yet you fail to acknowledge the utter absurdities of not only your empiricism but the implications of the finitude of all being and all existence, so fucking stupid it is not even conceivable to think that in an ontological sense there can literally be a pure nothing, a space of pure nothing, an ontological non-existence, without of course believing in a substrate called a god. There is no way out of this debacle. Either the universe is infinite, and that either the 'observable' universe has not been observed thoroughly enough or is just one domain of being that is within a larger one, or you admit to believing in a god. There is no middle way. This is what separates the materialist from the idealist position.

And finally, many scientists believe the universe will end in heat death, and many others think it will end in a big freeze. There are various different, competing hypotheses about the alleged 'end of the universe' just like the foundations of the 'big bang' are themselves flimsy, there is not even enough knowledge about the already observed and known universe to claim that it is in any way finite, but to say that this has anything to do with the finitude of all being and existence itself, from this very limited and poorly understood data, is the highpoint of absurdity.

These rodents love coming on revleft and telling us "What da science" is. My god, Lacan was right. If so-called "science" or religion wins, we are all doomed, this is what he said in the 70's. And we are doomed indeed. Go ahead, Aurorus, tells us about how BUT DIS IS DA SCIENCE! While having the most flimsy acquaintance with the actual, raw methods used by these scientists which can be up for scrutiny by its own right but which is almost always obscured by pop-science mysticism and trash.

Again, this fucking idiot drags this discussion now into one of cosmology. Congratulations for WASTING MY FUCKING TIME, everyone! Now, we have to deal with: evolutionary psychology, the ethics of nature, epistemology, cosmology, all because these little fucking children don't want to think critically themselves and literally need to be BEATEN into reason. Fuck my fucking life, now I have to dedicate, however long this fucking takes, to ensuring this thread dies. Literally fuck my life.

I am so fucking sick of people peddling this naive garbage thinking they are teaching us anything. Like no, sorry kiddo, you're not going to be allowed to be the spokesperson for the big Other, for pop-science and conventional thinking. You're not. You're going to be fucking crushed, again and again, until you shut the fuck up. That's how this is going to work. Enjoy.

DO NOT treat me like I'm some fucking moron without feelings and without dignity.

You act like a fucking child because you think you're some special snowflake who isn't by default a moron. You ARE a moron, to not be a moron requires actual fucking effort, it requires work, it requires self-criticism, it requires dedication and study. You are not willing to do any of those things, clearly. So you are even worse than a moron, you are likely, hopelessly, an enemy ideologue.



[Rafiq](#)

Supporter
Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

Originally Posted by **Aurorus Ruber**

I think they mean that we evolved through natural processes and therefore we owe our existence to the natural world.

Finally no one actually fucking cares what you think they meant, because I perfectly understood what he meant, and I responded accordingly: It is claimed that we owe something to the natural world, but this presupposes that the so-called natural world and so-called nature is actually meaningful, and that the emergence of man from the animal kingdom was actually meaningful and purposeful. This is my fucking point: Nature is not a person, it is nothing, it is pure, meaningless, utter, shit. What we call nature proper does not even exist - there is no harmonious nature, natural processes are a series of catastrophes and there is no meaning to it, not because nature cares about having no meaning, but because meaning is only relevant for the world of man, and because the natural world preceded the world of man, and exists independently of it, it does not conform to the meaning created by the world of man, it does not conform to men and women unless they FORCE it to, by means of labor. That was the point.

To say "we owe our existence to the natural world" is fucking idiotic, we owe our existence to a series of accidents and catastrophes which only retroactively have any meaning. The idea that we ought to be "grateful" to nature is both superstitious and inconsistent. Does nature appreciate your gratitude? DOES IT CARE? IS IT A PERSON? IS IT ASKING YOU FOR ANYTHING? WHAT IS THIS FUCKING "NATURE" YOU ARE DESCRIBING THAT HUMANITY "OWES" SOMETHING TO? You are telling me men and women should limit their abilities and productive capacities because they are GRATEFUL that for some STUPID fucking, accidental occurrence, their ancestors emerged from the chaos of the real? You are in other words saying "Let's conserve trees and ecosystems for the sake of it, because a million years ago the first homo sapiens emerged and it was owing to processes that were unwilling (which is the only significance of natural processes) that they emerged". Sit the fuck down and explain to me how this is an actual, viable position.

You sit there and act so reasonable, you don't understand the abject ABSURDITY of your position. And its absurdity derives from the fact that it is being held to scrutiny. That is why. What sustains your position is not the conscious use of reason but a deep seated ideological consciousness. And you guise this with some banal, common sense fact that "humanity emerged out of totally contingent and meaningless processes". And? So? What is your point? Why, ethically speaking, does this mean man SHOULD limit his activity and his abilities. It doesn't even fucking make sense either to speak of nature holistically. Are you literally stupid?

What is referred to nature is a series of contingent processes, the only reason why there is a word which represents all of those processes is because all of those processes have in common the fact that they were unwilling, and preceded the world of man, or more specifically exist outside of it, outside of the totality of human practice. The idea that there is a force called "nature" that is actually living, and breathing through all of the trees, plants, animals, that someone outside of humanity actually fucking cares about belongs in the realm of a James Cameron movie, not this forum. Take a seat, shut the fuck up and stop wasting my time. Honestly. Users take advantage of the fact that I HAVE to respond to them and I HAVE to take them seriously.

Aurorus Ruber

Junior Revolutionary

Join Date Feb 2005
Location Greater St Louis
Posts 206

Originally Posted by **Rafiq**

The crass naivety is so fucking disgusting I am literally about to vomit, not even kidding, I feel like I'm going to gag. Every fucking few months these STUPID MOTHERFUCKERS COME ON REVLEFT AND "TELL US HOW IT IS" about "HUMAN NATURE" and so on. I am so FUCKING sick of these motherfuckers, I am so sick of how fucking ARROGANT and BASELESSLY confident they are in spewing this FILTH, this DISGUSTING filth. The fact that you say shit like this is alone to incriminate you as a Fascist, and I mean this, I say it, I mean it - in my bones - I do not level this in any trivial sense, anyone who claims humans are animals, are abjectly fascists and have identified with the neo-Fascism.

Then what exactly do you think humans are, if not animals belonging to the ape family, shaped by evolution and made of flesh and blood? How do you think the human mind works, if not through the activity of the brain, itself the product of evolution and governed by physical and biological forces? Surely you aren't suggesting that humans have (or rather are) some kind of immaterial soul that distinguishes them from mere animals.



Rafiq

Supporter
Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

Originally Posted by **Aurorus Ruber**

Then what exactly do you think humans are, if not animals belonging to the ape family, shaped by evolution and made of flesh and blood?
Are you fucking trolling?

listen to me, Aurorus. When you FUCKING HAVE THE ANSWER RIGHT IN FRONT OF YOU IN THE COUNTLESS THREADS I LINKED AND THE ABOVE QUOTED PART, it is clear that you actually aren't fucking looking for an answer but want something to literally BEAT YOU into thinking critically. You fucking sit there passively with your utterly naive pop-science convention of man, which you have never in your life thought critically about and have always as a rule, assumed as a given, and you literally want me to sit here and FORCE YOU to not only think about it critically but to beat you into dispelling these naive, philistine superstitions. It would be just as fucking infuriating if you were to talk about how "doesn't da double slit experiment prove magic or whatever"?

YOU CONFLATE THE HUMAN REPRESENTATION OF OBJECTS for the ACTUAL OBJECTS themselves. You therefore assume a point-of-view which is extra-human and probably in your mind divine. Are you literally fucking stupid? What UNIVERSAL MIND or POINT OF YOU allows you to ABSTRACT man himself to be reduced and belonging to one of the 'families' WHICH HE ALONE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR DIFFERENTIATING as a family? Again, here we go again with this SHIT. It is always the same thing. You take a step back from humanity and say "Da humans r da animals belonging to this or that family" - WHO IS FUCKING SAYING THAT? WHOSE THOUGHT DOES THAT SENTENCE BELONG TO? A

HUMANS, OR A GODS? IF HUMANS ARE "ANIMALS BELONGING TO THE APE FAMILY", WHY IS IT THAT THEY CAN ENUNCIATE THIS AND REPRESENT THIS IDEA IN THEIR HEAD? WHO says humans are animals? WHO fucking says they are apes? WHO fucking says that? Who? Is there something outside of humans who say this, who think this? Are you actually just fucking stupid, again?

We are made of flesh and blood? our bodies are, certainty, but you conflate the ESSENCE which automatically, by merit of actually being able to represent flesh and blood as something contingent and not a given, the ability to represent it already enables one to be disembodied from them (i.e. again, transhumanism), you conflate flesh and blood as constituting the human body with flesh and blood as constituting the human HISTORICAL essence. This is what you fail to fucking understand. To be aware of a limitation is already to be beyond it. The fact that all of these processes can be abstractly represented by means of thought in the same way one abstractly represents a fucking rock, means they are contingent and are subsumed by the world of man, by the irreducible human essence which emerges at the outset of the symbolic order and language. No matter how dependent this is on physical processes, IT IS NOT REDUCIBLE to them, but is actually the active element which orients their expression.

The brain does not fucking determine anything, instead, man's subjectivity, man's social being, is facilitated and reflected in his brain. I have been over this in so much detail in so many different fucking threads, this is literally so fucking infuriating.

Again, AGAIN, as I repeat IN EVERY FUCKING THREAD at this point: Humans have history, AND THEIR BODIES HAD NOTHING TO FUCKING SHOW FOR IT. The way in which the 'mind' has worked has changed historically, and again, genetics had nothing to show for it.

Do you want to continue, or are you ready to stop WASTING MY TIME?

How do you think the human mind works, if not through the activity of the brain, itself the product of evolution and governed by physical and biological forces?

Here Aurorus literally just admitted that "his brain" (whatever that fucking means) was responsible for him typing the above quoted sentence. He therefore absolves responsibility and agency for doing so, because "it was my brain" that did it, "it was physical processes outside of control" that did it.

Do you not fucking understand that the UTMOST and LOGICAL conclusion of this is SCIENTIFIC RACISM? You FUCKING idiot? Do you not even know what war is brewing right now? Do you not understand how fucking SERIOUS this is? If people are as you say they are, WHY DO YOU NOT ACCEPT ACADEMIC RACISM, surely it is fucking REASONABLE that people who have been separated for tens of thousands of years according to different geographic circumstances are essentially different, right? You can't have one without the other. If men and women are apes, what actually fucking allows you to say that an African is the same as a European as far as their humanity is concerned. Huh? WHAT? Only recognition of an IRREDUCIBLE element, does one recognize that they in their human essence are the same.

Surely if there are physiological differences, there are also inherently mental differences, between races, and what do you know, certainly this should account for at least some of the disparity in their 'behavior', in their 'culture', right? Perhaps whites are superior to all those black and brown people, perhaps naturally they are smarter and selected for this for whatever reason. Why not? With your DISGUSTING fucking misanthropy that ABSTRACTS man from himself, and identifies this abstract thing as a FOREIGN AND ALIEN POWER that exists INDEPENDENTLY of men but which can 'categorize' them all the same, there is no difference. You fail to understand that your POP SCIENCE GARBAGE is the actual FOUNDATIONAL BASIS OF THE EMERGING ACADEMIC RACISM.

This SHIT is not a joke. This is life or death. Literally, I say it, those who peddle 'evolutionary psychology' and reactionary ecologism, should be treated with no mercy. They are less than animals if they do this.

Evolution is not "governed" by anything, finally. What we call physical and biological forces are only meaningful retroactively, we differentiate those processes from others for purely practical, HUMAN

reasons. You fail to understand that the idea of biological forces is not immanent to what is identified to be those forces themselves. You don't get this because you are an idealist philistine.

Surely you aren't suggesting that humans have (or rather are) some kind of immaterial soul that distinguishes them from mere animals.

YOU are the only fucking person who presupposes the necessity of believing in a soul, else, you would not be able to explain or articulate how it is that you can abstract yourself from all of these processes you at the same time assert are determining your 'behavior' and essence. What I have consistently asserted is that the social domain, man's entrance into the symbolic order, subsumes every other dimension of life, the biological, chemical, and then atomic. This is what I have asserted, that even though man emerged from meaningless processes, spiritless processes that is in the Hegelian sense, meaning and spirit was born, and retroactively all of these processes are only meaningful insofar as they regard this exact same 'disembodied' rational mind you dismiss as nonsense.

The fact that you FUCKING REPRESENT animals in your head, and that you ENUNCIATE it automatically distinguishes you from them. ARE YOU ACTUALLY FUCKING TROLLING, BECAUSE I LITERALLY ALREADY WENT THROUGH THIS ABOVE. Have you READ NOTHING? Again, WHAT IS AN ANIMAL, where did the representation of the idea of an ANIMAL ACTUALLY COME FROM, why are there animals, what distinguishes animals from plants AND WHY, who is this MEANINGFUL for and WHY?

How does it fucking come to pass that humans are animals, if they have to actively say "I am an animal"? Do you not see the absurdity of this, or do you want to keep this going?

Keep at it Aurorus. Honestly, I admit, my goal is that this thread dies and I can get on with my fucking night. That's what I want. You want to keep wasting my time, go ahead, but I promise you, I am not going to give up. What you need to do is shut the fuck up, think critically but privately, and LEARN. Stop provoking me, stop trying to get a fucking rise out of me, because all you are doing is wasting my time. If you have concerns, PM me. Otherwise, I will continue to attack and crush you, I will continue to rip apart each and every single thing you say, because insofar as reactionary ecologism is not enough to be worthy of being banned, I will make sure that it has no platform on this forum for as long as I am on it. I promise you that much.

Aurorus Ruber

Junior Revolutionary

Join Date Feb 2005
Location Greater St Louis
Posts 206

For what it's worth, I am not trying to provoke you or cause trouble and I apologize if I am irritating you. I am just genuinely surprised to see someone draw such a sharp distinction between humans and other forms of life given what we know about evolution and biology. Ordinarily such a position of human exceptionalism rests on religious grounds, the idea that God created humans separately from animals or that human essence lies with a soul distinct from the body which everything else lacks. So it surprises me to see someone make the case for human exceptionalism on purely secular grounds.

Originally Posted by **Rafiq**

We are made of flesh and blood? our bodies are, certainly, but you conflate the ESSENCE which automatically, by merit of actually being able to represent flesh and blood as something contingent and not a given, the ability to represent it already enables one to be disembodied from them (i.e. again, transhumanism), you conflate flesh and blood as constituting the human body with flesh and blood as constituting the human HISTORICAL essence.

But for all practical purposes, transhumanism is merely science fiction, and for the most part merely a pipe dream of libertarians and neo-fascists in Silicon Valley rather than a credible project. Perhaps in another hundred years we will have the technology to simulate human consciousness in computers and use that technology to upload the human "essence" to media besides the physical brain, but that

remains quite a remote goal for now. Of course many would question whether a digital simulation of a human mind really constitutes a human being per say, let alone the same thing as the flesh-and-blood human whose mind is being simulated.

The brain does not fucking determine anything, instead, man's subjectivity, man's social being, is facilitated and reflected in his brain. I have been over this in so much detail in so many different fucking threads, this is literally so fucking infuriating.

Here Aurorus literally just admitted that "his brain" (whatever that fucking means) was responsible for him typing the above quoted sentence. He therefore absolves responsibility and agency for doing so, because "it was my brain" that did it, "it was physical processes outside of control" that did it. Of course my brain is responsible for what I am typing. The thought processes involved in planning what to type and impulses sent to the muscles in my hands to hit the keys all rest on nerves firing in my brain. Nothing like that would even be possible without a brain capable of hosting linguistic processing, controlling limbs with fine enough motor control to type, and so forth. If the parts of my brain that processed language were damaged, I could no longer formulate sentences and therefore could no longer type. What would it even mean for my ability to type and thoughts on this whole issue to exist outside the control of my brain?

More generally, my entire sense of self and subjectivity is shaped by the fact that I fall on the autistic spectrum. And autism itself is a neurological condition resulting from the structure of my brain differing in certain critical ways from that of neurotypical people. I cannot simply will myself into no longer having autism, nor can I truly experience the world in the same way as someone without autism. That would make no more sense than a computer altering the architecture of its CPU by installing new software or something.



[Rafiq](#)

الإشترابية هي المطرقة التي نست **Supporter**

Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

Tell us, Aurorus, if you are an honest person, what do you actually hope to accomplish here? Do you ask yourself the following questions: "Did Rafiq already address precisely this in one of the links he shared for me for this explicit reason so as to avoid wasting his time with you on the matter until you're at least up to speed", or "Is it helpful for me to provoke Rafiq by making it as though I have drawn a definitive conclusion when it is clear I am simply not knowledgeable on the matter and should thus not keep playing this half-assed devil's advocate?"

"Is my disgusting, reactionary, neo-fascist filth going to get its last say on this thread? Is it possible that Rafiq will simply get tired and not respond?"

Listen to me, rodent, this appearance of simply being ignorant is not going to fly. IF you were simply ignorant on the matter, you would have taken it upon yourself to read not only the wealth of content I have provided on this website but you would at the very least incessantly be approaching the matter in a critical way instead of what amounts to demanding others hold your fucking hand. If you want to keep wasting my time, go at it, I will make sure your filth is ripped to shreds, but recognize you are exposed as not having an honest bone in your body.

You literally are trolling. Literally. That's okay, because again, you aren't going to get away with this. My word on it. It doesn't matter how fucking long this takes and you, since you have been here for so long, should recognize that I do not allow this shit to fly and it is clear that it would probably take my death before I do.

Originally Posted by **Aurorus Ruber**

But for all practical purposes, transhumanism is merely science fiction, and for the most part merely

Transhumanism is not a science fiction, it simply remains hypothetical for now - strictly speaking, because we have knowledge that the human body is contingent, and that the processes of the human body are physical ones, hypothetically speaking each and every function of the human body could be artificially replaced. The present problems and limitations are only contingent and temporary ones, but the notion that it is 'science fiction' utterly misses the fucking point: The point is that humans, so-called animals, actually do have - hypothetically speaking - the capacity to replace artificially every single aspect of their bodies, and still retain their subjectivity, and this is proven not by the fact that we have made this or that stride in the respective technological domain, it is proven simply by the fact that we can abstract our bodies from ourselves in thought, and perceive these bodies as limitations, i.e. the fact that we can imagine something as a limitation means it is contingent, and that, no matter how 'far off' the prospect of it is, the gap that separates us and it, if we have the will for it, is only a contingent and temporary gap. The fact of the matter is that you miss the entire fucking point here: The human body is contingent, to reduce the human essence to the human body fails to grasp that the fact that the body can be reducible to abstractly represented physiological processes means that the true human essence is not reducible to the body but is that irreducible element that can never be in a single snapshot be said to be reducible or owing to this or that, it is self-sufficient in the sense that it is irreducible, no matter how it RELIES on physical processes, it is IRREDUCIBLE to them.

You fail to understand that it is only here that we encounter an infinite loop. "Rafiq represents the idea of what determines Rafiq who represents the idea of what determines Rafiq who represents the idea of what determines Rafiq" and it goes on infinitely - to reduce humanity to an object of knowledge, inevitably places one in this infinite loop which actually reveals the irreducibility of humanity: "Piece of shit 'observes' humans, who is observed by another piece of shit in his observing of humans who is observed by another piece of shit of his observing of another piece of shit who is observing humans....." and it goes on infinitely.

That is because subjectivity is irreducible and the social-symbolic order moves only at the pace of its existence, and finally, subsumes every and all other domains of life. The only way around this is the idea of the extra-human god, which so graciously allows 'meager' human animals temporary access to his all-encompassing, god's eye view of the entire universe, wherein the representation of the universe actually precedes it.

The reason, above all, you incur anger Aurorus, is because you fail to perceive your limitations AS YOUR OWN limitations and not the limitations of others. The fact that you, for instance, are totally in the dark as to how it is possible that contingent and meaningless processes can give birth to something which goes on to subsume them, REVEALS YOUR OWN lack of an understanding. I shouldn't have to fucking sit here and lecture you on complex notions such as the death drive, for instance, when I have gone into great detail on the matter in various other threads. Ladies and gentlemen this is why my posts are so fucking big - because people lack the modesty to actually think critically themselves, so I have to introduce a whole wealth of ideas they are UTTERLY fucking ignorant of.

But fine. I haven't fucking complained about that. It's when they, like Aurorus, STILL INSIST, even after I have dedicated so much on the matter, ON PRETENDING LIKE ALL OF HIS 'CONCERNS' WERE NOT ALREADY ADDRESSED. This is what is so FUCKING infuriating and this is what actually reveals him to be a troll, and a righteous reactionary. He who ABSOLVES a certain domain of criticism, is a reactionary, he who INSISTS upon something without thinking about it, he who keeps a certain space free from critical thought, reveals what kind of ideologue he is. And since Aurorus keeps insisting on sacred nature, and specifically human nature, he reveals himself to be a closet Fascist, a Fascist who has not yet encountered that set of ideas that will make him go "Wow, that is actually quite reasonable and makes sense". I promise you, when people like Aurorus are exposed to the ideas of

the neo-Fascists, they will simply adopt them as "Wow, I always thought this all along, but I never was able to put it to words".

For instance if you want me to link the entirety of Zizek's "Less Than Nothing" and "Absolute Recoil", I can do this, but you fail to respect or appreciate the fact that you are dealing with ideas and notions whose rationality you are unfamiliar with.

...a pipe dream of libertarians and neo-fascists in Silicon Valley rather than a credible project...

Frankly shut the fuck up. Do not you dare talk about the neo-Fascists of Silicon Valley WHEN PATHOLOGICALLY AND IDEOLOGICALLY SPEAKING YOU ABOVE ALL EMBODY PRECISELY WHAT IS ESSENTIAL TO THIS NEO-FASCISM, to the emerging neo-feudalism, namely, the REDUCTION of the human essence to being an object of knowledge. What is ideologically essential of Silicon Valley, you embody, and so ironically you accuse Rafiq of being in that camp because he embraces what is and has always been non-essential of Silicon Valley, what we can vaguely call "Bio-Cosmism", which has its roots not in Silicon Valley but during the days of the Soviet avant-garde.

Your outrageous stupidity is that you fail to understand what is actually essential of the Silicon Ideology, and it has nothing to do with the bare OBJECTS, it has nothing to do with the bare, spiritless TECHNOLOGIES in and of themselves, but rather the fact that these tremendous strides in technological innovation, in virtual domains, from computer hardware to software, to the great globalization of virtual networks, and the list goes on, as scientific pursuits are not in and of themselves the Silicon Ideology any more than the steam engine was in and of itself INEVITABLY carrying within it eugenics proposals.

You fail to understand the point, which is the privatisation of COMMONS, of the general intellect, of advances in KNOWLEDGE (which as a rule are commons), becoming privatized. The entire point of silicon valley is that there is a difference: It's not the technologies themselves, it's the domestication and subordination of these technologies which have great revolutionary potentials into emerging relations of production and power which are sustained not by any sincere enthusiasm for technology but a mystified, ideological romantic-'individualism', various emerging ecologist superstitions (evolutionary psychology), an emerging academic racism which justifies the conditions of the precariat on the basis of "intelligence", and it goes on. The Silicon ideology mystifies such technologies and subordinates them into an increasingly fetishized and mystical universe of 'fascination' and 'mesmerization'. So in fact, as it concerns the active side, the views you espouse here, namely any and all kinds of bio-determinisms, are the characteristic hallmark of the Silicon Ideology and above all reveals the abject and pure inconsistency of reactionary trans-humanism.

All the ideologues of Silicon Valley are doing is applying into practice what you readily accept in thought, namely the reduction of man to being an object of knowledge. PRECISELY what enables these stupid motherfuckers to think they are so bold, and so revolutionary, so 'disruptive' is because of your philistine sentimentality which is somehow intimidated by it.

Make no fucking mistake, trans-humanism is an inevitability. It is arguably a process which has already begun. What is not inevitable is that this trans-humanism will be democratic, meaning, at the present pacing and rate, we will witness literally physio-biological distinctions between various sections of society, to the point where a new caste system emerges. An aristocracy which is distinguished not only by its titles and positions, but that is literally physiologically distinct. This is the anti-democratic future which awaits us. If you, like a fucking idiot, come and tell us this is all impossible, you in a sense cast your lot in with the neo-Fascists and with this precise future, not only because your ignorance disallows you from fighting it, but from the fact that the exact same superstitious sensitivity toward 'nature' which disallows you from recognizing this possibility as an immanent one, the same ideological consciousness which allows you to cast this future off into some forever evasive and non-imminent future that you don't have to in the ideological sense concern yourself with (i.e. so that, you can say "I don't actually have to respect this possibility as it pertains to the ideological, and sentimental implications to myself"

The fact of the matter, furthermore, is that there is a great possibility that reactionary trans-humanism would lead to the destruction of the human essence itself. In other words, strictly speaking

there is a possibility, and I myself admit I have not devoted enough to the matter (but still, a lot), that the 'trans-humanism' envisioned by Silicon Valley could actually lead to the permanent materialization of the process of capitalist accumulation as a machinic process that expels the historical, human essence. Of course, there are limitations to this prospect, namely, the fact that the process of capitalist accumulation is precisely dependent upon that estranged human, historical element, but the underlying point is that what Silicon Valley perceives as trans-humanism is inconsistent only for the reason that while at the same time they perceive man to be reducible to an object of knowledge, they still must presuppose a subjective space that allows them to not only abstract themselves in order to reduce 'man', but also envision the possibility that this subjective space could facilitate the transformation, materially, of 'man' himself. This is why their position is inconsistent and must be buttressed with superstition and mysticism, this is why the human, subjective essence which is a presupposition to all of it, they likely secrete into some embarrassing, erratic notion of god (Similar to how the 'dark-enlightenment' neo-Fascists speak of 'gnon').

Of course many would question whether a digital simulation of a human mind really constitutes a human being per se, let alone the same thing as the flesh-and-blood human whose mind is being simulated.

We are not speaking about a digital simulation of a human mind - artificial intelligence in this sense is not possible, because such a digital simulation will always be bound by the limitations of human knowledge. This is another highpoint of ideology in Silicon Valley, the notion that artificial intelligence can be created without producing that active element which makes artificial intelligence in the first place, namely, human subjectivity. They will never succeed in that endeavour. What I claim with regard to trans-humanism is far more radical, it is not simply the replication of humans by means of machines, but more specifically the replacement of the human body including the brain. The fact of the matter is that creating a robot which adapts and adjusts itself to the circumstances and conditions of human society will never be human, because it will lack that historical element which shapes such a society in the first place and furthermore allows its aufhebung.

But strictly speaking, just for the sake of it, no, hypothetically if someone were to 'die' and re-emerge with their 'consciousness uploaded' in a machine, they would be just as 'human' and 'alive' as they would be going to sleep in the night and waking up in the morning. As we Communists understand, as Marxists, in this sense humans are always in the process of dying and re-emerging, there is no static, 'pure' human who is simply enough as a human body, humans are always actively constituted by their immersion into the symbolic order, by their active historical essence, by their active SOCIAL RELATIONS which constitute them.

Let us for instance imagine that a replica of one's body and one's brain, experiences, etc. was created. And let us imagine that as soon as this body 'turns on', and when it does, it will think it is you, it will be exactly like you and have all the memories and experiences that you do, as soon as this body turns on, you die. Strictly speaking there is absolutely no difference between this, and going to bed at night and waking up in the morning. The fundamental experience of 'you' as uniquely you, as confined to your body, is an illusion. Your death and the re-emergence of a physiologically identical subject, would be just as different as the split second in time that you are immersed in, if the transition was seamless, there would be no difference, it is not that magically you would experience this other person's body, but that the fundamental experience of 'you' and 'experiencing' in the first place is irreducible to your body. Now, say you were to create a clone of yourself that was the same, as, being exactly as yourself. But this time, you do not die. Automatically we would be dealing with two different subjects by merit of the fact that they are occupying different spaces in time, and therefore, possessing subjectively and objectively different positions in the social totality and symbolic order as separate subjects.

Of course my brain is responsible for what I am typing. The thought processes involved in planning what to type and impulses sent to the muscles in my hands to hit the keys all rest on nerves firing in my brain. Nothing like that would even be possible without a brain capable of hosting linguistic processing, controlling limbs with fine enough motor control to type, and so forth.

Idiot, explain to me what you hope to accomplish when you say this shit. Are you literally saying "Rafiq has never addressed this or thought about it?" If you don't think that holds true, why actually

materialize your stupidity into a definitive conclusion about "the brain being responsible for you", why not actually just PM me with a question or a concern about the matter instead of degrading and polluting the forum with your filth.

But that's the thing, I don't buy the fact that you are simply ignorant. You are an ideological partisan, knowingly or not, of the growing neo-Fascism, you are a reactionary philistine whose positions harbor a deep seated sentimental place in your heart. You REFUSE to know, it is not just that you do not know, but that you actively, righteously insist - ideologically - on not knowing.

The fact of the matter is that you yet again fail to distinguish relying on processes as a precondition for being the basis of subjectivity, and THE CAUSATION of subjectivity itself. You miss the FUCKING POINT ENTIRELY AND AT THIS POINT I LITERALLY JUST WANT TO BLOW MY FUCKING BRAINS OUT. How fucking HARD IS IT FOR YOU TO UNDERSTAND THAT JUST BECAUSE SUBJECTIVITY IS FACILITATED AND HAS ITS BASIS IN PHYSICAL PROCESSES DOES NOT MEAN IT IS REDUCIBLE TO THEM? Do you not FUCKING understand this you abject FUCKING idiot? After I have gone into great detail explaining this?

Let me ask you a basic, stupid fucking question. If you were 100% aware of every and all processes in your brain as they allegedly 'determine' your actions, COULD YOU CHANGE YOUR ACTIONS? The fact is, this fundamental gap between awareness of physiological processes which are at the foundation of your ability to be aware, and your awareness itself, represents the fact that your subjectivity which enables you consciousness is IRREDUCIBLE TO THOSE PHYSIOLOGICAL PROCESSES, even though it emerged in a primordial sense through them. The social subsumes the biological, the biological subsumes the chemical, the chemical subsumes the atomic, and none are reducible to the preceding orders of being.

Your brain does not determine your actions, it facilitates and registers them. The active space and domain that concerns human will, consciousness and actions, is what we call the symbolic order, or its entanglement with the imaginary and the real, it is what we call the social-symbolic order. This is fundamentally irreducible, it is self-sufficient in the sense that it is its own active space of determination, i.e. for instance, THERE IS HISTORY. nothing FUCKING changed physiologically in the brain (which would be genetic) that was responsible for historical changes. The genetic coding for the brain, has remained constant for several tens of thousands of years. And yet what we call the fundamental human essence, history, etc. has not.

Are you literally a fucking idiot? Listen to me, listen to me very carefully, ARE YOU TRYING TO FUCKING TELL ME THAT "YOUR BRAIN" LITERALLY MADE YOU, FORCED YOU, TO TYPE OUT THE ABOVE QUOTED SENTENCE, IS THAT WHAT YOU ARE TRYING TO FUCKING TELL ME? So tell me this, do you admit to not being a rational being, do you admit to not having any control whatsoever of your bodily motions, do you ADMIT in other words that we should treat you like a fucking animal, who has no agency or control over his actions? Why should anyone fucking take you seriously then, you idiot? Do you understand the abjectly stupid fucking implications of claiming the brain literally DETERMINES you? Are you saying my brain 'determined' the me to type out the following sequence: 12904983209482349824? Are you saying my brain 'determined' me to type out that I wanted to illustrate the example of how the brain is forcing me to type that sequence, and it goes on, you dolt? You fucking idiot? If that is true, WHY?

That you do not recognize the utterly absurd implications of your argument is literally mind-boggling. Are you literally fucking stupid? Is that it?

What would it even mean for my ability to type and thoughts on this whole issue to exist outside the control of my brain?

It would mean your subjectivity would have a new physiological basis which could take over the processes in the brain which previously served as that foundation.

More generally, my entire sense of self and subjectivity is shaped by the fact that I fall on the autistic spectrum.

Your actual subjectivity in the sense of what is 'determining it' has nothing to fucking do with the fact that you fall into the 'autistic spectrum', for the basic reason that the implications of falling on the autistic spectrum in ancient Egypt are fundamentally different. Your subjectivity, your human essence, would be entirely different, because when we speak of subjectivity we are precisely speaking and dealing with that irreducible space which allows you to abstract yourself from your autism and, take a distance from it JUST BY THE FACT that you are differentiating it with a word. You fail to understand and miss the entire point. No one fucking claims the brain does not serve any function, the point is that to claim people are reducible to the brain is fucking idiotic - the brain in relation to the subject provides them the foundation of being a wailing and screaming fucking infant, which no other animal is born as. I went over what this means and why in so many linked previous threads, but this fucking idiot wants to continue to waste my time and deter me from my more important work.

The fact of the matter is that the structuring of the brain so that it can be said to be 'autistic' is absolutely fucking meaningless, it only becomes meaningful insofar as we understand its implications in relation to the symbolic order. In other words the implications of what it means to be autistic, and therefore the experience of being autistic, is not grounded in the neurological differences which give rise to autism at birth, but to the autistic subject's specific immersion in the symbolic order. Frankly the causes of autism are ambiguous and it is still debated whether or not those causes are 'genetic'. Because my knowledge does not extend beyond recognition that it is a controversy, for the sake of playing the devil's advocate, let's say there is a gene which leads to the structure of the brain in this or that way which can be said to be autistic. This alone is not enough to account for the actual experience, the human experience, of being autistic, and that is my point.

This is what you fail to understand.

But besides, the bare truth is the fact is that the word 'autism' is loosely defined and almost a manufactured word. The so-called autistic spectrum, is not a scientific notion, call it what you not, but what it is not is scientific. It is a loose term used to refer to a wide range of different 'behaviors', many of which don't actually exist in the context of what used to have been documented as something which affects .02% of people, but exist in an entirely different context for the subject. The word is almost devoid of meaning today, as it is used.

I cannot simply will myself into no longer having autism, nor can I truly experience the world in the same way as someone without autism.

And? It makes no difference that someone can't also will themselves into not having dyslexia. You fail to understand that subjectivity, or the fundamental human experience is not different at this level. What is different is purely contingent. Of course the experience is different, just as the experience of a person with no legs is different. But the fact that there is a separation between enunciating and representing that one is autistic, or that one has no legs, or that one is dyslexic, means that we are dealing with a subjectivity abstracted from that, to the point where as it concerns the Other, we could say "If Rafiq had no legs, or if Rafiq was autistic, he would be this or that way" - but HE, 'rafiq', endures and remains as a subject.

That would make no more sense than a computer altering the architecture of its CPU by installing new software or something.

This is exactly what Marx was speaking about, i.e. as it concerns the estrangement of the human essence into the actual objects of human labor, which serve as alien, foreign powers which go to determine the expression of this essence itself, this basic functioning superstition. You fucking idiot, you fail to understand that computers are the products of man's creative powers, to reduce the brain to being a "CPU" and subjectivity to being software in trying to explain or understand the human essence is literally the highpoint of irony.



[Rafiq](#)

Supporter
Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

Originally Posted by **Aurorus Ruber**

For what it's worth, I am not trying to provoke you or cause trouble and I apologize if I am irritating you. I am just genuinely surprised

No, that is exactly what you are fucking doing. Ladies and gentlemen, do you want to know why my text is taking so long? This is one of the reasons, because time and time again on Revleft some fucking idiot wants to waste my time, and when it is all over and done I need a day or two to get back on track from where I was. Thank Aurorus for it. All day yesterday, and all day today, I have put absolutely no time into the text. It is literally just sitting there. I can't get back to it until this SHIT is dealt with. Everyone who is waiting, thank Aurorus, thank him for the fact that all day today for when I was going to be able to, Saturday morning to Saturday afternoon, I will not be able to dedicate a single word to the upcoming text. Thank Aurorus. Thank him for the fact that it is likely that this will go on for the next week or so, because he won't just shut the fuck up.

So sick of these special fucking snowflakes. YOU ARE NOT UNIQUE. WE HAVE BEEN OVER THIS BEFORE, SO MANY FUCKING TIMES, WITH SO MANY DIFFERENT USERS WHO SAID THE EXACT SAME SHIT AS YOU DID. Meanwhile a text which actually is going to be unique, is prolonged, because this fucking idiot wants to repeat and re-hash fossilized controversies on Revleft, out of pure intellectual laziness alone.

If you are surprised, that is YOUR problem, that is something YOU need to work out. Stop fucking playing this game of 'testing the waters' and playing the devil's advocate. If you are innocent like you say you are, shut the fuck up and expend your time learning instead of wasting mine.

IF you are so surprised and simply curious, you would have taken it upon yourself to take the time to actually read the tens of thousands of words I have dedicated to the matter on this website, a fraction of which I have freely taken the time to link to you. If this was actually a matter of you being an innocent little lamb who is unfamiliar with notions that are quite basic to contemporary Marxism, then you would have tried to overcome your limitations instead of continually waste my time with SHIT that has already been covered and which belongs to the dustbin of this fucking website.

The naivety is literally an overload of stupidity and I cannot fucking have it. When I read the SHIT he says, as always, these small, naive fucking declarations, we are literally dealing with a perfect troll, someone who makes my FUCKING head about to explode in ten thousand different FUCKING ways. I cannot even begin to put into words, I can literally dedicated hundreds of thousands of words ripping apart in every single fucking way what you say.

But not so for Aurorus, this disgusting philistine scum, who doesn't have to put any actual real energy or commitment to what he says, he merely SHITS OUT pop-science platitudes casually like a philistine, like a big fucking destructive baby who effortlessly wrecks havoc on his poor parents who have to spend hours and hours cleaning the fucking mess. Fuck my fucking life, someone please just shoot me, fuck my fucking life that this thread isn't already dead and that I will likely have to spend more weeks on it, DELAYING MY ALREADY DELAYED FUCKING text, which I have dedicated my whole heart and soul to, because I have to hold these fuckers hands.

Literally a waste of fucking time. We have been over this so, so many fucking times on the thread. All of it is archived for everyone to see and read. And these philistines come here like they are special

snowflakes, each and every one of them is so fucking intellectually lazy that they literally individually need and want someone to beat them into thinking critically, i.e. they need someone to FORCE them to think.

"I don't care how often you dedicated thousands of words to this exact fucking topic, and I don't care how many times and how many different ways. Even though I am just repeating THE SAME FUCKING SHIT. The fact that it is ME, a special snowflake, repeating it, means it is somehow different. I don't want to go out of my way to actually fucking read, I want to make groundless fucking assertions about topics I admit to being totally fucking ignorant on, and retain my stupidity until someone challenges it."

Aurorus Ruber

Junior Revolutionary

Join Date Feb 2005
Location Greater St Louis
Posts 206

Why not just ignore me if you have all these other more pressing matters? Nobody is forcing you to post here against your will. You could easily leave the forum and dedicate as much time as you like to your other project.



Rafiq

Supporter
Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

No, because insofar as I am on this forum, I have a duty to make sure any and all kinds of essentialist filth does not pollute it. In addition, I have what is virtually an unconditional duty to defend every single thing I actually take the time to post, as a condition of justifying posting it in the first place.

You fail to understand that I do not dick around. If I am not certain that what is wrought from my head is not within the context of absolute knowledge, which does not simply mean absolute certainty but means that it can hold itself to the highest standards of the controversies of thought, I will keep my fucking mouth shut. Unless the limitations of something I post, I recognize are the absolute limitations of universal thinking, I will not dare post something. That is the method of ruthless criticism.

if I go out of my way to actually post something, it is because god forbid I have actually anticipated any and all 'oppositions' to it. Anyone familiar with my history here knows that I have a lot to show for it.

So, if it is my duty, the ethical thing would be to shut up and accept it, no?

But not so. God forbid I actually recognize that others have agency, that others do not HAVE to waste my time like this. God forbid it. So yes, I do have to post, if someone goes out of their fucking way to respond to my posts (which are barely made for the purpose of 'debating' but are made, at the outset, just like the initial post I made in this thread, to be informative), then I have a duty and an obligation

to respond to it, otherwise the initial post is unjustified. It is a question of duty and obligation, as a Communist, and the role I have taken up on this forum as one, on this meager online forum.

You choose to open up pandoras box and shift attention on very complex and broad topics because like all philistines you don't actually respect their depth. You shrug your shoulders, "Meh, whatever, I read it on Nat-geo once". More and more examples of the emergence of the 'expert' master, the community of 'scientific experts' which literally take up the role of thinking for others at this point, to where they don't have to bother with the depth of such a complex issue and can just flail their fucking arms around and let the master do the thinking for them. The 'expert' today possesses the same legitimacy, reverence as the clergyman, the 'expert' today is to the tech-aristocrat, what the clergymen was to the landed aristocrat. Exactly a phenomena that goes hand in hand with the emergent Silicon feudalism.

And if you want to play this game, where, one should not hold you to any human standard, then by all means. My only point is that any pretense to sincerity or honesty on your part is 100% bullshit and that any abuse leveled to you on my part is perfectly justified. That is my point.

You play this game of being innocent, so I hold you to the ethical standard that you should stop posting, or at least, read before you post, actually take into consideration that I may have already addressed what you are about to post before you post it. If you want to play this game where you admit you are irredeemable, we can play it, but drop the pretense to honesty or innocence.

[GLF](#)

Banned **Supporter**

Join Date Oct 2014
Location USA unfortunately
Posts 303

You talk about ruthless self-criticism, Rafiq, but who made you the judge? Just because someone isn't buying into your bullshit doesn't mean they aren't subjecting themselves and their views to criticism. It just means we think you're full of shit and overcomplicate things for no fucking reason. You don't hold a monopoly on objectivity. And just because someone believes that your ideas are fucking retarded doesn't mean we are bad communists. Perhaps you should do a little bit of self-criticism and see just why your views have nothing to do with actual communism.

Mankind will never be gods. We will never ascend into any sort technocratic collective or whatever the fuck it is that you have in mind. All of your ideas are fucking retarded and have absolutely nothing to do with Marxism, communism, or working class liberation in general. It's all just a bunch of abstruse and abstract science fiction mumbo jumbo masquerading as philosophy. It is worthless. Totally fucking worthless. People are starving right now, Mr. Marxist. Snap the fuck out of your delusions.

Aurorus Ruber

Junior Revolutionary

Join Date Feb 2005
Location Greater St Louis
Posts 206

Since much of this discussion rests on the definition of humanity, Rafiq, perhaps you could clarify some things regarding your positions. First, perhaps you could define some of the terms you keep using. What do you mean by terms like "symbolic order" and "subjectivity" exactly?

Second, where exactly do you draw the line between humans in the sense you use the term and our prehuman ancestors? Would you consider say, Homo erectus or the Neanderthals human, or does only

Homo sapiens sapiens qualify as human? When exactly did the first human come into existence and how would their lives have worked when no other human beings existed yet?

Third, you seem to draw a sharp distinction between the brain and its activities as a biological organ and the human mind. How would you describe the relationship between the brain and the mind? How much independence does the mind have from the brain? Would you characterize your position as dualist and if so, how do you reconcile that with the materialism inherent to Marxist thought?



Rafiq

Supporter
Admin

Join Date Aug 2010
Location Detroit, Michigan.
Posts 8,258

[Editor's note: 'Location C' is also the name of user 'GLF'. It was changed from Location C to GLF for whatever requested reason.]

Location C, answer me, are you a masochist? Do you enjoy being utterly fucking ripped apart, do you enjoy being humiliated and having the materialized expression of your thinking, and therefore yourself, utterly fucking torn apart and crushed under the rubble of another?

You fucked up bad. Fucking idiot, you had a free pass out of this discussion, and you came back begging for more, after you were already fucked up bad. You enjoy this? Good. Well, I literally can do this for the rest of my life. You are not going to get your last say. I don't give a fuck if it takes ten years to prove it. I will literally keep at this until it is literally not possible for me to, whether that is me being banned or me having no access to a computer. Enjoy your new life of constantly being utterly fucked up by a stranger on the internet. You want to waste my time like this, you fucking rodent? Fine, let's play this game. Enjoy your new life. I will make it so every fucking time you log onto this website all you are reminded of is how badly you fucked up.

Originally Posted by **Location C**

You talk about ruthless self-criticism, Rafiq, but who made you the judge?

Actually you fucking idiot, you would only have to begin, in answering this question, by asking - how and why did Rafiq arrive at the conclusions that he did? Did he do so arbitrarily, if so, what reason do I have to believe that he arrived at the positions he did arbitrarily? You FUCKING idiot, it is only out of ruthless self-criticism that the strange thing you identify as "Rafiq" came into being. I exist, as Rafiq, only as the product of ruthless self-criticism of holding EACH AND EVERY SINGLE position I possess and espouse to their contingent conditions of existence. And I have much to show for it.

Of course, you couldn't actually begin this way, because that would presuppose actually trying to and taking it upon yourself to, god forbid, TRYING TO UNDERSTAND MY POSITIONS. You do not fucking do this. You UNCRITICALLY dismiss them BASELESSLY, for no FUCKING reason outside of the fact that for the two seconds you dedicate to reading my posts, you automatically assume what is your own fucking stupidity to be immanent to my post. Instead of humbling yourself to recognizing the possibility that maybe, just maybe, you simply don't get it and have a lot of learning to do, you baselessly start shit-talking. Listen to me you stupid fuck, the only 'criticism' you are expecting here is the 'criticism of criticism' itself, which doesn't take the form of recognizing the conscious use of reason as of course contingent (but just as potent), for you the "criticism of criticism" itself refers to the fact

that you take it that I have not uncritically prostrated myself to your god, and that furthermore I have not 'proven' that this is permissible, to be a lack of criticism. You object STUPID fuck.

Just because someone isn't buying into your bullshit doesn't mean they aren't subjecting themselves and their views to criticism. It just means we think you're full of shit and overcomplicate things for no fucking reason.

So let us evaluate Location C's careful and sophisticated use of reason. According to Location C, just because someone does not 'buy into what I am saying', presumably just for the sake of the fact that it is because I have said it, this doesn't automatically mean they aren't subjecting themselves or their views to criticism. My god! Fuck, you know what, Location C, you are right. This entire thread, instead of actually positing arguments, instead of actually providing a wealth of resources on my detailed and expounded upon positions, I literally just said

"Because I am Rafiq and because you do not agree with my position, which I have qualified only insofar as they are mine, you are not subjecting yourself or your views to criticism".

You got it! Spot on pal!

Ladies and gentlemen, THAT IS LITERALLY Location C's mind, that is literally what he is telling himself. He actually, literally thinks, after having typed that, that he successfully conveyed this message and demonstrated the fact that "Just because someone does not agree with Rafiq does not mean they are wrong". The fact of the matter, meanwhile, is that MY ASSERTION THAT YOU MOTHERFUCKERS ARE DELIBERATELY AVOIDING NOT ONLY THINKING CRITICALLY ABOUT YOUR POSITIONS BUT EVEN AVOIDING THE CONSCIOUS USE OF REASON HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH THE FACT THAT YOU ARE "DISAGREEING" WITH MY POSTS JUST BECAUSE THEY ARE MINE, BUT BECAUSE THE EXPRESSION OF YOUR FUCKING DISAGREEMENT LITERALLY DOES NOT EXTEND BEYOND A RIGHTEOUS INSISTENCE UPON LITERALLY WHAT IS FUCKING, IN EVERY MEANINGFUL SENSE OF THE WORD, IGNORANCE. You STUPID motherfucker, I didn't say that you were devoid of self-criticism just because you disagreed with my posts, I said you were FUCKING DEVOID OF SELF-CRITICISM BECAUSE YOU ARE LITERALLY AVOIDING SUBJECTING YOUR UNCRITICALLY HELD SENSITIVITIES TO THE CONSCIOUS USE OF REASON AND THEREFORE TO CRITICISM. And you PROVE IT BECAUSE YOU CONTINUALLY IGNORE PRECISELY WHAT IS INCIDENTALLY MY OWN POSTS WHICH DO EXACTLY THIS. You stupid, shit-eating FUCK.

Instead, what we have consistently been dealing with, including in this very post, is a recurring ASS COVERING WHEREIN ONE LITERALLY ARGUES IN ORDER TO AVOID THIS. And to add insult to injury YOU STUPID MOTHERFUCKER, on top of all of this, as it concerns the relevant pace of this thread, the specific accusation of a lack of criticism leveled against Aurorus is that, LITERALLY THE EXACT SAME FUCKING ARGUMENTS HE IS EMPLOYING WERE ALREADY PREVIOUSLY ADDRESSED.

I DID NOT SAY, you fucking PEST, you fucking RODENT, you FUCKING PIECE OF SHIT, that you have to agree with my positions or my arguments for the sake of it, BUT THAT BEFORE YOU GO TO FUCKING POSTING SHIT THAT WAS ALREADY ADDRESSED BY THEM, YOU NEED TO AT THE VERY LEAST OWN UP TO MY ARGUMENTS AND RECOGNIZE THAT THEY, GOD FORBID, EXIST YOU STUPID MOTHERFUCKER, and that the organization of text and letters, and words, into sentences ACTUALLY IS DONE WITH THE EXPRESS INTENT TO CONVEY MEANING, WHETHER YOU ARE CAPABLE OF UNDERSTANDING IT OR NOT.

IF YOU DO NOT UNDERSTAND THEM, THEN WHY PRETEND LIKE YOU IN FACT DO UNDERSTAND THEM AND RESPOND TO THEM ACCORDING TO WHAT YOU ADMIT IS AT THE LEAST A LIMITED UNDERSTANDING YOU WORTHLESS FUCK?

What that means you FUCKING IDIOT is that if you want to reject or deny my positions, if you want to oppose them, THAT ACTUALLY REQUIRES THE EFFORT OF UNDERSTANDING THEM. If you FUCKING want to say my positions are BULLSHIT, that first requires that you can FULLY UNDERSTAND THEM and actually PROVE they are FUCKING bullshit by the conscious use of reason, if you cannot EXPLICITLY and THOROUGHLY justify your opposition to my post, at the very least YOU SHUT YOUR FUCKING MOUTH AND DON'T PRETEND LIKE YOU HAVE ARRIVED AT A DEFINITIVE REASON AS TO

WHY YOU OPPOSE THEM, because the REASONS as they were expressed, as they have been expressed YOU FUCKING IDIOT, were already ADDRESSED. You STUPID FUCK.

And just because someone believes that your ideas are fucking retarded doesn't mean we are bad communists.

No, it doesn't mean they are bad communists, you fucking idiot, it means they are not communists in any meaningful or relevant sense of the word at all, because an actual communist, whether they agreed with what I say or not, would recognize that god forbid these are controversies OF AND FOR communists and therefore would, by merit of their actual commitment and dedication as communists, be able to consistently and thoroughly decipher just what about my posts is wrong, in relation to the cause of Communism. The fact of the matter is that you are not a communist, you are a shit-talking fuck whose 'communism' is accurately represented by his user profile picture, something that is recognized as just another 'opinion' or 'political position' among various others on an equally recognized 'political spectrum', what you identify with 'communism' is CONSISTENTLY and cynically recognized to be a 'meager' opinion subsumed by what is the god's eye view of truth, the recognition of the 'limitations' of the 'meager opinions of humans' in favor of so-called objectivity.

My 'ideas' are 'fucking retarded'? Except you have nothing to show for that you shit talking little rat, do you, because you basically admit that you have no notion of 'my ideas' or you lack any understanding of 'my' (as though these are uniquely 'my' ideas and not the ideas consistent throughout the tradition of Marxism) ideas. You stupid fuck. You glim over something which shakes you to your core, as a bourgeois ideologue, and you represent your revulsion with left-sounding phraseology. Stupid fuck calls things 'retarded' and can't even enunciate properly why that is, consistently and thoroughly.

Mankind will never be gods. We will never ascend into any sort technocratic collective or whatever the fuck it is that you have in mind.

Mankind will never be gods, you fucking idiot, because in the relevant sense of the word men are already gods, you stupid FUCK. All god is, if you understand Marxism little kid, is the identified and represented estrangement of the universal essence of man. In saying 'mankind will never be gods', you basically admit that you believe in god(s), you believe in something which mankind purportedly will never be able to be.

So much FUCKING stupidity it is almost beyond representation, of the sheer DEPTHS of fucking STUPIDITY here. It is literally, literally fucking SHOCKING, how much utter, and especially SHAMELESS, RIGHTEOUS stupidity is demonstrated in this post. My head is LITERALLY about to FUCKING explode, FUCK my life that I have to deal with this STUPID shit now. FUCK my FUCKING life that I have to lower myself to this FUCKING stupidity, to this casual philistinism, to this attitude of "Bro, who cares about that whatever the fuck thing you are talking about". YOU FUCKING IDIOT, DO YOU NOT UNDERSTAND THAT ALL YOU DO IN THE PROCESS OF SAYING THINGS LIKE "whatever the fuck it is that you have in mind", ALL YOU DO IS ADMIT THE SHEER DEPTH OF YOUR OWN FUCKING STUPIDITY, YOU FUCKING MORON? DO YOU NOT FUCKING UNDERSTAND HOW ABJECTLY SELF-INCRIMINATING SHIT LIKE THIS IS, DO YOU NOT FUCKING UNDERSTAND THAT ALL YOU ARE DOING IS BASICALLY PUTTING UP A SIGN NEXT TO YOUR USERNAME AND SAYING "I AM A FUCKING IDIOT AND I AM PROUD?"

You claim mankind will never be gods, and yet what does it FUCKING say about you that you identify uniquely with gods, the unleashing of the unbridled abilities of what is mankind alone you FUCKING idiot? It reveals that deep down, you in fact reserve a sacred space for god, it reveals that deep down you still believe in one, and you have the fucking gall to come and talk about Marxism you stupid SHIT? Do you not FUCKING understand, you stupid FUCK, that YOU TALK STRAIGHT OUT OF YOUR FUCKING ASS when you claim that "mankind will never be gods", that none of what I say will ever be empirically possible, even though for all intended purposes the only thing that would enable you to claim that it is empirically impossible for what I say to be possible, is if there is something which is empirically non-existent to necessitate its impossibility?

You piece of fucking garbage, you talk about "we will never do this or that", offer NO FUCKING JUSTIFICATION WHATSOEVER OR NO ELABORATION OF JUST WHY THAT IS, you FUCKING idiot, JUST AFTER HAVING CLAIMED THAT IT IS IN FACT I WHO IS LACKING OF HOLDING HIS POSITIONS TO CRITICISM. You literally think your 'argument' is fucking SELF-EVIDENT just because in this superficial sense you find certain ideas abnormal or strange, you assume it is fucking A GIVEN, you FUCKING idiot, just after having argued that you are perfectly capable of self-criticism, in other words, you COMPLETELY AND DELIBERATELY AVOID CRITICALLY FUCKING THINKING ABOUT WHY IT IS THAT "We will never do this or that" BEYOND RELYING ON YOUR PHILISTINE SENSIBILITIES WHICH YOU TAKE AS SELF-EVIDENTLY INEVITABLE, literally, that these FUCKING sensibilities for you exist, in your mind, is enough to justify them.

This is because you are a reactionary ideologue who for whatever fucking arbitrary reason decided to one day start calling himself a Communist. Nowadays any stupid FUCK can identify with our tradition and get away with thinking they have actually grasped what is essential to it, by identifying with a few platitudes alone:

All of your ideas are fucking retarded and have absolutely nothing to do with Marxism, communism, or working class liberation in general.

That is because, child, your notion of these phrases and words does not extend beyond platitudes which do not go beyond enabling the cosmetic identity of calling oneself a Marxist, a Communist, or someone who is concerned with the superficial and utterly fucking meaningless notion of "working class liberation in general", which can at the present state of the left actually mean just about whatever the fuck anyone wants it to mean.

You secretly and fully accept the arbitrary nature of so-called 'Marxism' and 'Communism' as 'just opinions' and feel quite comfortable accepting that. That is why you are so put off by the prospect of actually owning up to the highest controversies of thought as they exist, secretly, you do not actually take 'Marxism, Communism' seriously, your acquaintance with the works of this tradition is superficial and again is situated neatly to a notion of a 'political spectrum' you share with Fascists. What you are afraid of is the universality of human practice being subject to critique, precisely this universality which you comfortably take as a given, so that anyone who actually does take this seriously, literally terrifies you to the core of your being.

"Bro, don't you get that none of this is serious? Honestly shut up, just stop with that mumbo jumbo. Don't you get that this is just pretend? Are you literally stupid? Do you not understand that?". No, kiddo, I fully understand that game. And I have thus far lived for the intent purpose of smashing and exposing those pseudo-leftists who are immersed in it.

It's all just a bunch of abstruse and abstract science fiction mumbo jumbo masquerading as philosophy. It is worthless. Totally fucking worthless.

It is totally fucking worthless for the bourgeois ideologues, but listen you fucking rat, Rafiq is well-aware of that and it is actually immanent to the posts themselves, namely, that they are not made for bourgeois and reactionary ideologues such as yourself but actual committed and dedicated Communists. It is not even worth saying anymore the essence of this anglo-empiricist philistine trash, every fucking idiot who keeps up with this forum should already know it. This disgusting, righteous philistinism, this blatant IRRATIONALISM, this blatant and shameless DENIAL of the use of reason. Literally I am about to FUCKING vomit.

Already attempting to justify why it is worthless, you fucking idiot, you who have just gotten done arguing about how Rafiq's accusations are baseless, already requires an immersion precisely into this 'worthless' 'over-intellectualizing', and we can't have that, now can we. So we literally have someone who wants to deny THINKING, uncritically, and we are to accept that thinking and critical thought is 'worthless' (already by a standard of worth he does not even want to think about as not a given) for the sole reason that this stupid motherfucker said so. How's that for us, ladies and gentlemen. This is the SHIT I have to fucking deal with. This highpoint of FUCKING stupidity.

If you have been trolling, congratulations, you have been successful. I do not fucking think I have seen something so stupid on this fucking forum as this post for the entire summer. And that is even counting the recent Spart trash.

People are starving right now, Mr. Marxist. Snap the fuck out of your delusions.

And now, we arrive at the high-point of ideological stupidity. You take the fact that "people are starving" a tragedy so great you purport the big Other, or god himself recognizes, and use this to avoid a confrontation with the actual hard questions in the first place, namely, the ones that form the very foundation of what it means to fight against the world which produces starvation, and the spiritual relevance of starvation in the first place, which for Location C as well as every other fucking hollywood liberal, does not extend beyond making themselves feel good about saving the endangered human species', the humans whom they deny solidarity and actual humanity, whom they reduce to the level of animals and reduce their suffering to matters of charity. You fucking idiot, indeed, people are starving. But all proletarians, whether they know it or not, are starving in an even deeper way. They starve not only for a lack of food, they starve for the blood of the philistines like Location C, they starve for divine vengeance against the bourgeois ideologues and the apologists of the existing order, those who attempt to disarm and deny a ruthless criticism of it. You fucking idiot, indeed people are starving, and their starvation occurs within the context of the present and prevailing universality of human practice. Until you have owned yourself up to the entirety of the thinking side to this universality of human practice when you are clearly enabled to, until you have actually conquered the domain of thought in the first place to be able to posit it as a limitation to real, empirical practice, we know your crocodile tears for what they are, they exist to prolong and distract individuals from answering and owning up to the real, hard, and essential questions, to owning up to a confrontation to them.

The fact of the matter is that in the process of shedding fake tears for the suffering of the damned of the Earth, you do so with the deliberate intent of avoiding confrontation with the actual primordial suffering of the universal proletarian subject. You fucking crocodile, you fail to confront the abyss of nothingness, of being shed of all sacreds, being reduced to nothing but that human essence itself, you fail to confront that it is only this which breathes horror into the phenomena of starvation, and any crocodile tears shed over the suffering of others, over starvation, is done in the same vein as tears shed for animals. You disgusting piece of shit, you think this is a fucking feel-good charity, do you? You talk about others starving, you fucking idiot, and yourself? For you, the alleviation of the starvation of others would absolve you your guilt and would allow you to go on with your illusions, with your superstitions, with your god, your nature, your philistine sensitivities which the starvation of others is an ugly intrusion upon.

Out of the very same philistine sensitivities which makes you find horror in the destruction of sacred nature, you find horror in starvation. BUT YOU FAIL TO UNDERSTAND THAT THE POINT OF COMMUNISM AND PROLETARIAN CONSCIOUSNESS IS PRECISELY THE ASSUMPTION OF THIS SO-CALLED INCONSISTENCY (BETWEEN THE 'GOOD' AND 'BAD' ASPECTS OF LIFE) AS REVEALING THE UNIVERSALITY OF THE ENTIRE CAPITALIST ORDER. The ENTIRE POINT IS THAT, rather than being an inconsistency, rather than the fact that people starving being some ugly inconsistency in the otherwise beautiful, harmonious, sacred world, THIS IS PRECISELY what is IMMANENT to that 'beautiful, harmonious, sacred world', it is precisely what is immanent to the EXACT SAME UNIVERSE of nice families, of beautiful nature, of sacred god and religion. They reveal its primordial deadlock it's failure. Not because this beautiful, harmonious world is too incomplete, but that this beautiful world is in and of itself the failure.

You fucking IDIOT. You are no different from the guilty capitalist who throws money to charities. You fail to understand that you cannot have ONE WITHOUT THE OTHER, you cannot have your cake and eat it too, you cannot have your beautiful sacred nature without those ugly horrors which intrude upon your harmonious, beautiful world.

It is fucking easy to assume that because god himself agrees that it is a tragedy that people are starving, then no meager human thought is necessary to understand in its entirety the full implications and meaning of the various horrors of today. And yet in doing so all one does is expose their reliance upon their faith in this SAME VERY GOD of the existing order which this starving exists in

the context of. This cheap, pseudo-moralist, thoughtless and utterly fucking in-genuine call to action, IS UTTERLY FUCKING TRANSPARENT to any IDIOT. Stupid FUCK, if it actually deeply moved you that people were starving, if you actually were fully able to understand the full and complete nature of this horror, you would recognize this as what you presently dismiss to be 'delusions', you stupid fuck. Do you fucking understand what it means to be a Marxist, you stupid SHIT? Do you FUCKING know what Lenin did when the first world war broke out, when such a horror broke out? He retreated into a cave and read Hegel. The great Marxists only emerged into 'doing da real tings' AFTER they had gotten their shit straight spiritually and in thought, not before. You do neither. You think people weren't fucking starving when Marx and Engels were writing you fucking idiot? You think people weren't starving when Marx wrote kapital, books that are full of far more complex, 'abstract', 'mumbo jumbo' than any of the posts I have contributed here? You stupid FUCK?

You disgusting fucking rodent. You disguise your own confrontation with your own bourgeois sensitivities, the same kinds which reproduce the conditions wherein meager humans are left in the dirt to starve, with a pretense to being fully engaged in 'da real world' and controversies which can uncritically be accepted to be the controversies of 'the real world'. You avoid confrontation with the essence of this 'real world', under the guise of actually being in the process of changing it. You pathetic fucking shit. You scum of scum, you piece of shit, who uses the suffering of others to justify reproducing it in thought. The injunction TO DO, to go out and DO, to, "my god, forget about all that bullshit, people are starving", is precisely the mechanism used so that precisely THE ACTUAL FOUNDATION and BASIS, both worldly and spiritually, of starvation, remains untouched, so that the meager limitations of Location C in his approach to solving world hunger, which basically amounts to "wait 4 da revolution 2 happen den pat urself on da back when it does", this fucking idiot who absolves taking responsibility for his UNIQUELY INTELLECTUAL positions by purporting them to have some kind of grounding in 'da concrete real world', in something else, in a non-existent worker's movement, perhaps, are accepted as the absolute limitations. The fact of the matter is that you are SCARED SHITLESS of the actual prospect of the overthrow of the existing order, and this is literally evident by the fact that you admit it.

Again, I have said it before and I will say it again. Forget about any of that bullshit about talking about "classless, moneyless societies", about talking about "da workers" and all that weightless BULLSHIT. You want to tell if someone is a Communist, if someone is for real, and actually is ready to put their fucking money where their mouth is? Ask them about nature. Ask them about the family. Ask them about religion. Then you'll know. It is meaningless to call oneself a Communist today, it is a totally fucking arbitrary word which carries none of the weight or substance that it used to. So the way you tell is by focusing on that which isn't covered by the shit-mongering 'definitions'. These are the weak-points and sensitivities which actually define the universality the subject relates themselves to. And why? Because they exist within the immediate vicinity of the subject and it is hard for them to fall back on weightless, substanceless abstract platitudes: They are only here forced to confront the actual and full implications of Communism in relation to themselves, and aren't allowed to take a distance from them. And it is not only because these are 'personal' matters, but because we are dealing with a complex network of ideological consciousness, in an age of consumer-identities and obfuscation, wherein, one can structure their ideological consciousness in a plethora of different ways with various different 'opinions', so that calling oneself a Communist, ideologically speaking can be different from being a liberal or a Fascist only cosmetically. The real substance of one's ideological position is revealed precisely at those weak and sensitive points dismissed as irrelevant, and this is also why those so-called 'Communists' who speak of 'SJW's', while there is truth in them, should be received with suspicion.

Originally Posted by **Aurorus Ruber**

First, perhaps you could define some of the terms you keep using. What do you mean by terms like "symbolic order" and "subjectivity" exactly?

You'd know if you actually read through the various linked threads, you fucking idiot. Why ask a question when you already possess access the answer? What does that say about the sincerity of the question?

The symbolic order, as Lacan understood it, is what Marx would call the world of man. It is the world of rationality, meaning, and of course and most importantly language. There is therefore a synonymy between the social order and the symbolic order, the two are one and the same, which is why we say social-symbolic order, to emphasize this. It is the domain of the symbolic which is the arbiter of all meaning. Subjectivity must be juxtaposed to the physical world of objects. I use it in quite a colloquially philosophic sense, which began with Descartes.

Then again, to assume this is an issue of 'defining words', is besides the point. If you do not understand the use of such words, why insist on wasting my time, why not instead take it upon yourself to actually, god forbid, put in actual effort in TRYING to understand, instead of so disrespectfully and lazily commanding me to hold your fucking hand? You lack even an iota of basic decency and this is why you are treated like a piece of garbage. I am not a supercomputer. I help as much people as I can, and I always get back to those who raise questions or concerns via PM, or at least I try to. But I work at my own pace, the necessary pace, so when you throw all of this shit in, shit I have already, while I was at a different pace in the past than I am now, already dedicated a lot of work and time to, you command me to drop everything just to deal with your stupid and lazy ass. And when I am done, you might gain a thing or two from being schooled, but I don't gain shit. I waste time re-affirm past victories. I gain just as much as a poor parent does when their child wreaks havoc around the house. Exactly where I was before you decided to do this. Any idiot can understand my frustration, therefore, ON TOP OF THE FACT that he is far from the first person to do this shit. I have literally repeated myself dozens of times on this fucking forum on this exact same topic. And it is again all readily available. Why do people not familiarize themselves with the intellectual climate of this forum before deciding to shit away their piss poor arbitrary, special snowflake 'opinions'?

"Meh, I don't care that much, just drop me some shit on the spot. I'm not actually going to god forbid think about thinks critically or read myself, I'm just going to, arms flailing, and like a fucking baby, demand you put it all before me here and now, right now, to literally OBSTRUCT my view to the point where I am FORCED to maybe, just maybe, if I am generous, think about it."

Second, where exactly do you draw the line between humans in the sense you use the term and our prehuman ancestors? Would you consider say, Homo erectus or the Neanderthals human, or does only Homo sapiens sapiens qualify as human?

There is not enough knowledge about archaic humans to know for certain, but it is fundemntally irrelevant and that is the point. It doesn't fucking matter if Homo erectus or Homo neanderthalis were 'human' in the Marxist sense, because it would make no difference as it concerns humanity as it exists now. Your question is just as borderline idiotic as asking where we draw the line with regard to what we define as human, as it concerns the various different 'races' or, in modern academic-racist politically correct discourse, 'population groups'. All we can say is: Perhaps it is likely they were just as human, and were historical, in fact it is likely they were. It is an irrelevant question however. The fact of the matter is that if Homo erectus or Homo Neanderthalis survived up until the present, we would know, we would know because we would be able to understand whether their societies were contingent ones that had to actively be reproduced, and that therefore they were historical beings. It is likely that the first bipedal apes already in a sense were 'human', that the symbolic order, and subjectivity first took flight here, owing to the fact that bipedalism freed man from the habitat, from a static and fixed ecology. There is a lot of evidence for mass-migrations among archaic humans too, so in all likelihood they were just as 'human' in the sense of how I use the word, given that they had no fixed ecology to adapt to.

No one can be certain of the exact details the emergence of man in this sense, only that owing to the fact that man today exists, that he emerged from the animal kingdom. We do not look for 'proof' of man's distinction from the animal kingdom from natural history, we find it in the present, and that is it. That is to say, even if we had no data whatsoever about the natural history that has led up to the existence of man, it would not make an iota of a difference as far as it concerned our understanding of the essence of man - such details are only retroactively important and tell us nothing about man today. They tell us only about the details of his emergence from the animal kingdom, not whether he emerged or not.

Again you want to fuck this into a discussion about epistemology, empiricism, evolutionary processes, you want to flail your fucking arms around because you do not have an iota of respect for the depth of these controversies and reduce them to being just as superficial as a casual stoner-bro conversation. You won't shut the fuck up until I literally drag god down from heaven and kill him with my bear hands. Until then, you will continue to simply just shit out these topics.

Again, to everyone else, I can only apologize for the delay in my actual, important text, you know, the text which actually has substance and content which hasn't yet been covered. In other words, new content that can't be found from searching through the forums. Thanks to Aurorus, all of you actual learning Marxists can be treated to being exposed to the same shit you were likely exposed to four months ago.

Thank Aurorus for it, this lazy and stupid fuck who won't not only use the search function but bother with the fraction of wealth I have dedicated to on the subject ON THIS FORUM ALONE which I have linked.

When exactly did the first human come into existence and how would their lives have worked when no other human beings existed yet?

My god, I literally can't believe this SHIT. It's like being forced to fucking school a 12 year old. Hooray for Rafiq, what a victory he is able to take away from schooling a 12 year old!

You ask when the first human came into existence. In other words, as it concerns processes that were within the time span of millions (with the first bipedal ape being 7 million years old, and the first archaic human being 3 million years old before anatomically modern humans 150-200 thousand years ago), you posit this as though one day a fucking person woke up and was human.

What is actually likely is that as the first bipedal ape became increasingly reliant upon language, the social order eventually came to assume all functions previously assumed by natural-physical reflexes in the relevant sense, and the first human modes of production or societies emerged not as the product of any single individual but collectively, in the form of emerged communities. The details of this are completely unknown, but the fucking stupidity of thinking we are talking about one human just being born one day, emanates such a crass ignorance and naivety. There is every reason to believe that the reality is that through various processes, certain communities of ape converged from another, owing to whatever mutation, and with the expansion of those communities, the emergence and splitting of other communities. No one human came into existence, rather, the first humans came into existence. Again, we are dealing with a process that occurred over the time span of millions of years, and one which led to the human as such. We do not justify the existence of man from the existence of ape, but the reverse. We know men and women exist. We know 'humans' exist. Your utter naive stupidity is no different from asking for proof of god's non-existence. You find it necessary that it is literally PROVEN in empirical reality of your own existence, of the non-existence of your god, therefore. You deny yourself and demand that EMPIRICAL REALITY show otherwise for it. This is what you fail to understand: Even if we knew nothing about these matters, it would make no difference. We know that man is historical, and that history, society, exists for its own sake and for the sake of its own reproduction. We know this not out of any positive empirical fact, we know it from disavowing superstitions as they pertain to the conscious use of reason, which in other words, limit man's activity and his knowledge, not in the sense of being a real natural barrier or limitation but a limitation that must be BELIEVED in.

You fail to respect the depth of this topic, in your abuse of it. It is perhaps possible, and who knows as some have posited that a first great ape revolution, in other words, a change in the comparatively limited ape 'society' led to the selection of traits which would over the course of millions of years shape the human body, but this is unlikely.

But again, it is fundamentally fucking irrelevant and the fact that you are reacting a challenge to your god, and indeed, an insistence upon his death, by demanding that he be replaced, in other words that EVERY FUCKING THING be answered RIGHT THE FUCK NOW even if it is actually irrelevant proves the perversity of your approach - you are not actually ready to disavow your god and assume your own freedom, you want him to be immediately replaced.

How much independence does the mind have from the brain?

Again, this has literally been covered. The mind is not physical, and the irreducible element, the human essence, subjectivity, whatever you like - is irreducible because it is not physical. Its physical basis is the brain. So to treat the mind as though it was physical, and therefore, 'independent' from the brain in the physical sense indeed would be an absurdity. For empiricist philistines this is simply impossible to grasp.

The point is simple: What emerged from meaningless physical processes is a new domain, a new order of being, a reality itself called the symbolic order which went to subsume those meaningless physical processes. Sort of in the same way that biological processes are irreducible to chemical ones, and detailed chemical processes are irreducible to quantum ones. No one claims that the symbolic is 'independent' from physical reality in the sense of surviving without any physical basis at all. What we are saying is that it is 'independent' in the sense of being irreducible to it, in other words, of representing a new, self-sufficient, ACTIVE DOMAIN of being that we call the social-symbolic order, so the question is not actually what processes enable its existence, but what gap in reality was able to have led to the emergence of this social-symbolic order in the first place. But the fact of the matter is that it is inescapable - outside of it there is nothing.

Again, I wrote a book on this, and how this is not the same as subjective-idealism or the reduction of reality to its representation but on the contrary the highest elaboration of the materialist position of a physical reality existing independently of the mind.

Would you characterize your position as dualist and if so, how do you reconcile that with the materialism inherent to Marxist thought?

No. The position is that of Marx's, which found elaboration in Lacan, and furthermore, finds its highest development in Žižek's transcendental materialism. On the nature of this materialism, I have dedicated an entire book, with the most relevant section as far as background information is concerned being here. In one of the threads which I explicitly linked to you, this exact question was brought up:

[Editor's note: The rest of the post Rafiq quoted from his arguments in a different thread, reason being that it bears great similarity with the present arguments.]

but if the social is wholly distinct from the biological, doesn't that reinstate a type of Cartesian dualism?

It is not a matter of the social being 'distinct', it's the fact that the social subsumes the biological, and reproduces the biological in the same way that the biological reproduces the chemical, then atomic, and so on. The highest 'order of being' is the social, because the very basis of you asking this question, in your consciousness, is a social one. Your 'biology' isn't responsible for that.

There is no soul, there is no supernatural basis of consciousnesses. The point, which if you're interested I've extensively elaborated upon here and here, is that even though only physical processes facilitate consciousnesses, consciousness is irreducible to the physical processes which give it a basis of existence.

That is because consciousness has its basis of existence in the active social being that subsumes the person's physicality. There is no supernatural factor here - it's just that the social relations, the social totality, and what Lacan calls the symbolic order, constitutes itself a very real reality, the highest order of any kind of reality (Marx and Engels would say this by speaking of how the 'thinking of thought' was the highest form of thinking).

The social nature of humans is conditioned by their physical existence, but that doesn't mean their physical existence is responsible for their social being. Put it this way: the only human nature is that there is no human nature, human nature at its most raw is the indeterminate, chaotic, wailing scream of an infant baby, searching for a symbolic order to latch upon so as to constitute oneself. After this, the physiological is totally facilitated by the social - every single physiological aspect of men and

women, is subsumed by their social being, so much to the point where our physicality is a contingency - we can, theoretically speaking, exist without our bodies, artificially recreate the basis for human existence physically. We have already artificial limbs, for example.

This is where things get 'weird': "Uploading" one's consciousnesses. It forces us to ask questions like, would this not just kill you? My argument first was that somehow, the experience of 'uploading it' would have to be there for the subject, so that the transition would still be 'you' - but that asks another question, like, when you black out or go into surgery, is it really the same you that wakes up? Or let's do a thought experiment. Let's say that one totally clones themselves and replicates themselves, and then dies. Is the clone actually 'you'? No, because 'you' never existed in the first place, and while you were both alive, the fact that you occupied different spaces alone made each of you different social beings, with their own subjectivity, and therefore their own consciousnesses. Quite simply, think of it this way: If you were to make a complete, 100% replication of you, with all the memories you have, and so on, and then die immediately after, you would no more be 'dead' than waking up in the morning. This is the contingency of death itself: You are effectively constantly dying, over and over again, all that bridges you to your former self, say, 30 seconds ago, is your memory of that person, the assumption of this person as constituting your own identity, and so on. 'You' are only your social being, your outwardly social being, and all that makes you 'you' is the fact that you occupy a distinct place in space than another person. If you were to clone yourself with all your memories and then die, 'you' wouldn't die, in the same way that falling into a coma wouldn't kill you. The 'waking up' is only 'you', because you have memories of a person, and relate to those memories in a specific way, that existed before the coma. It would be no different if you were totally, 100% cloned. Your experience doesn't exist, it's a falsity, because it is purely social. If you cloned yourself and stayed alive, your clone would be a different person - in the same way that you can be a different person and change without a clone, merely by taking different courses of action. And it's this context which makes the 'you' or the 'I' as traditionally understood an illusion.

It seems pure nonsense what I am saying. It literally just doesn't make sense - but there is a factor which is also missing for the inclination to think so. A clone that assumes you after you die (let's pretend this is going to happen in 2 weeks), is just as much 'you' as you would be presumed to exist in 2 weeks. This has just as much of an impact as it relates to your very existence in the here and now, as being dead and having a clone assume your identity in that same future does. So in experiencing death, and having a clone assume your identity with your exact memories, this wouldn't be the same 'you' so to speak, because you would be a person who remembers having died. If you were cloned before the death, then this wouldn't be the same person either, because this person did not experience death itself. This is very important in understanding the materialist epistemology against bourgeois positivism regarding the future and our practical relationship to it in the here and now. And the bourgeois formalists attempt to dig themselves out of this conundrum in the field of quantum mechanics, with silly theories like the many worlds theory, i.e. notions that the future and past all exist simultaneously in some physical plane already determined, and so on. It's pure superstition and nonsense.

Not only is your physical existence actively reproduced, through processes, so too is your consciousness. It has no static basis of existence, it's constituted by active processes. The only reason we say 'you are masha', is for all intensive purposes because of the practical irrelevancy of the fact that masha has no static basis of existence. Even though you are not a static entity, the fact that masha is being reproduced regularly the same way, uninterrupted, means we relate to you and identify you in a constant way.

So when I say that you are regularly dying over and over again, I don't mean to sound mystical - and I'm phrasing it bad too. You aren't dying, it's just that you have no static basis of existence to begin with. What you are is social. The particular you, that is, the you of your experiences, your feelings, and so on, this 'you' is regularly reborn every second, every day you wake up, this 'you' is not the 'same' one anyway (all that remains is how you actively relate to the past, your memories, and this identity). We truly are purely social beings, our consciousnesses truly is constituted purely on social lines.

So this is the point that one's being is irreducible to their physical existence - the physical facilitates one's social being, but the social dimension, the active inter relations between men and women, their

constitution into a social/symbolic order, which itself is comparable to a kind of 'super-organism', is irreducible to this physicality - it subsumes it, because the social reality is its own, self-sufficient reality, it is not dependent or determined by anything else.

Or is the point to simply emphasize that, while yes, we ourselves are organisms, our awareness isn't just a matter of physical organs within a closed system, but that the organism can now only be articulated within the contours of a larger social paradigm?

The question that you want to be asking is: What is the 'gap' here, between our physicality and the entering into the symbolic order, or as Žižek puts it, how does language at the onset colonize the human body? Žižek deals with this question by consulting neuroscience (something he is among the first to do in his field), his conclusion is that it is death drive, a space of existence which is 'in between' nature and culture, which is responsible for the distinct nature of humans. He says that neurologists say that some kind of short-circuit, absolutely 'irrational' process gave rise to human consciousness, with an insistence on repetition, and so on.

But as it concerns humans as organisms to social beings, this is a question of humans from birth into social beings. And again - an infant is at the onset not a subject at all, but an indeterminate creature, not an individual, but a 'soulless' thing, whose wailing and crying (which only human infants do) represents its naked dependency upon some kind of symbolic order, a social order. Through more complex processes, ones that are psychological, in accordance with each social totality this gives rise to subjectivity, to consciousness, a sense of identity, which is purely social. This process is literally like the colonization of the human body by language. Outside of this, there is nothing - there is no sense of self, there is no consciousness, there is no asking any questions, you do not even exist insofar as you don't have a sense of 'self-awareness', you just are.

But even so you're never one with your sense of self. You abstract a notion of your own individuality and you fulfill it, but never achieve it. The process of you chasing your own sense of self is what makes you an individual proper, the sum-total of this process. Keep in mind I'm giving a very simplistic generalization of something infinitely more complex, just as an introduction to the idea.

Also, do biological reflexes (as distinct from instincts) still fundamentally delineate the space of expression of human awareness and behavior

There are none as it concerns what can be called 'human awareness and behavior'. There are no biological reflexes that are responsible for the variations of human awareness and behavior. The fact that we are talking about them is the only proof we need of that. Or put it this way: Humans, if they are animals, are incomplete animals. If they can be called organisms, then what gave rise to a human was a catastrophe, a freakish accident. The biological is subsumed by the social, because biological processes are totally contingent and meaningless - there is no difference, meaningfully, between a rock and an insect. These are completely contingent processes that have no meaning. The transition from the biological to the social - true - relates to processes of the biological. But this transition does not tell us anything about the nature of the social itself, merely the fact that humans are not animals (but are social beings). This fact is unaltered throughout the course of human history - it means nothing in the same way that we have two hands means nothing, it's just a given. But when it comes to explaining 'human behavior' within the context of human societies, for example, the biological is totally irrelevant, and tells us nothing.

The biological reflexes we do have, are ones that are subsumed by our consciousness, something we conceive as external from our consciousnesses in the same way that a rock is external from you. So all of the biological reflexes, for example, that underlie your digestive system - that's just as much something 'outside' of you, and I mean you, as a rock is. Your consciousness is irreducible to it, it's an empirically observable reality, but the process of observing it is not reducible to any physical process - even if physical processes necessarily allow for you to make the observation, that's a

contingency in relation to your ability to do it. Your active constitution as a social being is responsible for it, and this occupies an order, space of being that subsumes all others.

In other words, isn't social learning a compounded way of adapting to the material conditions of our society and the relationships encapsulated in the modes of production, which I think reasonably can be called our "environment"

No it can't be "our environment", because this is only constituted by men and women. The mode of production is compromised by nothing more than men and women. If there was any pre-existing structures that make us 'adapt' for it, first -it couldn't exist, second, you wouldn't have any consciousness, you'd just in a totally mechanical way do things reflexively in relation to how your brain processes, for example, light, sound, touch, etc. in relation to others of your species - thirdly, and most importantly, there would be no history, our mode of production would be indefinitely fixed, and like animals we'd have an ecology that never changes. There would be no mastery of nature (technology), and so on. Morons call this the 'sapient paradox', when in fact it's not a paradox at all - it's just that their philistine stupidity makes them incapable of recognizing that their assumptions about human existence were erroneous to begin with.

[Editor's note: Nothing was really worth adding to this from the several posts that followed. For all intents and purposes, this was the end of the discussion. I think that there's more than enough there to chew over.]

[Incidentally, I can't believe you made it to the end, well done. Now you'd better start from the top and read it again so you actually understand it. Oh, and you, no, not you, YOU, I know you skipped to the end to see if there was a TL;DR version. Get back to reading you lazy good-for-nothing Leftist!]