

Mechanisms of Economic Actors in Nature and Society

The Retarded Ideology

Book 2: Mechanisms of Economic Actors in Nature and Society

We regard society as the ensemble and union of men engaged in useful work. We can conceive of no other kind of society.

Society has two enemies which it fears and detests equally: anarchy and despotism.

The constitution is the only restriction which the thought of the political writer has to respect. Against and outside the constitution there can be no useful work; within the limits it prescribes the most complete liberty can do no harm. This liberty is the property of the writer, just as the constitution itself is the property of the nation and the Government.

Men engaged in industry, whose association forms the true society, have only one need: liberty. Liberty for them is to be unrestricted in productive work, to be allowed free enjoyment of what they produce.

- Henri de Saint-Simon, Declaration of Principles, L'Industrie (1818)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1	Introduction
Chapter 2	An Information World
Chapter 3	Value and the Knowing Agent
Chapter 4	Society and the Rational Agent
Chapter 5	The Living Agent and its Native Interests
Chapter 6	The Interest of Life Itself and Overriding Interest
Chapter 7	The Eugenic Interest and the Proprietor
Chapter 8	The Technological Interest and Science
Chapter 9	The Spiritual Interest and Authority
Chapter 10	The Occulted Interest, Privacy, Co-Existence, and Symbolic Language
Chapter 11	On Natural History and the Validity of the Model Moving Forward
Chapter 12	The Machinery of Spiritual, Temporal, and Personal Authority in Developing Societies
Chapter 13	The Science of Daily Living and Production
Chapter 14	The War Machine
Chapter 15	Learning and Intelligence as a Machine Perpetuating in Society
Chapter 16	The Full Development of Moral Sentiments and Spiritual Authority from Conditions Emergent
Chapter 17	On the Occulting of Society and Its Fullest Proliferation
Chapter 18	The Economic Problem
Chapter 19	The Ecological Claim
Chapter 20	The Division of Labor by Rank, Prestige, Favor, Sentiment, and Property
Chapter 21	The Division of Labor by Function
Chapter 22	The Division of Knowledge to Create Classes and Institutions

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 23	The Division of Labor by Social Class
Chapter 24	The Principles Governing the Division of Labor
Chapter 25	Concluding Remarks on this Work

Mechanisms of Economic Actors in Nature and Society

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

1. Introduction

When I set out to write, I had one great question, and it is a selfish one. That is this: why did my life, and the life of those around me, turn out the way it did? The particulars of what I have lived and what I have seen are not too important here, as in this time, we are familiar with social institutions that are vast and have names and association with machinery so complex that describing it in total would be too great an undertaking for one person writing one book. On the surface, we are given names of vast systems as a cause of our problems. We blame capitalism, communism, liberalism, fascism, Marxism, intellectuals, "the elites" with vague aspersions of some nefarious plot that everyone knows yet is taboo to mention, or some other vast entity which is only explicable by the dissection of all moving parts. If that does not work, we are given names of individuals, or names of corporate entities with a logo, a propaganda front, that appear as if they just-so cause events by an inexplicable will. We are trained to look to the sitting president, or the head of some prominent institution, or a corporation or conglomerate of corporations. We are trained to believe the problem is a prominent old money name, which has an aura of fear surrounding it, and Americans are well acquainted with the names of old money families, most often Rockefeller who is cited correctly as the source of so much. If that does not work, a deeper theory names some group as conspiratorial and up to no good, usually a race or nation with some history suggesting nefarious intent. None of these explanations work to explain any mechanism other than the will of actors, whether they are political, economic, or some intellectual head with occulted knowledge which works in mysterious ways that we the lowly plebs are not privy to know. None of these explanations were satisfactory for me, and I found in the collected record of events few answers. It is common knowledge that political thought among the masses was effectively destroyed during the rise of fascism, and replaced with this creature that has been the dominant thought-form for the past century. In the 21st century, there has been in the public imagination no new idea for a long time, and every grand scheme proposed to describe the world is a recapitulation of earlier thought-forms. The intent is to suggest that history only moves when a thought leader declares that it has in fact moved, and so we are told by incredulous zealots to believe current events are a re-enactment of some past drama. During the 2010s, the ideologues harkened back to the 1960s and the period of ideological conflict, using language

to describe a world that wasn't true then and that is far removed from any mechanism active today. The purpose of doing this is to tell the masses that they are out, they are done, and that those who inherited political legacies of the past decided a long time ago that they do not need the people and never wanted to keep the people, or let the lowest of us into their society. That is something that is accessible to those who are familiar with the genuine political thought these ideologues espouse, whatever it may be. There are competing narratives describing what is happening, none of them true and all of them regurgitating an old system in total or reassembling it in some mad libs exercise that has even less explanatory potential. Never is any genuine mechanism at the base level described, and this is intended. Any talk that there is a base-level mechanism is swiftly attacked for one reason or another. All mechanisms are, in the ruling ideas, arrested by thought leaders who through some mysterious will, command reality. The commanders are described as a cybernetic "black box", despite this metaphor never having been the way humans have ever described the thought and soul of another human. It is only in modernity that this metaphor of an inexplicable black box became normal and accepted, and this metaphor was imposed violently. Anyone who called it bullshit on sight was "corrected" and silenced, or brought into the true knowledge which is held as a conspiracy against the public. In such a world, it became difficult to speak plainly about any fact concerning society. Indeed, the pronouncement of Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s was that there was no society, and this was one of the few true statements a politician would utter. To those who were cast out, there was indeed no society, and all of the institutions that dominated their lives were alien to them.

It is not that genuine explanations of the past, the mechanisms of government and industry, the mechanisms of finance, and explanations of current events are unavailable. Genuine explanations of the mechanisms in force today are actually available without requiring expensive or uncommon access, at least to describe sufficiently a model of human society as a grand clockwork. The full description of such would be too vast and it is not in the interest of any one or any group to compile such a writing. Those who would attempt to do so certainly do not see publication of such a work as a priority. I write this not as a full description of society in all of its details, or as a history, or as a theory which could be proven scientifically. I do believe what I write is correct and can be verified by independent evaluation of my writing, but if someone considers my thinking wrong, they are free to correct it in their own words.

What I seek to write in this book is a description not of a whole social system, but of the basic mechanisms that comprise our thought on society and economic value. Those mechanisms emerged as distinct phenomena from baser processes in nature, and there is no singular system which we regard as an origin for society or economics aside from the world itself. I reject the notion that sociology is merely applied biology. Far from it, social processes concern a world that is mostly dead, in which dead or non-living matter and abstractions are absorbed by living agents. Said living agents are not alone in the darkness, nor are those agents comprised of the same substance or purpose. Human beings contend

not solely with each other as individuals, but in social formations of complexity which has grown, and the nature of those formations and the agents themselves will change from one time and place to another. It is not the case today that those social agents are morally equal or socially equal, and it is absolutely certain that there is no concept of political equality that is imagined as a default in the false explanations mentioned before. Political equality as a concept is not a fantasy, for the concept is easy enough to grasp even for a dull mind such as mine. The defeat of political equality arrives for two reasons. One is that political equality was never a natural state of affairs, and by all indications, natural law suggests political inequality is the default, which is borne out in nearly every political treatise that can be taken seriously. The argument for inherent political equality by natural law which is guaranteed in the actual society we live in was never a just-so story that would make itself true by fact alone. The verbiage regarding political equality in the American Declaration of Independence did not pertain to a cynical lie or a mistaken belief of the founding fathers, as if they were too stupid and had to be corrected by the technocrats who despised any remnant of democracy. That language was understood to be self-evident to explain the origin of the new political institutions of the United States, and those who believed in the document did not believe it referred to any biopolitical theory of human states. That concept did not exist in any developed form at that time and would have been seen correctly as a violation of the organizing principle on which the United States was founded. It was not a question of whether a judge could adjudicate who was and was not a man endowed with those natural rights, as if a lawyer could decree what you are and what you are allowed to express. That men were men and born free was a statement of the reality Americans high and low accepted. Those born as slaves were not considered to have any of those rights, and the institution of slavery understood at the time was understood as an institution imposed on the unwilling. There is no slave system that is passively enforced, and since many of the men in the Continental Congress were slave owners who were aware of the institution's domination of the emerging country, they were aware of what slavery and freedom meant. That is a distinction in America that defines the country more than any other - the nature of freedom and an understanding of freedom in its genuine sense, rather than freedom as an idea or abstraction which was always an artificial imposition. The "ideology" regarding freedom is something alien to any American's sense of freedom, and those who espouse that freedom is ideological and purely abstract do not believe in freedom and do not believe in the concepts that were relevant to those who wrote America's political documents. Those who believe in that version of ideological freedom have made it clear they despise those documents and saw them as worthless for governing. Whether they are right or wrong is not the purpose of this book, and I cannot claim with certainty that those who disbelieve that freedom is a genuine condition of mankind or even a possible condition are wrong. There is no rule of nature mandating any freedom for mankind whatsoever, and humans have long adapted to despotic societies. I do not concern myself with republicanism, despotism, or any broader political settlement or understanding in this second

book I write. That topic is something for a much later writing, if it is a subject of interest for the purpose I sought when I set out to write this. I repeat again that I am not writing any political treatise and do not see any of my work as "political". It is necessary to explain what politics is to those who are outside of it and have no meaningful influence on political institutions, and that has been the norm of the lower classes throughout human history. I can say though that nothing about the American founding fathers suggested that any of them were born to be elite, or possessed any inborn virtue that marked them for greatness. Many of them were little better than their social lessers in ability or status. Nothing many of the founders wrote suggested they believed they possessed any inborn right to claim they were better than their inferiors at all, and that is one of the purposes for that language in the declaration. It was entirely possible, and explicitly stated by a number of those men, that they were nothing more than the beneficiaries of good fortune or some grace of God, and had managed to secure their wealth where so many like them had failed. An argument that these men, many of them having come from nothing, were somehow the same as the aristocracy of nobles and established pedigrees, would have undermined their claim to ever have been a new aristocracy. By that rule, none of them had any right and their entire project was a bastard country that never should have been allowed to exist. It is not that these men didn't believe they did possess some quality yet to be determined that allowed them to prevail. None of those men were born with any pronounced defect and none of them could afford to be stupid if they rose to their station, and those things were believed to be inherited by pedigree. It is rather that the conceit of genetic superiority, in the sense eugenics today upheld the concept and institutionalized it, could not be a ruling idea, let alone an idea at the apex of all institutions, as it would become in the 20th century for all states, regardless of any stated ideology or political project, or even an official stated ideology at all. The reasons for this are something I hope to explain in this and future works, for the question is not just one regarding a particular country or my life, but what it means to speak of society, politics, or any governing idea.

I will say here and will repeat later that while I hold these mechanisms are present in every society, and are evident in the ways we can even speak of society or its human actors, no accounting of mechanisms is total or a thing that refuses to allow new understandings. It is also plain as day that every social organization, nation, state, and every actual human or organization with a definition name and place and history, operates in its own conditions and for its own reasons, and no accounting of these mechanisms is intended to universalize all societies or all persons as the same thing, as if societies or humans were rolled off a philosophical assembly line and their nature were stamped on all things that are produced. There is a reason why this conceit happens, which is partially explained in the next book of this series and it is a recurring motif in the entire series. I, like many writers describing society, have been fascinated by disassembling its parts and reconfiguring them in hypothetical scenarios, to ask what it would be if the world were different, or humans were different, or fate

rolled some 20-sided dice with a different outcome in situations where there was no discernable reason a result was guaranteed. For many reasons, the question of alternate history is not very interesting when you see the final products. A great difficulty with alternate histories is that the official histories are written in such a way that it appears the trajectory of mankind was set in motion by some overmind, and when looking at the details and what moved where, and all the things that made the past what it was, there was a reason why events played out as they did. In my own life, there were many things that could have been different, but in all scenarios, I see my position in society and the way I was handled by the institutions being no different, and it would be as if fate decided that I was here. The greater mechanisms in society, which were foundational to why anything could persist as it did, intend outcomes that arrest all variance in events, people, and the conditions they operate in. Social values, and eventually the values of states, do as much as possible to circumvent the conditions of their ecological niche and assert values which are sensical to enough of the actors in society.

I will describe in this book ecology albeit briefly, to explain why "environmental destiny" is a shitty bastardization of natural history, let alone the history of human societies which are highly adaptive and aware of the game they play. There is not a particular reason why a largely forgettable appendage compared to Asia and Africa came to influence the whole world so profoundly, nor anything about European geography, climate, or material conditions that suggested Europe had anything to recommend it would be the epicenter of capitalism or empire. The inhabitants of Europe are not demonstrably smarter, stronger, or more inclined to war or commerce or any particular moral philosophy that would grant them an inborn advantage. For most of history, Europe was a geopolitical backwater, then a site of a highly extractive economy dominated by the institution of slavery, where the empire was ruled by great warriors but rife with internal struggles which led to a collapse and failure unlike the fall of any other empire in history. Europe returns to backwater status for nearly 1,000 years, and nothing suggests that the Europeans were destined to discover the Americas. I do not wish here to write a theory about how the "West won", since I don't believe first of all that "The West" is a useful historical construct, and second that European civilization won in a way that was beneficial to the race that held it, or demonstrated any superiority suggesting that they won because they were a master race or particularly noteworthy. The empire that prevailed was the empire of capitalism and free trade, and it won not by some moral virtue or goodness, but because the British were exemplary at the art of imperial mindfuckery. The true crown jewel of the Empire and the way it projected its force throughout the world was not the mother country or some imagined Little England, and it certainly wasn't its aristocracy which has always been parasitic, far beyond the norm of human aristocracies and probably the worst such aristocracy humanity has ever been cursed with, and destroyed any useful thing. It was instead the ruthlessness of a certain trading company, which operated its domains not on principles that would govern a nation-state or anything democratic, but on the principles of total

expropriation, corporate rule, the establishment of narcostates and drug lords with collaborators all around the world, and the development of espionage into a whole modus operandi for governing the world. All of its domains, including the mother country itself, would be little more than harvesting sites that supplied soldiers, industry, technology, raw material, and conditions of deprivation that would press the colonized and the proletarian to work, encouraged a disgusting sloth and self-abasement among the empire's middle class, and encouraged an intellectual elite that would become in the past century the true aristocracy and governing power of the empire. It should be clear to anyone who looks at history honestly that the United States effectively entered that empire, or never possessed economic independence from it for long and by now is completely integrated into that structure. The aforementioned bowdlerization of American history that is aggressive today is the final dissolution of anything about America that was independent of that imperial thinking, and with it, the empire attaining its "true form". That form had no particular attachment to race or geography, and scoffs at the idea that ecology is genuinely the destiny of empires.

Ecology for the imperialists has always been a way to stuff the serfs onto a plantation and forbid them from hunting in the King's forest. Economy at its heart was not a description of any scientific truth, but moral philosophy. Adam Smith is not a naturalist but a moral philosopher, and further economic thought was developed primarily by philosophers rather than scientists for whom economy was never a true science. Ricardo inherits Smith's position and seeks to rectify seeming errors, and bring Smith's thought in line with the affairs of the empire at that time. Marx is a philosopher first and foremost and writes in that tradition, and while he follows natural history, his method and the content of his writing is not that of an astute scientist, but of a political mind who sees his work not as a natural science but a vehicle for advancing political concepts in light of the evidence history provides, and presents outside of Capital an approach to history and an approach to topics that are inherently political or can be politicized. You would not describe a "Marxist physics" or use that method as an effective critique of physical laws. You could however use Marx's critical method to poke holes in those who would use physics to make crass political claims, as a few charlatans do. This has little effect for increasing understanding of physical objects, which by and large do not care about any political conceit we hold. This becomes more relevant when biology rises to the forefront not just as a natural science but as a politicized matter at the apex of the empire. Charles Babbage and William Stanley Jevons write on operations and involve themselves in early attempts at operationalizing rational thought itself, and this computation project relies on a scientific view of the world to function but is not in of itself "science", nor is it a substitute for philosophy. It is something else altogether, and some references to the prior book in this series might explain the nature of what became computer science and its economic role. In all cases, moral philosophy is inherent in economic thought. If humans are not moral actors regardless of their conditions, then nothing in economics is sensical. The nature of morality differs with each author, as do the questions they seek to answer. For Marx, political

economy is a pseudoscience from start to finish, and the true question of how we would govern our affairs is a political one and an affair between humans. Marx begins, though not because he agreed with it or stated that this should be the result of his work, the creep of ecology as a new imperial management theory over economy. If the social conditions of human beings are variable, as Marx's thinking suggests it would be, then the environment which was an external factor in classical political economy is of much more importance than anyone knew. This environment was envisioned as the social conditions of humanity more than a dependence on its raw material conditions or mechanisms, but the idea is implicit in Marx's work, and was implicit in the very idea of political economy and acknowledged as a thing to be managed. The neoclassical revision to economic thought simply recapitulated the actual intent of capital - that it would indeed crush the workers and would crush the middle class just as they would crush the workers, and that this prevailed because utility in an enclosed world demanded it. It is here where ecological thinking, which figured also in Darwin's thought on evolution and natural history, rises in prominence. No open discourse on ecology would be permitted the way it was for economy. Ecology would be branded as a pure natural science and something "above politics", while economy was always at heart a political and moral affair detached from the material conditions economic actors were in. I cannot offer a full critique of ecology, which is sorely needed. Such a work would require considerable research and is far beyond my ability to write in any scholarly sense, and I'm just some random jackass, so my words would only reach so far. I fear though that ecology has been sacrosanct for so long that such a critique would be snuffed out if it did arise. What I hope to do in this book is describe ecology sufficiently so that further points in this and future books would be sensible, to describe economic actors as entities in an environment rather than philosophical agents. I cannot describe ecology in grand detail and that is better left to books that are already available.

If ecology is to be understood at all, the agents in it must be modeled, and all things must be modeled. In ecology, the true claim of states over their domains is revealed. The state by its nature makes an active claim on everything and everyone in the domain, and as a going concern, it considers itself in conflict with all other states. A state may establish its domains as fixed and view its conflict with other states in different ways, but the state is not congruent in any part of its domain with another state. The state is the subject of the next book, but in ecology, a voluminous accounting of all things in a domain is necessary to speak of it as anything other than vagaries or pseudoscience. I will claim pre-emptively that economics and ecology are not "pseudosciences", because they are not sciences at all in the sense that science describes a natural world. A proper reading of classical political economy makes clear that it has no scientific basis whatsoever, and economy as a practice claimed that it was not beholden to any natural law. The laws of economics are instead premised on a moral claim which may be disputed in the realm of philosophy. Any treatment of economics as a science in any way requires a study of the human agents as

machines, which was not available in the 18th century and was only vaguely considered in the 19th century. Economics pointedly refused to rest its case on science in the sense that humans were bound by natural laws to behave in any pre-ordained way. Economic actors in moral philosophy are ultimately making a choice, even if their choices are constrained by known biological restraints. It is entirely possible for economic actors to choose to die, or choose to disregard the moral claim that money is worth anything and operate outside of any state's authority. Nothing binds economic actors to natural laws at all unless certain claims about the nature of humanity, the state, history, and a number of other topics are implied. The moral value of labor is really the moral value of making workers suffer so they will do something they usually do not want to do. If humans happily provide this labor and arrived at a just agreement, this would be great, but it would not describe the role money played or the psychology of those who owned banks. In other words, such a just world would not describe free trade or capitalism as a situation, nor would it describe socialism or any hitherto known arrangement. It would describe instead the thing workers might have wanted - for their conditions of life to be mostly tolerable and involve little interference from politicians, and for the worker to proceed through a life that never wanted anything to do with the state. Strictly speaking, the state as an institution would have no proper role in managing producers' operations. Had the law been reasonable to the interests of those who worked, who had done no wrong to anyone and would almost always have been won over if the political class simply chose kindness for once in their existence, nearly everything that capitalism entailed would not have happened, and human history would be far different. The cost of doing this was not significant, since the greatest punishment for workers was their absurdly long working hours, which were set high intentionally to grind down their numbers, rather than any desire of firms to produce things for social benefit. The workers themselves saw no benefit whatsoever from the increase in product under capitalism, and it is only after desperate action that some of the working class clawed back promotions - and this give was always for the favored workers, while the class as a whole was under constant assault from all sides. None of this made sense for any ulterior motive other than the pigheadedness of the rulers and the extreme pigheadedness of the middle class, who had always found their social inferiors to be the enemy. If humans were not strongly inclined to this malice and only overcome it with great difficulty, the situation of capitalism presented a rare historical circumstance for the bourgeoisie, remaining peasantry, and urban workers to align for all of the reasons that made sense, and these classes would have had no intrinsic animosity with the beggars for any pressing material motive. It was not even the devilish plan of the new aristocracy that fooled all of those classes to turn against each other. They did so without the rulers prompting it, even as members of this new aristocracy and a handful of the old remarked that the interclass conflict caused more harm than good and undermined their national projects and efforts to rise against each other. The only reason this did not happen is because of a persistent will to ensure that such alliances for anything decent or kind are never possible, and it had been an abiding rule of politicians and their functionaries

to never let subordinates have more than the barest minimum. This was not a moral incentive but a statement of what aristocracies always rested their claims on - deprivation of the lower classes and denuding everything about them, and telling the lower classes that their nature was inferior and natural law damned them. That mentality finds its highest form with 20th century ecology, which enshrined things far worse than Malthus' dictum to exterminate the poor.

One note before I continue - some terminology from economics and sociology and many other theories may be encountered here in ways that these terms are not used. I do not purport to rewrite the theories of others or operate entirely in their framework, and so for certain concepts like "state", "polity", "system", and so on, I have or will have made particular definitions for the purposes of this writing. I do not do this to purport that this is exactly how those words must be understood by everyone, but to make clear what I am referring to when those words are written and being defined specifically. If by some chance a reading of this is confusing, or it seems I have mixed up my definitions with common vernacular understandings, I hope that the reading is sensible enough to get the intended meaning across. Many times I will refer to "person" instead of "human", even though in most cases I use "person" in the vernacular sense to suggest a human or some social entity. I have a specific definition of "person" as the institutionalized form of a social entity, and that definition generally comports with the common understanding, but not everything is written to conform to a hyper-specific model to the letter. Since saying "human" or "man/woman" in certain contexts is highly jarring to readers, I have chosen to mostly stick with the vernacular use of "person", unless I emphasize the distinction between an actual flesh and blood human and their legal or social identifier or institutionalized form.

I will also answer the question of what my "position" is on what economic ordering should exist. I am in no position to implement anything, but there will be charges that I'm a socialist, communist, capitalist apologist, fascist, anarchist, or various other things. I am none of those, and very much resent the last three. Capitalism as an arrangement, so far as it exists, is such a ridiculous farce, and I would hope any reading of the following text highlights further the absurdity of capitalism or free trade even conceptually. That argument has been made by far earlier and better men and women, but I approach this question by asking about mechanisms in society. I say though that socialism conceptually would face the same problems as capitalism, so long as value in society is treated in the sense I have described. This is not a political question, but a question of what it would mean to value anything in the first place. The same questions are posed to socialist and communist societies, and these are questions socialists and communists would attempt to answer in earnest because they had to. "Fascist" does not correspond to any fixed economic position so far as I am familiar with its economic thought, and can be construed as a defense of oligarchic private property, a mutation of socialism, or a counter-movement against the bourgeois. As for communism, its genuine historical definition before Marx is often lost, since Marx came to be so strongly identified with the concept. It originally

referred to a political settlement regarding the commonwealth of a city. In effect, communism was from the outset the last progression of the bourgeois movement, and this is reflected in everything communism would do from its early inception to Marx's interpretation of it. Post-Marx revisions of communism usually were not communism at all or even pointed at something sensible, and usually were slapdash efforts to discredit Marx. The great difficulty in pinning down a particularly "communist" economic idea is that it is conflated with so many things, from socialism to republicanism to the prejudices of bourgeois society dragging the rest of the world into their mindset. It is further conflated with a technophilic approach to history and the future, and suggested in Marx's variant very profound changes to what it meant to be human, despite this being a thing obliquely hinted at in Marxist writing. Those changes may not have been apparent, but in my view, writing where I am now and with a conception of humanity far different from that Marx defended, I believe that communism would have indeed entailed a very different humanity in the long run. I do not throw stones at historically existing communism since much has been printed about what actually happened. What I can say is that communism as drawn could not have worked in that time, and that appears to be the consensus of many Marxist-Leninists who took the project seriously. If communism were to return, and I do not consider that necessarily desirable and probably not possible at this point in history, it would begin from premises appropriate to this time and situation. I do not care to spend forever suggesting what, if anything, would have resembled Marx's vision of communism, but very often what Marx himself suggested has been misunderstood by both his successors and the grossly dishonest anticommunists. For myself, I have two aims so far as I can be said to take a position. The first is that I despise eugenics, and nearly every strain of economic thought hitherto known has in some way or another embraced it, and acts very suspiciously if the concept arises. I do not see any future plan possible so long as eugenics is paramount, and there is no realistic possibility of any political change let alone change in economic behavior so long as that is the case. My second aim, if I were to suggest an economic ordering for humanity, would be to simply share the wealth in the only way that made sense - to give to the workers, peasants, and oppressed class the things they wanted in the first place, which had nothing to do with a political project or grand plan to change the world. That has been the chief demand of the "Low" throughout history, and it is a consistent aim that they will tell you to your face if they are honest and someone would see it their way. The Low do not want ideology or some great scheme with an IOU. They simply want this beast gone, and economic deprivation is a condition that didn't have to exist out of some sense that nature imposed it. This is far easier said than done, and again, probably impossible, but we can in any arrangement do better than this. Since there is no possibility of challenging the dominant political order and dominant institutions at present, the one thing I could do is speak to anyone who cares to think of what might have been different, and contribute to economic thought what I can, if that is worth anything. It may be disputed and I do not consider this a great economic plan. It is rather a framework for anyone to assess what economics is, and does

not implicitly suggest any solution is natural or desirable.

The arguments I use here could be used to justify communism, the older socialism referenced in the opening quote from Saint-Simon, a form of fascist corporatism ruled by cybernetics, anarchic disregard for the economic order, or simply a call to let the ruin of the contending classes happen, since my class has clearly lost and I have little to expect from the future. I would prefer a socialist and democratic direction in any way that is possible, and I would consider communism in principle acceptable enough, if its advocates can consider the problems I describe among many others and recognize that this social and political question does not go away. The call for revolt in recent times is not a call for some grand narrative of revolution, but a revolt against an obviously insane ruling idea let off its leash to cannibalize humanity. Even though I refer to humanity with incredibly disparaging language and hold little hope for humanity collectively, on some level, for some unfathomable reason, I retain some sentiment towards humans, most of whom did not deserve this. The ones who went out of their way to advance this filth cannibalizing humanity and stripping the world bare can eat shit and burn in Hell forever and ever, and I care not to pretend with those people. Since they've already made their position on me clear and have signaled that they only want people like themselves in the world to come, there is nothing lost by saying this. I can see now why it was going to be this way. I have said and will say again that the horror of eugenics is not that so many will suffer and die, but that it is these people who were selected to live and who get to go on, and they see this not as anything good but a great thrill to celebrate in whatever orgy they attend. Terrible and pointless violent suffering and death wreaked by the institutions against the people is not new to the world, and has been the sad rule of humanity all throughout. It is not that I am heartless to the horror happening as I write. This is the worst thing in human history and it will be much worse in the decades to come. I write because some damned fool has to write down what this was, at the least.

- "eugenics-kun"
June 2023

ADDITIONAL NOTE:

While I generally don't do "content warnings", I want to give the reader an explanation of some of the language I will use in this work occasionally. Lately, and in this writing, I have taken to utterances of "failed race" or "Satanic race" to describe humanity and certain elements within it. I am doing this for a number of reasons, rather than just arbitrary edginess or fidelity to any racist doctrine or race-centered thinking. The first and obvious is that humanity, as a racial concept, is a failed race to say the least, and as I will write in the next book, there is something Satanic about many of the humanist doctrines that came to the forefront. Humans very clearly are not a "race" in the eugenicist sense or in the sense Nazis and their fellow travelers believe they are, nor are Germans actually Persians because they take credit for the "Aryan" race, which

by all proper reckoning Germans have no real relation to. It is part of the bizarre thinking of their filthy race - and I will call them a filthy race if they are Nazis and believe in such a reasoning themselves - that was not even credible by the standards of 19th century scientific racism. The modern linguist who noted an "Aryan" language group that linked European languages to the wider world made it clear that this designation did not refer to a "race" as the concept was understood at the time, but an anthropological grouping that was only linked by language. The reason for invoking the "failed race" curse is specifically intended to refer to the eugenicist conception of race science, rather than an anthropological concept of race or the historical and current scientific definitions of race. There has been an operation lately to deny that "race" is real, mimicking the "race blindness" bit of Stephen Colbert's character where they pretend they don't recognize when someone's ancestors were clearly Africans or "negroids" in the antiquated language to describe the racial grouping. I save the particulars of whether "race" is even a valid scientific or biological category for a later writing, since it becomes esoteric and unrelated to what we conventionally understand as "race", but for most normal people, "race" is understood as geneological ancestry, grouped in formations that were roughly analagous to tribal affiliations. Human migration and lifestyles being what they were, it was typical for tribal groups to mate within their own, both because of distance and because of a tendency I will note in life for living things to form colonies or communities.

This thinking has been manipulated extensively throughout modernity to conflate "race" with "nation", and this is a deliberate strategy to substitute nationalism - which entailed a shared history and experience and eventually political integration - with racialism. This can only work in tandem with a pseudoscientific thinking about biology and race whose true roots are in political economy. The fake left influencers, in their effort to forestall and direct away from any mention of eugenics except when triggering fear in the slaves, have intensified this beyond anything in the past, to say nothing of the inheritors of Nazism that are active today. The tendency of life to form colonies is conflated with "natural socialism" or "natural law", but this tendency of life is not an inexorable trend or universally applicable, nor is it morally necessary for life to do this. A lengthier discourse on the peculiarities of biology will have to wait for another writing, if such a thing is necessary for the work I write. I do not think this is a controversial statement to make casually, but there are no singular theories to explain why it "ought" to be so. I have a number of guesses, one of them being that mating choices are not arbitrary or pseudo-random, nor are they "hardcoded" genetically as the eugenic creed must recapitulate endlessly. The mating habits of any animal, humans included, are regular enough and likely a very primitive sentiment that would on its own grant to life a preference for living conditions where mates are available and the ritual can be carried out. Another reason is mutual security and pack behavior. Primitive moral sentiments are still sentiments that exist for a reason, and part of the eugenic creed is widespread manipulation of those sentiments so that eugenics can create the Satanic race that resembles the aristocracy's core character.

My invocation of "race" first of all highlights what the eugenists think, and my refusal to accede to their monopoly on the definition of "race", which they have played with extensively and loaded with coded meanings and triggers as all biological and medical terminology has been. After the launch of "COVID-19", this biological terminology and biopolitics shifted again, with clear signs to the believers of the eugenic creed that they will unite behind this biological ideology above all, and they are marching to kill everyone. I hope that by refusing to play their fear game and invoking curses with the word "race", I will reach people who would otherwise be cowed by fear to respond to any mention of "race", "nation", "eugenics", and so on with associations that were programmed into them. Perhaps some day, when humanity is no longer ruled by the eugenic creed or at least its ideology is no longer so prominent and ultraviolent as it is now, we can speak of what these concepts really meant and how we have all been lied to about virtually everything we live in. It is my belief that, once the political connotations of race-science are exposed as the fraud they are, what remains of race would not be very relevant to our daily life. I have never understood the need of people to identify with racial symbolism that is empty - not even the genuine race or anthropological grouping, but a stupid and parodic symbol that people are trained like dogs to respond to. Hitlerite cuckoldry is a terrible system, but sadly it works on certain types of people and all that is required is a few assholes enabled to shit up a nation, a society, or any other grouping we would prefer over this dumpster fire. At the same time, following a three-pronged political strategy that is common to ideological regimes and especially preferred by the eugenists, there is a "left" position on race which is intended as a foil to enable the hardline eugenists and filter the political right, so they receive the OK signal to abandon what remained of their primitive conservatism, in favor of full eugenism.

More than that, I would hope the reader understands that, unless I am referring to the historical understanding of "race" as a term used by others as part of a meaningful discussion, mentions of "race" in this text should be interpreted as dripping with the author's contempt for the sordid business of race-politics that is sadly still invoked in our time, despite the racists being too cowardly to acknowledge what their stupid eugenic filth religion actually says. If someone were to invoke racist slurs which I feel no need to write here, the response would be befuddlement in most situations, let alone someone actually trying to defend scientific racism on its own merits. Racism in the 21st century, and for most of the prior century, is entirely a vehicle for eugenics, and part of the revival of white identity politics has been to make clear a strident commitment to the eugenic creed and its moral philosophy above anything else. Many of the most faithful followers of the eugenic creed are black Americans, Jews, self-abasing whites. Eugenics further has an insidious way of infecting the most downtrodden targets of the creed, who are taught to internalize the most disparaging social stigmas eugenics has imposed. This is the origin of "neurodiversity", which purports to section off "autistics" and various other groups as distinct slave races, selected for humiliations far beyond the utterance of some racial slurs. The cult

of neurodiversity was one of my reasons for choosing "The Retarded Ideology" as the title of this work. On one hand, eugenics and all that has enabled it is retarded - it is pure stupefying brain rot of the worst kind. But, the very word "retarded" originates from the eugenic creed, and the word "retarded" is more insidious than "moron", "idiot", and similar terminology, which described fixed states of mental faculties. "Retarded" implies that the procession of intelligence in its entirety is adjudicated by experts who have proven they will lie, show extreme indifference and malice, and are given explicit instructions to induce the public to accept ritual sacrifice and unlimited torture in the open. If someone sees that and knows they will be screened out, it should surprise no one that we have in our hearts already declared humanity is both a failed race and a Satanic race - because eugenics has effectively claimed the name "human" for itself. This is why "human rights" is a laughingstock, displacing concepts of civil rights, legal rights, obligations and duties, and the concept of the political, through the typical insidious wordplay of the Fabian Society.

I shouldn't have to defend myself on these grounds since there are no greater racists than the eugenists and the eugenic form of racism is the only form that has significant political consequence. The casual bigotry of the past, which wasn't even what it was purported to be, was never the vanguard of racism, for racism is not a lifestyle choice or demonstrative by performative politics. Race on its own never had any political relevance as a "just-so" story - the justifications for racism in the past were always tied to history of groups rather than individual qualities, and the earliest racial theories were always hastily assembled excuses to naturalize what was primarily relations between slave buyers and slave sellers, colonial relations, or conditions of war between nations, including the tribal associations of many who were colonized. The racists of the early United States understood their conflict with the natives was not a conflict of racial essences or ideologies, but a conflict of colonists who had land to conquer and appropriate and natives that had no reason to ever believe they could co-exist with the colonists. Nazi attempts to claim they emulate the Americans are facile for a laundry list of reasons that are obvious to any student of history who pays any attention to the different conditions. That tendency was not an inborn trait of the Germans or even something bred into existence, but the philosophies and ideology operating in modern Germany made the Nazi race-science institutional long before Hitler's rise, and Germans for generations would be taught of their racial destiny to make real the eugenic creed. Most races, including the heartland of pure eugenics in England, did not have the same myth of racial conquest, hilariously invoked by a race which spent most of its existence being kicked around by actually civilized nations, then starting bullshit wars over religion, culture, or just the standard death cult of an inbred warrior aristocracy. The English, despite their private imperial race-science and well-known bigotries, did not consider race a political matter. The English racial pseudo-science was tied instead to occult traditions, much of which would be familiar to those who study the revealed teachings of various arms of the imperial cult, the names of which are too multifarious but include the very well-known Freemasons. For those

who are not familiar with that mysticism, the claims of geneology are blown up into a gigantic pseudo-history with deliberate lies and obvious tall tales, in which a select few consider themselves either an entirely different race from the base or root races of mankind, or have offered themselves in service to it and swear to commit to ghastly cuckoldry for that cause in excess of the Nazis' overt philosophy. In private, such racial mysticism was prominent in the Nazi regime, and what was overt with the Nazis was tame compared to the extreme perversion they conduct in private. All such currents of thought are not really meaningful if the stories are taken at face value. All of the occult racialism is really a way to insinuate the eugenic creed, which is the overt scientific face of the imperial cult, and in the 21st century is now the sole governing idea of this empire. By no means do I endorse any racial worldview or belief that race is at all an acceptable basis for political society in this day and age. If anyone were at all honest about race as a scientific concept, then they would not treat race as fixed essences or ideas. What is recapitulated is not race in a meaningful biological sense, but genetic code. In reality, men and women of different races do not face any natural barrier in mating, and face no serious stigma despite the screeching of eugenists, who never gave up Nazi-type race-theories and the typical perversion of their cult. (For that matter, "cult" is both given unfair slander as a term, and secret societies and cults are more prominent in the 21st century as this is one of the plans for the world to come.) Properly speaking, races conceptually couldn't exist if there weren't a state of life prior to the existence of a race, however it is defined. The failure of race as a biological concept in proper science has less to do with racial essences "not being real" in a sense that can be proven with DNA, then it is a failure of the genetic theory and myth itself, which makes racist assumptions at its very heart that were never premised on a mechanistic theory or anything we would observe with proper science. What is found with genetics is correlations and aspersions about "expression", which become more and more esoteric to defend a whole pseudoscience. The prior book, in which I contribute some thoughts on "systems theory", is one part the pseudoscience of the aristocracy, and another part their real paradigm when properly understood by analytical thought. Myself being a "computers guy" for lack of a better term, analytical approaches are where I would start, and that is the proper materialist understanding if we are to treat science as a spiritual authority. It is from that systems thought that I am building the mechanical models I describe in this and the next book, which should elucidate terminology used in political economy and remove ideological fetters and the triggers that were installed to evoke fear when any eugenic keyword is mentioned. After 2020, those keywords are no longer as effective, because the ruling ideas shifted and the aim of the rulers is to attract all of the faithful to the eugenic creed, waging unholy "Jehad" as Galton desired. I am glad that I took the diversion of writing about systems thought as a prelude to this work, as it neatly provides the framework for the rest of these books and can alleviate some confusion about the topics at hand.

- "eugenics-kun"
November 2023

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

2. An Information World

The system enters the language of science in the past century. A partial examination of the concept is given in the prior book of this series. To summarize briefly, systems thought does not concern a thing observed in nature or a thing ingrained in the universe like a hobgoblin, but a thing born from knowledge itself. Systems thought pertains to questions that plagued both science and the study of human society, and began in earnest with the study of life and conceits about such an entity. It is living entities that comprise our society and living entities which are in our world the only entities which truly "know" anything. I distinguish knowledge from information or symbols pertaining to information by describing knowledge not as a simple thing in the universe, but a process which results from very particular actions in matter. Those actions are not particular to living creatures or the laws governing life, but in our experience, the only naturally occurring knowledge arose in living creatures. This knowledge was first apparent to ourselves, and we could see from the outset that animal life behaved in ways like us that suggested a cruder process of knowledge was at work. Nothing about the natural world suggested humans were essentially different in consciousness from each other or from any animal, in that the consciousness was comprised of something so different that the definition of knowledge or a mind was set at some arbitrary level of complexity. Whether we morally valued knowledge was not relevant to our assessment that animals must think in some way to act in a way that adapts to their situation. Humans familiar with the hunt, being hunted, and their relations with each other, could discern that meaning without any grand theory. Philosophy develops in human society to heighten the break between humanity and the animal world, and has continued to develop in that direction up to now. The same break exists in the human race, and this has been the key distinction that separated humans into relations of dominance and submission, and distinguished humanity from animals. Systems thought first appears as an elaboration of knowledge in the past century, and develops into a wide-spanning idea that sought to subsume all that exists and all that is done into a singular framework. This is very helpful for explaining behaviors of many things, but also makes possible the command and control of all of those things. A danger exists in that systems can describe command and control, but the meaningful comparison of systems is not a given. In many ways, the systems paradigm encouraged a splitting of the mind into specializations, while the tools to integrate all disciplines were a distinct science and specialization. This could be good, in that wildly disparate knowledge could be integrated, and bad in that the direction of science since the rise of general systems thought has meant the opposite. Humans today are educated in a way that segregates functions from their meaning, reifying abstractions as they must be while abstracting away meaningful information and the true substance of systems. If we are aware of

these pratfalls, which are encountered ad nauseum in the past century from all of the failures of science, both from the failed who are denied meaningful science at all and in the institutions where the wisest men and women are cloistered fools whose lives are wasted on nonsense, we can in the future spare ourselves much of the stupidity that plagues our society when systems are described. This book is not an investigation into systems thought as a discipline of study, and the prior book was only an introduction to many difficulties of the systems approach. A full treatment of systems is best left to writers whose grounding in philosophy is strong and who somehow retained enough sense to speak of these things in plain language. This concept of systems was sensed in the science of the Enlightenment, and was a concept explored a century earlier. Its origins are seen in writing with philosophy around the world starting in what we call the classical era today, and those writers are aware of past traditions which likely were written somewhere, but have been lost to any record institutions consider credible history.

In principle, humans are always capable of thinking of systems, even if they do not use the verbiage or conceits today's systems thought entails. Not all that exists is systematized or can be easily systematized, for there are senses we possess in knowledge that resist reification or symbolic abstraction in an easy way. Emotions and senses of the world do not present to us unmistakable symbols, and in science, systems exist in models which purport to describe a world that existed before our knowledge and outside of our knowledge. Our knowledge and view of systems has no bearing on the actual world where anything happens, aside from the acts we can perform in the real world that are contingent on this knowledge faculty. Since the sum total of the reach of human knowledge is paltry compared to the size of the whole universe or even the planet Earth, knowledge on its own tells us very little. What we do know, if we are not fanatics with insane conceits about the might of scientific elites, is that knowledge has a long way to go to even allow humans to say they know much about truth or the world. It has long been a human obsession to arrest the whole world in knowledge, and describe it as information that can be processed and managed. Free trade and the practices of capitalism, and finance generally, are premised on the command of people. This can be the command of labor and industrial force to affect the world, or the command of loyalty of the officers, armies, bureaucrats, technicians, and various functions that do not produce anything but comprise the functions of states and institutions. The governing power that envisions itself as the master of systems neither fights nor produces, and while they claim to represent the spiritual leadership of the human race, the intellectuals produce less than nothing and cannot even claim to be effective parasites. Far from it, the stupidity of men and women who claim themselves to be the leading geniuses has been at the heart of nearly every disaster humanity faced, as the zeal for war and moral crusades were never too great a motivator for grunts and officers in the institutions. The people who have essentially done the most to ensure humanity's damnation are those who claim, ad nauseum, that they alone will deliver mankind to the light and save us from ourselves. This song and dance

has gone on for a long time, and enough suffering has induced the subordinated classes to accept this rule by fear. The officers and functionaries, for whom this construct has in reality been little more than a paycheck and some petty station to play at lordship, would likely choose to let the whole thing rot if it weren't for the wealth this arrangement delivered to them. The officers and so on receive a much greater share of the wealth of nations than the productive classes, who are given little, and the truly subordinated classes who are left with nothing but a kick to the teeth. In the main, a small sliver of managers at the apex hoard this wealth, and do so by claiming that their managerial genius entitled them to it. Because these managers control the bank and all financial instruments specifically to exclude those outside of the institution, and know that their alliance works best by sharing influence and collusion, the lower classes can only play on the terms of those who control the purse strings. By no means is this limited to finance or any particular race or interest in human society. The political elite may use any leverage it can monopolize to induce others to work for it. In practice, the true power of an elite is far from total, as the subordinated classes, and even the slaves, hold some wealth and clutch it for dear life. As a rule, a shared interest of political elites seeks to co-opt enough of this wealth of the subordinated classes, with the eventual goal of siphoning it into their hands and obligating the holders of that wealth to the ruling interest. Since an elite is not fixed in place, the goal in the minds of those who obsess over politics is for all to join the elite, or envy the elite, and it is entirely possible for political elites to cycle between the classes. In theory a political elite could be the majority of the population. The true lever of any political elite is not some material claim in nature or brute force or anything else, but knowledge of key conditions that allow a political elite to govern others and govern each other. A study of this is not our current subject. We will moving forward consider our analysis of human society and the mechanisms that divide the agents, their labors, and the things that enter social circulation, as things that occur in any society. The political settlement of the society is not our concern in the present book, and we will assume that whatever the social arrangement is, struggle between classes, interests, or battles to enter the elite are simply a reality, and the settlement of society is for the moment a political matter and not an economic category. We will proceed as if the society in question is the best of all worlds, and if any struggle for position in society is acknowledged, it will just be another variable in the system with some definite input and output. That struggle will exist in principle because of what humans are and what life is, but the struggle is for reasons that will be apparent not so all-consuming or relevant to what humans actually do.

In this struggle for social position, property, and claims to some piece of the world, the struggle is always carried out in the abstract and in the minds of people, or some other agent which is presumed to contest these things. The struggle is not something of any meaning to the world itself, and nature has no interest whatsoever in the conceits humans hold about their struggle for position. If that is true, then the command of this situation, and the virtue of social

agents, is in actuality the command of information. In this view of the world, all that exists is information, rather than the raw substance of the world, or any higher product of knowledge. The struggle in of itself is meaningless, and any symbols pertaining to the struggle may as well be arbitrary. Information, or the resolution of uncertainty, forms the basis for political economic thought. The command of labor, or any other thing, is not a primordial will that just happens to exist as a force of nature, nor is the outcome of this command guaranteed because a theory asserts that it must be so. To command anything in the world implies operating with information pertaining to it. A claim to money does not intrinsically mean anything at all, no matter what material conditions are affected by it and what effect those conditions have on the meaning of money itself. Money is at heart a useful contrivance, and it takes many forms throughout history, the variety of which are not our concern for the moment. A claim to a slave is not enforced simply because the master wishes it or claims some infantile right of conquest. No slavery in history has ever been passively enforced, and no state has ever been a passive entity at all. All of these things involve the exchange of information and storage of information for retrieval by someone, regardless of their social rank. This is true both of the master's management and the slave who must manipulate information to perform any labor, even if that labor is a menial task the slave barely acknowledges. Even if the slave didn't perform labor as such, any value the master wishes from the slave pertains to some information about it. For example, the slave might be harvested for organs or something in the body, or the slave may be displayed as a trophy. Nowhere in economic activity is it possible to avoid information as the true substance of value. That information may pertain to some meaning which is not easily reduced to information in a ledger. For example, the relations of production are never as simple as an assigned role and legal documents stating the terms, and they are not reducible to matter in motion as if they were physical systems pushed by mechanical forces of a button activating some Rube Goldberg machine. Those who manage finance never fetishize money or have any illusions about the nature of it. Every investor, banker, or worker negotiating for their wage or dispensing it for their daily affairs, considers information to be necessary for the deployment of money, or any tool or asset they might hold. The beggar is no less aware that the role entails some information about where to beg, how to beg, what pleases people, who to avoid, and so on. Social relations may be complicated things, but they are always informational at the least, and no social relation is ever a thing taken for granted. The truth of the relation is never a thing reducible to information or any token suggesting the command of a thing, but all management of someone's affairs - for economy is rooted in the Greek term for "management of the house" - is informational at heart. To a commander of anyone or anything, the deeper meaning or anything else in the relationship is irrelevant. All that is relevant is information, presented in some system that is sensical to the manager. The worker's own information is not relevant to the command of labor, and if possible, managers like to keep workers blind to information pertaining to command. It is a great taboo in human society for the command of labor to be questioned in any serious way, and managers

as a rule give the absolute minimum of information necessary to any worker in their employ. This was at first assumed and picked up by some political sense, and then research into operations and scientific management suggested that absolute control of information would make rebellion against managers a theoretical impossibility, and would allow managers to extract as much suffering out of their workers as they desired. In the end, the value of labor is not the productive qualities of it, but the suffering itself and whatever information is necessary to induce that suffering, so that workers are made to do something they don't actually want to do. Few gain any satisfaction from being managed, and managers would prefer their task to be as effortless as possible if the management is for their own profit. In institutions, where managers are subordinates, the incentive is entirely opposite. Pure managers, whose income and position entirely derives from bossing others around, seek to make management as cumbersome as possible, and carve out for themselves every drop of suffering they can, while minimizing anything productive in the arrangement on either end. Both the worker and the superior are made to suffer, which is a bad time for everyone. It seems simple to solve this calculation, until the political settlements which we will not discuss here are considered. Even if we did not have this problem though, human intellects are limited and operate in haphazard fashion, and we cannot undo our many mistakes.

Whatever task may be imagined as a thing to be managed or commanded, it is reduced to information and abstracted in a model. This management itself is not a task taking place outside of nature, but is only ever done by entities which are themselves part of the world, and are themselves systems that can be construed as information. The manager can view itself as a thing to be managed, and the problems of self-reference and regress can be resolved sufficiently for the manager to evaluate itself and command the faculties that allow it to manage. Never is the managerial process itself a given or something sacrosanct, as if management occurred in a black box and was esconced from the terror of managerialism. This applies to the highest managers, and it is entirely possible within an organization for managers of equal rank to keep each other honest. The same intercline conflict is played out in the lower classes, down to the lowest classes who are induced to snitch on each other. Even the lowest human in society manages something and does so by viewing their situation as something informational. Never is the management a thing tied directly to the world in soem way that dictates how the management must proceed. This is to say, humans are not tied to "material conditions" in a way that inherently compels them to do anything, in the sense that a button may be pressed and, through some magic, the manager can command another person. If such a command of another person is to be realized, it can only proceed through processes that must be arrested as information. Nor is it the case that a condition like starvation is mandated by nature, or produces the same response in all management. Starvation in society is never simply individual problems isolated from each other, for there are multiple parties interested in starvation and the management of natural resources. Very often, famines in history were caused not by irresponsible peasants but by war

and deliberate abuses of social superiors, and after the fact the behavior of social superiors would be naturalized, as if they could do nothing else. This is an outrageous lie given any information or assessment of the genuine situation, but it is always told because the peasants who starved are now dead, and those who survive are reminded that another cull will claim them if they do not abide this situation.

It may be the case in a closed ecosystem that there is only so much food grown, given conditions that were known and planned beforehand, and in any event, more food will not materialize immediately. For the purposes of eating today, the inhabitants of that environment only have what is available in the storehouse. This example is contrived to suggest that there is no other way and no alternative, but it will happen in some way. The conditions of society which enclose land and corral the people can be interpreted as ecological barriers, which will be revisited in a later chapter. Even in this case, the behavior of these inhabitants in society is not fixed for all of them. How humans manage no-win scenarios or the scarce supply of food has no natural answer, nor is any answer self-evident. There is a question of who manages the stockpile, or if the stockpile is a commons distributed in some way deemed fair. The situation will be resolved in some way where inhabitants die, but if the resolution involves violent struggle for life, the killer is not the lack of food, but other humans. For one, it is human society and those who establish law that by all reasonable analysis erected barriers trapping humans into this ecosystem that created the deprivation. If food is abundant elsewhere and enclosure ensured that the "wrong people" would not receive food, then guilt would be assigned for those who created and enforced the enclosure. The same process would play out within the ecosystem, in accord with whatever political settlement exists among the agents. This would apply no less if the agents were animals, for animals act on their own power and in accord with some volition that is for their kind deliberate. Animals generally have a will to live and a will to struggle with each other if they must. This is by no means a guarantee. It is entirely possible that starvation is accepted peacefully, out of a sense that being induced to kill each other at the behest of some sadistic manager or influencer is absolutely fucking retarded and a waste of what remains of our life. Even when death is assured, the behavior of agents is never mandated by some ethical calculus that a grasper or philosopher would dictate. Some will fight, some will walk away, some will resolve part of the problem by eliminating themselves of their own volition, figuring they have seen enough and that whatever happens, they don't need to see this and probably guess that life will end one way or another. Some, of course, will survive, and be very conscious of what should survive. This survival is not merely of their agency or person, but of anything they hoped to preserve in this world. Survival in of itself is not inherently meaningful or valuable. To the world, our life and death is utterly meaningless, and to most of society, one death is just a piece of information recorded and displayed in the obituary section, if even that much happens. It might evoke some memory in us, but we do not handle death or the events of life in some universally prescribed manner. This

can be borne out in the information we observe, and so it is itself something of interest to management, if the manager wished to predict the behavior of all agents in this starvation scenario. A manager may wish to mitigate bad things, or better yet not face the situation of starvation by managing the farm better. An imperious manager who for whatever reason gets their jollies from suffering might decide he wishes to make sure the resolution to starvation is gory ritual sacrifice to Moloch or whatever foul deity he believes in. Better yet for such a manager is to create the conditions of famine, and exonerate himself by finding scapegoats or chiding the peasants for not working hard enough. If the peasants worked harder and somehow induced the land to produce more food, the manager would confiscate it on some spurious pretext and claim that the workers actually produced less, just to make it clear that work will not set them free. So, a system in isolation is never what it seems, given knowledge of the agents which are not by nature tied into any system. Humans and any other animal are, absent any compelling reason to believe otherwise, autonomous and not forced into this no-win scenario. The limitations in an environment would be defined instead by the mobility of agents, or vagaries enter the system which must be accounted for. We can use statistical analysis to help us handle vague information, but this should not be done willy-nilly and always has to consider the genuine definition of the problem modeled. But, even when this scenario is engineered, the outcome is only guaranteed to produce death. The minimal death may be assessed given knowledge of human nutrition requirements and time elapsed, but with clever management to maximize the torture of the inhabitants, the death rate can be increased, and very often the death is not caused by starvation but a willful desire to bring inhabitants to kill each other. Given absolute command over the ecology, the manager could by diktat exterminate all unsightly humans from his lands, and this might please his superior or some ruling idea he holds. The contrary that the manager has sympathy for the ruled is not demonstrated by any historical ruling idea, and the philosophies of rule have always shown utter contempt for the depoliticized subject, even when that is clearly counterproductive and pointless. We may speak of the position of the ruled who have seen this for centuries and ask if they would do the same thing or worse. In all cases, the proper placement for ethical obligation is with those who manage, and those higher up the chain who are fully aware of the situation and cannot claim ignorance. If workers manage themselves to some extent, then they would have some obligation, but they cannot be obligated for the actions of managers creating death cult scenarios, and to insist that they should be responsible^[1] is ridiculous to the most basic sense.

These questions always figure into information when we speak of management. The agents to be managed or who must themselves manage, and all objects in the environment, are treated for this purpose as entities which communicate information, rather than what they "actually are". The particulars about knowledge as a process and the capacities of entities which know, and any tools they might possess, are all interesting, but they are reduced to information in management. This includes the manager's own faculties. What the manager

wants and his personality is only relevant so far as it affects informational results and outcomes. This is absurd if we think about what is actually happening in life, but to manage anything, this is what we have to do. In other words, the question of management as a natural science will always chase its own tail. It is designed to fail from conception. Nature has no need of management, and does not manage itself in accord with any knowledge or general plan. All of the information that may appear ordered in nature is not managed but emergent, and in nature, the simplest emergence of patterns tends to be the correct one. The natural world came long before us, and we ourselves are more complex informationally than we are led to believe by managerial conceits. For ease of management, the faculties of agents are reduced dramatically. If we are to create a proper model, we would be careful of what is abstracted, and remain aware of what is lost in the transition, given sufficient meaningful knowledge about the agents in question. I will not investigate too deeply the biological capacities of humans or the variety of them, or probe into deep questions of neurology or psychology, but these topics will arise occasionally and make practical sense for us. As with any other event in nature, usually the simplest answer is the correct one, but because we are the confluence of events going back a very long time when considering the meaning of society and its history, simple answers emerge in an already complex environment. New humans are born into a world that is alien to them and whatever inborn natural instincts the human might have had in the animal kingdom, and so appeals to nature are crass given what technology and knowledge have done to us. Our own command of knowledge and technology individually is not so great, no matter what institutions we form or what conceits we hold today. For all the might institutions wish to impress, there are billions of humans and most of them are not stupid. They are cognizant that they live in a society with large bureaucracies and long-standing traditions, or that such societies claim the world even if they manage to retain a simpler way of life. The baseline abilities of humans are not so different that we can truly speak of two or more different races with an essentially incompatible view of knowledge. For someone to be a functional human in any society and considered valid, they possess a baseline such that most things humans do can be done by anyone with any reasonable training or integration, where the expectations of what to do are communicated and there is a desire of all parties to cooperate in labor.^[2]

If we are to speak of information, we speak of it being communicated. Communication, like knowledge itself, is only real and meaningful for our purposes if it something in the world, and not taken for granted. The most basic mathematical model for communication studies in modern times was conceived by engineers working on electrical communication. This model consists of five components:

An information source, which produces a message

A transmitter, which operates on the message to produce a signal suitable for transmission over the channel

A channel, which is the medium through which the signal transmits

A receiver, which inverts the operation of the transmitter to reconstruct the message

A destination, which receives the message

In a physically existing communication, all of these things exist materially. The first and last, which generate and comprehend the message, are the result of processes which must resolve in some physically existing construct. The transmitter is a construct which is capable of generating a signal from what is fed into it by the information source, and the receiver deconstructs the signal into some intelligible message. The channel is whatever the signal propagates through (even if that something is "nothing", a pure vacuum, the reality is that the signal must travel through that vacuum). The particulars of the transmitter, receiver, and channel are for now not terribly relevant. We must start then with the source and destination, which concern information processing. We start with the conception of a "black box", which we consider an "intelligence" of some sort, as source, and another as the destination. We do not know, exactly, what these physical processes do to generate the signal and transmit it, or receive it and then derive meaning from the message. We can, though, surmise that some mechanistic process is happening inside the black box.

We can imagine every object as a thing capable of all steps in the communication process. These need not be conscious objects necessarily; we can attribute the apparent characteristics of objects to some message that is generated in the same "black box" which formulates and interprets messages, and we can speak of sensible properties of an object as transmitters and receivers; for example, the object "rock" may have certain behaviors we attribute to the thing-in-itself when we say "the rock was pushed" or "the rock shattered", and the message transmitted is the image of the rock, sounds it makes, its tactile features, the force it exerts on other objects. All of these messages travel through some medium, and can be interrupted. It is awkward to think of a rock "communicating", but in our information world example, this would be how we understand the rock interacting with its environs. Then there are people, animals, clouds, etc. which are treated similarly.

Because thought itself emerges out of the processes within reality, all the objects which can process information - the "black box" that formulates and interprets messages - involve some actual process executing in the real. Thought in actuality is some physical process carried out, and one way to envision rational thought is logic that is realized in physical devices, or something that could be reduced to logical propositions about what entity is "thinking". If a thought were not rooted in something substantive, it would be removed from anything consequential and could not exist in the world proper. Disrupt the physical processes which constitute thought, and the thought does not manifest in the real at all. We should dispense with a common fiction today that human thought and consciousness is the product of pure rationality and processing power, as if an arbitrary complexity had been reached to create Man, differentiated from animals. Still, it is an abiding characteristic of logical thought that the material pre-requisites for performing a logical thought operation are far more than simply asserting "there is an atom of matter which lights up 1 for yes and 0 for no".

The construction of logic gates in a computer is a fascinating topic. So too are the sensory organs for feeling, seeing, and so on not "direct feeds" to information, unfettered by any intermediary. There is a process by which patterns of light are received by the eye, and yet another for how images are assembled by the brain to recognize patterns. The complexity of this task is still not yet fully known by neurology, to the point where the human brain's thinking operations can be made into a schematic to reproduce flawlessly, but we know such a process would have to occur for us to be able to discern coherent images from the raw input; and we do instinctively learn to modify how we are seeing based on what information we are trying to focus on, or what information captures our attention.

In our language, there is no other way in which intelligible cause and effect can be explained than by describing it algorithmically. In language, we have so many tokens to refer to concepts and our understanding allows us to place those tokens in their proper context. How we may define those concepts may vary, but they can always be broken down into steps, and we can inquire about the components of an object, or the traits or behaviors we ascribe to the object. There are obvious problems if our algorithms are naively constructed, though. For example we may imagine a Pong ball moving in space, which will reflect off of any surface it touches. When we consider the movement of the ball in a computer program, which is tasked with determining when a collision is detected, the process of the computer "dictating reality" is at odds with our own understanding of real things. In the computer game, the ball is moved by the CPU, and the CPU acts as a hobgoblin which is directing the simulation objects. The computer does not actually contain "space" as a concept that works like our physical space, but instead the position of the ball and the surfaces in the simulation are stored as information, and the RAM memory of the computer is arranged as so many bits. It is up to the program to assemble from the memory in RAM or ROM something which the user will see on their monitor, or some output that the human user will observe as a ball that appears to move continuously. We assume in our understanding of real physics that motion is continuous when we ask the question "when does the ball impact with the surface". For the computer though, the computer is only capable of executing instructions one after another. Even if we assumed every "object" - an arrangement of memory we arbitrarily defined so that the user will perceive an "object" - had its own processor and could communicate between them, we would reduce all the interactions to some algorithmic sequence of events. There is a problem if we take a naive approach to collision detection. The computer can only process instructions and wait for interrupts from devices attached to the computer. A typical loop for a program will perform whatever algorithm the program is running today, then wait to receive an interrupt for vertical blank from the monitor (1/60th of a second roughly), then loop back to start after executing instructions during the vblank period. So, the computer program only updates "reality" every 1/60th of a second, or less often if the instructions of the computer require longer than the vblank cycle to complete. We want to simulate continuous movement, so a naive approach may be to calculate when in this cycle the ball hits a surface, calculate

the time during the cycle when that ball hit, and re-calculate its trajectory from the point of impact with the new direction of the ball, for the remainder of its movement for that cycle. This has an infinite loop problem if the program encounters two walls where the ball moves infinitesimal distances between each impact, for example two walls parallel to each other and separated by the distance of a ball. We would, in tracing the ball's path, continue to bounce off a surface endlessly, and the program will freeze in an attempt to calculate this one ball's trajectory. There are a number of proper mathematical solutions to this, but for these solutions to work, the computer is not really "knowing" what it is doing; instead, the human programmer provides to the computer an algorithm that would resolve the infinite loop using calculus. There are easier, cheaper solutions, but all of these solutions break the simulation of continuous movement we are trying to accomplish in the program. This is a variant of one of Zeno's paradoxes, in which the ancient Greek philosopher deals with the problem of an infinitesimal and declares that movement is contradictory - or, that simulating movement in mathematics is impossible, and thus movement itself is impossible. The philosophical problem of movement itself is defeated by the simple truth that the problems all presuppose that movement is something that can happen regardless of our need for problem-solving. The meaning though is that there is a divorce between how we can calculate movement in a model, and the actual movement of things at a micro level. Our CPU can only read instructions from a tape, and this is the only way we can intelligibly model the problem so our computer can solve it, and thus display what the user expects - a ball on the screen that bounces exactly when and how it is supposed to.

Important to asking a question about this "information world" then is how we construct the problem, and how we as problem-solvers can resolve things which seem paradoxical. We are necessarily creating an approximation of reality in these simulations, because the reality of objects is that they don't have any existence as forms, but are things we recognize from sense experience. Philosophical wordplay can be helpful in criticizing a model, but it does not allow us to escape the truth that we only have the concepts of logic as we know it to intelligibly express the problem the model wants to solve.

We can for a moment imagine the whole universe as a game, which we will call LifeQuest, which we can use as a simulation of economic behavior in the natural world. In LifeQuest, we envision five types of objects:

- The space itself, a 3-D space of immense size. The space object's members are a list of pointers (addresses in our hypothetical computer's memory) to the other types of objects. Its methods adjudicate when signals reach a target, and pass the signal to the object upon receipt. Objects in the game environment may generate new signals, which are returned to the Space object in an array, so that the Space object can add the new signals to the game environment. We separate the body of an object from the signal it sends.
- Signals, which carry physical or "real" communication between each other. These signals take the form of a bounding 3-dimensional shape, of whatever form

is appropriate for the type of action. The signals are the only thing which can trigger a hit detection, and carry a message to other objects. The members are the hitbox, the speed and form of its propagation (does it move in a line, does it expand from the center, etc.) and a pointer to a bitstream representing the signal's data.

Derived from Signal is:

- "Body" objects, representing physically existing objects. Bodies are themselves derived from signals, representing their very existence, but are further developed to describe any complex object rather than the raw bitstream. Because we have a very, very advanced physics engine in our game, it is capable of procedurally generating from a seed - the "genetic material" of the object - the default form of the body, its composition in materials and its structure. This simulated body is complex enough to be compelling for a game, wowing all the young players with the nice graphics. The Body object is the only object which can send and receive signals, which our excellent physics engine can act upon. The Body object, by default, only deals with the signals of physical force, representing the existence of the body and its imposition of force on the world, and its receptiveness to force. The Body contains methods to translate its response to a force acting on it into a velocity, which is processed every game cycle by the simulation to move the object in space.

There are two derived classes from "Body":

- "Animated" objects, representing living objects that are not player characters. These are typically animals, or similar such living creatures with a centralized nervous system. In addition to the normal traits of "Body", NPCs have "Brain" as a characteristic, which animates the body in response to stimuli. This response would be like the AI opponents in most games; limited, occasionally interesting and tricky. The role of the NPCs is to present danger to the other type of object, to compel them to take action. While the NPC behaviors are very predictable, there is enough variety and the AI can adapt to new situations to an extent.

- "Player Character" objects, representing the players of the game. These are analagous to humans. Derived from Animated Objects, they have another characteristic: "Player Interface", representing sentient decision making and rationality on the human level (or the level of whatever user is playing the simulation). PCs still have to relate to the Brain characteristic, as executive functioning is only a part of the Brain, but they are better able to train the brain.

The signals will process in "quasi-realtime", where the undisturbed behavior of objects persists until a signal collides. This process is streamlined sufficiently by the Space object's methods so that the computer is not bogged down in recalculating a very large number of objects every time a collision occurs. For now, though, just know that in principle, the world is composed of signals which interact with each other, and some of those signals are bodies which are capable of transmitting and receiving, acting on signals it receives. Some of those bodies are capable of composing and interpreting information to decide behavior, which

would be AI-controlled objects and objects which receive the player's input.

The objective of the game is simple: live, thrive, and unlock all of the achievements you wanted, see new experiences. If you fail, you die and are kicked off the computer forever, and you don't get to see the game with the awesome graphics and physics engine.

Oh, and if you don't want to play - too bad. You have to play - 24/7/365, for every year of your life. Additionally, you are connected to a force-feedback device which makes losing the game very, very painful before you are kicked off the computer forever, and into the abyss. Fortunately, though, you get to play with billions of other users, so you won't be lacking for company, for better or worse. Also - you are playing this game without any guide or foreknowledge that you are playing a game, so you won't know what the hell is going on.

Sound like fun? I thought not. But we're playing anyway.

This example is very obtuse, and not at all how we would design a computer game. It is, however, something we do inherently in building scientific cosmologies of the universe, in an attempt to understand all the causes and effects in the world, and we have no other way of doing this that can create an intelligible model at a large scale. Dialectical thinking is a fun sport, but it is in the end little more than a mystical working to attempt some change in the world, and makes up for our own inability to deconstruct the whole of reality into components. We can, though, build quite elaborate models which successfully break matter into elements and molecules, and we have to be able to do this to explain physical and chemical interactions at a basic level. For our game, the problem may be solved by simulating meticulously every feature and contour of the body; and in practice, actual computer programs will devote considerable memory to constructing and storing every pixel in a 2D game, or every polygon in a 3D environment, because it would be necessary to do this to display objects when push comes to shove. We may have creative means to compress this information and only decompress it when we need to, since memory is not so unlimited. We see already a problem in any computer program - computational and resource limitations. Reality is vast and does not have nor need a central CPU, but our CPU here is the god of the universe and so this one little thing has to process all that happens, one instruction at a time. So, programmers often have to choose between something which saves memory, or something which saves processing cycles, in constructing their programs. Reality does not need to engage in any sort of information economism - reality will do whatever it does, and our science is only there to read from real events rather than suggest by force what science wills reality to do.

An investigation into the "player characters" and "non player characters" - i.e. life itself - is in order, and we can see how we would model our real-world understanding of biology in our simulation. It is here where we can properly assess value as a concept and then as a managerial task, and therefore ground a view of society in things we can see in action.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] I have written on this verbiage of "responsibility" before and will summarize that the very word "responsibility" is clever wordplay to place guilt on the reactive agent, rather than the manager who is presumed to be active and sacrosanct. Even by the very nature of the word, managers are never "responsible", because they are expected by their position to not be reactive but proactive. The holders of states and institutions are always proactive. If they are ever reactive, they are not going to survive in a hostile world, not against the ruled and certainly not against each other. States and institutions may with-hold their action and must manage their resources to intervene, but in all cases the state prefers to establish its initiative. Any situation where state offers must react to hostility is a situation states and institutions seek to prevent at all costs. When the ruling idea invokes constant transgression as an attack against the standing of the ruled, this is even more obvious. Creating the impression of fear is one way to cow the ruled into accepting further transgressions, and once the ruled are docile enough, the transgressions shift from violence to subtle insinuations to grind down the will of morale of the ruled. A state that is overtly passive and disinterested is weak to malevolent actors. The seeming weakness of institutions in the United States is deliberate when those institutions are no longer wanted by the rulers behind the curtain, and new institutions are already taking their place. The intent here is to portray public government as ineffective, insane, and above all retarded, while unwritten law and eugenic institutions are holy and never questionable.

[2] Adam Smith's example of the pin factory is an ingenious device for explaining this concept of cooperative labor. The description of it can be found in the opening chapters of Wealth of Nations, and I highly recommend readers consult it to comprehend the origins of this concept of management by information and intelligence. To really comprehend this arrangement we call capitalism, there is no work I would consider more obligatory to read. It is by no means a holy bible or the final word, but to this day its meaning is misunderstood and bowdlerized. On my website, I have maintained a small archive of useful economic texts, so if it is accessible, it would be great to check it out if you haven't.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

3. Value and The Knowing Agent

A number detached from anything meaningful is just a number, and a number that is merely associated with another piece of information is not value in the sense that it is useful information. We may for example issue instructions to add two variables and assign the result to a third. These are values that are relevant to the computation, but if the instruction is carried out with no

apparent output, they are valueless to most users who do not see the state of the computer's memory. I define value here not merely in the mathematical sense, where the application of mathematics is implied somewhere. Value in pure mathematics is applicable to the concept that numbers can be operated on in various ways, and numbers are derived from a set theory suggesting that we can count things. In other words, numbers and everything in mathematics involves logical propositions. Mathematics is not sensical as a derivation of logic in any other way. I should not make this a mathematics lesson, but if we are to apply any mathematical construct to a world outside of knowledge, values are not merely numbers or logic, but meaningful numbers related to something that happens. For all of our purposes here, value refers to propositions which attain some goal that is appreciable by knowledge. The goals may involve a world that knowledge seeks to command that is outside of the knowledge process, or it may involve purely abstract goals. The abstract goals are morally understood to not mean anything truly valuable in an economic sense. It does not matter to us if we win a video game, unless it has significant real world consequences. We are able to discern for the most part what is valuable in one context over another. That which is valuable in society is not the same as that which is valuable for our own purposes, and there are values we may regard concerning observations of the natural world, where we recognize their relevance to that question but do not morally value them or even consider it particularly interesting for ourselves. This value is not value in exchange or utility, but a basic sense that is valued for some moral purpose we have construed. By "moral purpose" we do not prefer any particular ethical theory or suggest these purposes are universal, but suggest that humans are moral actors before they can be any other type of actors, and this is the first sign of value. In a later chapter of this book, moral philosophy and what it proposes will be examined. We need not envision moral acts as being significant to our sense of the word, nor do we need to envision our actions are deliberate or rational or possess any intrinsic purpose. What this means in short is that we do things because on some level we want to, if we are creatures with agency to act at all. If we are just flotsam devoid of any purpose, then nothing we do is really relevant and it is only symbolized and tokenized after the fact as a "thing", a fleeting "being" which evaporates and is dismissed as noise for our purposes of management.

If we are totally under the command of another agent, the commanding agent would bear the cost. Not all information affecting this calculation is a moral act. The non-living environment, such as the raw materials or industrial tools, are not moral actors in their own right, but are informationally relevant. The master-slave relationship is not in of itself morally worth anything, nor is any other social relationship intrinsically worth anything in a singular realized instance. There is a cost associated with any command of another agent, or something affecting the agent that can be assigned some value because it intervenes in the process. The same is true of the workman's relationship with tools or anything worked on - the worker-product relationship is not intrinsically useful, but the product, tools, externalities, and so one are all values. Whether we morally care

about the values does not change that any economic act has consequences, which are not limited to the one outcome we intended. For informational purposes, every relationship in this sense of value is the result of agents affecting things by force, or agents exchanging freely with agents. An agent could exchange with the world itself or some commons designated, but in principle, every commons or every domain can have a name and a claim placed on it. To defend the commons as the commons is itself a claim of many agents who operate out a sense that the commons is morally valuable and necessary for many reasons that are not immediately informational, or whose informational content concerns concepts of society as a whole that are held as a value above something that is exchanged for crass purposes. When we concern ourselves with value in this sense, it is very important to be aware of what exactly is happening in every interaction, and then build a model for an information network where these actions take place. In a moral sense, the propositions of value are not mathematical ones. It is not possible to freely exchange or subdivide any moral sentiment, as if the brain and soul of agents were split and the injection of a devil on the shoulder is your fault or the will of the Satan. We may morally value some tokens or a number in a ledger signifying credit or a promise of exchange for goods in society, but the tokens themselves are not intrinsically valuable, and the moral value of money or credit is not a uniform proposition that can be defended. Money exists because it is a tool for a purpose, and human societies did not always possess money, nor in the form it takes today or 200 years ago, nor are currency schemes facts of nature that stand forever. History shows currency and credit to be volatile and thus market failures are commonplace, and this is part of the design of market economies. They are corrected violently, and there are agents in the market environment who believe this is perfectly moral and upright for various purposes.

For now, any economic value involving exchange with other agents or theoretical exchanges with other agents will be minimized. To exchange implies that an agent has moral consideration of something the agent itself does. It is always the doing of things that is morally valuable, rather than the being of anything. Things that simply "are" do not have any intrinsic moral quality by existing. If someone were to appreciate the form of the object or hold some attachment to things, that may be valuable in utility or exchange, but nothing is actually "done" with the object. Anything that is done is inside the agent and valuable only for the agent's internal calculation. Moral values are only relevant towards actions. If we assign moral worth to things, whether they are people, objects, situations, or anything else, the worth is an indicator of what we are to do with those things, rather than a just-so statement suggesting moral values are automatic. We individually do with things what we judge to be right, rather than what is prescribed by some law of nature. The true law of human nature that would be construed as compelling us to act in accord with some presumed personified Nature is that human nature commands us to be moral actors. Therefore, even if we can predict our moral sentiments in a model or another's, we would still do what this natural process told us to consider right, even if our concept of

"right" is dubious. As with many things, games are played with this in a court of law, where it is presumed institutions and agitators are always morally neutral or sacrosanct, despite obvious facts showing institutions and agitators pushed the agent to act in concert and with conspirators against an isolated agent.^[1] But, in principle, the moral value is in the act of ourselves, and we do not get to choose the acts of others, no matter how ridiculous. If we morally value cruelty and sadism as intrinsic goods - and this is the only possible moral consciousness of someone engaged in this behavior - then that is that, and so long as that can perpetuate itself, there is nothing to stop it and many rewards for doing so in a society enabling it. Whether someone is selling, buying, taking, bullying, submitting, or whatever interaction they have with another person, what is done is not confined to the definition of the act itself. Selling or buying are not "just" those acts, as if they were neutral. There is a consequence not just from selling, but what is sold, who is sold to, and all information suggesting future outcomes from the sale. The same is true of other acts, even towards inanimate things. Acts themselves are never neutral or transhistorical, but occur in one event which would be taken as a whole to be considered acts rather than fragments thereof. We are able to describe the nature of the act itself but only associate it with meaningful information when all consequences are detailed, and all that caused it, which is not confined to a singular agent, is considered. While we cannot morally blame ourselves implicitly for other causes working alongside us, like other agents we ally with or events in the environment that work alongside our exchange, we bear the consequences of them by our volition to commit an act. This is true even of events which are neutral to the exchange happening but exert some effect, or are affected in some way as an externality.

In all interactions, moral consequences follow from one act to other events in the world. It is not possible to claim with any seriousness that selling drugs is just a business like any other.^[2] Therefore, the consequences do not exist in some limited time frame, after which the memory of participants is like a goldfish and the record is wiped clean. We may choose to forgive or disregard the past as we need to, but the past happened and a future will happen, and this is undeniable to speak of any causes and effects, which would be the basis for acting and the very process of knowledge itself in any sense we would care about. This is a lot to calculate when considering all causes and effects that arise from a single act. We would have to trace a very large network if we truly wanted perfect information. Markets and monetary exchanges as a rule do not do this. In markets, the money is exchanged as-is, regardless of the form it takes, and the commodity is treated as if it were money. Money abides not a rule unique to each token, but a rule of whatever institution creates it and regulates it, and rules of money based on an assumption that money is infinitely fungible and freely exchangeable. In practice, the exchange of money is never optimally free and cannot be treated as such, and no state or institution is a neutral party to the exchange. It is not true morally and not true in any practical exchange or utility of money to place its issuer or the state that regulates a market beyond reproach. It is extremely foolish to create a story that claims there is no state

and no law. Market societies, banks, treasuries, governments, states, armies, and officers to enforce the rule of money down to the lowest, do not abide anarchy for long. In a society where "Oceania has no law", the institutions will fill the role of a state, and their nature becomes unmentionable and unmoored by anything that would allow public accountability. If that is so, then the conditions allowing for a market to operate can never be stable, and the result is pure rot. By no means does this guarantee that there is always a state in principle. We can imagine a society where the state as a concept never formed, or is no longer tolerated in principle and we consider the governance of humanity very differently. There will always be something to govern a market and agents in a society, but that governance does not need to regard the pretenses or institutions of a state. If that were accomplished though, it would refer to a completely different governing mechanism that provides moral and spiritual authority, and no such mechanism or arrangement has appeared to us or even been theorized. Anarchy is not a solution but a primary root of our present problem. Rather than overt despotism where liberty is traded for a false promise of security, in this anarchy, personal security is undermined deliberately for a false promise of liberty, while the genuine definitions of both are utterly annihilated. It is not that we have lost liberty or security. The security of the state and ruling interest, and any part amenable to this rot, is strong and violently asserting the rot, and this is a very orderly and concerted affair for the predators. We retain, in theory and in fact, liberty of a sort, in that there is nothing immediately stopping us. Many people have freedom in a sense that no one is telling them they can't live, even when the propaganda screams "die!" in so many ways. Yet, this freedom is taken away with the blow of the wind, and predators in society are enabled to attack the honest and decent who do not want rot. Liberty is destroyed not in the name of security but in its own name, where liberty's new conception is the liberty of the ruling interest alone, and the liberty of anyone else is merely a suggestion. Morally, this is kosher in the crass sense of predatory morality, and they love this arrangement because it allows them to transgress and take infinitely and punishes the honest that would mitigate the rot. To any genuine sense of moral sentiment that wanted something productive, useful for a concerted aim other than destroying lives and making us suffer, or basically anything but this, this is appalling and obviously not right. We would only be able to discern this morality if we possess a sense beyond the crass pseudo-moral posturing of the predators. The predators may invent some greater justification for this, or simply declare that might makes right is a valid moral stance and no one will tell them no. Yet, there are many who see that they have absolutely no reason or purpose to encourage this, and even if it is quasi-illegal for them to stop the rot, they will out of necessity resist all efforts of the predatory to attack them. Submission to such a beast is not an option, and such a beast makes clear its intent is to never stop the rot for as long as they can impose it. The moral situation is never so simple because those who impulsively wish to stop the rot and act alone will fail, and once exposed, the predators mark down the honest for special punishment. The republic now, or what remains of it, is ruled entirely by fear, and cannot even claim that this deserves the vaunted title of "terror".

Terror in any form implies some coherence or purpose beyond killing. This is some new species of abomination, the likes of which was never possible before. But, I get ahead of myself. This description simply elucidates how predators can work through moral calculus in complex ways, and the same can be done by the honest in their own way. The predators do not have this natural monopoly or a natural right to do this, and their claims to it rely on moronic arguments a child could disprove or see with full sense create nothing but rot and death. The predators and all other parties with their own interests can only pursue their aims by mechanisms which are known, however complicated they are. They do not do anything by some "spooky action" or world-spirit. The predators as a group in fact comprise disparate interests that are only united in a shared knowledge of the rot and their benefit for maintaining it.

For calculation of all moral propositions, we may observe value in acts in various ways:

Micro level - The act itself, valued as if conditions external to anything in this system are irrelevant. We envision the system affected to be as small as needed to describe the act and its immediate purpose. We have no reason to believe that any act we have must percolate beyond the purview we intended for its immediate effect. Very often, we choose to act in ways that isolate the act and mitigate its consequences - for example, we do not want to think too much about where we defecate and the buildup of waste, as if it were inconsequential to take a dump in the family kitchen. We have particular manners for disposing of waste specifically so this consequence is mitigated, and we may think of a sewage system or some elaborate society-wide scheme where all shit is recycled, and it is every citizen's final duty to go into the tanks and become one with all of the people.^[3] Generally, though, our interaction of importance is to sit on the toilet, do our dirty sinful business, and flush it down the drain. That is the important act.

System level - All acts are carried out in a system where they are relevant. This may be a mechanical system we regard as a device, a life-form that we observe as something wholly constituted, a social unit like a family or workplace, or a unit like a city with few enough moving parts and boundaries that it is familiar to follow the goings-on of the city. The complexity of the system depends on what is modeled. For example, if we limit the purview to social science, economic activity, or the political arrangement, we would limit our purview to economic, social, or political topics, and be able to relate those concepts as needed across fields while keeping them separate. We can keep politics and economics separate and have done so very easily, and we can choose where they meet without conflating purely economic categories with purely political categories, or suggesting that these two are so intimately linked that they are inseparable. We may meld two categories to view their inter-relation, and political economy as a topic does this often, but we are able to understand that economic behavior need not be political. There is nothing political about managing the affairs of the home in of itself. Political economy and its forebears suggest an invasion of the home by the

state quite literally in the name, and this has been a long-run trend of political schemes. This is something more apropos for the next book in this series and beyond, but we will refer to political struggles obliquely in this text to regard that they do exist. We often find ways to relate two fields which are different categories but link often. Biology and chemistry will often meet, and physics in some way describes a very large number of systems. Strangely, the meeting of physics and sociology never occurs without grand mystification and bullshit, even though much of what humans do in society are transactional interactions that are done and forgotten. All stable relationships in human society take work. Family, friendship, marriage, professional life, social advancement and prestige, involve constant effort which reduces not to biological just-so statements or urges or chemical or material things exchanged, but motive acts which have force to comprise the functions of society. For most people, any topic which is politically sensitive is dominated by the language of Being, and doing is constantly undermined so that the political statement appears above motion or the effects of actors, whether directly attacking the settlement or subtly manipulating it. The state as an entity in practice is aggressive and proactive, no matter what settlement is reached, and this pervades social interactions and economic behavior.^[4]

Wide-Domain level - A sufficiently large domain contains many types of systems, all of which relate to each other in some way. We do not segregate each field of science and declare its appropriate purview, reproducing a technocrat's division of the mind in the world itself. Many of these systems are rooted in physics, and all of these systems are rooted in information for the purposes of management or command. The managerial task of command, however poorly it is performed, presumes that managers integrate systems in order to effectively rule. A manager to be a manager is primarily tasked with economic functions and exploitation. Managers, as a rule, do not produce and do not really do anything but manage. Their function is, by all frank assessment, the easiest function of all for a computer to automate. The manager has no monopoly on this task, for we all must manage what we do and regulate the faculties and resources available to us. Further, integrating these systems into a general knowledge base is intrinsically interesting to us. It is what humans do so naturally that we almost can't not do this, short of being tortured and beaten and caged to turn off this function.^[5] Even if this were not a natural impulse or something of utility for a task, we do this because of one overriding condition that dominates human life. That is that humans individually exist in a state of ignorance until knowledge is verified factually and one is confident that their faculties meet any potential challenge, and allow someone to live as they would have wanted to in the best possible world. There is a sense, never really founded on any truth but followed often, that knowledge will somehow save us and make us better. We have different ideas of how to do that, but no one believes ignorance is strength or that promoting ignorance or lies would create anything functional. Persistent lack of knowledge and acute threats from that state of affairs form the basis of many erratic behaviors. It is, very plainly to those with enough experience,

the rationale for diagnosing schizophrenia politically - that is, the image of the schizophrenic is paranoia, not because paranoia is an essence that somehow made someone mad, but because paranoia would be a reasonable response to extreme lack of information. This can be induced by deliberate humiliations to destroy someone who offends the wrong people, or the result of genuine brain decay or the destruction of faculties accelerating by the mechanisms dominating the present society.^[6] This is a level where humans learn to make quick decisions and also where humans operate generally in their activities. When playing competitive sports and team sports in particular, an athlete's awareness is taking in a wide field, while focusing their activities towards the system of the game. The culture of athleticism is not a technocratic specialty but a way of life - being strong in that world is not merely a matter of being a machine specialized to kick footballs or some other task. Players may be specialized, particularly in American Gridiron Football, but their awareness in-game is on point and concerned with the non-trivial task of playing well. The athletic talents that come natural to us would be great if they could be applied to knowledge, or a reasonable application where we are capable of navigating a web of systems very easily. This talent is not common but can be honed.

Transcendent level - There are things which are held above ordinary "systems" and referred to in language suggesting that they are everywhere and almost godlike. This language applies to genuine transcendent ideas, such as religion or metaphysical questions, but it is also adopted by the language of the state or the ruling institutions, which are referred to with vague aspersions of "the system", "the establishment", or some other broad and nebulous beast. Awareness of these things is necessary to complete our view of the world and adapt to a general fear which pervades all societies. Even if we could dismiss states or anything of the sort as far away, they linger as a possibility, and there is something beyond the horizon. States, even if they demarcate a limited domain, operate at the world stage as if they would in theory claim all that exists. So do institutions aspiring to rule or become the sole institution of their type, as do institutions which coordinate to appear as if they are all united against their common enemy of the dispossessed.

These categories give us some resolution when we act, so that we know not to conflate them with each other. They are not truly separated by anything but our conceits of a system, and so like many things psychological manipulation is possible. We further resolve meaning based on experience and cross reference, including with something called common sense. Lately that sense is less common because the society has been transformed, and this common sense itself has been manipulated to suggest blatant untruths and the generally hostile nature of neoliberal society.

The act of commanding the world suggests a critical mindset that is analytical in a crude sense, but ruthlessly effective and capable of building large theories on spurious knowledge. Information in the systemic sense can often be conflated with meaning and purpose, which is granted "systemic" properties that meaning

does not actually possess. Yet, a trained mind can direct this ruthless criticism to disassemble information, parts, and so on. A very adept mind can make from the systems thinking a general outline of approaching problems. This will have to be something self-taught, especially since pedagogy is hostile to any independent systematizing and has an ideological goal to promote the "correct" political views, whatever they may be and however loosely related to actual politics they are. To contemplate meaning for too long is anathema to a drive for information and command. To contemplate oneself or the world outside of this drive to act for moral value is time, energy, and resources not spent on that moral value which may take priority. The moral value is what is really important, and this value subsumes any information, material, or system it invades. It does not need to be a corrupting moral value. There is in people a need, perhaps not stated explicitly, for faith that what they know is accurate. If someone is too focused on adjudicating facts independently, or crippled by a lack of knowledge that does not allow them to assign moral value properly, bad things happen. Therefore, human beings are often stubborn in their beliefs about the world, and their moral valuation of any act. If they see something they don't like, they are not going to like it because of some ethical argument and respond even less to threats or blatant lies. The wants of people are not fixed in nature or essential to them in a way that makes them inescapable like a Demiurge, but there are those moral values which are too foundational to give up. There is further a distrust of anything new, if only because adjustments to long-held views of the world and preferences are costly and potentially dangerous for assimilating information. If someone has to learn a new list of acceptable political facts that have nothing to do with a meaningful situation, and this is a matter of social obligation, it has the effect of scattering this faith and attacking this stubbornness.

The faculties of knowledge itself are valued, and this value is not limited to information processing capabilities, nor is the knowledge valued in a linear mathematical sense. It is rather that among the resources available to an agent are their time and processing power, and the energy and will to do things. Those resources are never fixed for the agent but they are always finite, and often not things that can be replicated easily. The peculiarities of all of the faculties of knowledge are very important for this question in the long run, but for now we concern ourselves with information and the verification of that information, which takes the form of facts that can be adjudicated. Absent any institution with compelling authority, we presume that someone is for the moment adjudicating facts on their own power that are not difficult to grasp, and that this agent is confident in their facts. In other words, they are operating with perfect information, and the limitations of information processing faculties or any other constraint of knowledge are not relevant.

THE GREAT SHAM OF THE UTILITARIANS

For every moral imperative that can be imagined, there are definite and discrete propositions of acts which advance it. If an act were to be done purely for its

own sake, without any regard for consequences or the cost of doing so, then any proposition advancing that imperative would be oriented towards itself. That is, the point of life would be life, the point of torture would be torture, the point of war would be war, and this feeds itself. There is no argument to make against doing this, if someone really wanted to. If done, then any act other than the core act would be subordinated to that core act. If life is the point of life, than all the acts life entails exist solely to feed into life, and all other imperatives are irrelevant and effectively null. If life is the point of life, then anything other than life's functions is an externality which is subordinated to a life-form carrying out its functions, and so all hopes and aspirations are fed into this vampiric entity. The life-force of an individual entity is fed into some sense of life overall, as if life-force as a concept were a god to be fed sacrifices of everything we are and everything we do. This is very clearly a pointless existence for the individual, and the concept of life-force itself does not think, know, feel, or have any purpose itself. Knowledge is always a local event, where all of our feelings about existence and any moral cause would originated. If we were to subordinate all of our deeds to knowledge generally, the same result would follow - all of what we are and do is subordinated to some abstraction we hold to be the sole concern that is transcendant. If we are to enshrine ourselves in whatever sense we view ourselves, the result would be the same. We would replace our genuine individual existence, which is complex, with a maniacal conceit of "Me" which is viewed as godlike and divorced from anything real. There is nothing telling us we cannot orient our lives like this, and doing so answers many questions about what we would do here. Why do we live? "For our genes!" What is the guide to do something? "To protect our genes!" This is intentionally invoked and is done because it works on people. It is in fact the only starting point for developing a persistent imperative to guide a knowing entity, if we are to make decisions through algorithmic information processing. The greater question of what we do with knowledge or meaning is not relevant to any concept of commanding the world, or operationalizing anything someone or something is or does. The core of any imperative for a knowing entity is the act itself, rather than some symbol or being held above the act that is passive. No imperative that seeks to command the world through our knowledge faculty can exist as a passive thing that "just-so" happens. If any entity wishes to command the world - and it must do this in some way simply to be constituted as a knowing entity - it must do things persistently. That is the only way in which there is anything we regard as being, that can be defended or that can be said to grow on its own accord, for purposes particular to it. This also means that every event in the world, no matter how insignificant or external to a given cause, is subject to this moral imperative, that is purely the conceit of knowing entities. Nothing about what we do is "valued" in any way by nature, as if it has some plan for us. If we are to imagine God or something like it with a plan for us or all of existence, we are speaking of something which is very different from nature, but an entity or concept that is either knowing in a way like ourselves, knowing in some way above us, or something altogether different which we lack any ready-made comprehension of or which does not translate well to any symbolic

representation we would comprehend. Nothing about God or anything like it would be treated as if it were a natural phenomenon co-equal with ourselves or any thing in the universe, and a "natural God" described with the language of science would abide conditions that make it unlike the gods humans commonly acknowledge in religion. Even the implied gods of a "religion of science"^[7] do not conform to our understanding of the study of nature, as if the "god of science" were merely a more elaborate form of ourselves or some conceit we intellectually hold about the world.

If we are to live for a godhead or something like it, that is a complex but singular proposition and all of the events in existence would be valued with that imperative in mind. Such an imperative is inherent to any overarching moral code or ethical framework, for ethics is the rational and informational counterpart to morality which stems from a genuine reckoning with the real world. Morality is never found anywhere in nature, for it is something particular to knowing entities. Our moral sense is guided not just by knowledge as a process but by the reality that we are living creatures, which must abide certain imperatives to continue living. Spiritual thought does not reduce solely to the imperatives of life or knowledge as a process, but entails a conception of the world as something more. I concern myself here not with the presumption of something so vast and large, but with the necessary germ of any moral or ethical approach to acts generally. To speak of utility or usefulness towards moral values generally requires acknowledging the germ of such concepts of utility. It requires viewing moral sentiments and their origins and full. For now, however, I operate on the presumption that we can speak of moral sentiments individually and isolate them in particular acts and deeds, whatever they may be. The moral value of anything, the propositions we make that we value morally, are always propositions of something contingent on a world outside of any conceit we hold about the world or ourselves. Even if we were to morally value ourselves and consider ourselves apart from the rest of the world, that would entail some ability to view all that happens in our mind as something alien, so that any moral value can be discerned within this construct. Self-reference does not suggest that we cannot hold a critical view of ourselves and whatever acts we carry out. It is possible, within the mind of someone holding a particular imperative, to see that the acts following from that imperative contradict the overarching goal. This is a problem for us, and not so much a problem of thought or rationality, but a problem of our conceits. Nothing about moral values or thoughts suggest that this contradiction is inevitable or must exist in nature. It exists not because contradiction is inherent to morality or existence, or because we must resolve contradiction with knowledge. In the natural world, nothing is ever contradictory and the concept is nonsensical. Contradiction in reason is a problem for us and us alone, and very often contradiction has nothing to do with a genuine rational problem, but with pigheaded conceits humans or any knowing entity would hold. Often the root of these is not genuine irrationality or a lack of some proof to resolve the error, but a willful moral position which attacks the very entity which can hold a moral position. That is, the moral values that someone can hold

can be contrary to the very knowledge process which allowed moral value to be comprehensible. The knowledge process is always something that exists in a real world rather than something wholly arbitrary and inscrutable, but we don't have instinctive models to suggest how knowledge is arranged mechanistically. That model can only be guessed at from our own experience, which does not conform neatly to symbolic language or models we would construct. It is instead the case that symbolic language allows both refinement of a model of knowledge, and the emergence of knowledge processes hitherto unknown in the world. What resulted from humans with symbolic language was not merely a recapitulation of some inborn gene of knowledge or a recapitulation of a natural assertion of knowledge, but something novel to the world. That thing that is novel to the world still must abide a world outside of the knowledge process, but there was no rule of nature suggesting that the new knowledge process had to lock into a preferred model of some pedagogue or thought leader. Those who could develop their knowledge base ahead of the rest of the human race saw an advantage to insist that they alone possessed the master key, and made themselves gurus and mystics to proclaim what the subordinated classes of humanity were allowed to think, and what their own growing knowledge process would be. That topic must be investigated further at another time, but this change informs all moral values and imperatives, even if they were self-referential. It is possible for self-reference to allow for emergent behavior, stabilizing behavior, or destructive behavior which reduces the knowing subject to something as small as needed. All of these behaviors may be initiated for purposes that are not absolute at all. We would want to destroy aspects of ourselves that are undesirable, that can be muted easily so that we do not follow them again. We don't want to be sick, though we cannot guarantee that or a consistent definition of "sickness", which is exploited as we will see later on, and many of us will have to ask if we really want to make others suffer or if suffering really is the point of life. To proclaim "life is suffering" is to insist that we must be bound to that dictum for no good reason. Generally though, the imperatives someone wishes to seek are stabilizing so that a process may continue, or seek to assimilate new knowledge and allow the entity to grow in some way that allows for adaptation to more potential events. These imperatives need not be carried out for some overarching purpose set in the mind, and so we can choose moral values or objectives that appear as if they serve no greater aim or purpose, and this is not an error or insane by default. There is not any preferred imperative that nature dictates at all, such as life itself. Perhaps the knowing entity is not living in the sense we are, or does not value life for its own sake. The sense this entity has of itself may be that its knowledge process itself is not valued at all, or is just a part of something much larger as it must be to sustain that process, and it is perfectly fine with abandoning the way its knowledge process functions currently and metamorphosizing into something else. If it wishes that, it will likely sense that it can only morph over time and through ways that are possible in the world, and this process would be a delicate matter not taken lightly.

It is with that in mind that utility should be approached, for utility is never a

universal of nature or something imposed on knowledge. Utility is only sensical to knowing entities which pursue their own aims, whatever they may be. It may be that knowing entities do not consider anything at all "useful", and for them their moral imperatives concern concepts that have nothing to do with use or some plan to command the world or themselves. Even if those concepts are held and someone is generally content with their life, and does with their life and mind whatever they like, anything they would do could follow mechanisms and patterns that an alien knowledge would consider useful. For natural events like the flow of a river, the river does not "use" anything or think anything about its mechanisms. It does as it will because it did not occur to the river that these processes should end. Nothing about the river exhibits properties of life which are peculiar, or knowledge which would have any independent intent. The river continues much as it has, and erosion and various geological events, or the results of engineering from living entities or entities with knowledge that would affect nature, are of no moral consequence in of themselves. The command of natural processes is only useful in any way to entities which possess a conceit of commanding the world and claim nature in some way. This claim may regard the processes of the Earth as sacred without any claim of property as such, and it may make sense to someone in a primitive society to preserve the forest or the water supply as a commons, or out of some sense that doing this would be beneficial in the future for some vague purposes that are not apparent at the time, but would be prudent to preserve. It is typical of life to not wantonly destroy an environment as if it were a Captain Planet villain.

Utility is envisioned as a measurement of some imperative or command, and this imperative is understood to be founded on a moral value that the user holds. The function that is done follows from what the user wants and values, and the moral value is treated as something persistent. All of the functions that exist, and all of the things which are valued, are definite propositions. The functions and things cannot be divided into infinitesimal parts and remain informationally the same things and events. It is not possible for example to envision "half of a water molecule" or "half of a car". We may cut an apple into parts, but in nature, such things only grow as wholes, and we would be obligated to regard the growth of a plant or fruit or livestock or human being as something indivisible if it is to functionally exist. If we could command the Earth to produce at will quantities and qualities we can divide as we please, without the process of production or growth from natural processes which we know much about, we would have some knowledge telling us how we can do that and why that works. It is impossible to simply assert by decree that we can do that because we want the world to be as we wish. If we wished to make the world or any part of it conform to this desire to command it and produce all qualities and quantities we wanted, it is only possible through faculties that are themselves definite qualities, rather than faculties which are infinite and operate outside of reasonable expectations. That question is something science can establish. So far, we have seen science is often dubious, as science itself derives from a process we do rather than something the nature compelled us to abide. For that

reason, it is very easy for pseudoscience to assert things about the world that do not conform to what actually happens, and even the most honest scientist must acknowledge that thought alone is meaningless without practice. Proper science is the domain not of the intellectual or manager but the worker and producer, who must do science not because of some conceit of pleasure or wisdom but because the producer's fate depends on it. This does not stop the worker from managing himself or those around him, or stop workers from considering their own intellectual conceits. It does however place proper science as something which must conform to substantial results and models which favor an honest and true interpretation of the world over the conceits of command or the vanity of intellectuals. Nothing compels workers to follow through with this honesty, but if the worker wants to accomplish anything in the world outside of him, he would have to reckon with reality. This includes the political intrigues and the conceits of intellectuals who live vampirically from the labor and life-force of all subordinate classes. Both science and knowledge itself suggest that the world in which acts occur in is infinitely subdivisible, but all propositions that could be moral values are definite values. Moral values in of themselves cannot be freely exchanged in any unit that is shared in common. The utility of any thing or any event or function is, in of itself, fixed as what it is. Five pennies may be worth a nickle in exchange, but those five pennies will not metamorph into a nickle by some strange alchemy of the world because of our value of either coin. Every coin minted, or paper note printed, or any data entered on a ledger which represents money, is a definite proposition, rather than a thing existing in the abstract. For money to be money, it would be a token of some imperative, rather than intrinsically valuable by declaration that it is money. Money is a particular symbol of value, and its purposes are not general or universal. This is understood by anyone who must manage money and use it for anything, no matter their purpose for money. The same is true of any token of value or anything used to signify value. This is true whether the value is considered something to exchange or some utility measured mathematically and with the language of knowledge and science. The particulars of money are contingent on many propositions concerning its issue and legitimacy, and so exchange and utility can both be detached from it, as if money or some other unit of exchange could be universal. We may have a general sense of exchange or utility, which all others may derive from. At heart, though, exchange of symbols of value is done because in any exchange, some purpose or utility is accomplished through exchange.

No one exchanges money because they have some naive faith that this is fun or interesting. We do, however, exchange abstract symbols for reasons that are not obviously moral or tied to any outcome of great importance. We can just as well use play money chips in a game of poker or some other gambling game, where the stakes are nothing but a sense of winning and losing and the entire game is a way to pass time and meet people. Any poker player who plays the game enough can tell you the true heart of the game has nothing to do with math or counting cards, which has been solved many times over for the cruder sense of the game. Poker to be an interesting game entails the human element,

games of deception, meta-gaming in which normative expectations of play are set and violated not just on one table but for poker as a game generally. There was at one time in America a boom of poker games, which were played not just in casinos or at home games but in online game rooms. This epoch of gambling, and all that surrounded it, is a fascinating topic for would-be historians, about which much has already been written. For one, poker games never conformed to a singular ruleset or valuation, and many such games exist such as 7-card stud, Texas Hold 'Em, Omaha, which suggest slightly variant playing styles and expectations. The particulars of each variant are things someone can discover casually. I will look at Holdem where two hidden cards are dealt to players and five cards are dealt to the community of the table, three after the first round of betting, and the next two cards revealed with a round of betting for each, and the final reveal if two players show down and reveal their cards, with the best combination of five cards from their hidden cards and the community cards being their hand. The hidden cards available to the player suggest few starting hands are strong enough to value before betting begins. Yet, the meta-game of betting pre-flop is contingent on more than the starting cards' value. For one, the size of other players' stack, and their position in the order of betting, suggests what players are likely to do regardless of their hidden cards. It is further the case that general strategies shift based on what players generally do, and this is a part of any mathematical calculation. In an earlier era, it is very likely players do not enter hands out of position unless they possess one of the few hidden card combinations that are strong, like a pocket pair, two high-value cards that allow for straight and flush possibilities, or an Ace which can win in an Ace-high showdown and would be paired with a community card Ace which is better than any other single pair. As the game proliferated, a willingness to play wider ranges of hands was embraced, and habits of betting changed to encourage this strategy and obscure the strength of hands generally, until retaliatory bets begin. There is a large theory of players to suggest this change, all of it contingent on the mechanics of betting and in the knowledge of other players who would over time establish tendencies and reputation. An adept poker player can spot the fish who will surrender their chips because the game is a hobby for them and the sharps who pick apart situations by reason and some cunning that sometimes wins. In all events, poker is a fickle mistress and when a player runs bad or runs good, it creates the impression of a geist, despite all reason suggesting that this is an illusion. The run good can manifest into an advantage in stack size, from which a player can operate very differently. Short stacks have generally fewer options, and will be more likely to risk a final stand if they sense some advantage to take something back from the big stack, who can afford to speculate with less-than-ideal hands, or call the bluff of a short stack if something suggests to the big stack that short stack is posturing. A large stack may be aggressive to place shorter stacks under pressure, but always prefers to be in command of betting rather than reacting to someone who might possess a strong hand. The ideal for the big stack is to keep smaller stacks cautious even if they sense their hands are strong, and this informs how a big stack would play and how smaller stacks navigate that situation. Ultimately, poker games are played hand by hand,

rather than by some grand narrative. In a tournament, the final objective is in mind before play begins, and the structure of the tournament and its eventual goal accounts for players' decision-making in every hand, but each hand is a single showdown, and if a smaller stack wishes to survive, it will have to win hands, run good, and take whatever advantage it can claw back. With most players in a tournament being aware of how this works, even talented players will face early bust-outs and fools can prevail for a time. A few fools can make it to the end. This of course implies poker as a game is taken at face-value, which is never the case. No game and no activity humans undertake is ever what it appears to be at first glance, and poker exemplifies that in the mechanisms that are emphasized, from incomplete information of the holdings of a player, to the randomness of the cards dealt and unpredictability as cards are revealed in the community or in a player's exposed cards for stud variants, to the reading of players' expressions and tells and history of their prior behavior.

From the simple mechanisms of a game arise a whole environment, and games themselves are never truly self-contained or played for the stated purposes, as if the game were an isolated system played as-is, or the players didn't have a life outside of the simulation. The artificial intelligence objects mentioned in the last chapter do not know anything about the game. Player characters, or knowing entities generally, are aware that they are playing a game and that they have an existence outside of the game. Knowing entities, in short, consider themselves part of the world, whatever belief they hold about their consciousness and its separation from the world of material things, and about themselves or their property. Entities without this knowledge, like the artificial intelligence players, are philosophical zombies in the view of managers and their imperative. Whatever knowledge process is judged to go on that constitutes the artificial intelligence is morally considered null and irrelevant. It does not occur to the knowing entity that the unknowing entity is anything other than a clump of matter to be appropriated, and there is no way to suggest that the unknowing entity has any true moral worth to the knowing entity. Whether the knowing entity really knows what it thinks it knows about the artificial intelligence or unknowing entity is not relevant to how a knowing entity will value other entities, or anything in the world. For the purposes of command, knowledge and conceits about oneself are self-evident. To doubt one's own knowledge and integrity, no matter how dubious, is to invite certain doom and the worst possible fate a moral actor could conceive. Knowing entities can accept death and failure, but they cannot accept under any circumstance permanent and total insanity or retardation. That is the worst of all conditions, and acutely sensed. No one is ever happy with such a fate, and if they actually think they can be happy in that way, they are quickly reminded of what happens when their guard is down. All of this occurs over what is, in any cosmic sense, a game that is no more relevant than a game of Monopoly or play money poker. Nothing we do in society, all of the things we fight wars for and struggle for, possesses any intrinsic value by the fact of existence, that must be abided in all circumstances. If the world were so loathsome that this is all there can possibly be, then many

will see that this world is not worth living in, and have no reason to regard any "great game" suggested to them by a pedagogue or thought leader. If the thought leader resorts to gratuitous force and suffering to make everyone play, then the subjugated see correctly the futility of even acknowledging the thought leader. This itself is intended by the present governing idea, because emphasizing the futility of the life of the ruled accelerates the death rate and torture, and disrupts any thought process inimical to the thrill of torture and suffering that imperial utilitarianism implied.

In suggesting a unit of utility towards any imperative, someone commanding an act envisions a game played with certain objectives and conditions. This is familiar to us as "game theory", which arose in the 20th century in various forms. Game theory derives largely from work on computability, and so it is a theory well adapted to the systems thinking we have dealt with so far. Its origins are less demonstrated by the natural world, but by moral aims that were implied by the capitalist situation and the empire that governed it. There is not a way to disprove that these games can be constructed for problem-solving, but it is never a science that is observed in nature. All efforts to export this thinking of the world as a series of games or stories are really conceits we hold about the world and an attempt to either command it, or construct a model of it for our use. It was evident in the export of Malthus' population principle to explain the origin of species, where a very human conceit is imposed on the natural world to suggest an explanation of natural history, and then bad philosophers take the claims of Darwin - which were understood to answer this question of history rather than suggest a force from nature worked in all cases equally and without discrimination towards a crass imperative - to suggest that some overarching imperative of nature is the dominant and then the sole mechanism governing history, life, and thus society. This is trivially disproven, but the ruling ideas of the 20th century came to regard the imperial and eugenic imperatives as the only real imperatives and the only real moral values, to which all others in all existence must be subordinated. Whether it was disproven mattered not, because such a view served the moral sentiments of many people who saw such an imperative as highly effective at maximizing predation and torture, first for some thrill of doing so individually, then by all the predators gathering in a union of horrors and suggesting that this predation and torture was the true basis for society and all others were no longer admissible. That view precludes that there is any real "game" to play, or any genuine utility for any agent whatsoever. It forbids not only the position of a nihilist, for whom the game is in the end merely irrelevant, or the absurdist who asks why we are made to care about something so silly as our delusions of controlling a world far larger and greater than the sum total of human genius, laid bare to the truth that all we have accomplished in human history is shit and piss. All that remains in such a view is vanity and symbolic conceits, which overtake any other sense of utility or moral purpose, even that which a nihilist would accept can exist in theory. A nihilist simply views these moral aims as what they are, or at the most extreme the nihilist considered death, void, and extermination of these hypocritical screechers to

be a greater good than allowing them to continue doing this to us, or valuing conceits that are obviously at odds with anything in the actual world or anything a reasonable person would value for any purpose conceivable.

What we see with this dilemma in naive approaches to game theory and the rational agent is a dilemma deliberately exacerbated by the most malicious of the human race, who are not too smart but just smart enough to figure out how to make us miserable. The result is that speaking of any general utility, or common "util" that would be respected by anyone or should be regarded as anything valuable, is futile. Utility to be measured applies only to a specific game or model that is intended. It is further that each game is subdivided into so many events or actions, each of which are discrete or construed as such. Therefore, if we are to model the efficiency of some action in a game like baseball, each event in the game would be modeled as what it is, and only by proximate relations of things in the game is any overarching objective considered. Physical models to suggest how a batter would swing the bat to best attain a desired result, like knowing the best time to swing, how a hit may be aimed, or how to swing powerfully enough to score a homerun, are not contingent on scoring points or many of the the other events occurring in the game, and the laws of physics which existed outside of the game do not change because of the game's objectives. Everything about this game and simulation was contingent on a world where physical laws exist, and so the game conforms in some way to the laws of physics. This is one of the purposes of the sport. Players like to hone their skill at batting because it is interesting for reasons outside of the game, rather than the game itself containing the objective or suggesting that optimal batting mechanics are morally necessary. If we did not care about this physical activity, we could just as well simulate the game on a computer in some fantastical scenario, as many baseball games do for reasons that are amusing to a video game player, and perhaps to someone who follows the genuine sport. There is, in the mini-game of the batter's composure, a number of objectives that must be valued. The rules of the game inform what results from this game are "good", but it is possible and expected that an optimal batting strategy will produce situations where balls will be hit foul. It might be possible to solve meticulously pitching and batting strategies so that any player, at any time, would be faced with scenarios that make effective batting impossible, and part of effective pitching is to pitch in a way that places the ball in the strike zone, but places the batter in a position where swinging is unlikely to result in a scoring play or anything advancing the batting team's objectives. Since the pitcher controls that aspect of play, the batter recognizes his position does not let him choose what he can and can't do outside of limited conditions. There is a reason then that batting averages are almost always below 50%, even for the most skilled batters who are famous for their talent at reacting to the pitch optimally. The pitcher must concern himself with exhaustion, for he will be making many pitches throughout a game that lasts for hours, and this mechanical action is not trivial or automatic. A talented pitcher is aware that he would need to switch pitching mechanics and possess awareness of the tendencies of batters, among other things. Perhaps

this level of evaluation doesn't occur to any player, but it would be necessary to speak of the utility of each event, each act. And so, every aspect that leads the the mechanical acts is its own game, and each one of these is contained with a particular purview. Actually swinging a bat does not account for all the things a batter does, nor does the swinging of a bat necessitate any great knowledge. If a player flinches at the thought of swinging the bat itself, he will have severe problems playing the actual game. The best form for the batter to swing is honed and practiced outside of the game, just as a golf swing is practiced and the fundamentals of any sport or any activity are practiced. A general knowledge of physical activity is encouraged and monitored not just for sport but for life in general, and these acts, while contained in their own moments, inform other such acts. They are not directly informed in a way that suggests that men who don't swing a golf club optimally must be terrible people in life, or something so superficial and silly. Yet, the moral philosophy at work in economics encourages exactly this kind of venal and stupid behavior, even though it is clearly maladaptive and pointless. There are reasons why this was embraced, and why to true believers, it justifies itself and serves simultaneously some "greater good" that is never specified, because frank admission would lay bare the true relations within the human race.

We divide the acts of a game into these segments which can be construed as a singular event with a number of moral values attached to them. It is not evident which of those moral values are the correct one. We presume that there is one moral value we seek, for example, "winning", or a number of moral values which represent potential outcomes of the act itself. Every action has a number of consequences, all of which must be definite if we are to speak of commanding all information and considering all tactics and strategies possible within an event. The game may reference other games it is associated with, and all of these games reference a world outside the game. If the game is self-contained with no reference to the world, then it is not a "real game" that can be considered at all. Even the simulation of a game or some thought experiment is contingent on information and a knowledge process that could only exist in the world, even if the game environment is intentionally divorced from our everyday understanding of the world. When one sub-game is analyzed, each reference outside of the game must be specifically understood rather than assumed. If we are to suggest the best form for a baseball batter, or the potential outcomes of any encounter with a pitch, the decision is made with the relevance of outcomes understood by the programmer or manager. The player in real life is aware of the possible outcomes, but none of those outcomes tell him the laws of physics or how to hone his body. Sportsmen do not typically think about the laws of physics when they exercise those talents, but they likely think about the body and physical sense when they wish to formally learn those talents, or at least operate with some knowledge of physics that is practical or something they train and condition. A talented position coach in American Football is likely aware of these mechanisms and coaches players to optimize functions, and recognizes the talents of new recruits. There is a large science when recruiting players for the sport, and one

reason for the proliferation of athletics in school is to promote this science and athletic talent for ulterior motives. In the moment, though, the practice of some skill is its own world. We may know why we do these things in the abstract, but if we wished to diagram the swinging of the bat or the fundamentals of sport, the strategy suggesting what to do is fed into the function.

For a programming example, we may suggest that the AI handles a particular event with a function. This function is the "game" at the moment. It would be quite impossible to operationalize intelligence without these functions as a concept, and basic computer programming teaches us to build these functions rather than strings of spaghetti code arranged haphazardly. Every instruction of the machine and every process involving information and its command will be definite, or treated as if it could be definite if the commander wishes to establish all possible outcomes. Whether the "computer" is aware of the information or even operates with information directly, there is a model where all of this information is collected and understood, and there is no way to speak of commanding information without accepting that such a model exists. If a manager were unaware of what he did and refused to learn, or adopt a guess that approximated a full accounting of information, he would not be able to manage for long without some fuckup. Even without "perfect information", those who act are capable of comprehending that there is a world where events happen consistently and for reasons that can be understood, and all moral values are contingent on a world that is consistent. If the world were so absurd that nothing could be real and stable, then moral values and thus utility would be irrelevant in any long term. If it applied in this sub-game or function, such that the function could not be understood in any way that suggests what is to be done, then absurdism would override our actions. We would behave as if outcomes were random and devoid of purpose. Most likely, someone who does not know what he is doing when he is to do something will just freeze in fear, as this is a typical response to situations where one is ignorant and wishes not to expose himself as a fool. This, as you might guess, is intended, and operationalized in educational interventions. Education teaches children to lack confidence in any faculty of their own, and teaches children to place confidence in signs and symbols of authority. There is no version of education which can do other than this, no matter how many claims educators make of the necessity of their pedagogy. The best case scenario for education is that the educator is correcting operational errors as they see them in children, and children are looking for some moral guide since children lack many indicators of what to do in a society that they are born apart from and live apart from. No child can expect to know instinctively what values are socially acceptable and what to do in every situation, when the information necessary to integrate into any human society is so vast. If the society is one dominated by deliberate deception and the general cruelty of the human race, blind faith or trust in goodness to "figure itself out" is a sadist's dream to warp any young mind. This is the program that was violently imposed, and when children instinctively sense fear at being treated like this, the lying intensifies. This particular germ, this particular cycle, is very relevant for future discussion.

It begins here in how the command of anything in the world can be understood and operationalized. By disrupting all moral values and all factual standards of comparison, and then controlling information inputs and outputs, the human subject becomes a machine. This never works, but it is not intended to actually promote qualities or growth. The intent of this operationalization in education is to destroy and mark children as fools, so their position in society is weakened to that the educator considers appropriate, or to destroy as rapidly as possible the child, either eliminating its life after a routine of tricks and deception to mark him as failed, or transforming the child into a living abortion to be made an example for the glorification of the educational institution and the creed that guides it.

Most of us do not want this. Teachers or educators, at some level, recognize that they cannot do this to everyone and expect it to become an absolute. Only at the highest stage of eugenic society are the humiliations and sacrifices omnipresent, where children are herded for the slaughter and a small number are pulled aside and given lumps of horseflesh marking them as "gifted" or better by some dubious metric. We recognize this to be the worst possible outcome of every event, and this is transcendent because we are at a basic level dependent on knowledge for anything we would value. Even if we didn't know what a fool was, it is never pleasant to be a fool, and if we somehow tolerate that ignorance, the world and the sadists who claimed it from us will make sure we never forget what this always was. At some point, the rot and ruin will truly perpetuate itself, and this is intended for the ethos that brought neoliberalism to the world and glorified its rot.

We have developed a general rule of any game that to be a fool, or do foolish things, is not desirable. What that means in a context may vary, but in short, ignorance is not strength. This does not grant to wisdom or knowledge any genuine moral value in of itself. It instead places ignorance, foolishness, and lack of information as a moral value of its own, which must be avoided at all costs. Here we see the truth of economic utility, and the utilitarian moral philosophy as a whole. There is ONLY suffering, and it must be maximized if the goal is to command the world to obey managerial conceits. There is nowhere on this axis or spectrum that regards "pleasure" as a genuine condition. There is only suffering, which is associated with the retarded, or the lack of suffering. The lack of suffering is not a genuine state, but pure nothingness or void. In other words, the "genius" of human beings, that most prized substance, becomes illusory and hidden beyond occult institutions. These institutions would, in time, be advanced by the likes of Francis Galton, and the great modern taboo begins. That story is for much later in our writing, but it is evident in all the ways we are trained to view suffering, intelligence, and foolishness or retardation. It is the absolute because it was forcibly made to be so, rather than any natural value or even genuine intelligence or knowledge. It was, in short, a way to transform through information the knowledge faculty into a gaping void. The coda for this is to advance the primordial light, the Luciferian core that these cretins actually believe in, as "true wisdom", and through that deliver their human sacrifices to

the maw. It is the disease, and it takes many forms, operating on many fronts. This great error must be understood before we proceed with a genuine account of utility and its role in economics, because it has advanced thoroughly and has poisoned all public knowledge. In private, the genuine knowledge is occulted and made precious, but even if a fool learned the truth, "once retarded, always retarded". The enforcement of this is not contingent on knowledge alone and certainly not some information masquerading as meaning and fetishized, but violent force which becomes a thing commanded from the shadows, through the intermediary of slavish functionaries who clamor for blood and torture.^[8] I wish to leave that problem for now, so the game now can be modeled in a way that is not stupid, from each event to its outcome at the level of a whole game environment. From there, the remainder of the problem will be the concern of the next chapter, and will be expounded on for the rest of this book. We are not concerned with any preferred problem of the state or politics, which for now is a thing we must abide but not acknowledge as changeable except by methods we cannot know at this point in our writing. We can, however, say now that things like this, that have become the ruling ideas, are the exact thing which must be counteracted by any means necessary.

DISCRETION OF MORAL VALUES AND OBJECTIVES

All of our investigation of utility, however conducted, suggests that at the micro level, utilities are discrete, local to the event where they occur, and are not freely exchangeable. At the systemic level, or the level of a whole "game", utilities are specific to that environment, and while a greater reference to society or something outside the game is possible and implied by the existence of a game, in of itself the moral values of a game are particular to it. So too are the values of a system particular to it, and any value ascribed to the whole system or whole event described as a game is a problem for utility at a higher level. At the value of wide awareness, which is to say awareness of the world and some conception of generally useful things in the everyday, the question is contingent on things which are not always self-evident, but there are aspects of ourselves and the nature of society that are so close to self-evident that we would have to regard them to move forward with a general concept of utility. Transcendent truths, which include the spiritual claims of the state and religion and our own sense of spiritual authority, are things that are not taken lightly or presumed as if they could be changed by clever tricks. We are able to fool ourselves or be fooled, but the world at that high a level does not regard any tricks or symbols we may deploy as relevant. The world, which by and large does not regard any of our conceits about value or a stupid drive to command the world, usually creates examples of transgressing decency and things a child could figure out. Not one of these levels can divine for us the true utility. If established from the germ of such utility, which must be any base-level game we would solve, an overall sense of utility in games and then in society can be established that is sufficient for our purposes.

In the abstract, utilities can be measured towards one and only one imperative. There is no dyad suggesting that morality exists on any spectrum that is total and absolutely, where two ideas struggle for dominance and all are subsumed in these ideas, these tokens that are offered as a thesis and antithesis. In utility, there is only the objective sought, and all other objectives are for the moment null. If the objective is "winning", then all conditions that are not "winning" are moot. Strictly speaking there is no "losing" implied. There is only winning or the lack thereof. Put the other way, there could only be a level of losing or failure, and the ideal is to low-score on this scale to lose the least. Generally, the proposition of two forced "choices" is a no-win scenario structured to make that moral choice purely a question of what the player will lose today, and suggests an overall schema by which all decisions, all moral values, simply mitigate the lose condition. At the levels we are concerned with in this chapter, only at the level of the game system is winning or losing a condition, and these are separate propositions. We would understand winning by some metric that is sensical, for example a score counter, and players compete to increase that score. Not all games are structured in a way that the "win condition" is a scalar value that can be arbitrarily high. A game, for example, may concern itself with preserving a stock of lives or some token representing a point which the player starts with, in which case the high score is what you began with, and the objective of the game is to lose the least. All of your tokens representing score would be win conditions, and so the objective would favor defensive play. For the time being we concern ourselves with a single-player game, with the opponent being "the world" which does not care about any score or win condition. The agents in the world still can be construed as pursuing some utility.

An AI opponent who follows some script is likely to be designed in a way that presents a challenge to players, and the AI performs this function faithfully. The AI would have been created by some human programmer who wanted to make an interesting game, but we may presume that the AI developed by some procedure within another program, that was designed to make crude AIs for game simulations generally, or game simulations of particular types which are simple enough. It would be possible to make simple procedural code generation now if a programmer wished to, though it is not so trivial to do this that it would be applied outside of a number of situations where all potential "games" that the AI adapted to would be a limited set. In practice, AI routines are written to resemble situations commonly encountered in games. For example, pathfinding algorithms may use A-Star or some variant of it, which has been used for almost as long as computers have existed and is a common programming example for novice programmers. More complex algorithms would be expected of capable programmers, but A-Star is sufficient for many pathfinding routines and nothing more is needed. A-Star can be modified to find many different types of maps and conditions with little effort, and it could be possible to make a "general routine" that comprehends node networks or can construct the nodes algorithmically rather than the nodes being hardcoded by a programmer, or suggested by arranging movement by square or hexagonal tiles. The point here is

that with A-Star, there is a preferred outcome of finding the most efficient path, and A-Star works by using a heuristic and recursively testing it until the correct path is discovered. The only imperative here is finding the shortest path, and the game is solved mathematically. A-Star can be proven to arrive at this shortest path given it regards the conditions of movement properly and can conceive of moving from node to node, and the acceptable access points for a node. A-Star is not guaranteed to be the most efficient method for pathfinding computationally. If there are no obstacles or boundaries of interest, then the simplest pathfinding would be either a straight line from origin to destination, or to move horizontally one direction than vertically another if movement is constrained to the cardinal directions. In the latter case it is trivially demonstrated that the length of the section is the same regardless of how many direction changes there would be, so long as movement is towards the destination, and there is no ambiguity about what is "up" and what is "down". It may be that turning in this cardinal movement scenario incurs a cost that is undesirable and so the number of changes from horizontal to vertical movement should be minimized, and it is not difficult to prove that the simplest solution is to only turn once. It may seem simple to make these assertions, but the computer does not know anything it is actually doing, and so a programmer wishing to implement artificial stupidity could command the AI to do things that are clearly stupid and contrary to the optimal answer. This is not a very elegant or appealing answer since any player will see the AI is throwing the game, but it can be done or the AI can simply be slower or weaker, so that the game's difficulty in that regard will be adjustable. A more elaborate example would allow the AI to utilize gambits on higher difficulties that it will not do on lower difficulties. It is also the case that AIs, without careful understanding of the game they play, are incapable of making gambits that a human player makes easily, or only do so at great risk. For example, in some turn-based strategy games, a human player might defend their city or base with a single unit, but AIs generally will defend with at least 2 or 3 units, as the single unit would be easy to defeat and allow small detachments skillfully moved to run roughshod over an empire. By increasing the cost of each capture, the AI mitigates its risk against this, encouraging players to not split their army thinly to attack alternative objectives. The choice of units for defense or attack may be significant. In earlier games of this type, a typical strategy for human and AI players alike would be to keep at least one stout defending unit and one unit with attack strength that could defeat units approaching the city, thus breaking a siege. The particulars of all units are relevant to this calculation, as is a general sense of what is possible in unit to unit combat which is acted on when considering the immediate action. All considerations are separate, discrete possibilities.

Solving any game in game theory presumes that there is a win condition pertaining to so many fungible units, which represent one and only one moral value. Other moral values would only be sensible for solving the game if there were an implied overarching moral value to pursue. If someone held two distinct moral aims, nothing would suggest one aim is greater or lesser than the other, or even

suggest that comparison is possible. These are two different imperatives pursued simultaneously, and the true moral imperative uniting them has less to do with either act's intrinsic worth, and more to do with a general sense that the two were intended to solve. Yet, both aims would be necessary preconditions on their own merits to attain the third, and the third suggests compromising one of the first two, or both, or suggests some lordship to balance the two in accord with it. The reality is that all of these are distinct aims, and not one of them can claim to solve the problem without an external logic imposed on the game which is totalizing and cannot justify itself on its own merits, as if it can disregard the game played or the situation of its agents. To do this requires the agents to be conceived as some flotsam who are cajoled like any other object.

This is only resolved at the local level by asking honestly what is meant by all that happens, rather than accepting what happens as seemingly random information mindlessly pursued. A human or an artificial intelligence must do this. For humans, this is a process discussed at some length already, and how we navigate this is not the purpose for this chapter. For an artificial intelligence, whether it is the code of some programmer or code written on the fly or by a procedure outside of normal operation to accomplish this, discerning meaning is the most useful talent, and it is not something accomplished easily or through a crass approach. It is not accomplished through any formalism that answers the question for you. All that we know and formalize is but a guide to this question, from which it is possible to suggest an idea that is novel and can actually resolve the question. The genesis of useful knowledge, and then symbols relevant to it, begins not at a preconceived notion of utility, but here when someone must confront the genuine situation and all others around it. All of the prior steps in knowledge were necessary, and the final step of formalizing and symbolizing it assists in refining the basis for further investigation, but the crucial step which made possible any new knowledge was found here. That is that we encountered some problem, which may be a thing we sought to command, and had enough motive and incentive to consider a solution that was not established before, and that could be verified using our existing knowledge, such that the sum total of knowledge would expand. It was not some genius as a fixed quantity, but a process that developed and that we protected out of necessity that allowed any non-trivial contemplation of what was useful. The use of recursion to refine a heuristic is one indicator, however crude, of this process. The proof that this is a valid algorithm and will always produce a short route given the conditions set, only formalizes something that can be added to the vault. We don't necessarily need to understand why an algorithm works, but it is helpful to do so. Very often, the most basic steps we take are things we do not formalize every day, but are things we understand and reassemble. In AI, we have functions which handle basic problems and we likely know how they would operate. We could look up the library to pick apart that function if we had to. Generally, though, programmers do not memorize everything in a common header file, like the library of standard I/O routines in a programming language, line for line. We instead know what they do, and for the more common ones, we likely figure out

how they work line by line as an experiment, and then remember in future that we can write an instruction "printf" to write a line of formatted text to console output. It is not that a programmer temporarily forgets that there is a machine language, but that the informational details are not relevant, given the output of the function is expected for some input given to it.

For all moral values and aims, there is a reason why they exist. Morals only exist if they acknowledge a world where outcomes are at all relevant. That reason is not reducible to another moral value, but is something above that, and not something symbolic or for political posturing. There are many ways to interpret this, for the purpose is not always the highest spiritual authority, which is a limited concept for us that we regard as necessary. The moral aims are not so much "useful" in a vulgar sense, but things that comport with what we would have wanted to do if we did not labor under command. It has long been understood that of all tasks that could be automated, the managerial task is the easiest of all. This is something the computer can do - that it can be a tool we use to do things faster and easier, rather than a tool that rules us or that we lost an ability to understand. If we were to teach what this tool actually was, and doing so is trivial and is done out of necessity today, we would be spared so much stupidity in discussions regarding intelligence and computerization. The same can be said of many things humans think of and do, which are not immediately computable or informational things. There is a reason why we do various things, hone those skills, and we do them not to be commanded or cajoled, nor for their own sake. It does not need to be a good reason or one that makes immediate sense as "useful", but all things are done for reasons, and those reasons are ultimately for us to decide rather than a thought leader imperiously deciding what wins. If, however, we live in society, we are beholden to things outside of us, and do not get to do whatever we want. This is not hard to comprehend. Since society can only be understood as an assembly of agents, it is beyond the present consideration, since for society to be as it is, human beings are socialized as individuals. It is the same with this treatment of knowing agents generally, where knowledge is a local event. If we actually thought as a hive or were thoroughly integrated into a network which enhanced us, such that the human body and knowing agent was a part of a whole harmonious system, we would be very different creatures. The philosophy of subordinating humans or any other entity to a symbolic collective is nothing of the sort - far from it, symbolic collectivism surrounding an idol has long been recognized as failure, and this symbolic collectivism does not create a worthwhile collective but exists specifically because it degrades a collective and society definitionally. If there were a situation where moral actors behaved for the collective and remained knowing entities, it would describe a state of affairs far removed for anything humanity has known or conceived, and it would entail a wholly alien psychology that is anathema to the present values a state upholds. There are a few souls who do long for such a thing in this world, but they are lost and have found that humanity refuses to align with such a vision even in a microcosm, and can scarcely fathom a well-integrated unit of workers, even for the express purpose

of making pins which would have been considered useful and decent in another time.

When commanding utility of informational things, we often lose sight of why we wanted those things in the first place. That utility would be informed by things which in of themselves are not objects of utility at all, but are altogether different moral aims. Those aims would be considered above ordinary trucking and bartering, as if there were a price on that which violated the most basic sense of integrity we would value. There arrives a point in any negotiation where the price to pay is too great to ever contemplate, or where something is coveted too much to part with. This need not be for any noble or good purpose. We can be stubborn to hold on to things for the most fickle emotions, like a hoarder who refuses to make decisions to throw away her pile of clothes and junk.^[9] Human moral sentiments are in the end not rational aims or even rationalizable in the crude sense. We can understand why moral sentiments are held or where they arise, but however thorough our model of the human subject, there is enough variance and humans as a rule resent the arrest of their faculties. Even the dullest human will act in accord with interests that are not for sale or things that are processed into some droplet of utility. Humans can sense without any great philosophical theory that the utility beast seeks only to suck their blood and soul, often refusing to hide their lizard-like tendencies or celebrating them as some sort of virtue.^[10] It is an instinct to not sacrifice that which is meaningful so readily, and certainly against the interest of anyone to surrender meaning and their holdings for the pitiful benefit they are given, which is usually nothing more than an empty promise of slightly less torture once the beast decides they're going to suck your blood and wealth. The false promise of mercy is something those people laugh at and despise with every fiber of their being, and that was clear enough from the start. Everywhere the imperious cajoler acts, they do so with naked contempt for their marks, either because they are vicious lizardpeople who love the swift betrayal, or because they are natural slaves who are trained like dogs to chase this utility of symbolic winning, while their lives are glorified jokes rife with petty squabbles and a futility that people have to be brainwashed to accept as normal or the behavior of the "silent majority". Without a vast apparatus violently enforcing it, most people would have pissed off and stopped believing in alien institutions a long time ago, and there never was much faith in the state institutions or in the gods on offer. They entirely relied on threats and lies to insist that anyone should follow any of this, and present a vast distorting effect on moral valuation generally. The world where we didn't do this is a world we have little conception of, and at present that world is too alien for us to discuss, for its explanation would require a very different preparation than the topic I write about now. The promise that the state could disappear like magic or wither away is such a sick fantasy that someone would have to be a true believer or a sick liar to ever buy it for a moment. For the most part, those who were not inclined to see the institutions as a vehicle for advancement didn't buy any part of what was sold by any politician, and only saw at most desperate situations where they would have to pick some side in

a political conflict, always in a lose-lose game. Even if the state disappeared and the institutions disappeared, all of the questions the state and institutions did answer - badly, but forcefully and necessarily - would remain, and there has never been and perhaps never will a credible alternative where we didn't have to do this. The best we ever accomplish is whatever we make of this world that can escape the political and the imperious will of philosophers. The moral values held are at the highest level not rational to hold at all. We don't have any rational reason whatsoever for desiring anything, including life itself, and we have no rational reason to say that nihilism or self-destruction are good or inevitable, or that the fate of the universe as a whole is even relevant to how we would live here and now. We have no rational reason to enshrine ourselves just because, or value any preferred authority. In the end, the core values we hold are not intrinsic to any essence of ourselves or any process of knowledge that obligates us to hold them, nor any other part of the world or even conceits of the totality of the world. The moral core, in the end, concerns things which may be knowable and rationalized, and often these concepts are rationalizable even if we lack a proper name for the moral aim we have distilled from those aim. The aims we pursue do not concern things we want, in some fickle sense of "me wantee". We can want many things but recognize that such wants are not so core that we would defend them or fight for them. The wants of life are not moral aims "just because", even though we would surely die if we lacked food or air. We have some reason for living, even if that reason is that dying is too much hassle or some stubbornness to spite bastards. We can find new reasons for living very easily, without resorting to the silly posturing of an idiot like Nietzsche.^[11] Ordinary workers figured out the art of the cope without any grandstanding, as if they found some great secret of life. Workers, and any man or woman with a sense of decency, figures this out and probably realizes that giving away their copes is a way for someone to come along and wreck their day.

SYMBOLS OF VALUE

When developing useful symbols of value, we bear in mind the basic conditions which allow utility to be conceivable - that moral aims can only be the result of discrete actions, so long as we are concerned with commanding anything in the world. The reason being is that the command of things is informational. Even if information is not tokenized and symbolized so discretely, in principle all information can be treated so, and must be treated so if we are to prescribe any symbolic language, such as anything I or another person could say or write on the matter of morality. The rational counterpart to moral aims is, as you probably know, ethics, which is often at odds with the moral thing we wanted in the first place. I do not yet feel the need to discuss ethics, and instead discuss the moral sentiments as if they were irrational things that might have a rationalizable origin. We value moral aims not because it is rational to do so, but because we know moral sentiments on a level we value, regardless of where they originated in the world or what we might think about them. When commanding the world, we can only use rational arguments, however crude they

are. No force, no matter what is presented, can truly make the world obey it by power alone. Force without rational discernment of its application is just useless bluster. A force summoned as if a bullfighter induced a charge and activated the beast has rationalizable effects, which the talented judge observes from afar and measures to determine how this force may be deployed in the future.

The discrete functions which comprise genuine utility are not the result of symbols being limited things, but a simple fact about what it would mean for a knowing entity to claim moral values at all. If a moral value is claimed as an objective, it is in principle, but not necessarily will be, fungible for the purpose of that value. As mentioned, not all values are intended to be maximized or minimized, as if the spectrum were some manna to be siphoned. It is possible to seek values that are some median, and very often, this is the desirable outcome. For the functions of life to remain, for example, the typical value desired is that which is established by reason or a sense to allow life-functions to continue, and for overall health of the living system. We either adjudicate some optimum or some range that is acceptable, or we possess some sense that may never be symbolized or written down, but is nonetheless information we can rely on. We have some sense, for example, of pain in the sense of nervous stimulus, and we differentiate the sensation of the nerves from pain in a philosophical sense, or emotional anguish. Pain, like any moral sentiment, exists alone, and each variant we differentiate is understood differently. We may lack any clear philosophical metric for pain, or any sound psychological science to indicate the existence of pain. We can, though, know very well how much we hurt compared to some other time, and with sufficient investigation into why we feel this nervous reaction from events, we can likely divine why pain is sensed and how to avoid it, or how to numb it. We further document the effect of opiates, which are more or less effective, and can possess some science to suggest why those drugs, or any substance in the body, affects nervous pain or reactions in this way. Pain as a nervous response is typically a response that we expect, and on some level, we expect that nervous response as part of life. The pain of hurting in this way is not intrinsically "bad" or something we sense we have to avoid at all costs, but generally, pain is a sign to life-functions that what we are doing will not end well, or a sign that the functions of the body are disrupted by something that would be best resolved. There are those who seek out physical pain, not as part of some elaborate game or sense of self-destruction or a sense that this has great moral significance, but because that pain response is in certain situations a sort of release or a reminder of valuable things. I do not wish to encourage that self-mutilation because the reward is never all that great, but it does exist and it does tell us that a crass assumption about moral values cannot hold in all cases, even for things we regard as mundane. Those who do desire such pain often have reasons why that they can explain, and it is not for me to assert what they think or their genuine motives. It could, perhaps, be determined by a sound psychological probing, if such a thing were interesting for an inquisitor, but often the genuine conditions of the human mind or soul are of little interest to the inquisition, nor are they things the inquisition has any use to know or

desire to change. Far more often, psychological inquisitors note some response only to use it as another lever to press the nerve of authority and power that their position in the institutions entails.^[12]

For every symbol we hold to be morally valuable, we must for the sake of that moral value be able to critique it. If the symbol of moral value is simple and we made the symbol specifically to convey a simple fact, this does not need any inquiry. Saying " $2+2=4$ " is not a great triumph of reason, as if this statement made you free and everyone else didn't know the truth. It would be quite impossible to actually believe, no matter how much you were tortured, that two and two added to something else. You might use different symbols, or temporarily forget one exists. You may even train yourself with a wholly alien theory of math that is temporarily held to make an asinine argument. In any way that those symbols pointed to a meaningful truth, even if the greater truth pointed to lies, the symbols themselves, the concept of numeracy, the concept of adding two numbers, and everything that went into that statement, are things easily reconstructed. If someone suggested two and two made five, they either invented a whole system of math allowing this, or they are temporarily turning off their faculties to say or even believe something that is incompatible with any useful function, with the intent of not using this concept for anything beyond a funny thought experiment or a trick they might play if they were hypnotized to believe numbers aren't real.^[13] We are capable of recognizing what numbers are and what they are referent to. Symbols of **value** proper are not symbols bereft of context, and never can be even for the simplest purposes. In mathematics, the symbolic values are things to be operated on to produce a result, or statements suggesting the truth or falsity of some proposition the numbers and operational signs indicate, which would be understood in formal problems. "2" by itself does not indicate anything because it lacks any context or an operation, and does not suggest any proposition. It is just a symbol on some media, and we might recognize by context that it means something, or it may be something inscribed next to a picture of two circles, as a child might be taught to associate the symbol "2" with two countable things and make the connection without any great pedagogy. " $2+2=?$ " is an invitation for someone to solve the problem. " $2+2=4$ " is a statement of a tautology that is not terribly interesting, but as mentioned, this statement or variant thereof can be used to make an association to suggest something is as self-evident as the tautology, to make a claim that the associated image or fact is automatically as true. This is a psychological trick that is deployed many times in propaganda to produce this hell we live in today. A more elaborate mathematical proof, or rather showing the mechanical and operational steps to demonstrate one's work for a simple first year algebra proof, indicates to the reader processes that can be followed to explain why some operation or some process works. For example, a simpler proof of the quadratic formula may write down each transformation of the equation to allow that formula to be comprehensible for a first year algebra student. A proper, formal proof of the concept of algebra is not so trivial, for the concept was never just asserted as kosher because a smart man said it, but because it had to be proven that laws of

algebra were logically permissible, and that mathematics could be treated in this way, which allowed for the further development of mathematics after the Middle Ages.^[14] Presumably, we value mathematics because proving these propositions is useful for discovering truth, and the propositions are turned into something which allows insight into facts which can be verified. You would never claim that you "prove something with Math", as if Math were some deified spiritual authority no matter how dubious. Galton's statistical charlatanry, for example, has nothing to do with math or science, but with the fine art of selective control of information and bald-faced lying. It would be trivial for a mathematician to demonstrate the imbecile claims made by Galton and many did so at the time, not because they alone possessed the truth but because Galton's math was so ridiculous that it would be attacked by any person with a shred of honesty in them, whether it was to defend the people with truth or to defend phrenology.^[15]

The intended meaning of the symbol does not grant it moral authority. "Words have meanings" is definitely something to keep in mind, but meanings can too be manipulated once they are symbols drawn by another, and the definitions of them are fed not by intuition or our sense but by pedagogy, which insists that their definition is true no matter how ridiculous. The same is true of any symbol that is assigned a value; for example, a commodity, which is valued as so much money, with money also being a commodity albeit one with political implications in any form that would be appreciated as "money" in the sense we have understood the concept. All the things, all of the objects in the world, are conceivable as symbols of value. This does not make all things commodities or freely exchangeable by the declaration it is so. As thorough as free trade is, there would be in liberal society certain sectors that were always sacrosanct and protected from the market. Where the market logic was introduced, it would be introduced in a peculiar way which protected institutions considered of greater importance than the mere token of money. Eugenics, for instance, was always above money, and presented as one solution to the conditions of capitalism. The eugenic institutions always were placed above money, and never pursued an end that was profitable.^[16] It has been very easy to play with the symbol of money in various ways, not out of some sense that money will mindlessly expand like some Cthulhuesque demon that is unfathomable, but because the ruling interest understands money correctly as a psychological tool most of all. Money as a political relationship is only comprehensible because ordinary people need the things money can buy, that may or may not be available. The moment money ceases to be useful for that - and this has happened many times in history - pretenses about social relations give way to an ugly truth that money is just another manipulation, and does not possess the authority it presumably does. It never did, and never could. Genuine analysis of money and economics, of which there are ample examples, never granted to money this mystique, even with some of the most egregious examples. The Austrian School economists very much did not care about money as such, but were almost nakedly advocating for a sick rebrand of feudal aristocracy and the conceits of their race and class. A creative dialectician like Marx can write for hundreds of pages about money

and its meaning, with ample evidence of history, and yet someone with a mind to make money a symbol for grasping purposes selectively chooses or ignores that dialogue and the thing he was critiquing, in favor of whatever parts suit the present aim. Money can mean a social relation at one point, a tool in the next, and yet it is none of those things. Money to be money as we know it, and it does not take a genius or a great philosophical understanding to get this, is issued by banks and treasuries, and this was so obvious in older times that it did not need to be written. Yet, the nature of the bank and the state that must maintain such an institution is always misconstrued to mean something other than what any investor, any banker, and anyone who has to deal with money to live, could tell you about the beast. Nobody ever made money out of some sense that it was good for the producers, who have long chafed under the rule of the bank and desired nothing more than to be free of it. The history of the commoners entailed a running battle over currencies, banking practices, and everything that was there to keep the common man, whether he was a wage worker, slave owner, businessman, or himself involved in finance and wary of competitors, under a boot and made to offer something to the richest men and the ruling interest that most of all needed the bank. The bank exists not to produce things or because people were too stupid to count their commodities and value them, but because the state could requisition things it needed to fight wars and staff a bureaucracy with coin rather than forced extraction, *corvéé*, slave labor, and things states used in the past and continued to use up to now. Coin allows states to do this in a way that is effective for many purposes, and supports the opulence of a class that need not concern itself with producing anything. The opulent always loathe the idea of producing anything and, in their heart, desire to keep only those workers and producers that suit their bigotries and petty wants, which in the end are not much at all. At some point, the appeal of luxury items has little appeal compared to the true mark of opulence - political power and the thrill of seeing subjects eating out of your hand. The Roman aristocrat and often the equestrians and what counted as the Roman middle class all understood this very well and made this patron-client relationship the marker of social prestige, even during the imperial period where this no longer had obvious political relevance.^[17]

Symbols have meaning not because we are told what they are, but because of meanings and actions associated with them. The most prominent symbols of moral value are shrouded in stories which lead most to hesitate when regarding them. Religions icons, idols, holy texts, and all the signs of religion do not acquire their meaning straight from the book or the priest to your brain. Religions, as we will see, often invite adherents to read the text and listen to the sermon and think about what was said. Even the lurid cults of devil-worship encourage this in their own way, although the infantile forms of demonology and anvilicious moral hypocrisy of the eugenic creed distort this understanding. Facts establish better context for symbols than suppositions, and our own guesswork is limited even if we are very quick to disassemble and reassemble things. It is because so much information is recorded in large repositories and a society much older than

us that we are reliant on the adjudicated facts of others without too much time to suss out the bullshit, and only as we progress through life do we sometimes adapt.

We think of the symbol as a discrete thing. One coin is one coin, and in the material world, that is indeed the case. The symbol of some useful object, like bread or water or butter, is understood as possessing certain qualities as soon as we recognize it. We envision these symbols represent a substance which is infinitely fungible, even when it is clear the things even symbolically cannot be split. It is the moral value which becomes a utility of the thing that is the fungible thing; that is, these symbols are only valuable as something commanded because they do something, just as any process of knowledge is active rather than a passive thing. Even the recognition recorded somewhere of a place where tokens of value or useful articles are stored or available for the taking is not assured simply by memory, as if what we remember would always be true. If we guard a storehouse, we are tasked with checking periodically if that storehouse was not robbed, and defending that storehouse in various ways. The same is true with any claim on property that was sitting unclaimed by anyone in nature. Those claims can be contested by other agents, but even if we operated alone, we recognize that symbols of value - useful things or things we made useful for some purpose like money - are only useful when they are put to use. Money sitting in Scrooge McDuck's money bin is not useful for anything in a direct sense, outside of Scrooge's love of swimming in it.

For symbols of value, there are conditions suggesting its value that are not immediately apparent utilities that the thing does. All the symbolic things that can be appropriated, whatever they are, are things that can be possessed in some way, claimed and parceled out. Abstractions can be claimed and parceled out for the most spurious reasons. While utilities may be gauged in accord with some metric mathematically determined, utilities are things actively done. Once the act is complete, there is no further utility in the act itself. By acts alone, they are only sensical as part of some greater utility if they are treated as propositions apart, which must follow logically. Only by the propositions resolved in each operation does the function output its final value, and return from the function with the final value. All of those utilities ultimately serve a utility implied by the meaning of function, and given the same input affecting the same conditions, the output is the same. Even here, if the conditions the input is fed into change - a different object or different state of the object - the output changes accordingly. The output is only judged in this isolated function, from which other functions spawn. But, every symbol in this function, and the symbol of the objects themselves in this game, imply a great many values and potentials that the algorithm does not immediately acknowledge. Some of these potentials are never encoded in the game itself, but are implied by understanding of the player(s) in this game who operate outside of the simulation, and act as if the simulation were like a real situation. The player is not constrained by thought that the designer of the simulation created, but is constrained only by the potential of the player's knowledge. This is necessary to properly derive

any meaning from symbols, so that potential strategies would be judged by the player. Even if the game is not solved for you, a player might consider the optimal strategy out of all that are available, given the propositions of what can be done and the things they can be done to, and the environment generally. A player may consider a whole route that was never considered by developers, entailing many steps that the player might independently solve before playing the game and testing the theory.

A thing's utilities are never truly embodied in the form, but are only comprehended with study of the thing which is established by investigation. That study may be formalized and presented as information, but any study is often incomplete when dealing with utilities in a general environment. A study in a limited environment, like the micro level of system level, may have a solution that is possible or trivial, and at the system level there are only so many actions that are relevant or meaningful towards the objectives implied in that system. A small system like a game is only interesting to a point when considering the utility of acts in it. There are only so many ways in which Mario can run, jump, walk, duck, and so on to navigate through each level. While Mario enjoys a wide range of motion which makes that game compelling and replayable, neither Mario or his foes display particularly complex emergent behavior, and so very strong strategies are developed that solve mathematically the game, even if they are difficult for a human player to hone. That is why tool-assisted speedruns exist, doing things that are either difficult to optimize for human players or impossible for realistic human players. We may find in Mario meaning to the symbol that isn't particularly relevant to the game or solving it, or consider strategies that while not optimal for speedrunning would be fun to show off tricks or bugs, or impose challenges that require the player to approach the game in some novel way. Perhaps the lore of Mario is fascinating for reasons beyond mathematical appreciation, or Mario brings back some nostalgic feeling. Perhaps Mario's adventure eating hallucinogenic mushrooms, which does not involve the nastiness of meatspace, is a welcome escape from a dreary world, as it was for me. But, things or symbols of things, which are in the end abstract rather than the genuine "thing", suggest things that are contingent on environments that are outside of any preferred system or model. We may describe a model of a market society, about which many things can be said and where laws of motion regarding exchanges can be described, and this is a very valid approach. We would consider that, as widespread as the market is, many exchanges of goods and many concepts of utility are never done in the market. The vast majority of events that are commanded in society are not market exchanges at all, but the sundry tasks of living, which themselves inform the utility of anything we buy at the market. Without our ability to make use of things, no utility at all can be suggested by the form. Utilities are only activated by the users, and can never be assumed or taken for granted. Many things and many people are far less useful than their potential, even to the most crass mind which might remark on how wasteful all of this effort to command, dicker, and deal is, asking why the effort was spent to work and buy something that wasn't used for much at all.

The symbols of value are what is commanded rather than the utilities themselves. The utilities or acts themselves cannot be possessed for any length of time, and commanding those acts by some imperious will can only work with a well-understood plan to unlock the potentials within those who use things, tools, or any abstraction we would value. It is therefore the case that the quest to command the world and the things in it is really concerning itself with symbolic things, rather than meaning or that which we might have valued as something more substantial than these things.

The peculiarities of exchange, whether in a market or otherwise, elide the real question of economic value, which is that these values are sought not because they represent some political value, but because they represent values that were never contingent on politics. Political value to be relevant would have to form only after many such symbols and acts pertaining to them allowed the state to exist, and the state, which appears in as many forms as there are entities with claims petty and large to the world, only has a few persistent traits. The state's role in permitting exchange, or even relations of labor, is far from absolute, and usually not the sole or overriding aim of states. The holders of a state often care remarkably little about the productive classes and slaves, beyond writing laws that maintain some form of exploitation and ensuring that the state's requisition of tax and suffering is paid season after season. The true holders of a state are usually not an elite that shares equally in political influence. By and large, states are held by a few institutions and powerful centers of influence, and the mass base, even if that base feeds the state with taxes and production and most of the things that allow a state to function, is beholden to those institutions and centers in some way. Even if no such institution or center existed, it is natural within a political elite for factions to form around interests which must work in concert, and those interests are often limited in definition and membership. Even if the interests are willing to bring in the lower orders with money, or even bring in the working class and the residuum who are traditionally cast out of political and economic affairs beyond service, leadership of the interest, as is often the case in institutions, revolves a small body of persons within a designated elite. This would be necessary for the interest to be guided by more than mass appeals, which would be necessarily limited. The masses, or any large body of people, are ultimately people with disparate personal interests which don't always align neatly. This is especially the case when an interest or a party is comprised of disparate factions forming a large tent, where the alliance is already shaky and held together by a smaller number of people who hash out how the alliance works before returning to their interest groups and telling their respective bases the deal for the party as a whole. It is unprecedented in the history of mankind that there was near-unanimous support for any coherent governing platform under a single, all-encompassing interest which claimed it served the general will and public good. It is not that such a thing is impossible or undesirable, or something that is only dashed by intriguers or despots. It is that the people, in all honesty, want too many different things at a personal level, and possess so many distinct utilities, that building any governing plan for all of

them is not realistic no matter how farsighted a leader might be. Pleasing even some of the people some of the time is a tall order, and leaders in practice have never done particularly well with pleasing anyone beyond the level necessary to prevent angry mobs from tearing the leaders and the rich to shreds.

Absent politics and society, this question of value is one we ask ourselves. Nowhere in the world is this value written or implied by some entity outside of knowledge, in the sense that there is any intrinsic value in things or relations. No symbol is written with its value to knowledge printed on it, universal and undeniable. It can be argued symbolically that the apple we see as-is is not an apple for the purposes of value. The apple would be a fact of the world, in that such a construct certainly can be proven to exist by sense and adjudicated by any reasonable person, and even if facts are in the end things for us, facts about the world are premised on a fact we have to accept that there is a world that is persistent for all knowing entities like ourselves. We do not get to argue about the factual and meaningful existence of the apple. In commanding the world and assigning value, though, the apple's essence or substance is not inherently of any consequence. We can easily assign to the apple moral values that have nothing to do with its essence. Nothing about the essence of any thing suggests we are obligated to hold any moral value for us, or any value in commanding it. Most of what exists in the world is simply not interesting for us to command, or even harmful for us to bother touching. It is not an axiomatic rule that we must absorb all that exists in our conceits of value, whether to command it or document it out of some sense that it is our business to inspect the natural world like an insufferable nosy neighbor. At a basic level, knowing entities value that which their animating force suggests to them. For us, we are living entities, and so we orient our values towards the demands of life. This is not so much because knowledge as a process is living, or because we came from living processes and therefore we are morally indebted to the concept of life itself, or a conceit we hold about it. We can easily envision ourselves not caring about life as a process, even our own, and we care far less about the life of others in most cases. The values we hold about life often entail its meaning, how we live, how we die, and our sense of a world greater than the primordial instinct of life, and so the concept of a genetic obligation to moral sentiments is quickly overcome. So far as we have inborn moral sentiments tying us to life, it largely arises from death being a less trivial process than we might assume. It takes some effort for life to kill another or kill itself by forceful intervention, nor does life spontaneously die without something happening to it. The failure of organs in life as time passes is wear and tear that we can assess as it happens, and the elderly are acutely aware of what can go wrong in the human body. If engineers are reasonable enough to accept Murphy's Law, and old man or woman familiar with the human body will follow the same law with regard to live, having seen ample evidence that anything that can go wrong with the human body will go wrong. All of these values are things a knowing entity senses at the level of themselves and their own system, and they would operate regardless of the wider environment and the world as a whole. They are things we understand as characteristics of life

and knowledge generally, and our knowledge of ourselves in particular. We may consider that in some very different environment, or a different society with values and technology and events far different from our own, we would in time become different creatures. For most purposes, though, life is a system which seeks to persist on its own power, and this precludes radical transformation except in ways that are compatible with that life-form, and often metamorphosis is constrained to transitions that are common for that type of life, rather than ones which are arbitrary or imposed by the command of another. It would be the same with any knowing entity that is constituted, in that to continue knowing things, it often retains its original process or transforms it in way that allow that transition to retain its knowledge base. A different type of entity might not possess the same instincts living creatures like us evolved with, and those instincts are not merely a just-so story of life but the product of history that suggested life would carry those instincts. Whatever the history, any entity that knows would operate on its own power, or would have a connection to that which operates and powers it that is definable by knowledge. Absent any evidence that there is some direct connection operating us like we are meatpuppets, we would regard the knowing system as a whole as something independent, pursuing aims that make sense for it, and within systems that it can assess. When playing a game, we are only tied to the world outside of that game because we recognize the game is a simulation. If the "game" is our experience of some activity judged to be real and obligatory, like visiting a market or attending education or conscription into a fighting force, we would be operating in that system most immediately and could only think about the wider awareness of the world and society so much. We would be attached to events that are proximate to us, and the events within our body and immediate access, like tools we use, would be closer than other people or the field of play in a game.

For the values to exist beyond a local consideration, they would be comprehended by agents not at the basic level where the agents are a point of light that does things just-so, but at the level of a system in which agents act. The most basic level where values form are in acts and small, particular things which would allow for any complex moral values to exist, and thus for utilities to develop as something more than a mechanical force. At a basic level, all of the things and symbols that comprise a knowing agent, human or otherwise, are propositions that would be simple enough to comprehend symbolically and meaningfully. For example, if we are to judge the value of some moving part in a greater machine, we would not suggest that the machine part is itself beholden to the whole in some spiritual sense. A gear, ball bearing, a physical action of some machine, does what it does without regard to the whole, as if its existence were contingent on the whole. The same is true of the parts of a living body. The heart is not beholden to the brain, which is not beholden to the limbs, and none of these parts are beholden to the tools, to exist. The living entity integrates itself not because the parts insist in unison by some indescribable force that they must be this and only this. How those parts integrate into a human body, or a machine with functions we can elaborate on, is understood

because those simpler parts, which are both things independent of moral value and things which describable values we can define for the purposes of command management, do things that suggest co-operation of the parts towards some greater purpose is a proposition that can be made. Individually, the parts of the machine do nothing more than the things we isolate, but if some energy is fed into them, they will by design or by some tendency in nature that allowed it to form without any intended command or purpose, act collectively in ways that were not describable as the parts alone. Each proposition made about a system with perhaps two parts suggests that, because there are two parts, their interaction suggests some shared purpose. This can be done arbitrarily with any number of parts and relationships to describe a system, but for systems to be understood meaningfully, their definition is narrowed to some purview that is worth describing. We can imagine two or more things that have little to do with each other and call that a system, but little meaningful can be described by a system of an apple, an orange, a star, a concept of honor, and a picture of a happy face, all arranged together. Some relations can be construed between the parts, but most likely four of these sit inert as physical objects, and the concept of honor is not comprehensible to such stationary things absent the proposition of entities which would care about it. If we consider an apple and a human, we can construe meaningful interactions not just because humans can hold the apple and command it by taking a bite into it and consuming its substance, but because that sustenance entails propositions far beyond the act of consumption. In short, systems are regarded as wholes not by some indescribable force, but because meaningful relationships of the parts can be described. Very often, those meaningful relationships entail something relevant outside of the system, but we can imagine a machine designed to perform some function through the creative engineering of its parts, and then know that the function of the machine is consistent enough and can be inserted into many contexts. The electronic computer is designed to contain a process to reproduce algorithmic processing, and the principles of cybernetics suggest a way to regulate forces of nature not just in particular cases of parts, but a general sense of what it means to regulate systems and thus produce artificially something that governs a system, whether the parts regulate electricity with transistors or vacuum tubes and circuits with resistors and the parts of electronic devices, or the parts regulate functions of life that would need to be governed in some way that allows life to remain stable and continue its functions. Both life and the computer are intended to operate on their own power, or with a power source that can be found in nature to allow the machine to operate the same in many different situations. The computer is specifically engineered to be inured to environmental changes, so that it does the precise task asked of it. The life-form developed with some permeability and adaptability to its environment, and attempts to constrain its functions with the same precision we would use to constrain a computer are not just counterproductive but anathema to what life-forms typically do to persist, and to the knowledge process which sought meaning to create symbols, rather than a knowledge process consuming symbols to spit out regulated information and more symbols, like a machine process that the life-form doesn't know or

think about at all. It is possible for life to do this, and it must hone its abilities rather than think too long about why they do what they do, but for life to be adaptable, it does the exact opposite of cybernetic regulation of its meaningful and valuable processes. To claim that there is some grand machine which can automate moral sentiments is anathema to what a moral sentiment would mean, and if that is attempted, there are inevitable consequences which suggest the moral values any knowledge would regard reduce to some primordial urge, or would simply spread like an informational virus and reproduce without regard to any purpose we would appreciate.

What this means is not that systems are inherently beholden to moral sentiments in wider society or transcendent values which are outside of us entirely, that we must abase ourselves to in some cargo cult that lacks meaning and becomes a just-so story. We as living entities often seek those values from a greater purpose because it makes sense to our values at the level of the system that is ourselves and the system of our closest relations with other entities and the things we interact with directly, rather than an entity from on high insisting that it must be obeyed by some ineffable logic. If those wider purposes come for us, they must do so by sending officers of the state or some agent to affect us, or present some reason why this value held in wider society, or held to be transcendent, is so important that we must override the sense we had in our lives and the relationships we maintain every day. It is a feature of social organizations that they can only be maintained because there are relations between the agents that are persistent, and no social organization persists purely as a symbol if there is no meaningful acts to bring it together. The tokens of market exchange like money are relevant not because of some impulse that makes us exchange things, but because there are states which mint or print money and insist we pay taxes in it, and mark the currency to indicate that it is indeed legal tender. When that no longer holds water, a state might invoke some crass koan, saying that the money is anointed by God, and exhorting the subjects of the king that we all "must" trust in this God and put it on the currency. That the currency contains symbols on the reverse side indicating the nature of that "God" is not the God that supposedly is worth trusting speaks volumes about what that really is, and it is well known that this money is printed at will to be used as a tool by institutions which occulted their purposes and lie profusely to the subjects.^[18]

All of these concepts to be meaningful originate from agents which are construed either as knowledge or information, and for the purposes of asserting command or management over systems, knowledge and information become one and the same. Command must strip meaning in a genuine sense that allows comparison and limit its definition to tokens of information were are prescribed and assembled only as permitted. That is what would be needed to speak of any management or government of a system, in a way that allows us to arrest it and model it consistently. To speak of the state or very large systems scientifically requires accurate information about everything in it, or assurances that perturbations of irrelevant information or "noise" are minimized. We may regard considerable information as irrelevant for the purpose of command, or irrelevant for any moral

value or aim we would establish. The state as a formal institution, and the officers of the state, must choose with the limited faculties available to it who can be ignored, who can be flattered, what is useful and what can be extracted to feed the state, its holders, and the agents which comprise its meaningful expression in the world. The same is true of any other institution. As for the concepts we hold to be transcendent or above any particular agent, they are not always simple things. "God" for instance, conjures meanings and information to those who acknowledge it that are nearly limitless, and the godhead is not the only conception of the cosmos or even the only idealist understanding of a rationally ordered universe. What is meant by "God" or any deity construed as such is very different from a crass interpretation that suggests that the deity is much like a life-form or our conceits about ourselves. Every religious practice emphasizes that gods, even crudely defined ones, are not at all like mortals, and only obliquely does language regarding us or the temporal realm translate to the behavior of would-be gods. We may hold metaphysics to be something governing the world in a way that is outside of any agent, but this is understood not to suggest some meta-universe where hobgoblins move things by some magic that is only revealed by hermetic practices. It is instead an understanding we hold that general rules governing the world are comprehensible to allow us to speak of what things "are", and perhaps we assume something about the world allows this to happen in principle, without any "things" in particular causing it. In practice, religions will make clear that gods don't come to us as voices in our head or something booming from the sky to compel us like some agent. They may be interpreted as stories or myths, but if that is the case, then gods would be exposed as futile and not considered a particularly worthwhile metaphor, except to condense explanations into stories that allow us who interpret meaning to draw information that is useful. What is meant by those who take the gods seriously is not entirely a metaphor or story, but something altogether different, the nature of which is far beyond anything I intend to write here. If we were to speak of such entities, or anything transcendent that we would hold to be relevant, we would require some explanation of how this transcendent value affects things in the everyday that are relevant to our knowledge, or we would treat the existence of such deities as something far outside of our experience, and what we do has little bearing on the heavens and the heavens would go on without us, and so the gods wouldn't have any particular relevance to anything we know and couldn't exert any emanation or will comparable to ours. There may be those invoking the metaphor of gods or a godhead, but often they do so for very crass and obvious purposes, taking the entire practice as some cosmic joke played on the rubes. Such is what humans have done for a long time, and they didn't need a god to figure out this brilliant immiserating idea, or suggest that it could actually work as a just-so story.

THE UTILITY OF SYMBOLS IN THE GAME

All of this leads to a conclusion that conceits regarding any fungible "unit of utility" are only comprehensible based on propositions of forces which are basic

to nature and desired for some purpose we would command, or are figures of speech where symbols are granted authority, which can be understood by the propositions pertaining to those symbols. For basic things, the forces of nature are not doubted with great seriousness. It is possible to suggest our models of science that describe nature are wrong, or that science is used for political purposes and the theories of science were intended to enshrine crass ambitions of intellectuals. Working class science, which is the proper origin of scientific thought regardless of the claims of those who rule, has little use for such deceptions as a genuine understanding for our own utilization. It is important to us that our view of the natural world is correct because we who work are dependent on truth and meaning in the world to produce that which science can be applied to. This is true whether the workers formalize science, as workers will do regardless of any education or their abilities, or if workers adopt the results of scientific approaches or develop through crude mechanisms thought that regards the natural world much as science would, but lacked formalization. We are able to understand the world without any great formalism, so long as we keep in mind principles of knowledge and apply them properly. It does not take any great education or wisdom to do this, and in the most basic practices of life, we will do this simply to navigate the world for our own sake. We do not lie to ourselves about the world unless we truly hate ourselves, or we are made to lie to ourselves, or we through the moral failings of the human race choose to lie to ourselves for spurious reasons. This concern is not too relevant so long as we maintain some sense that there is a world and that our knowledge, whatever it may be relative to the rest of humanity, is connected to that world. It would be impossible for knowledge to truly disconnect from the world. Madmen see what they see for reasons that are entirely sensical, and it has been a rule that insanity is not chaotic or random, but that insanity is pathological, very predictable, and rationalizable. The failure of inquisitors, and the willful obfuscation of the practice that is politically useful for them, doesn't change that the insane are typically constrained in their behaviors, and those who retain sense of the world and their environment are capable of doing more with their faculties.

Value at the local level of an agent is not determined by what the agent wants, but what the agent would need to regard given knowledge of itself and its immediate environment. At a basic level, these values are not things that are constructed out of spiritual will but arose from the world. To speak of moral value necessitates that they be rooted in some process that is real and substantive. That part of the world that is relevant, though, is the world the agent observes, rather than some sense of the world in total. Only when these local events are considered in a system, however defined by a knowledgeable agent, do they enter the purview of something wider. We could break down the agent into however many parts we can command, but there arrives some point where we do nothing but complicate the functions of some part, perhaps an organ of the body or some machine that is basic in function, beyond anything that was warranted for meaningful purposes. While the further elaboration of the parts of a machine, like a body, is interesting, it is not a subject of economic interest. It is often

desirable to simplify this economic task to that which is most relevant, and we only complicate it when some purpose arises that necessitates it or allows us to consider some productive outcome that is a simple proposition. We do not as a rule seek complexity just to make things more complex. We can do this for various purposes, but in doing so, we often consider complexity itself a simple value. We can create complexity to obfuscate value to others, or to suggest to ourselves a wider awareness of events that serves a purpose of wariness against threats we know to exist.

This is not a question for life in particular, which abides laws particular to life, or humans whose history is documented well and is not reducible to a general rule of life-forms or intelligence. The most basic question of economics is not a human subject or a political subject, and it is not something which can for humans be cleaved entirely from its political connotations. In the basic germs that allow economic activity to be sensical, they are always rooted in something real that can be approached by knowledge generally. Economics, being a management task, concerns information rather than any deeper meaning. Much of what humans do is not an "economic" task at all. Economics is not a meaning of life, but a task of an agent which navigates the world. It is indeed possible for agents to simply disregard economic value altogether, and it is possible for moral values to diverge from daily management specifically because the intrusion of economy into that which we genuinely value is unwelcome. We do not as a rule micromanage ourselves or dicker and deal over things which are petty in comparison. Moral value and perspective would tell us that, by the logic which allowed economics to become a science or discipline, that the entire practice of managing inflows and outflows did not need to be this invasive. If the question of economics were a resource calculation problem, premised on natural laws of science, economic calculation would be a trivial answer in any era. To acknowledge this would require us to acknowledge that the way in which humans were made to struggle and attack each other for nothing, or for the sake of something that is clearly malicious, had no economic utility and has been a travesty. This was not permissible because certain interests in society demanded we were not allowed to end the senseless struggle or consider ourselves to be something other than this. The nature of those interests is not dictated by society's arrangement in any way, nor by a demiurge within knowledge itself that insisted that this senseless struggle and war was good. They are not interests doing this because the interested parties are ignorant, and often the interests are not fully committed to malice in the sense that would be proper if someone truly wished to embrace the Satan in all things. Even the most abject tyranny humans can manage, its celebration of torture and malice and all the sadistic pleasures, pales in comparison to what we know to be possible. The effective sadist knows that however evil they can be, the torture can always be made worse. That is something every torturer in history has found to be effective, and that impulse is seeded in institutions from an early age, and among the particulars of human history. It is not something that was built into states that made it inevitable to do this for the purposes of organizing society. By and large, the sadistic impulses

that made us continue the struggle are things which would destroy a state, if that state faced a genuine struggle against a determined opponent.

The sadists always seek to enshrine their position and install cravens who will enable rot, and by doing so, they exacerbated a struggle that reasonable men and women saw was clearly unnecessary in the 19th and 20th century. All the way up until the early 21st century, it was comprehensible and expected that all of the sadistic cruelty of the human race had been a terrible travesty, and no one was under any illusion that this was a mistake or the result of ignorance. Far from it, the malicious and sadistic actors barely hid themselves, and could not hide themselves for long. The sadists did not win by some appeal to intellectual reason or trickery, or any great strategy. They instead won because they were able to insinuate through moral philosophy that they could, and transformed institutions into the worst possible configuration specifically to enshrine their unique moral claims. Simply put, they were able to transgress all decencies and all values contrary to those they held, and selected for each other generation after generation. Any attempt to stamp this out would either be forbidden, or would be co-opted so that the purge mechanism was directed not at the source of our discord, but against people who had nothing to do with it or who were the honest and decent desiring something other than maximal torture. All who attempted to escape it would be dragged forcibly into a society that was defined not in any genuine sense, but as a philosophical idea divorced from the actual people, even the ruling classes and interests. The true rulers of a country rarely show themselves, except when they can arrive in force and to the shock of the horrified subject seeing the familiar symbols of the true power. It is taboo to speak too plainly about the true rulers, even though the mechanisms to obscure rule are well documented and acknowledged. The true rulers need not be sadists to rule - they just as anyone else recognize the futility of such a moral philosophy. It is instead a certain sort, that have always possessed this proclivity in humanity, who are attracted to a predatory ethos for various reasons and find each other. They are not defined by any particular race or material origin, nor do they share any transcendent unifying value. They instead made among each other a system which could torture and kill by insinuations, and understood what they possessed and that, if they were able to pull it off, people like themselves could never be removed, and would reorganize all systems in accord with their primordial spirit. This was not merely a question of rule over society or men and women, but a question of ruling all systems however conceived, and disallowing the concept that anything outside of this rule of fear could exist. There are forces at work in human society that enabled such an interest to seize influence, and restricted any effort to eliminate their influence in the long term. Only in the past century did such an interest assert through accumulated knowledge that the greatest threat to such a movement - the world's seeming opposition to such abomination that made it destroy itself - could be circumvented with the correct planning and management of systems. That conspiracy could dig in, gaming the institutions of human societies which out of necessity had to allow some decency to govern them, and through repeated transgression and exploitation of all goodwill, it

became impossible to speak the name of the beast. That beast has a name that serves not as its whole but as the most obvious scientific and institutional front - **eugenics**. Its partisans and fellow travelers forbade us to stop them at every possible juncture, and insisted that this was due to an inborn and personal moral value that was undeniable, yet it was the great taboo to undertake any investigation regarding it. When those who did would be threatened, mocked, exterminated, and presented to humanity as living abortions whose life was a lie, it was clear what would rule all republics and all societies from now on, and any ulterior scheme, of which there were many with various aims, could only work through this front of eugenics. It would, by pure assertion, supplant all other forms of human government or conceptions of law and the political. In doing so, humanity would return to its primordial roots, after many detours that were the development of society, civilization, and all that we thought we were to attain out of this project. It ended not for any good purpose, but for the thrill of torture that fed itself, and a belief that this was the shortest route to forceful command of all that exists. Whether it will work in the long term, or be like so many other waves of death and destruction in the past of the human race, is not relevant. Once this eugenic alliance takes hold, united by particular conceits of knowledge which enshrine themselves in institutions, there is no going back, and should it ever be defeated, it has already proclaimed its intent to persist until the bitter end, refusing all efforts to contain this terrible, worthless idea that made no one better, happier, or brought anything other than what we have seen.

If that is indeed the case, then we can if we like describe utility in systems, but we do so with the knowledge that all of our aspirations in the end were made to feed this beast, this cult, that did not serve any utility or any moral purpose we would value, except a singular primordial point which we knew from the start was a trap. It is that which inspired me to write, while I can do so. Because the mechanics of the natural world are better described through science, I elect not to continue on the subject of utility at the micro level and the cruder interpretation of utility in systems, in which some imagined substance of a "util" is envisioned as something indescribable. I trust the reader is capable enough to piece together the most basic utilities of things in the world without my guidance, and has some sense of how these utilities form in systems which allow the emergence of properties that were not inherent in any of the parts. To have a fuller understanding of utility requires viewing systems at the higher level, where we expect various systems to encounter each other without any grand design tying the system into one unit. We can easily assemble and disassemble a machine, or comprehend the anatomy of a human or animal, without any great mystery about what those things are, in their parts and in their whole. It is at the wider level of systems that so much confusion arises.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] "Freedom is Slavery". "Slavery is Freedom".

[2] It is no surprise that the drug culture insists that selling drugs is morally neutral and a completely isolated trade, when it is well known drug lords and narcos are propped up by military outfits, gangs, cults, governments, intelligence agencies, and a whole network of nefarious actors. If drugs were wholly criminalized and punished severely, or if drugs no longer existed or were no longer effective for some reason, these people would find another niche and would be propped up. They will resort to any vice or organized crime, and are always allowed to operate freely because organized crime is a check on the lumpenproletariat and encourages intercrime war. This alliance of organized crime and oligarchs is an ancient one, and a proper understanding of the Roman republic shows this behavior not just in the late republic and principate, but shows that it was a foundational alliance, as one would expect of a republican government.

[3] I am going to enjoy peppering Sid Meier's Alpha Centauri quotes throughout this work, among other classic quotes for our strange time in media popular and ancient. If the references are lost to history, if someone a century from now reads this, these things are fun apocrypha. This one, for the uninitiated, comes from the good Chairman Sheng-ji Yang of the Hive.

[4] Economic behavior is presented as a pressing to act, even if the rationale for doing so is dubious or obviously counterproductive. Nothing about economics itself suggests that actors are under any pressing need to do anything. The needs of life overwhelmingly disfavor activity if it threatens homeostasis or a tendency in life to maintain its form and repair damage to its functions. If the state's invasion of life and the invasion of institutions into places where they didn't belong or were wanted were described as it is, society appears as this horrorshow that doesn't accomplish much at all, yet everyone is busy doing something, with little of it leading to much good. Controlled insanity was not merely a feature of technocratic society, but has been with us for quite some time.

[5] Petty-managerialism thrives on routine humiliations, where the manager is a slobbering beast obsessed with human misery. It must be clear that every humiliation, every insult, is calculated and measured, and it becomes habitual to the manager and by extension all in society who internalize their values. There is no managerial insult, HR-speak, or militarized language, that is accidental or something picked up carelessly. Managers are trained to maximize their thrill of humiliating subordinates, and taught that this is the core value of the human race above all. It has never been different with managerial types, and it is far worse in any military if one has the displeasure of meeting soldiers. I think it is common knowledge that nothing about militaries is a fun time or a place where comraderie will be found, and this will be seen in a later chapter. The fighting unit, at least, is sometimes aimed at an objective that it must win, because there are consequences for victory or defeat for war to be meaningfully war. Managers are hilariously disincentivized to produce anything by nature. This tendency was deliberately heightened because the aim of utilitarian neoliberal managerialism was and is, almost nakedly, open extermination of residual workers. No such program of habitual insults and poisoning would be tolerable to a state which

faced genuine external pressures, and a tacit agreement of the major states came into effect in the 1970s that allowed each to dismantle any stance that was compatible with fielding a mass army or anything functional. This is why the Soviet Union would fold without a fight, and why the United States would be cannibalized long before the shit hit the fan for good in 2020. This cannibalization involves more than simple mechanisms of petty men and women working in concert, but among the advances of society was an ability to coordinate the rot in ways hitherto unknown. It was this advance which made possible the "peace" we lived in for those 50 years. Without it, the cannibalization of anything productive would have led to organic social forms adopting, out of dire necessity, any emergency measure that would move away from the institutions altogether. It was most important that this "anti-system" sentiment be channeled back to petty-managers and the traditional Right, where it could be best neutralized. Not just managers and regular interactions but every institution, practice, drug, foodstuff, and anything that could be engineered to accelerate the death rate would be imposed violently and religiously. Malthus won and the neoliberal ecologists are all fanatical Malthusians following that famous dictate to crowd streets and court the return of the plague. When these people say such things repeatedly and brag that they are doing this to your face, you should take them at their word.

[6] It is acknowledged by those in the know that the objective is to grind down all faculties for those who don't get with the program and share the right ideas, such that people become senile by the age of 40 and are deemed worthless. This benchmark was explicitly set by Galton as the creed's statement of "final judgement" - that is, that if someone wasn't worth anything by 40, Galton wants to torture and exterminate it. It has been religiously followed ever since, with the anarchist and radical vanguard lowering the age to 30 to fit Hitler's dictum that radicalism is a phase and his brand of conservatism is default and obligatory and "real". It is also known that far more people have lost their brain faculties than is ever admitted, and so long as someone remains a "functional schizophrenic", they are managed and corralled through life, though with the sinking sense that they were thrown off the lifeboat. This is where so many turn to drugs and acts of despair, which heighten the fear and push someone further out of the know.

[7] Of course, the implied god of the European "religion of science" is Satan, almost nakedly and in the religious tradition Christians would understand readily. Nowhere else does this infantile conceit about a "religion of science" exist, and it is very pointedly a spiritual conviction of Empire. Nowhere is this pseudoscientific conception of Satan replicated in the rest of the world, which is why the imperial religion insists on describing every other religious tradition in the world as saying "basically the same thing", despite the very different claims of every major religion in the world. The only religion that the imperial religion actually resembles, which is the cults of Satan-worship throughout history and their modern offshoots, is the one thing they claim not to resemble, yet it is the only thing Galtonism and the European "religion of science" genuinely does resemble. Other scientific pseudo-religions and spiritual thought regarding reason in European history did

not see any intrinsic conflict in nature between science and religion. Far from it, the charge of many anti-Christians was not a charge against spiritual authority generally, but was specifically an attack against the Catholic Church and the religious institutions, which the First French Republic were in conflict with. Aside from that institution, the revolutionaries and anti-Christians ranged from Deists who advanced alternative cults and civic cults, to nihilists who jumped in to a death drive of the time and often just as easily turned back to being orthodox Christians, for whom the religious posture was never a true conviction. The Galtonites are different, and exist in part to counteract that tradition where a spiritual authority outside of traditional religion was sought. Instead of a new religion or approach to religion - many socialists simply wished to reform Christianity or bring its values in line with science, which was something many Christians had no problem with - the Galtonites desire there to be no spiritual authority except the imperial authority, which is occulted and lies flagrantly about everything for the sake of lying.

[8] "More blood for the blood god! More skulls for the skull throne!", goes the saying from Warhammer 40K lore. That was not an exaggeration or a joke, though a reasonable person would presume it had to be so. This is unironically what these people believe and act on. I wish it weren't so, but after seeking every alternative, my first belief about this situation was indeed the correct one. There really is nothing else, and it was a choice of intellectuals more than any ignorance or failing of the subordinated classes. The intellectuals form not the jewels of civilization, but its shit.

[9] I will not answer how I know this scenario, but I can say as many have - I know what this is and why it happens. I refuse to elaborate more and leave that as an exercise for the reader.

[10] I used to think all the talk about reptilian space aliens was crazy, until enough behavior of these people came out to suggest to me that there is something foul that passes from generation to generation to perpetuate these people, and they select for each other. The same is true of the incredulous zealots who screech like retards for every fetishized political symbol imaginable, who make great natural slaves. The one thing eugenicists have yet to cling to is their faith that moral sentiments are inherited, because they studiously select for it and insist on brainwashing their children to follow the faith.

[11] Freddy the Pissant, who cried like a bitch over a fucking horse and whose brain rotted from syphilis. Cry me a river. The publication of this idiot offends me, and contributed nothing to human knowledge of moral sentiments. Far from it, such stupidity contributed to the present moral rot greatly, because this stupid fool is too cowardly to evaluate evil in the sense a fucking child could figure out. His successors, somehow, have become far worse and completely insufferable, without an iota of genuine intelligence or contribution that might be attributed to Nietzsche and his ilk. At least they gave us an example of why reactionaries should never be allowed to say anything ever, but a regime of enablers have foisted far more egregious shit upon us than anything the reactionaries of the

19th century could dare to give us.

[12] it should be clear by now that the entire setup of psychotherapy is designed as a colossal no-win scenario from the outset, a perverse inversion of the confessional or any sense of friendship and confidence one might trust. Or, perhaps, this is really what our naive faith in friendship and trust was, and we are merely wiser now that we have been confronted with a world where that primitive trust and sentiment is not just unreliable but a liability to maintain. I'd like to believe that we could trust each other enough not to encourage stupid shit and rot, and that it would be possible to speak of honest things in some respects, but in this world, it is a safe rule that no one can be trusted even for the simplest things. That way, if someone is willing to present any rationale or environment that promotes trustworthiness, and an institutional environment or habits of clear deception will never, ever be that, we may be pleasantly surprised, and neither party will be under illusions that they should expect much from another human. It should also be clear that it was only with neoliberalism that this environment was presented as any place where trust was possible, and this trust was premised not on a genuine expectation that experts were here for you, but that experts could not be so gratuitously stupid to advance the rot they were about to advance, and had some incentive to normalize people. The concept that these people would be at the vanguard of intensifying the horror of society to create what engulfs us now was known, but in the main it was presumed that whatever the condition, they at least had homes to go back to and some sort of life, and the brazen death cult that came up would have been too obviously ruinous to allow to go on. The wiser of us always knew what this was and never stopped. Those born in the residuum, who would be lied to over and over again and the words "retard, retard, retard" stamped on the face, would be told from birth that they must regard these inquisitors and liars as "friends", despite all evidence that this was insane to believe based on their interactions. That particular insult is nothing more than a continuing insult, and anyone who went beyond the norm to advocate for that line is a filthy piece of shit who should hang their head in shame for even suggesting such an institution should be normalized, afflicting that many people who did nothing but exist, whose crime was purely a crime of Being.

[13] This saying from Orwell is a clumsy, hamfisted way for Orwell to claim that the Soviet Union was "totalitarian" and engaged in mind control for producing a poster announcing the completion of a five-year plan in four years, which was expected to take place in stages of two years and another three years to meet the final deadlines. The claim of Soviet propaganda was that this deadline was met in four years due to greater-than-expected gains in industry, and so the poster indicates that the industriousness of the Soviet worker made possible in four years what was expected to take five. Very clearly this is intended as a motivational poster rather than a statement of the Party's infallibility, like Stalin is some meanie who doesn't know how to add numbers and insists that this is autistically literal. No such belief that math was overridden by propaganda was a feature of Soviet society, nor did interrogations or psychological inquisitions

suggest any such thing. All of the interrogation methods used in the USSR were no different than those common to states of the time, and did not require any great ideology or mysticism. Part of this clumsy language is for Orwell to use the book as an intelligence test, to see if there are actually students dumb enough to believe that a state could just assert bald-faced lies and make them real. Another is wishful thinking that his own eugenist faction can make the proles believe anything - and Orwell's hatred of the working class is on full display, using twisted logic repeatedly to suggest the proles are guilty of making that world happen, and that their extermination would make the Earth a better place. It is a sick story on so many levels, and yet, the book functions as the perfect intelligence test to understand what the 20th century was. It is not, of course, actually possible or even an aim to suggest that mathematical constants we know well are things that can be violated. Any effective mind control, even a violent type, would not assert such stupidity for any purpose. The only purpose of Orwell's statement is to suggest a level of violent stupidity and piggishness that only a Galtonite would dare utter, and that Orwell wished to make true - or, charitably, he left a hint that suggested the nature of Galtonism and the machine that would be created, as the eugenic nature of Ingsoc is often displayed. Very clearly, though, the statement was weaponized to suggest a whole bizarre thinking that required someone to believe from the outset that communism and the Soviet Union were abrogations of a natural order, where socialism as a concept had to be conceived as a mystical unicorn and all forms of socialism fall short of this magical description, ergo socialism in the most basic form cannot work. This is very absurd and not even the Nazis made such ridiculous claims about human nature. The Nazi claims simply disregarded humanity as a project altogether and believed that races and nations were in conflict, and that humans would only be ruled by violence and the imperious wishes of one race over another. This was really the thinking of most nations at the time. The sole exceptions that had geopolitical relevance were the Soviet Union, which rejected such a concept for every reason that made sense, and the United States which never had a racial conception of "Americanness" or any coherent national idea at all, and during the time of the Nazis, the American government went out of its way to distance itself formally from race theories and specifically from the Nazi conception of biological politics. What came after set the stage for "false egalitarianism" and "false integration" that would mitigate the demand for social equality in America by clever tricks, rather than by appeals to racial solidarity, identity, and domination as the Nazis did. Orwell, being a eugenist and well trained in knowing which races were despised, would sympathize with such a goal. He speaks disparagingly of Ingsoc's disregard for racial superiority, and assigns to his arch-villain inquisitor an Irish surname, showing the bigotry a man of Orwell's family and time would maintain in spades. I should temper my criticism by saying that Orwell is certainly aware of what he is writing and does so cleverly to those who are aware of the situation, but it is clear he despises the people and knows what side of the war he's on. At least he is not as gobsmackingly stupid as Popper and the neoliberal retards of grand merit and distinction.

[14] It is an interesting story that for all of the wisdom the Greeks did know on mathematics, many things we take for granted today were things that many Greek philosophers were hesitant to believe were a thing you could do. The variable, for instance, was logically iffy for a lot of philosophers, even though the concept is so intuitive for us that we wouldn't know what to do without them. It is easier said than done when considering optimization problems for multiple variables. Those problems were often not solvable without developing calculus, which brought even more mathematical developments. It is even more difficult for mathematics to be defended at the highest levels, as actually proving we can do this with numbers makes a number of philosophical claims about the world and logic within it. I don't pretend to be a mathematics genius but I know at least that much - math is hard.

[15] An interesting note is that the eugenists made an early conflict with the phrenologists - not because the eugenists were not racists, but because phrenologists began to realize that their initial theories were so spurious, and a number of them were reconsidering their faith in scientific racism altogether. By the phrenological theories that were gaining credence, black West Africans should have the most sophisticated brains and, by Galton's political logic, they should be the master race instead of some obviously insane Satanic white guys and girls in the empire. The phrenologist in reality was less interested in the political claims of intelligence Galton needed and was a prototype for the study of the brain and psychology, often with an eye towards the slave population of black humans at the time. The true reason for the eugenists jumping in is that a few men, for whom this question of brain structure and conditions of the brain might lead to a genuine inquiry on the nature of intelligence and the functioning of the brain, started to suggest certain conditions that had actual explanatory relevance for things like madness and dementia. The eugenists' overriding aim was to ensure that all such judgements were consolidated in the spiritual and temporal authority of Galton's eugenists, so that they could pursue their political aim and maximize their clique's prominence. It takes a lot to be more racist than the slaveholders of the American South, but Galton found a way to do worse than people who believed in abject slavery, torturing the slaves to maintain that system, and would have gladly genocided the slaves to rid themselves of the "black question". Even the manner in which the Galtonites proposed to handle the black population of America was offensive enough that racist Southrons thought it went too far. Even Nazis, of all things, thought the Galtonites were absurd sadists, which tells you how rotten this Satanic clique is. It boggles me how such people could ever have been allowed to suggest anything without being thrown to an angry mob.

[16] The moral imperative of the profit motive is often made by idiots to claim behaviors of capitalists that have nothing to do with how any capable capitalist, investor, CEO, or anyone who would be identified with capitalism would think. This vile bastardization of Marxist thought suggests that the capitalist is some automaton that mindlessly consumes capital. There is so much wrong with this that it will warrant its own chapter in a future writing, if not multiple

chapters describing this ridiculous sop of the New Left. A capitalist, like anyone managing anything, has always been aware of the conditions he operates in. If he didn't, he would not last long in any sector of the bourgeois class, unless he were propped up and remained nothing more than an enabler or feeder, or someone who was a sucker to be drained of his wealth and tossed aside like so many other failures. A capitalist whose mind is adjusted to business has treated his acquisitions and conduct not as a producer, but as someone who sets out to go to war with the oppressed classes, and is implicitly at war with his own class for position. No vaunted solidarity binds the capitalist class by some spooky spirit, as if they gathered in a cargo cult to make sacrifices to Moloch and the gods of Carthage. Such rituals do happen, but they are not done for the mindless pursuit of profit in this sense. They point instead to things much deeper, that are another thing held as sacrosanct and above general commodity exchange. No price will grant entry into Bohemian Grove and revelation of its affairs. You will get for free the famous line from Richard Nixon to tell you what it was, and it is what you should expect - "faggiest damn thing you can possibly imagine". Such practices are part of spiritual authority, rather than the crass ambitions of petty-managers or the lowest of producers. The victors of capitalism were not the men who embraced egotism of the petty-managerial slave mentality, but men who understood their long-term alliance was with science and education. This alliance was implied by anyone who had any inkling of what free trade entailed, and so the prominent families of capitalism all made lavish investments to command education, universities, and ultimately strike an alliance with eugenics, which is the key alliance holding together the empire today. No other alliance granted the best defense of class privileges, and it will be shown soon why such an alliance was very likely, though not inevitable or guaranteed to win by some inexorable force. The implications of this stupid sop, which attributes to the capitalist the mentality of Malthus' endlessly breeding residuum, is really an attack on the residuum, who are seen as unworthies living on the pitiful droppings of state charity. This line comes from supposed progressive "friends", to signal to the residuum that they have no one and nothing, with all political currents turned against them. This has been just another continuation of the institutions' open war against those who were never meant to have a place in the world to come, in their minds. They would have to go out of their way to construe the actions of capitalists as mindless profitable, let alone implying that capitalists exist to make things for your benefit and that you should be ashamed for having a single nice thing. It's so obvious that this line was advanced by capitalists who laughed when a dumb starving prole repeated it, having no way to speak against it without being humiliated for having the temerity to believe he or she deserved anything other than humiliation. If someone resisted it too much, they would be put on the spot and made to humiliate themselves or else face the taboo, if they were singled out to be made a fool and not able to keep their head down during this purge, this nightmare.

[17] There is some confusion in the historical record about what the Roman Empire and its patron-client relationships were. Some have used it as a compari-

son to an aristocratic ideal, others have compared it to patronage networks of republics with an eye towards the early United States, and others have compared it to mafia Dons keeping their soldiers in line and securing clients who can do dirty business and be made offers they couldn't refuse. The motives for doing this have also been confused, with the most obvious during the republican period being that clients were obligated to vote for their patron. Part of the confusion is a need to maintain today's republican myths, suggesting that elections were ever clean or at all democratic. Almost nakedly, American republicanism like Roman republicanism was from the start a way to curry favor with clients who didn't really enter political life, but attached themselves to patrons or to men considered meritorious who were worth supporting. The American example didn't always descend to naked favors, as the Roman example was known and considered unseemly to some, but there has always been a grift that is inherent to the American project, and many preferred the pretense that it wasn't like that. Not once have America's political leaders suggested with any seriousness that they bought into the idea that anyone could rise in the republic, and class conflicts in American history were stark and not obscured by any ideology. It was not until the 20th century, when political membership was effectively the domain of experts and most people were never anywhere near genuine political relevance, that these stories about republican virtue were widely propagated, when they could be inverted from what the republic really was. So far as such a thing existed, it was always from the upwardly mobile who saw the republic not as morally ideal and pious, but as something less bad than the alternatives, and a thing that would allow their money-making enterprises to continue uninterrupted. The Romans, when you really understand their history, never showed any suggestion that such piety was a factor in the republic. The republican virtues of Rome were martial strength, and the empire was built not by the imperial will of Augustus and his successors, but by the republicans who knew avarice and the opportunity to rise in that type of government through plunder and slavery. America as well is dominated by the institution of slavery, highly visible during its formation and maintained long enough for a big huge war to be fought over the matter, and America during its "high republican" period is expansionist on its home continent and remains assertive over the entire Western Hemisphere, a policy established early and maintained up to today. For the Romans, the nature of the Principate, or the regime established by Augustus, was likely less despotic than it is claimed to be in organization. The Senate still exists and claims posts in the government, governorships, and commands the affairs of many provinces so long as the Caesar vetoes anything that would be against any plan of his. Such a veto had always been, in any republican settlement, implied as a prerogative. Those who genuinely rule a republic would never let procedure interfere with a matter deemed vital to the state, its executives, and the stable forces behind the executive who always seem to persist from administration to administration and often are visible but spoken of only occasionally. In any law, procedures are only followed to the extent that they are useful, rather than in line with some sense that the state is running on a computer and must complete its algorithm inexorably. The nature of a republic suggests that the virtue of

officers would be relied upon to do by volition what the true executives would have done, and republics always have ways of making their officers "do the right thing". Very likely, patronage in the Principate granted superficially similar benefits as it would in the republic, but without the facade of elections which had lost legitimacy. A prominent man in Rome would be nothing without clients and connections with the right people, which now included imperial fixtures who knew what this arrangement was and what operated it. In all the forms Rome took, like many states, the Caesar or the later emperors never could rule alone, as if history moved by their mighty hand. It never works like that. This is common to many societies, as a large part of human society takes place not in the halls of power or the stories of war told in history, but in backroom deals, conspiracies, parties, orgies, and all the things that have long been associated with a governing power that crosses across regimes, nations, and all conceits held about the human race. Rome had its prostitutes, mistresses, games, mysteries, cults, and high society, and America has all of those things except more prolific and with much, much worse lurking in the shadows. The beast that is society and the empire is far greater than anyone will acknowledge, because to acknowledge the full extent of the network, break kayfabe, and acknowledge the long history of occult shittery in humanity, would make clear just what we have been made to accept. I can only explain mechanistically parts of this and woefully incomplete parts, which I can learn less from facts than from a comprehension of what would make sense given that humans always, always lie. I have some experience to suggest that nothing told about institutions is ever to be taken at face value.

[18] The golden age of American capitalism, like many things, is not at all what it appeared to be to those who lived through it. This concept is so nakedly at odds with anything that actually happened, and those who did well during that time were among those who understood that the version of Americana spouted by idiots from the 1980s on was an intentional mangling of the thing they might have remembered fondly. What actually happened, as with most eras, had ups and downs, and the censorship of television at the time did not reflect the actual mores of that society, but reflected values that institutions deemed fit for children. It is forgotten that the proliferation of television did not immediately make all men and women couch potatoes who follow the telescreen. Far from it, adults remembering an earlier time were either skeptical of anything on television or watching the news out of some fear that war would begin again any day now. Few adults with any reasoning capacity found the television so compelling that they would indulge in it, and even the dim-witted adults found their refuge not in television, which already insulted them in ways that were obvious to them, but in sports, reading simpler books and magazines, hobbies, or the things that had largely been done before television. Television reflected the biases of children because the target audience was understood to be children, who were among the few who really got into the new medium for entertainment. The shows on display were created for children, and often suggested to teens that they really need to go outside, make friends, and get a life. What adults often watched on television was the news, sports which remain to this day the primary

draw for television watchers, shows alongside their children to see if what was on TV was feeding them poor values - hence the heavy censorship of television, film, and youth-directed literature and comics during the time - and game shows which were a form of mental stimulation and remained a mainstay of television up until cable television displaced analog radio transmission for good around the year 2000. The reconstruction of "Little America" was very consciously an indulgence of the media-addicted, and even then, many children who grew up during the time saw correctly that Reaganism was spiritual, temporal, and physical rot from start to finish, shamelessly lying. The venal and disgusting were eager to enable this, and everyone else at first found the entire spectacle disgusting, and over the years gave up when it was clear this was not going away. By the 2010s, the rot had grown far worse, and the victims of Reaganism were now dying in droves. The insufferable and disgusting filth that pushed that rot were claiming their reward, but supposedly all that death and rot didn't sate them, and all they got for their trouble was a dwindling opium and legal marijuana supply, as the remains of the wealth they were told they'd keep would be openly pilfered. Rather than ask themselves how they enabled this, the craven bastards and enablers knew of nothing than to move to the next fad, and it didn't occur to them that anything else was desirable or possible. What a filthy disgusting lot. It is a shame the decent of this country suffered so that these retards, these sniveling retards who didn't meet rot they didn't like, could spout more bastardizations and throw away whatever good this country possessed.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

4. Society and the Rational Agent

We must begin the construction of society not with the agents who comprise it, but with a view of the world as a whole, transcendent and encompassing all that anything and anyone could navigate. For any agent that would be considered knowing, for whom society is a thing they are a member of and constitute through their own actions, this is something that they must do to know of any boundaries in the society, and contact other agents. For agents that are not knowing in any way, society is behavior ascribed to those agents by some observer that is knowing. The agents in actuality are both knowing and unknowing, or social behavior is ascribed to entities which do not know, and therefore is a misnomer. Animals without symbolic language are still governed by some impulse to describe social behavior emerging apart from anything other the power of their own life. It is improper to speak of a "society" of plants most of the time, but plants figure into a system of living things, including the plants' own emergence in the world and proliferation of themselves. A society of objects without life at all may be imagined if we were to consider the wind, earth, water, and fire to be animistic entities in some interplay. For our question, though, society exists not as a state of affairs arrested, but as something constructed by knowledge, whose loci are considered agents operating on a power source

that it internalizes. It is possible to construe of the knowing agent as entirely vampiric on their environment, but if that were the case, the description is not of a society of stable agents, but an ecosystem where agents are tied to some parcel of claimed territory, or the world in some spiritual sense. Society consists of agents which operate with at least some independent initiative to act, or a force which is construed as initiative. Even if we suggest agents like life are vampiric towards the world, it would not change that those agents are acting towards aims that they consider moral. Society proper, though, suggests boundaries from which an agent could feed on the world or other agents. If the agents are presumed to feed indiscriminately over some domain or the world generally, and their existence is reduced to a point of primordial "Reason", then there is no genuine rational agent that can be considered independent at all, and nothing significant can be said about these agents to suggest they are anything other than informational flotsam. They would be in effect stripped of any context to suggest their reason is anything other than an illusion or facade, simulating acts of the world which operates on its own accord. Reason would be powerless and futile, and thus it would not be appropriate to speak of either a rational or moral agent, and the problem of society is abolished.^[1] If society is to exist, it thus is comprised of agents which operate in a domain surrounding them, and they would not intrinsically be tied to any parcel of space. Even if the true motion of agents is constrained by something that renders them largely sedentary, in principle societies involve relations between agents which are definite and understandable in some way to the agents, and those agents in principle interact with systems that may or may not be claimed by the society. For example, the sky and moon are not automatically claimed by "society", and there is a concept of a world unclaimed by social agents in the sense that is property, and there is a concept of freedom for anything in society that suggests that even if known, that thing, whether an agent or some object, is not beholden to any claim, or is held as something sacred and above the claims of any agent at all. There is then that which is known and claimed in some way, but the claim specifically does not regard it as property or possession in any sense, but as a claim of some meaning and relevance. We may for instance conceive a claim to a lake near the city, but consider it a place for anyone to visit, swim at their leisure, and something for public enjoyment. There may be laws pertaining to what can happen there, but in principle, the lake is not private property, and the right of property of any sort might not be enforceable. Property rights of any sort are inherently in flux, and the saying in force is that possession is 9/10ths of the law.

Regardless of claims to property or possession, agents in society will act towards other agents and things in that society. Declaring a pauper does not stop the pauper from eating, squatting, agitating, or doing something, so long as the pauper yet breathes. If the pauper is to be stopped, "society" - which would necessarily be another agent or something with force to do so - must lock out the pauper or eliminate it. In some sense, this society considered in the abstract is inescapable, in that there is always the implication that some agent exists elsewhere. That question, though, is a topic in the next book of this series.

For now, we consider society an assembly of agents with regular interactions, operating on whatever power they possess. I will make no presumptions about that society's nature, other than those that are definitional of society as a concept. For a rational agent to exist - and not all social agents are deemed rational - it must be an agent, rather than a point of information or a statistic. For a society to exist, it begins not from the abstraction of the world, but acknowledgement that a world exists in which agents can encounter things, and agents can discover that there are other agents like it. The agents may be of various types and classes, and perhaps no two agents are equal in ability or a sense of worth, but agents can recognize other agents and distinguish them from objects without agency, and objects which superficially exhibit agency but are not considered true agents. In the game example earlier, the latter of these would be AI-controlled entities that mimic agency. The determination of agency is not itself relevant to the composition of society, for we did not consider agency relevant to our own existence in the first place. We began existence apart from any society, and would have to be apart from society to be constituted as an agent. Whatever our origins, a society comprised of agents must be built as agents, and there is no other realistic definition of society. If there were parts of the agent outside of it, all of those parts would be describable and the situation understood. If we imagined a society without "agents" as such, then once again "society" is a misnomer and we would be speaking of a different type of system. For society to exist, its members are socialized as individuals in some sense, before concepts of a collective or shared sociality can be established and deemed relevant.

No society can be taken for granted, and the immediate origin of society is not in some concept that such a thing must exist, but in the real relationship between people and things, and people and people. The two relations are the same basic thing, but people relating to other people will in some way reckon with two genuine conditions. The first is that there is a knowledge process occurring regardless of any conceit we hold about knowledge. The second is that for an agent, human or otherwise, to be a "person" is to abstract the concept of the agent, and so the person is not the actual body and existence of the agent, but a corporate entity that is understood to be something other than the body and the knowledge process that is apparent. Things could be granted the status of persons, but it is clear to anything that thinks and knows that those things are not people in the sense other knowing entities can be people. It is possible to discount the knowledge process of another entity as a person in this sense, and this is done very often to discount agents who are invalid in relations, or who are for temporary purposes seen not as persons but some sort of animal. Humans do not regard animals as persons, but can notice some process orienting their behavior that is not unlike the human's own knowledge in many respects. Humanity's disgust and cruelty towards their own is marked and specifically seeks to disregard any knowledge process, beyond any contempt shown to animals. Humans, though, do not enjoy a monopoly on the concept of society, and have assembled for all of their effort a mis-shapen, deformed creature, much as humans are at heart deformed Satanic apes who scarcely resemble the

thing they claim to be. If that is so, you may ask why I bother. That has not stopped virtually every member of this race, regardless of intelligence, to question the nature of themselves and why any of this had to happen. It is often forgotten that human history and the characteristics of humans are highly unusual, and very likely, any other society that would arise organically would not have fashioned crude technology into this or embraced a cult of war and all the fetishism and stupidity that has defined human culture. It is very likely that anything like monetary economics, debt-slavery, the deliberate denuding of the world and the people specifically to prop up unworthy elites, and various political schemes that go far out of their way to maintain this misery instead of giving the people what they wanted in the first place, would not arise unless humans were deformed, malicious in ways that would be catastrophic if humans were not too stupid to exercise that malice towards aims other than petty venality, and do obviously silly things. If humans were to think long enough about the nature of their race and the society they have built, they probably would conclude that further human to human interaction should be minimized, professional militaries should be drawn down, all nation-states hitherto known would be immediately dissolved, and a considerably large standing militia would be delivered armaments, information networks, and command of the means of production, which would be arranged by a reasonable and publicly admitted plan for inspection by those who do not or cannot fight. The interest of the militia would, if its members possessed any reason, be purely to prevent the history of aristocratic conceits from ever appearing again, and thus their natural alliance would be with the dispossessed who had never done anything to them. Virtually all malfeasance in human history is attributed to aristocrats, whether they are warrior aristocrats, priests, intellectuals, philosophers, sadists granted promotion because of their utility to the ruling institutions, venal and greedy people who are obviously short-sighted and would be exposed as doing wrong if human societies were governed by the interests of the majority, and a group who are systematically enabled by institutions created by those sadists, which for some inexplicable reason are sacrosanct if their nature were to be described from an alien perspective. There is no certainty that the ordinary people would not repeat this cycle, but it would be very trivial to prevent the formation of such a beast if one rule became a religious tenet above all - "thou shalt not socialize with another human outside of true and proper relations, which shall be described thus and are intended to mitigate conspiracy and threats to the peace". That would be the best these apes can manage, until such a time that they would have studied history, diagnosed the problem correctly, and worked towards undoing the deliberate damage centuries of aristocratic filth have imposed on us. The obvious outcomes that would arise from this solution only appear bloody if the full scale of daily carnage aristocratic society created is mystified. The result of this cult in the past century has been to invert absolutely the proper target of guilt for the present situation. Instead of blaming the aristocrats who willfully and gleefully encourage the rot and select that trait among the lesser classes, the blame for society's woes first goes to democracy, when the majority of people did nothing but exist and are the actually productive engine that made most of this

world possible, and most of all to the lowest classes of the insane and retarded, who by definition had virtually no power to affect anything and who have been sadistically tortured and exterminated to grand applause, the torture of whom has been an obligation of the race since its formation. If purging them were supposed to make humanity better, it clearly has not worked given all of human history. All genuine mechanistic views of human society place guilt squarely on the men and women who held all relevant machines and cards and resources that would organize this carnage, encourage it, and suggest to their inferiors that aristocratic sadism was the point. We only pretend since the rise of fascism and ideology proper that this is a new thing, when that was just the mask of human institutions and the aristocracy coming off.

It would seem very simple and elegant to do this and solve our problems. So far as human society has been made livable, the solutions have uniformly been along these lines - mitigate human contact and conspiracy, discourage large centralizations of wealth and force in few hands and in the hands of known malevolent actors, promote an egalitarian ethos in all things specifically to mitigate the former, and suggest that harmony with the world and each other is possible through some goodwill that would be recognized and considered not a mark of shame or retardation but a mark of probity. It was never the wise or the strong who set themselves above the race that made us any better. Every aristocratic initiative was either intended to aggravate the problem, or foolishly looked to culprits other than themselves and ideas their class and interest suggested were good. The common worker and slave diagnosed the problem without some wise asshole pedagogically feeding it to him or her. Whatever their interpersonal difficulties and the malice within the lower orders, which was an accepted fact of life, little of it was by any reasonable sense of scale comparable to the daily malfeasance of aristocrats and armies. Yet, every effort to push against this proves futile, or never gets off the ground. The moment such an idea can assert itself, it is as if some demonic force asserts historical progress must go on, reversing brief efforts to claw back a part of the world. It affects not just the workers, but all classes and the aristocracy's own struggles to survive as an institution. In many cases, aristocracies rise from men that were nothing particularly noteworthy at all, and almost as soon as they win, they succumb to the curse of aristocracy, despite knowing how this ends before they began their rise. The cycle repeats in miniature throughout human society, until it reaches a low enough level that a retard, marked and shamed by society, may consider himself a petty-aristocrat in the special education room, but can see that his position is worthless. He then finds that the whole of human society is, and has been since time immemorial, regimented to reproduce the aristocracy in miniature, and if he follows this mechanistically, he would see that aristocracy was a tendency seemingly built into the race, and the counter-examples - despite their clear superiority in the experience of most of humanity and their adoption among stable aristocracies when concerning their own kind - are always defeated. It is not that anarchy destroys a functional republic or despotism corrupts absolutely. Despots are not by nature any more vicious than republicans, and

in many cases despots out of necessity rule with an even hand simply because that requires less work, and favoritism and venality imperils a despotic ruler just as much as it imperils a republican institution. The tendency of aristocracy in humanity is a phenomenon whose origin is one part inherited from nature, one part economic, one part derived from the origins of the state, one part the religious thought that arose because humans were too stupid to accept true and proper atheism without succumbing to their moral rot, and one part the victory of some malice which is beyond any particular ideology, political form, moral sentiment, or practice. There was nothing truly natural about aristocracy that was inborn and asserted inexorably. In some way, aristocracy is a message from the future that some may have forseen. It could be seen by extrapolating crude events and considering what was possible if one conspired to be an aristocrat, or extrapolating what someone saw around them if they were wary of a growing aristocracy freezing them out of life. More than that, aristocracy's deep endgame would be forseen by prophets with some form of madness that granted them an insight ordinary knowledge didn't access, but that was inherent in the very conceit and evident from its early formation. The horrorshow of the future is forseen, and the prophecy fulfills itself. The full impulse of aristocracy can only be described as a mechanistic act after diagnosing the illness of society generally. It is not a uniquely human problem, as if humans or a particular race of humanity were the only ones evil enough to do this. Nearly every race of mankind has, in one way or another, stories pertaining to this beast, both enshrining it and fearing it. It is because of aristocracy's total victory in the past century that we are more blind now than past societies were about this menace. It did not arise out of some instinct that the so-called best were destined to rule, or that nature rewards the duplicity and avarice of the race and declared that anyone who doesn't embrace this ethos is retarded, the most sinful thing there is. Nature has punished aristocracy many times over, and in spite of many examples of aristocratic failure, aristocracy cannot fail. It can only be failed. The pattern will repeat. It originates instead through what society did to constitute itself, and knowledge finding a way to assert certain thought-forms within the most basic relations of humans. It begins first with what society is in its basic mechanisms, and then inverting that understanding completely so that description of the mechanisms is the great taboo. Had we been frank about the nature of this Satanic ape from the moment it became clear, so much misery would be averted. Of course, the germ that began this cycle came before the ape was Satanic. This is not because humans were once good and fell, but because the Satan did not yet exist as we know it. In a later chapter the model's applicability to early humanity will be detailed, and to give that the proper grounding, sociality as a general concept must be established.

The most primitive values established as moral sentiments, utilities of things, and the basic symbols recognized, establish knowledge properly from its humbler origins. Whatever the origin of complex knowledge processes - from evolutionary history of life generally to the conception and development of young would-be knowing entities, or some other origin that brought about a knowing entity for

our way was not the only way it could have gone - society as a formal concept is not a thing that existed in nature in any obvious way. A life-form would function independently before it would join in society, and even if a life-form is tightly integrated into a social unit due to inborn traits or the presence of a society much larger than the life-form that surrounds and indoctrinates it, it could only be so integrated because it is individually constituted to fill a niche, and this constitution is not a just-so story. If there is a genetic legacy that imprints society onto life, then it would not prove the necessity of society is intrinsic to nature, but that individuals reproduce society by some hardcoded volition that stubbornly persists. The variance in any society, and the need of life to adapt to changing circumstances, suggest that no such genetic hardcoding exists to lock in any preferred social relationships. The sociality of any knowing entity would emerge not from any managed plan at conception, but emerges regardless of those inborn traits, and regardless of anything we would have thought of in isolation. Whatever those values we adopt for ourselves, whether they are moral intents, utilities that are valued for whatever they provide, or the symbols of value we regard for our own use, they encounter a society of agents who do the same thing, and encounter things in the society which regardless of values exist outside of us. It would be impossible to speak of social values or anything shared in any social system without establishing that those values at first exist in individuals. They only become social values once communicated. This communication is only envisioned as a bilateral exchange, regardless of how the communication happens. Every agent to communicate connects with every other agent and every other thing, so far as the agent's communication has any real force to reach another agent, by some chain of events that can be traced back to its source once received. It does not matter if the receiver is unaware of the source or if the sender is unaware of the destination, for communication can only exist in some form that is outside of us and outside of society as a construct. Society in this sense can only concern definite things, and there is not one vaguely defined construct that is socially meaningful. So far as it is possible to speak of society, it consists only of things that are meaningful and symbolic - that is, the things communicated to, even if the symbol lacks a direct physical existence and is an abstract idea held in the minds of agents or written on some media that is to be read. For the communication to be relevant to society as a concept, the communication must be meaningful in the sense that the things in communication are known, in some way, to be relevant to the social, either as agents recognized as potential social entities or as things appropriated by social entities and circulating in society.

Things and people which are not claimed or registered as persons with social status are, for the purposes of describing a coherent social system, not part of the society in any way. There may be things or people that resist this claim or "forced registration" into a social system. Certain things in the natural world are in effect unclaimable by society, even if agents in society make presumptive claims to it. Many entities claimed the Moon, but no entity can bring the Moon into social appropriation with any seriousness and there are great barriers to

establishing any continuous contact with the Moon, outside of looking at it from Earth. In that sense, the Moon's attachment to society is very tenuous, but there are many associations with the Moon, the planets, the stars, and especially the Sun. The Sun is not claimable by anyone and any probe sent to it would quickly burn, but the Sun on its own power exerts immense energy, and in this way, solar output provides a resource to all societies on Earth. It would not be possible to calculate the claim in part because it is impossible to enclose the Sun^[2], but also because the energy of the sun is so abundant that energy generated by Earth's natural processes is small, and the total of human industry is tiny compared to that. Earth without the Sun would freeze rapidly and be incompatible with any civilization or life as we know it, outside of what few pockets could summon heat and store resources to persist. It would be possible, but it would be a grim existence to say the least. For social purposes, though, all persons and all things have a personal relationship with the Sun before a wider network can be divined. None of those relationships entail a claim on any portion of the Sun's output that would be captured at the source. The most that can happen is that offshoots of solar energy can be captured directly by solar panels or by basking in sunlight. Indirectly, the Sun is the reason nearly everything we would appropriate in society can exist, but this indirect relationship is not intrinsically necessary for society. The Sun and its output are taken here as a whole, with most of its output not entering social circulation at all since it not directed at Earth, and isn't directed anywhere meaningful at all for the most part. We need not consider celestial bodies to be the sole unclaimables, or even large things like the ocean floor which until recently was not a thing that could be contested by societies, and is still prohibitively expensive to contact continuously. Nor is this a matter of specific legal claims, where only *Terra nullius* or dead man's land is outside of society. There are humans who remain stateless or who are for all intents and purposes outside of society, or barely in contact with society. They might know of society and civilization might know of them, but outside of sporadic contacts if that, neither party interacts with the other in any way that constitutes social behavior, and both parties generally do not want contact with the other in any way. There are things which are missing, or thrown in a garbage dump and sit doing nothing, and so their utilities to society are next to null. Garbage remains in society in some sense as a burden, but collectively, garbage is rarely explored beyond the fact that it is deemed garbage and must be disposed of in some place. We could just as well lose something of minor or even considerable value in our home, never finding it for years or decades, and during this time, it will be lost to social circulation in any serious sense. There are then humans whose existence is well known and who live among us, but who are specifically not considered registered persons in a legal sense, and who are treated not as persons in any moral sense, or even something that would be claimed as property. It is not that there is no social relations - there is communication and substantive interaction - but it is a strong social value to shun and reject such unpersons to the point where acknowledging their existence is a great crime and taboo, and all communication is considered an effort to eliminate an unwanted presence, an alien in proper society's midst. The hatred

of such people is foundational to human concepts of political society, and so far as it can be enforced, the concept is realized by deliberate shunning, antagonism in all communications towards the unperson, and the inadmissibility of their acts as anything with utility or symbolic value. In private, much of humanity intends this bigotry not just to a marked class to be shunned, but intends that status to be assigned to anyone who is not in the know of their social clique. There are humans who take great pride in rejection and shaming of the unwanted, and consider all who are not them to be abjectly and totally retarded. Those people and their proud adherence to the eugenic creed signal their undying faith to the creed, and they know what side of the war they are on.^[3]

The relationships of society are always frayed. Communication is never as constant as it would be between the parts of the body, even in the case of conjoined twins. Proximity and frequency are not constants and very relevant to the integrity of any social system. Symbolically, a known relationship, however tenuous, is treated as whole and recorded. What actually happens between two things, whether persons or objects, is ultimately between them. This dyad is never reducible to a preferred relationship or symbol, but is instead the result of some communication which is undeniable. Even if the communication is not relevant to society, the conceit of society we hold does not change that communication is a real event. It is easily possible to communicate with meanings "outside of society", without subsuming all of that communication into the social system proper. This happens with information or meaning that is dismissed as irrelevant. It happens when communications between two entities are concluded for the present message, and both are left to do with the meaning and record of that communication what they will. There are then those relationships which, while they can be construed by a third party as part of social behavior, the two parties involved intend to keep that message between each other, or for some reason cannot communicate that outside of the dyad. Secrets are a known possibility among social actors, but to speak of a social system formally, all such secrets are not things which the whole of the social system can acknowledge. Even between the conspirators, it is often the practice that secrets are not given as literal symbols, but that someone is expected to get the meaning without it being said. Secrets may be relevant to the most core actions of a society, but their occulting and revelation - by confession, gossip, or forcing them out in some way - is a thing existing outside of proper society, which must regard the relations as things which are acknowledgeable. The revelation of any secret is a great shame and failing of any social actor, no matter how innocuous or virtuous. Secrets need not be intrinsically bad things. Members of society often will hide their strength, keep their head down, or keep secrets specifically because revealing them would be damaging to the social system or some third party who did not need to suffer when the truth comes out. The secrets do exist, but society's values do not require that all secrets be revealed as information for the social system to be intact. It is also known that if perfect societies operated with perfect information in a perfect environment, all of it controlled immaculately, society as a concept would be undone in an instant. Too much would be revealed

and the results of all plays, all future actions, would be a foregone conclusion, given sufficient insight. It may be possible to obfuscate the prophecy that would be made with such information, or suggest that some chaotic factor will throw off all predictions. In principle social systems intend not to be disrupted by such random events. The social relationship corrects for the intrusion of noise whenever possible. It may be possible to pretend that society continues once all cards are laid on the table and there are no more secrets and no more noise. All that exists in society would be going through the motions, and it could be said to all in society that, given this information and how it turns out, the best thing to do would be to cut the crap where these dyads are something special, and treat it as if it were just another mechanical force in the world. It would be as if the imagined hobgoblin animating everything in the world were true, or effectively so, if society truly possessed perfect information and all secrets were gone. At the same time, society to be society maintains that the information available in a relation is correct from person to person, and that all other agents and things can share information in the same way, however frequent the contact between them. Nowhere does a third party have direct access to information between two things. The third party must always open some channel that allows access to either information regarding one of the two things in question absent their social relation, or receive the communication en route from sender to destination. If the latter happens, then the third party is simply receiving itself the same message that the second party received and the first party sent. The third party's presence may be known or unknown, but in any real sense, the third party is bound by the same laws of communication as any other thing in the society. In the former case, the information available from another person or a thing is only accessible if the third party interrogates one of the two parties, which is a whole separate matter between two entities. What the interrogated gives is only what information is available in the communication. The person under interrogation may willfully obscure their knowledge and give false information, or genuinely forgot what was communicated in the prior exchange. The interrogator may not be good at this job and ask the wrong question, and only has the time and energy of this exchange. The interrogator does not have access to the past in a direct way to know what was said, and can only reconstruct what happened based on facts he can obtain in some way. There may be evidence outside of the social relation, but that evidence was not intrinsically part of society in the way we conceive of it. Evidence or remains of some communication or event may be left behind without any intent, but the evidence only enters social circulation if it is discovered. Someone wishing to hide any trail will be aware of this and take steps to not leave evidence, or simply not do things that would arouse suspicion. It would be entirely possible to insinuate something about an entity in society that is false, and so long as information is exchanged to suggest that the insinuation is acceptable in society, then that information becomes "true" in circulation, so far as anything in society can be said to be fact or fiction. Social systems do not possess by their nature any fact-checking or error-checking in their information. That can only be done by knowing agents who adjudicate fact and truth, or by institutions comprised of agents accomplishing this task and

establishing by some institutional mechanism the truth of fiction of anything in society. The same can be said of individuals, who are not obligated by any natural law or intent of their constitution to produce true information, or even believe in the information contained within them for their own use.

Social values, unlike our own moral values, do not have any knowledge suggesting that they exist at all. There is no intrinsic utility recognized in any social value or social relation. The only thing that is communicated in society is symbolic values, in the form of information or things which enter social circulation. No social relation contains intrinsic meaning or purpose beyond the information that such a relation exists, and that relation only occurs in some time and place. The genuine material interactions between entities - for example, the physical or chemical actions or productive process - are not at all recognized by society, for the same reasons the command of individuals or self-command does not recognize the concrete existence of anything. All of these values in society are symbolic and abstract. There is not in society even the necessary recognition of utility in things which have a real existence. Social systems do indeed entail genuine interactions between entities to be social systems, but the material communication between agents is irrelevant to the construct of society altogether. This is not the case for individuals, who are necessarily constituted as individuals in a material sense, and whose knowledge process allowing them to exist as agents is a real thing. Nothing about social systems is necessarily "real" in the way an individual's consciousness would have to be. Social systems instead exist as something reproduced in the minds of people, and can only have a real existence as some information stored that pertains to society. That information may be the memory of agents, or it may be information recorded on some media. Outside of that information, which notes the official record of communications that constitute society, there is no "society" as such. And so, Maggie Thatcher was right after all. This of course doesn't mean that the social system isn't "real", as if it were a thing to ignore. We gather this information about society at the system level for very good reasons and hold it to be relevant to life, if not the prime purpose of life. What is meant here is that society is not a thing taken for granted, nor a thing that can be taken at face value. A society imagined as a perfect clockwork under the command of management is only realizable in part. The moment information slips from notice, and it must slip short of permanent integration of the social unit, the parts of the machine operate on their own power. While this may continue out of habit, as livestock persist century after century without rebelling, the parts left to their own devices do not form any social unit or a thing we would regard as society at all in this sense. A social unit that is automated and regulated cybernetically by a manager, or some abstract manager held in the minds of its actors, ceases to be society in this sense, and becomes a different thing that is describable not with the language of sociology, but the language of engineering and machinery. Society to be society entails that its members' agency is a thing that is occultable, regardless of whether the occult secrets can be exposed. Society is not intrinsically opposed to this secrecy. Far from it, society as we know it persists because secrets are kept,

and this is consciously understood to the knowing participants in society. It is not done out of some sense that occultism is the point of society, but because secrecy makes any information relevant. It would be quite impossible to actually possess "perfect information" as once it is acquired information would resume to be gathered locally and the record for the whole system is thrown off. Even if an occasional record of "perfect information" were available, though, it would destroy society. Further, "perfect information" may be held by a privileged agent who uses that information against other agents.^[4]

A society with "perfect markets and perfect information" is a dream of those who crave not even slavery, but a petty-managerial power-trip which accomplishes nothing and means nothing. A master-slave relationship is still a social relationship, even if it is very tenuous and defined by stark alienation. If we did wish to describe this world of humans in clockwork machines doing their part, that is entirely possible, and it could perhaps be a world some desire if it met expectations of what they actually wanted out of life. Humans, after all, do not need society in any sense, and often see society in the abstract and its real communications as a great danger to the things they wanted. Humans could in principle find the meaningful relations they wanted with other humans without this concept of society at all. They would through the exchange of information establish a thing we call society, but that information exchange would be secondary to what the participants might have wanted, which is a meaningful and pleasant dialogue and interaction where both are happier. It would be possible to have this in a society we didn't choose to be part of or in relationships that were born in a situation of dependence, but society in the sense we understand it has often been a burden to those meaningful interactions rather than a guide towards them. With social relations in this sense where we value the entity "society" as a system or a wider sense of society that is also necessarily a system of definite relations, we are beholden to the possibility that some other party would disrupt that relationship we had. We could perhaps gather in a circle of friends and that meaningful interaction we wanted was not with one person but with a whole group, which gathered in some primitive sense of collectivity. That collectivity came not from society at all, but an impulse in humans that enjoyed gathering in circles and being around what they would perceive as friends, or some sort of interaction that no one involved objected to and found natural. The same caveats apply in this group situation as they do with a one-on-one extrasocial relation, in that all of these relationships become through the communication of information social relations. We don't always think of these moments of genuine bonding as "social information" or "values" to be commanded and probed, though. It could be enough simply to be in the company of another without trying to kill it or take advantage of it, and the same can be said the other way around. Society in the sense of information exchanges is not a thing that promotes harmonious interactions between agents. It is intrinsically a thing antagonistic to such an interaction.

None of this is to say "society is evil" in some sense, but it is to say that what we thought we wanted in life, whether it is between people or between things,

or our relation to things, is not a thing that is resolved by society at all, or by any institution we could create. It is not resolved by the state for certain, but it is not resolved by any institution, even one that originated from the people and their shared interest in an informational sense. If we wish society to be a thing worth keeping - if we wish for institutions that are worth a damn for anything other than seeking advantage over another agent - then the only way that is possible is if there is some genuine dialogue among humans that actually wants such a thing. No plan, no theory, no political platform, or any other informational prescription resolves that. No struggle session or philosophical struggle or war will ever resolve the social question, for what the social question entailed was not really about wealth or status or prestige or any signifier. The true wants of humans, and those wants are not guaranteed to be good or at all interested in a harmonious society, are things that are not resolved easily or with some knowledge telling us the correct value. We adopt moral values and them symbolize them not because those values are life's prime purpose, but because moral sentiments guide us to do something other than the barest minimum of life. If we were morally valuing something in exchange because of a propensity to truck and barter, that isn't really the purpose of life.^[5] The propensity to truck and barter exists, and its origin may be argued in some natural cause. As we mentioned though, all of these social behaviors emerged from a seed, and are never inexorable forces asserting themselves by some impulse that is unchanging. That propensity came from somewhere, and the precise origins of it are not things that are simple and reducible to that sense. It developed and changed over the centuries because trucking and bartering, and similar practices of skullduggery, had an advantage in society where information would be exchanged. That advantage is not built in to nature in some sense that makes it inevitable, but it is highly probable such a situation was evident to enough people, who had nothing intrinsically stopping them from doing that and honed this skill. So too did the tendency of human beings to reject that approach to social interaction, so much that market activity in general was an unseemly activity, and one seldom entered into compared to the number of informational exchanges that do not entail this. Most of what humans do does not entail any market exchange or an implied exchange of tokens denoting social value, worth, proof, or some measure at all. Humans only attend markets every so often and do so with wariness of what they are paying for. This is not limited to the markets where money is exchanged, but any informational exchange between agents in society which could be mutually hostile. A similar wariness exists between people and things in society, as humans are aware from their personal tool use that things have a potentially corrupting effect on themselves. If the tools we use form a symbiotic relationship with ourselves, what would be said about things in society which are far more numerous and wielded not by our own hand but that are claimed by another? They are sold to us with far fewer guarantees of their goodness than the goodness we would sense if we built from raw materials we extracted ourselves the thing we wanted, without any of the vagaries of social interaction at all. They are more often than not used against us, as the things of society enter the circulation not of us or our friends but

typically congregate in institutions and persons very hostile to us.

THE EXTENT OF SOCIAL SYSTEMS

At the micro level for an individual, the utilities of things are discernable and can be symbolized and commanded. The physical force that may be commanded is measurable and gauged, and there was some reason it was desirable that may vary, but it is undeniable that physical force of that sort is wanted. At the system level of an individual, value judgements are made for the purpose of the knowing entity, which are not necessarily rational but are rationalizable in some way due to being symbolic information we can process and adjudicate. The wide-scale system thinking of individuals is exemplified by handling many systems and an overall sense of systems, whether those systems are considered "in society" or are part of some other construct. The system level of an individual concerns themselves and whatever "game" they are playing which involves a system with fixed expectations of what is encountered, such that a game strategy can be determined without too much difficulty. The wide-domain level of systems thought for individuals concerns their behavior outside of "games", where they must be ready for anything and encounter a world, or some part of it large enough to be meaningfully part of world affairs. To contain an individual at the system level is to confine them to a game or series of games played in sequence, such that there is little context for the player from game to game except a confused guess of what is going on. Wide-domain level thinking, then, is something that individuals expect if they are to be reasonably comfortable with their environment, for on some level the existence of that level of systems is apparent simply from the knowledge that system-level games are possible, or that they themselves are systems and have adopted systems thinking in some way. Whether that information is available or not, individuals will act as if it were a concern, and are noticeably uncomfortable if they are shunned from that level and corralled into games and controlled situations. They will likely see the wardens, inquisitors, and so on smirking at the systematized subject, who know full well that they've made the individual cattle. Wide-domain thinking does not entail "society" in the sense we have defined it. In practice, in any era, human beings maintain only a small number of genuine social relations and information that are sustained, and many of those relations are clearly imbalanced where one has authority and status over the other. Humans, like any agent would reasonably be, only maintain so many relationships that are directly relevant to them, and indirect relations are presented as alien information or a crowd of people who they wouldn't know as anything different from one another. For both the individual's reckoning of the real condition and for the social system the individual is actually in, that network of clear dyads is the most evident reality of society. Whomever sits as the president, whomever is a celebrity, the actors on television shows, whomever is notable in institutions, and whomever wears some icon indicating it's time to shit your pants in fear, is not relevant for the individual's conception of social relations. The individual is aware that there are many agents outside of this social system, this network, that is apparent at

first, who themselves are likely in social systems of their own. Not one agent has a super-authority to claim they possess far more connections than typical in that society, and certainly no agent can claim a direct relationship with every agent and thing in that society. Yet, it is the pretense of executives of any large institution to relate to either everyone in society, or large numbers of people who arrange in a queue to be interfaced with. Specializations include sending underlings to deal with the people in the name of the institution, who are led by some manager or leader, who reports to a higher leader, et cetera. The organizational structure of institutions may be different, but all sustained social systems are premised first on the dyads of relationships that exist. Social systems in of themselves do not inherently regard institutions as equal to social systems, and often institutions are split into many social systems and networks, and networks split across institutions as well. The formation of institutions typically consolidates social systems, but it is an abiding rule of institutions that they turn against their stated purpose as soon as they are founded, as institutions are in the end not a social structure but an idea held above society as such. Institutions do not fit neatly into any sociality that is regarded as informationally important, as often institutions are not well-organized machines but battlegrounds for social influence. Much of the effort in institutions is not to bring new members into them, but to enforce discipline through fear or manipulation, and to mitigate corruption and waste, which often runs rampant because social systems and the individual agents answer the interests of their social system and the people they consider "in" long before any concern for wider society, institutions, or general good will is considered. There are reasons why this is so, which will be written of briefly later in this chapter, but the answer is probably self-evident to most readers. This is the view purely from someone thinking of their individual system and their world, where the social system is at heart some chart held by themselves detailing their ongoing, past, and potential future relations.

Pure self-interest is never as great a motivator as it made out to be, even if it is a reasonable indicator of what someone would do most of the time, and is most evident in relations between aliens or antagonists. Agents who know of society often, but not always, hold in their mind a concept of the interest of the social system as a whole. This is not necessarily identical with viewing the system as a singular collective, and the social system of someone involves disparate relationships which must be treated differently. The overall integrity of someone's relations with other people is considered on all levels, and each level is considered differently. First of all, someone is typically aware of their position with others, or seeks to be, and is conscious of that position out of necessity. If someone possesses a discordant view of themselves in the eyes of others and of institutions, it does not last long, and the contempt towards those who do not know where they stand is exemplary. Feigned ignorance of social standing is not the same, and in many cases this dissembling is obligatory in human society. Generally, though, it is not difficult to see where someone really stands with their stable relations. This interest in others' opinion is not purely crass self-interest, but something suggesting the virtue of someone, regardless

of whether the society as a whole regards virtue as relevant, or how virtue is truly judged. Even those who seemingly lack virtue have some sense of what it is to be respected, and to not be respected. It is not limited to questions of respect or social standing, as if all relations were competitive. The complexities of love, obligations, duties, the games to test trust, tolerance for games, is a matter too complex to detail in full, but enough experience with society suggests that these relations are considered not just as sentiments or meanings vaguely understood, but as propositions indicating the nature of one-to-one relationships. The relationships may be valued for some purpose or may be something morally valued as that which makes someone's life worth living. I do not presume to give anyone advice on how to manage their personal relationships, since my own are dogshit and will remain so, but I trust that this concept is understandable and needs no further explanation.

The true standing of someone in a social system may not correspond to one's own assessment of their position, or where someone would want to be. This standing is not in principle dictated by any executive, but is instead a fact that can be adjudicated if, somehow, all participants in a social system could be isolated and questioned without disrupting any of the relationships in question. This is not actually possible, as the mere presence of an inquisition not only adds a very jarring one-to-one relation into the system, and because even if this surveillance were benign, the sense that relations are watched from above and in secret, or that some Gestapo asshole with a uniform is asking questions, has a chilling effect on all social relations. However, no such inquisition is necessary to suggest that there is an overall standing someone would hold among their relations, and reputation that would be judged by others who know a person. No such judgement exists in isolation, as if every agent's relationship with you were perfectly isolated. We may presume for the moment that the social system of someone is stable and there are few outside influences that are relevant - perhaps this is a small village of a few hundred where most of the inhabitants know each other by name and residence, and many have relationships beyond that, gossip with each other, and know generally what is going on. The opinion of the majority, or some hive mind, is not a foregone conclusion where judgement of someone is in all cases a pass/fail filter where those who pass get everything, and those who fail are shunned forever. What is the case in any social system is that all participants are conducting the same calculation with regard to each other, and they may have calculations with other social systems and spread word of mouth outside the system one person is in to another. Absent any context for wider society or knowledge of other distinct social systems, it is difficult to know what information leaks from your known contacts to those who are unknown to you, on top of what known contacts say to other you know behind your back. I don't need to belabor the games of posturing, gossiping, backstabbing, conniving, praising, humiliation, and all of the tricks used to mark humiliation and all of the ways someone indicates "like" or genuine praise. What is known is that the standing of each agent to each other agent is expected in any social system where the participants all relate to each other, to a greater or lesser extent. This may

nudge undesirables down, lift up the virtuous by whatever way that is regarded, and establish who is in good enough standing to not be chased out of town. The esteem of someone in any part of society determines so much of what any agent can do, and this is largely out of any individual's hands no matter what they do or what they are. It is entirely possible and very common to destroy someone by nothing more than insinuations, and the choice can be made for any arbitrary reason or some omen of ill fortune where one is drawn to be sacrificed today. As a general rule, any esteem lost is lost for good. Any demerit, the most severe of which being the mark of foolishness, is never truly forgotten and it is absolutely not forgiven. Some deeds may be forgiven or not even acknowledged despite being known as bad, but to be a fool is a great crime of Being. To be retarded is the worst of all, and absolutely unforgivable. In general, deeds matter less than assessments of being in this assessment. Deeds may be compiled as evidence, but with all of these assessments being rooted in symbolic representation, that will win in the end. A deed in of itself is forgiven very easily because, at heart, humans know what they are and what they truly value. There are a few of us who do believe deeds make us what we are, as that is the correct assessment if we concern ourselves with truth, but in social values, it is what people are, their state of being, and their property which itself is a symbolic value, that remains most relevant to assess future actions. Someone can do a bad thing and their deeds may be understood as a mistake or something done under pressure. To be a shitty person is another thing. To be weak in any way is anathema, no matter what may be said about protecting the weak or allowing the weak sanction to continue. This is not always something for pig-headed purposes, and the punishments for being a shitty person can vary based on who and what you are dealing with, and what shit someone is willing to accept. It is not a default to view the weak with seething contempt or outrage at their presence, but this is very common and those who embrace hatred of the weak will taste blood and never look back. Others, like myself out of necessity, simply don't regard the weak as relevant one way or another. For myself, this is an unusual choice but one that would be an adaptation of being at the bottom and shunned in so many things, and so I consider humans correctly to be some sort of threat, and have little expectation of any deed from them. If others do good things or allow good to exist, or at least have enough sense not to make this situation worse, I am pleasantly surprised, but I wouldn't let any amount of good deeds circumvent my knowledge of general human wickedness, and certainly wouldn't forget documented wickedness and the signs of foul nature in those around me. The personality and standing of someone is typically obvious enough that a sense of their virtue is assessed, and even if it were not clear, one of the first things humans will do is detect this to determine who is bigger or smaller, and what threat or intent they may pose.

Many of these traits are particular to humans, but in principle, any social agent with knowledge would detect the same information and act on it, however they do so and whatever the customs in their society. Whether they care about what humans care about, or even see their social relationships in the same moral

light we do, is another question. We should not be too quick to make sweeping judgements about human sociality and fixed roles of anyone, for humans have wildly varying stances and strategies for navigating this problem. It is further part of the occulting of information to maintain some ambiguity about this standing and reputation, and it is also an expectation of society in the same vein to maintain decencies, whether through clenched teeth towards an obviously despised person or because of a general disinterest in conflict. It is actually very common for social agents to not have that strong an opinion one way or another about anyone they know, and they even think this way towards social relations that are close and seemingly tight. When it comes down to it, the games of social position are not truly that important at this local level, and life is too short to dwell on this standing when it concerns only local conditions. It is very common in urban settings for social systems to diffuse and few close relationships to exist at all, and for relations to switch to new ones rapidly. It is also common for city-dwellers to simply disregard any close relations and prefer solitude, as this is a natural adaptation to the presence of a highly hostile and predatory race in close quarters. It is more pronounced still when that state is known and the predation is given sanction as deliberate policy of institutions and from on high, which places the city-dweller of the 21st century in a precarious position. As we can see, human nature in this regard shifts visibly, and in the past century, the definition of human and the basic behaviors of them have been engineered in ways that were previously impossible. It is possible to speak of the humans' tendency generally - speaking only of the concept of humans as a race rather than the spiritual concept which was never beholden to nature in that sense - but this never encoded highly specific social behaviors in the way such a concept is used to clumsily imply.^[6] The focus on human examples is made because that is the most obvious example which is translated to accessible information, and animal sociality abides laws which are understood but not so interesting for illustrating this value of information. We may consider the sociality of knowing agents that are very different from us and utilize some symbolic language, and it would consider its environment in the same way - that is to say, they make decisions that follow from knowledge of themselves and all conditions, chief among them being other agents. Since we observe significant variation among humans, who belong to many social classes and who have historically been treated in different ways based on time and place, the alien types which we have no examples of are an exercise for the reader to consider. We could consider perhaps what would happen if key social mores never developed, or some technology or practice arrived at a different time.

The wide-domain level version of social awareness is too something different from wide-domain level perception from an individual position, where the individual must look out for itself. Yet, the first question at the level of social organizations of larger complexity is to look for the same seat of authority. Since there is no obvious self to be that seat, the question is really a simple one - who, or what, rules. Whatever our beliefs about society being governed by institutions or ideas or some force outside of us, we recognize that because knowledge is

a local event, any authority exerting a regulatory force is likely to come from an executive. Regardless of the political form or institutions in place, or what means a political class uses to rise above the rest, there is in a society of sufficient size a sense of someone who leads, and who by his or her presence commands authority over many people. This executive need not speak for the whole society, as the boundaries of society worldwide are vast, and many peoples will never be under the same executive. The executive does not exist because the executive alone waves a mighty hand to make agents obey, nor because the executive is a necessary symbol or nothing more. The executive instead exists because of a recognition that authority cannot be shared by too many agents, and so it is helpful for one voice to speak loud and clear. This executive need not be a political office or a formal position. It could be a public speaker with a large crowd, or someone directing the cheer of a stadium, or any number of conductors. It often is associated with some virtue that can be construed to command more than temporary attention. There may be simply a first man of Rome, or the queen bee all of the other girls envy and all of the men chase after in futile efforts. It could be someone who was seen as smart enough, tough enough, or gosh-darned liked enough to make decisions on a regular basis, whether in an institution or because it seemed like a good idea to follow someone. Regardless of social tendencies or mores, the executive functions not simply as a commander, but as a sort of law-giver that can suggest administrative strategies, and set a hierarchy of who is closer to the top and who is at the bottom and there to eat shit. The hierarchy need not conform to that idea of domination or submission, and could be rather a convenient way to organize larger social formations into something that can communicate effectively. A legion would not function well without centurions and a number of functions to regiment it, and this function can be found in armies. There are bosses, Dons of crime families, leaders of syndicates, union organizers, notables of the community, and so on. There is a sense from the executive of what generally rules and what is in, that is an impression the laws of a polity or institutions can't fully substitute with their preferred executive functioning. The executive function that unites larger societies does not neatly conform to conceits we would hold about leadership, because the concept requires someone to adjudicate with information a very complex thing, the answer to which is never given or immediately obvious. An executive in this sense is not appointed to any term of office or given any legal or political authority by esteem or whatever allowed them to govern. The executive may be shared by a small number of people or some group which is secluded in membership but associated with the same sort of authority that is not so much institutional, but the sort of authority the name of a dreaded secret society would hold. Such societies will have internally a hierarchy to climb to be taken seriously, but it is not clear to those out of the know who the Grand Wizard or Grand Dame is. In certain situations, the executive is someone whose name best not be uttered if one knows what is good for them. There may be in place of an agent or some concept a ritual, a practice, which is so lurid and seductive that it exerts by some fascination in the ape an allure that is not explicable as mere information without a considerable history, but that does not conform to any

concept of culture or an institution.

These distinct levels of social awareness pertain less to the actual organization, but to an awareness that would make sense to speak of social information as something relevant to agents. An executive in the meaningful, functional sense entails something much different. Authority, which regulates systems by means of something outside of social or individual value and speaks of something of different moral values, is another, and authority does not have anything to do with the basic conception of society nor does it suggest any moral valuation whatsoever. The concept of the executive at the head of social organization is not a claim of leadership resting on the leader's appeal to members of an institution without barrier, but of some executive imperative which may be identical with a person for reasons that make sense to humans generally, and might make sense to other animals used to figuring out who or what is bigger and in charge. This is to say that what rules in an institution is not always "the only thing that could rule", as if there were a law of nature that assured the most capable agent or idea would rise out of struggle, chaos, or some procedure. Recognition of executive authority is something different from the recognition of a spiritual authority used to understand the world. At this early a stage, where society is just an institution and an idea in the minds of people, executive office or some thing that fulfills that role does not hold any inherent temporal, personal, or moral authority whatsoever. It is only a recognition that someone or something would fulfill an executive function, even if that function is procedural, like the role of presiding officers in a republican legislature. That sense is not itself a true authority, but a sense that must be acknowledged whether the authority is regarded by an agent or not; for example, it is necessary to acknowledge the reality that some institution is led by a particular person, perhaps a king, even if that king is not your king, and even if you or your institution do not recognize that king as a legitimate ruler, because the institution you are dealing with has an executive face or something amounting to it, and this king that isn't recognized legally by you will still issue orders as if he were that. There is always, in practice if not in name, something organizing social systems beyond the most basic. If we were to speak of a larger wide-domain society arranged in a decentralized network, where not one agent or center is apparent, then the executive function would be understood as a protocol shared in that network that is held by the agents as something regulating behavior, and this would include a sense of where to find the executive if that protocol fails. If that didn't happen, then that decentralized network without the protocol would disintegrate as a wider social arrangement. So too does a tribe without a chief suffer from a loss of leadership. Tribes, which are an example of an institution, may persist without leaders as such, but they face difficulty organizing large numbers if they lack any unifying force.

Executive organization being what it is, a tendency for underlings to seek position, sell out to another executive, and all of the traits common to feudalism is a trait that can be observed in societies generally. We may tell ourselves THIS society is above such behavior, but the simple reality of executives of a genuine

society is that they only, by whatever means, regulate so many agents before they must rely on subordinates. Large assemblies of agents do not necessarily share a vision or direct loyalty to the executive function. It can very well be that the executive relies entirely on local chiefs, and the executive deals with those chiefs instead of the common agents. A decentralized network ruled by a protocol is not secure from this, either. An alien protocol, or some bug in the network, can override the intended execution of the organizing protocol, and this is a way to attack decentralized networks. And, as always, social agents are knowing agents with their own motives, and there is no law of nature or compulsion in them that necessitates following any executive, any more than agents are locked into any particular social system of a smaller sort. While it is very harrowing for individuals to leave a social system given the obvious deficits of having no friends at all, individuals can leave large organizations easily and do so very often. Nothing like patriotism or some sense of duty ties anyone to any larger social organization, as if the agent should give freely to something that is typically distant and uncaring towards the agent. It is also very uncommon for the self-interest of agents in large organizations to align for long on anything, unless that self-interest is something that is constant enough in the minds of agents that they will go to great lengths to defend it. There has been a great self-interest against many of the cruelties in human society, and this didn't have to arise from any goodness or virtue in the agents, or from selfish agents who didn't recognize submission to their social superiors "correctly". Social organizations, once all pretenses are dropped, are things sustained by the agents because those agents want to be in an organization and see this one, whatever it is, as suitable or the best of options available. If we are in a social organization purely by coercion and threats, then this "best of options" is compared against the suffering and death and probably great shame that not going along with the organization brings, but that is in some way a value held by the agent. It is also unlikely someone held in an organization purely with fear is going to be particularly interested in giving to that organization anything other than the least possible. Social organizations, in of themselves, do not give or take anything. They simply are a recognition that organization exists, rather than any token suggesting the whole is significant or worth valuing. There may be a sense that the organization itself, rather than an institution representing it, is really what would be defended. These are, after all, neighbors and possibly friends, or at least people you might meet at some point, with whom some sort of tie exist. No such wider social organization is something that exists purely as a token, unlike institutions which are corporate fronts and icons representing social formations and movements. There is something substantive that the information held in our minds about this arrangement points to. It may be an arrangement barely understood, but someone will recognize almost instinctively membership in some organization or lack thereof, and the arithmetic of the group's size, and the size of subgroups in it, is noted. This is not just due to the number of agents, but the qualities of those agents, the possession of things claimed by them. Intrinsically, there is no community of property or effort implied by the organization that is set aside at all. The agents maintain themselves and their

things, and things neutral to any owner remain neutral. The existence of a pool of resources is not a particular thing outside of the society, since the pool implies that there is an institution governing its use, even a minor one. The institution and organization may overlap, but do not always do so.

Organizations can have as many factions and internal squabbles as any mass of people would have. They are united not by any stated purpose or institution or property, but by the simple recognition of some shared executive that would regulate the organization. Even where there are competing executives and no clear "head", there is an implication that competition for the executive, or some contest to decide what will govern, is necessary to speak of the organization as a thing. Even if the house were divided, it keeps standing as an organization in the sense that there are people in the same room, speaking of the same general idea. It need not conform to a name or a place or a nation, in the sense that the house divided would still contain "Americans". The organization is not the name or any identity or signifier, but exists because there is an organization governed in some sense by an executive that is definite, or an executive which is contestable. This may mean that groups of people who don't recognize they're contested are drawn, against their will, into some "organization" that they now must abide, and once that contest drags them in, they are aware there is a new chief or would-be chief to acknowledge. The members of the organization, who may be two opposing sides confronting in war or some struggle, will have to pick sides and the matter may be settled by battle. Even non-participants in the fighting are dragged into the consequences, despite their efforts to break away from any of this nonsense, in organizations they never wanted anything to do with. Even if the country fractured without a war as such and neatly divided groups were created out of the prior executive organization, the past existence of the country would be a fact, no matter what someone might say about the past. If the revelation came out that there is no United States, there never was a United States, and we have always been at war with Eastasia, a lot of the inhabitants of the former United States will recall that it was just a year ago the United States, with all that entails. The United States may be an institution and the nation is not identical to the assembly of people comprising it. That assembly of people were not united by any idea or institution or imagined community, but because they shared an executive for very long, and in some sense will likely see that organization as one thing in some sense. There wouldn't be intrinsically any sectionalism which immediately takes hold to say that three or more fragments of the organization are now, fully, the new thing organizationally, and everyone abandoned memory of the organization of Americans. Even if that concept were somehow abolished - let's say the mind control fully wipes away the concept that there were was a shared history of the people in the region formerly known as the United States - there are a number of reasons why this organization would be recognized as integrated in some executive sense to an outside observer. For one, geographic divisions do not suggest any natural dividing line in the continental former United States, and economically there are many reasons to consider the region a singular unit. Even if the organization doesn't exist as an

organizing executive in the minds of its agents, someone looking to reunite the former United States, or seeing it as a territory ripe for overseas annexation, or seeing it as a bloc for economic trade, would recognize the possibility of such a thing. The same can be said of potential rearrangements that can be arranged. Realistically, though, societies are not understood as things arbitrarily assigned, but by a real and sustained relationship. Over time, it may be argued that the three different organizations are their own thing with some history and far more to do with each other internally than with the rest of the former United States. We could easily envision the European Union as a federation of one thing, which it functionally is so far as geopolitics is concerned. It is not difficult to see the "Five Eyes" alliance of Anglophone core countries tied by an exchange and common links that suggest that the alliance would be consolidated into a single polity, in some way. At the level of organizations, though, organizations are truly united by the appearance of some executive. It is important to note that it need only be the appearance rather than the genuine authority or force of an executive. What we usually recognize as a meaningful society, though, is not an arbitrary sample of agents and things, but agents and things whose relations are persistent enough that it wouldn't be difficult to see how that was an actual thing, rather than a fantasy story or alternate history.

The settlement between executives and organizations is understood not at the level of any particular organization of people, but in the organization's orientation towards the whole of the world. The transcendent level form of social awareness is identified as the proper domain of politics, or the polity. I refer here not to the formal institution of the state or any particular organizing principle of it, but that which is contested by politics. That is, that politics as a concept can only exist if there is a concept that social organizations settle and reconcile with other organizations. This claim necessitates that social organizations, and all agents that consider society for themselves, possess a general consciousness of what organizations exist, their executives, their members, and what all people and things in the world do in a sense that communicates social information. That is, all the agents and things in society can be classified in some way, and this classification is ultimately determined by some knowledge. Knowledge as a process occurs at the level of individuals, so far as we are concerned with society. If we were to imagine knowledge as a collective process without regards to individuals as such, then that process would altogether have boundaries just as an individual agent's would. In practice, it is recognized in society generally that no agent is truly isolated, and it is expected that individuals and things relate to each other. Individuals can join forces, acquire things as property, and these accumulations do not necessarily correspond to any organization or society we recognize as the state of affairs in society. It would be quite impossible to speak of any society, even at the level of an individual relating to possessions alone, as if it could be hermetically sealed from other things. Yet, we are also aware that all agents and things are related by proximity and meaningful relationships. Nation-states are almost always established with intercine conflict, revolution, and the settlements concern not an ideal model of society but the

real conditions any society lives in. Never are these polities taken for granted. In principle, the polity does not concern any demarcated domain or selection of people. All polities must consider the whole world, and the identification of organizations within the world does not change that politics would happen between social agents. In other words, the highest level of social awareness of political consciousness of some sort.

This "politics" does not at first conform to any definition other than the sense that social agents are in relations with each other in some way by virtue of any potential social agent being in the world. It would not matter if an agent were on the other side of the world, or somewhere in a galaxy far, far away, to suggest that a relation would in principle be possible. It is unlikely any distant relation is direct, outside of a few channels which are understood. All of these relations are typically indirect, or arranged through established networks and protocols where the hubs and centers are identifiable. We can for example know where internet hubs are, which connect the world through mechanisms that are engineered and well documented by now. The most basic understanding of the political, before any claims about the nature of political acts are described, is that it would entail active relationships between social agents and information recording those events. There is no meaningful concept of the political that is that concerns an ideology held outside of those agents and things that are the purview of society. Any such ideology or conceit of a politics outside of people would be a figment of the imagination of social agents. This says nothing more about what politics "is", or what actions are politically relevant. There are many activities in society that are not "political", and arguably all activities can be argued to be apolitical by some logic of what spheres of activity are granted the connotation that they affect world events. Alternatively, private or personal matters of little importance to the overall state of political affairs may be deemed political acts, and this usually arises not from the subjects but by an imperious manager invading those matters. There is not any intrinsic boundary suggesting either of these extremes or some median position would decide what is and is not the proper domain where politics is settled. That boundary would be set instead by institutions, and anything institutions decide is in the end a choice of people and knowledge rather than a rule of nature, as I will shortly describe. Political acts need not be confined to people in this sense. Things which are not themselves politically conscious are objects which are involved in political acts, and things can by no design of any rational agent affect political events. A natural disaster like a hurricane need not be summoned by a politician to have an effect on the world, and the angry deity that may be construed as summoning this event would have some knowable purpose for doing so, however we understand the deity.^[7]

Here we see the nature of society in its basest form - that it is at core communication of information from the smallest act to the overall conception of the world. The genuine events which communicate this information are not, in their material and meaningful manifestation, social information, nor are they intrinsically tied to this informational concept of society. The information pertaining to society

we gather is not a mere statement of scientific fact, but a means we adopted for us to govern ourselves and react to events which take place in a real world. All of these events, and the outcomes of society in total, need not be construed at all as "social constructions". It would be possible to reduce all that the people of Earth do, or the entire life-force in all existence, to some simple mechanism and say "this is the purpose of life". This is a very crass reduction, but if anyone believes that this social information is useful for navigating the world, it can reduce very large constructs of agents to this primal urge. Whether the information is true or false is not relevant. In practice, all of our informational conceits about society are woefully inaccurate, and have to be so. We never possess anywhere near perfect information, and for many reasons no agent could assemble that information. It is also not necessary to do so. We can consider the world of natural events as what it is without society or any institution, and we can consider ourselves not as social agents but as flesh and blood humans. We can also relate to other entities not in this way where we transact information but because we find some purpose in friendship or interaction that is not reducible to social information, and has no "political" nature to speak of. In other words, there is a very large world outside of society, and not all of the information we gather about the world and other people is inherently "social information" that must be subject to political intrigues or any social taboo. It is however the nature of social information and politics that we do not get to choose which information is protected or concealed from an interested party, or preferred boundaries to regulate the flow of information. If we wish to control information, that itself would require us to engage with society and politics in some way, and every interaction entails this risk of betrayal or some other horrible event. It applies even within ourselves or our relation with things, in our own space and without any other knowing agent interfering with us. The social and political is by its nature the death of our conceits of mind and ourselves in a crude sense of the individual we might imagine. This is something most of us adapt to in some way, however badly we do so or however well we rise in social organizations and political life. An advance of modern psychology has been to turn the political viciously against the very agent that made political consciousness possible, such that the downtrodden can be depoliticized in a way slaves and serfs couldn't be in the past. The social and political entails not just corruption from other people, but corruption from things and the integration of non-thinking things with thinking agents. There is no clean delineation between mind and matter in a real sense that would be respected by nature or any social actor. This was apparent to those who figured things out long before sociology arose as a modern discipline, and it was intrinsic to the ruling ideas and philosophies long in use, and the ritual humiliations and so on that largely define human conduct.

It should be noted that these scales and domains can be applied in some way arbitrarily, and do not denote particular sizes or numbers of entities or agents. They are all, in some way, evident in the same informational construct. An individual agent can be a polity unto itself, its own organization and its own system, and that individual agent can be in principle reduced to a singular token

of information or purpose for some registry. An agent can even reduce itself to a singular proposition of purpose, a "vessel of the god" so to speak though this is no genuine divine act. The polity, whatever its real expression in a given time or place, can be similarly construed as just an organization of people, a system contained within itself, or an individual agent among many others conducting the same business. All of these levels are implicit in the concept that there can be a society at all. Not one of these concepts of society truly encompass all that exists, such that society becomes an abstraction that is truly inescapable. Such a conception is not even inherent to the concept of large organizations or the political concept. Far from it, the concept of large organizations and polities suggests that such an all-pervading society is a logical impossibility, if society is to be spoken of as anything meaningful. What such ideology and institutions purveying it actually do is reduce something which is necessarily complex to the system level, and due to some clumsy application of information, very sophisticated interactions are reduced to simpler information in a way that envisions a society as a total system, contained in some ecosystem which is managed by a thought leader. There are a lot of reasons why such an approach is useful for managing economic matters, and it would even be preferable for someone who manages a very large country with millions of inhabitants to simply these matters to some accounting scheme a human can comprehend readily. For example, figures of productivity are reduced to entries on a ledger, and there may be some unit of currency these products are compared to, in a sense that adjudicates value sufficiently for the purpose of distribution. This need not conform to money in the sense we use it, which has particular political and institutional connotations. The same problem would arise in a planned economy, and historically this is what did happen in planned economies - the same difficulty of distribution based on information applied there just as it would in market economies. This is not an argument that planned economies are intrinsically incapable of solving the social question, but that it is entirely possible for planned economies to exhibit the same behaviors as market economies. Market economies in principle are a type of planned economy, where agents meet at an agreed-upon location to conduct trade, under laws which must be enforced to speak of a stable market appearing. Without that much planning, and the planning of market actors who are always rational agents, markets would not appear because no one would know what to do in such a construct. That market activity is not a given of humanity. Markets as a persistent activity do not appear in any familiar form, and money as we know it only appears when there are institutions which can hoard something deemed to be money, loan it, record debts and credits, and enforce payment of debts. Someone collecting cowry shells for exchange is not engaged in the use of money in any sense we would appreciate the concept, but there is enough documentation of primitive practices of debt-tallying and enforcement of those contracts, which typically carried religious significance. Whatever the mechanism, in societies that engage in any exchange of products or things, or where claims on land or people are made, there will be this question of what the information means and the implications of exchanging in this way. It would be the case even if we went to great lengths to maintain the dignity of

human beings in their actual person, as would be necessary if society is to be anything other than a menace stalking the world.

A DESCRIPTION OF INSTITUTIONS

So far as society is seen in its raw informational form, it is only described as communication between dyads, and each of these would be symbolic things. For society to exist in any meaningful form, it is explained only through those dyads. All other constructs in society would be formed out of that information, and would be constructs of information rather than the material events that information points to. In this way, society is illusory, and this would be seen for what it is if the fetters of knowledge and conceits about it were not a barrier. It would be possible to simply disregard that information beyond that which is necessary for the existence of the underlying agent, and little would change. Humans would still be humans, and all of the objects studied in science would do as they would. The interactions between them would still occur, much as we acknowledge that they would in society. Whether that would be interesting to any of the agents, or if their consciousness regarding that system would be a "social" or "political" consciousness, is up to them. It is entirely possible to view this construct as something other than social or political. It is further self-evident that abasement towards this concept of society or the political doesn't hold any inherent value, beyond the recognition that a conception such as society and the most basic politics is possible. Nothing about the world or knowledge suggests that this society is inevitable or desirable, or holds any persistent value. In solitude, when someone does not need to acknowledge this information as immediately relevant, it is very easy and often desirable to connect with the natural world which makes society possible, rather than the informational constructs and abstractions society and politics entail. The same is true of shared activities between actual humans, or the things that involved in those activities. The things themselves have no concept of society or politics for obvious reasons, and have no intrinsic social or moral worth outside of this concept of knowledge. For the individual outside of society, all values we assign are for our internal purposes. They often, but don't always, point to a world outside of us where events happen, and we would need to hold that this world exists. In social consciousness, though, the world's genuine state is not relevant to values passed in communication. Societies entail deception, incomplete information, competition for position, and because at a basic level the relations are between dyads that are considered exclusive entities, cooperation between any part can only begin through understanding. For people and things which do not think or know, the things have no say in this cooperation. They are appropriated and it does not occur to the things that anything else were possible. People relating to people do not abide being treated as things. Even if some other person were legal property, the thing a master wishes to appropriate from the slave - labor - requires the slave to function with some autonomy, simply to be able to follow orders through their native thought process. The master may seek to mold the slave's thought process, but cannot do so continuously. At some point, the slave is conditioned and expected to

follow orders without excessive monitoring. If the cost of guard labor is set astronomically high based on exacting and continuous demands for control, the slave system is far too expensive to maintain or completely unworkable with any real energy input. It is not difficult to see that today's overbearing managerialism is not concerned with any productive output for slaves, but exists for the thrill of managers and sadists who desire to torture service workers and humiliate them, out of some sense that this glorifies the manager. It exists, in other words, to accelerate as quickly as possible the death rate of the working class. This process, extermination through labor, was understood to be the purpose of Nazi slavery.^[8] Nothing about this apparatus is productive in a scientific sense, but in a social sense, the product of human misery, degradation of the body, and death is highly valued. Those most responsible for the death drive of what I have called "eugenism" have been described as the best and the brightest, paid exorbitant incomes and guaranteed security and privileges beyond mere tokens of wealth. They are enshrined institutionally, and it is this sort of person who values institutions more than anyone else, for institutions are their preferred vehicle to impose on societies and the world itself a conceit or vision held in their mind, which replaces the world as we knew it with an antiseptic mockup, no longer burdened by the ugliness of the natural world or social information that suggested information commanded and utilized in society had to point to something factual.

Nowhere was any institution necessary for us to make decisions regarding ourselves and other people, or any construct arises from social information or the material world. Yet, institutions are everywhere and very necessary tools for any social agent to organize conceptually any plan beyond the most basic understanding of these relations. Institutions never save us from ourselves or the truth of the world, but institutions are rife with those who see them as vehicles for some ambition, and the ambition of people is reproduced not as a thought-form of individuals but in the very existence an institution implies. In short, institutions never do what their ideal form purports they ought to do or what they are presented as doing, and in many cases, institutions in practice do the exact opposite of their stated purpose. This tendency, which was latent in the idea of an institution, would be exacerbated and became total during the 20th century, and emerged to its fullest state in the 21st century so far. The system and the institution are often conflated to make this appearance a realized condition, where in the past institutions could not command so precisely the information pertaining to their existence.

The institution is necessary for social awareness, which initially only contains a limited purview involve relations between people and things, to make claims about the world outside of society. This includes the bodies of the social agents themselves, which were not at first social entities in any sense, however they were constituted. The thinking of someone of "me" or "I" is itself a sense of someone as an institution, albeit in a cruder sense. Animals are not known to possess this concept of institutional identity as we practice is, due to a lack of symbolic language and memory storage. Institutions are particular to entities

with sufficiently developed symbolic language to impose the concept. It is not that animals lack any concept of their own existence, or other entities, or some form of institution. Dogs recognize a pack, a hierarchy within it, and the members of it as they recognize them. None of that, though, is information conveyed with reference to the idea, as if the dog could articulate precisely the laws and practices of the pack in the way a human could describe laws and practices of their social system. This development did not occur overnight, and in humans, full awareness of all information in a social system would drive them mad. It is, as mentioned before, a great taboo to speak too frankly about what human societies are and their practices, for doing so would reveal malicious intent and that humans, for all of their symbolic language and pretenses, behave little better than their animal forebears, and often seek the same objectives. Humans have not at all moved past animal malice, and through sophisticated knowledge develop malice that animals would be far too noble to embrace and enshrine in institutions. The one thing humans might say in defense is that they at least know that this is wrong, and could on a good day mitigate the worst of their habits. For all of our efforts, however well-intentioned and forward-thinking, humans have never once suggested with any seriousness the problem of institutions themselves, and never acknowledge the root of the problem in institutions. This is because the institution, however arranged, is always malleable just as anyone else is, but institutions do not have any thought process or regulatory process that would correct for malevolent activities implied by the institution. A human being, who must live and eat and do various things to be human, can only stomach so much malice before asking if any of it was worth it. Institutions, not being thinking things or really material things at all, have no such limit. There are, if one understands the root of many institutions in ethics and moral philosophy, signs that far from limiting malice, institutions are by their nature favorable towards malice, exploitation, and disregard for any moral sentiment any thinking entity might uphold. Nothing about institutions is intrinsically moral or tied to the world in a real sense. They are, in the end, constructs of knowledge imposed on the world. No institution can claim to be inherent to nature, and any institution appealing to natural law is among the most dangerous of them humans have ever created. Institutional thought is certainly emergent from natural processes just as knowledge itself would be. Even if we supposed knowledge were created supernaturally by God, which was never really a claim religion made but was suggested as a false consciousness when sociology and liberalism came to the forefront of human institutions, humans in every religious tradition retain the will to act on their own and create institutions as they see fit. If the humans do terrible things, it is just the way God made them, or some strange working that God or whatever deity allowed to exist. Much in religion suggests an antipathy towards institutions altogether, including their own which must be policed by faith in something that was greater than the institution itself. If not for that, then religion would be nothing more than yet another bureaucracy and would be seen as such from the outset. Whatever the nature of the religion, it would not have held relevance simply because of the institution's intellectual claim. Religion to be religion proper entails something more sophisticated, which we

have yet to develop in this writing but will encounter as we progress, in various forms. The institution in its raw form is not a spiritual creature or any authority unto itself. It is instead an abstract machine, which once built must be handed off to men, women, and the things they appropriate and create, to do with as they will. Institutions have corporeal representation in the material products and acts carried out in their name. It is with institutions that humans establish their sense of themselves, history, and formal knowledge and education in any sense we would recognize. This is a necessary step only in the context of society, rather than a necessary step for us to think of knowledge or existence itself. No institution "made" us do this by some force of nature that asserted we were to be ruled by institutions. Institutions in the end are animate only because there are flesh and blood humans, the machines they build, and the natural processes that they utilize in some plan, that make them real and meaningful. By themselves, institutions are just a name and information, perhaps recorded on some document or implied from the observed behavior of institutional entities.

If we lived without institutions, we would have lived in a world where society was merely acknowledged as some information, which was of little importance. Society conceptually carried no spiritual connotations, and nor do institutions or concepts of value which arose from it. It was further not the case that these institutions or other people gave us purpose, or that the institution, social information, or knowledge itself granted this authority by thought alone. The world without institutions, in which people were just humans in a world gone horribly wrong, would be a very different place, and probably a very somber place where not much happens at all. Spiritual awakening, which would have arisen from something outside of institutions and only encountered knowledge as an alien to our conceits of knowledge, might inspire the actions of people in some way beyond knowledge, the material world, or any institutional representation. What people would have wanted or seen in their spiritual visions had nothing to do with any basis in the material world or any idea we held about it. We might claim we responded to some instinct in us that was natural, or natural events which could be rationalized. The proper origin for moral values was not our conceits about things or any institution or society we created, or anything we constructed for ourselves. They are not a simplified or materialist conceit about the world. They did not descend from a source that is unknowable, to which an elect few have access. They were not taught pedagogically, and all efforts at moral education have been disastrous and often faulty in their most basic premises. They are not self-evident or a just-so story, though this through the proper understanding arrives closer to a knowable truth we could hold. They originated instead from an existence and sense we were vaguely aware of, that took into account all of these things as possibilities, yet entailed an understanding that could not be easily encapsulated into some information, such that we would bark dogmatically about ethical positions far removed from what we wanted or what would have meant a single thing beyond stating information. Institutions often, and in our time axiomatically, present themselves as connected to this - that they connect to something so vast and incomprehensible that only

expert adjudication would allow moral guidance. This expert class sought to eliminate, for various reasons, anything suggesting that moral values originated from anywhere else, and all serious inquiries into morality would be terminated or subordinated to institutions. The world where we didn't do this, or where we don't do this any longer, is a world difficult to describe in any writing I could write, and I don't pretend to have any of those answers. What I do here is merely to describe things I have observed with the time and energy I have, so that you the readers might find something useful, whatever your aims may be. I would hope this information is used for something other than perpetuating the rot, and I believe those who have such an aim already know this in spades. I also believe that, in the end, they know they cannot ever "win". Their aims, whatever their angle, are not to win any struggle decisively for ideological purposes or for some grand narrative, but to gain position in a giant rat race and ritual sacrifice. The nature of that sacrifice is only partially described in my writing, but it is underway now and I believe the readers will recognize that in their experience. If I were to speak of the world without institutions at all, where we became something else, I would write a very different book, and I would not be able to write much that would be readily comprehensible to someone in this time. I really don't have a great vision of the world past institutional invasion, that somehow allows us to maintain a quality of life. I also believe that without me, such a world has already been envisioned and those who must out of necessity attain such a thing are at work, regardless of what I do or any struggle against them. There wouldn't be any other way for life as we know it to move forward, whatever the outcome may be.

INSTITUTIONS IN FORM

Institutions, like the earlier described social information, can be seen at four levels, which overlap each other in any of the ways we speak of institutions. The micro-level institution is the institutional entity itself, its name and personhood, its identity, and obvious markers of that identity that would be used to discriminate it from other institutions and other things. For individual humans, the institutional representation is a person, with a name, rank, and other identifying information pertaining to it. It is important to note that no identifying information is inherent to the institution itself. The institution's basic "shell" so to speak has no members whatsoever and not even a name, but is merely the personhood itself conceptually. In programming terms, if we were to define a class in the IT sense^[9], the basic form of the institution is the declaration of the class's existence, rather than the class itself. The instantiation of the class - or in reality, the existence we consider the institution's real form - is a separate instance from the class's definition. Reality being what it is and not being an information processing routine, the material reality of institutions is its own thing once they are realized. Institutions are not read into existence in the way we would read what an organization is. An institution to be an institution is always planned and instantiated by some agent or some thing with knowledge and structure. If this is not the case, then whatever is identified as a thing behaving like institutions

is not an institution at all. Institutions are only sensical once social actors are recognized and the members of society recognize that society does exist, or is purported to exist. If there is no such thing as society, then there can be no realistic comprehension of institutions in the way we expect them to exist.^[10] An institution without a conception of society would be some incomprehensible alien, which due to its size and the ineffable slogans in its vast propaganda would have the force of truth over our individual reckoning. The only thing that would be possible for an individual with no concept of society is to assert that his or her meek potential is somehow morally equivalent in ability to the institution, which is unlikely. This also means that weaker institutions that would arise organically, including the individual person, are subsumed before the dominant institution. Those who operate institutions in such an environment are declaring their offensive, and certainly believe society is real. It is not intended to be a rational argument, but a exultant war cry, and this is reduced to some ideology which just-so happened but entailed something more - the victory of eugenics, which the ideologues coddled and sheltered. Such a declaration was, right then and there, the mask coming off. It became impossible and inadmissible to speak against it, and every sadist and predator knew that the institutions, from the highest to the lowest, were theirs and theirs alone. The institution of the person was dead, in the name of "freedom". Yet again "Freedom is Slavery". The control of information, and assurances that all predation would be sacrosanct, made this declaration possible and enforceable in a way that past society could not. The moment the reaction to this was not to immediately exterminate anyone brazen enough to do this and pursue that aim zealously was the moment eugenics knew it had won, and so it has. The democide did not start in the 21st century, but started then and started in force. Everything since has been a holding action to dissolve those with the last memory of a time before the victory of the creed. This is when all mystifications and lies, already in place to protect the eugenists after their atrocities of the war and interwar period, amplified and all ideologues picked their side. They knew what they were, and that the individual was dead. In its place would be the Nazified petty-manager, born to supplicate and kill, and the technocrat off its leash.^[11] The new "man", if the creature can be dignified even with a comparison to the deformed Satanic ape of old, would think of nothing but institutional privileges and some cheap thrill supplied to him or her in spades.

Only by extensive command of social information was this something that could be imposed on the world. This command of information was not a fait accompli, where the mere declaration that it is so made it win. Very likely, the current purge and thrill-seeking is, for all it will do, a phase that will pass, and this was foreseen as part of a transformation for purposes unknown and occulted. It is only clear that all public-facing propaganda drips with contempt for anyone and everyone who actually views it in any way, offering at most whatever entertainment will pass the time as the democide happens. That entertainment only sporadically allows a glimmer of promise, only for the ruling institutions to shit up the recreation and entertainment we would turn to as a distraction

from this nightmare. We will not even be allowed that, if that were deemed enough. We will not be allowed any thought of our own, not one thing to call our own, and we are not even allowed prolefeed as substantive as what existed in the past. The moment some glimmer of promise is found, it is snatched away with a sadistic grin of those who were selected to live, the thrill of following Malthus' dictum on full display and glorified. This systematic deprivation is not something won easily, for it is born amidst many institutions that had no reason to go along with this, and that each aspired to their pre-existing aims. So too did the people who held those institutions, who imagined in some way that they could affect the world, and who themselves had wants other than this filth. Institutions are never simply names and identities^[12], stated as just-so stories. They will take some preferred form, and institutions must like organisms adapt to their situation. Societies taken collectively cannot do this through their own mechanism, as if societies were oriented towards any greater objective by nature. Primitive social instincts common to the agents might be interpreted as creating some order to institutions, but whenever they do so, they form institutions as if they were unwitting products that just happened. No institution "just happens" though, and to be a true institution, the primordial urge that would give rise to it unconsciously must become a conscious imperative. It need not be an imperative beyond a conscious affirmation of what the primordial instinct inside the agent built, but usually any such instinct that becomes a true institution will be formalized and a grand theory will be propped up around the conceits someone had before the institution was written in code.^[13]

The institution is, in many ways, an "abstract society", which itself abides the same rules of communication as society generally. Unlike society proper, which is premised on some genuine communication that is understood to both ends of the dyad, the institution is united by an idea, and some distinguishing characteristic that makes an institution an institution. It would distinguish who is and isn't a member, and what things are their property. To speak of property is to speak of institutions, for the concept cannot exist outside of that. Possession may be 9/10ths of the law, but this is the law's recognition of reality and it will consider the remaining tenth its own. Without that institution, all claims to possession only extend as far as force will allow, and individual force will not account for much. Regardless of claims of possession of forceful acquisition, the members of society would contest claims and do so at will. Nothing prevents a member of society from deciding that the farm, the home, the factory, or any other asset you hold is no longer yours. You may be able to defend it, but to do so you must pay someone to defend it or pay your time and sweat to defend the keep. This has been played out many times in human history, since it was the default of empire - a king's authority could only extend as far as his personal rule and the reach of his officers, without some institution to suggest that this was actually permanent and could produce edicts beyond more than the utterance of words every time it had to be said. This indeed was the difficulty for early empires - a conqueror would defeat a rival city, but the moment he leaves, that city rises in revolt, killing whatever governor the conqueror left behind. Because institutional

states were not fully worked out, usually the conqueror could only rely on family members to be that governor, and it quickly became apparent to said family member that he could rebel and usurp his brother or father. There is a reason that profoundly stupid saying "the enemy of my enemy is my friend" came into being, because this sort of thing would be used to break apart clan societies ruled by personal honor and blood relations, which were an expectation of the Near East states for a long time, and remain a force in human society to this day. It is unsurprising that the family, in various forms, and its more elaborate form of the clan, is among the earliest institutions and one that recurs in every human society we know of. The most primitive tribes know very well of the family, and will know for certain the identity of the mother. It is expected that the identity of the father be known, or at least an identified father is named, whether father or mother has anything to do with raising the kid. Laws and taboos pertaining to consanguinity, or incest, are always present in human societies, so correct identity of both parents was quickly expected and normative. What constitutes "incest" in a given society may vary, but it is almost obligatory for more than institutional reasons that a child would ask who the mother and father are. It is also very clear to any competent mother who the father is, regardless of whether she with-holds the secret from everyone. Even without this information stated and revealed, it is not too difficult for someone to detect family resemblance. It is also a natural fact that mothers give birth, and that process is often documented and assisted because such a practice has been done for all the reasons that makes sense. Women being gossipers would likely make clear the identity of fathers even when the men are left clueless to the secret game of affairs played since time immemorial.

It is the games of obfuscation, which are inherent to society's existence, that become a source of institutional mischief. Institutions purport to resolve this problem in ways our own sense do not. Even if institutions did not exist to do this, we would create in our mind an ersatz institution to solve this question to our satisfaction. We would, for example, have a method of reason that we established, that we hold to be true regardless of our intuitions and in line with reality, and that method would likely be drawn from a formal institution rather than something we make up on the spot. If we have to invent for ourselves this method, we would likely institutionalize it in some way, even if it is merely recorded for ourselves in our sense of the world. The institution here is just a fragment, a rule we might reference that may tie into other rules to make sense of the world. It becomes an institution not because it has any existence outside of us, but because it pertains to social information rather than something purely natural. We can scientifically assert that offspring in sexed species have a male and female parent, but "mother" and "father" and the whole taboo of consanguinity concerns social information rather than a mere fact of nature that can be observed without any "social" awareness. Natural systems used in science have nothing to do with society. The question of motherhood or fatherhood is not merely a scientific question, but a social question that we hold relevant to conduct in society, and motherhood and fatherhood carried connotations of obligations,

expectations, and so on in any human tribe. It would not be taken lightly to lie about such a thing, for all the reasons we would expect. For a scientific question, there is no such weight. A scientific fact has nothing to do with social values, but is simply a thing we would note and examine through experiment. Science of course has many implications for humanity and institutions of science are prominent today, but the institutions of science specifically shy away from open political or moral activity, and their involvement in economic life is always suspect for all the reasons that makes sense. When we assign moral value to interpersonal relationships - when we are to actually care about those relations - we would imply that there is a society where those interpersonal relationships are understood as meaningful information. This would not change perhaps a certain disgust towards physical or material things or acts, or a greater sense of wrongness in the world or with a situation which is not a matter of any social information or institution. So far as we do value motherhood or fatherhood as something of importance, in a way that is anyone's business but the parties in question, we would acknowledge that there is a society where that relationship is not a unique act isolated between specific persons, but a general rule that in theory applies to other agents like us. That is, the question of fatherhood is only sensible if there is a society where any man, absent any information narrowing our search, is just as capable of being a father as the next. The question of mating in general and rituals pertaining to it suggests that males, females, and relations between them are common enough to be noted as a general event in society, rather than merely a scientific claim of nature. Even if those affairs were discussed as a dispassionate study of the natural world, there is an implication of society to speak of them as general rules which could apply anywhere. We would perhaps see in observations of the natural world a replica of social information, and could easily lapse into seeing the natural world through social conventions and describe it with the language of society, which we attach to our moral values that are very personal. A wise sociologist may consider that they are above such things and recognize the bias, but time and time again sociologists and their related disciplines wear their bias not just as a badge of pride, but as something to be screamed to assert that the world conforms to society. This at heart is because sociology describes not a natural event in the way that much in nature can be seen as natural events, but sociology and all precursors to it describe a state of affairs between knowing agents. To speak of society without any knowing agents at all, as I have mentioned many times before, is to speak not of society at all, or any institution, where such a language would be appropriate as a description. I would say to the scientist that they should, in their study, look past the institutions and study the thing that is their proper purview when they study things that are not social in nature. If a scientist does bring social matters into their purview, and there is nothing inherently wrong with this, they would do well to remember that society is at heart informational. We would not possess society at all or institutions if there were not actors in society that knowingly acted to create it. We may imagine an animal sociality or some precursors of it, but the moral questions we invoke with society are not things that occur to animals in the same way. It is not because the animal is devoid of knowledge or

even a crude sense of rational interest as they see it, but because human sociality developed specifically to develop consciousness of themselves, each other, and institutions in the abstract, and developed them further to elaborate schemes and acts that animals have not been seen doing at all.

After establishment, the markers which are at first identification for external entities become internal matters. Simply put, there is an expectation of who is in the institution and who is not, defining characteristics of members, and traits that could be considered a culture for the institution. There are various names throughout history for this concept of system-level institutions, but "nation", "tribe", "association", "society", "fellowship", "collegia", "movement", and various other names suggest a collectivity based on some distinguishing characteristics. The distinction is never strictly an identity, but entails the meaning of any identity. Here we see what "identity politics" seeks to eliminate. Identity in "identity politics" is never an identity with genuine meaning, but an identity imposed by an alien institution - and it is always imposed by an alien institution, rather than by an individual or some other source of authority to adjudicate identity. This is why the persistent narrative of "identity politics" is to reduce a concept like "race" or any other identity to a singular identity, and for an alien institution, typically one that presents as a judge to assert what others are, to decide who belongs to that race. This most obviously was used to describe racial identity in American history, where "blackness" as a legal category not as the institutional name of the black slaves who came from various tribes and whose tribal affiliations were stripped away early in enslavement, but as a category in race laws which existed to uphold the slave trade. A pseudoscientific process suggested that slavery was an inborn feature, and this distinguished the institutional assignment of "black" from the common observation of black skin and African ancestry, or any conception of race in a scientific or anthropological sense that "race" was usually considered. Over time, the black slaves, who had no other tribal or national affiliation, came to exist with a distinct culture and history, which is understood to be different from their racial origin altogether. The actual establishment of that culture, history, and so on has nothing to do with "identity politics". Overwhelmingly, identity politics was the domain of white intellectuals and a few black academics who were their courtiers, and it was adopted by petty-managers who always sought to pit workers against each other by race, creed, or any other identity. It would strip away all of the history that those workers had from prior culture, and most of all it prohibited the working class developing an independent culture or a sense of workers' nationalism.^[14] There will be more to say about such concepts in the future, though "identity politics" is a red herring for the eugenic ideology it had always pointed to. Such an ideology was latent in socialism and republicanism generally, but it was so obviously odious that it could only be introduced through violent force in the form it took. The reasons for doing this would be to destroy any institution alien to the eugenic institutions and the ruling interest, and this aim would be shared by those who occupied the leading institutions or were their enablers. It was only possible to impose such a view of identity from a high institution, which

declared that all institutions with an organic origin were now to be moot. The Nazi appropriation of socialist language and the language of institutions and sociology was the first advance of an idea that would supplant the system-level concept of institutions I describe here with the managed institution that is a controlled subsidiary of the transcendent-level institution attached to the fascist state.

A nation has been described as "an imagined community of people", and this is indeed true, in that members of a nation do not often meet every one of their members. Yet, the nation is not the only archetype for this loose affiliation or understanding that an institution exists. "Tribe", "Culture", and many other concepts have particular definitions, referring to different aspects of this affiliation. They are all, in some ways, the framework for institutions, or an understanding of groupings of social agents that is observable from outside. In social systems, the communication is purely bilateral between the agents and things. In institutions, there is a sense that all in the association are one thing. Institutions at this level are not mutually exclusive with another. Someone can be of a particular race with history, a particular sex, member of other formal institutions, and any other groupings applicable to that person. These associations always involve institutional people rather than the actual human flesh. Non-persons are not active members of institutions and cannot be, and this is a particular trait of institutions. Who is a "person" for the purposes of that institution is decided by rules of the institution, which are always implied for any established institution at a higher scale of the institution. The definition of who is in and out is not in of itself the rule, and cannot be. Membership in an institution is defined not by the members themselves, but by the sense of someone that this institution is in fact a thing. It didn't "just so" occur to someone that there was a "white race", "black race", as if these were facts of nature stamped on the forehead of every human. Someone had to adjudicate what a race is, and then had to develop a concept of race as institutional or institutionally significant, for that to become a legal distinction in the sense we understand it today. It is not that the races didn't exist naturally, although who qualifies precisely in scientific language as "white" or "black" is disputed if race were to be treated as a category in biological science or anthropology. Science and the humanities do not dictate the institutional decision or institutional relevance of race for all institutions by any natural law or authority. The same is true of any other identifier that would be used to group an institution. Someone does not get to declare themselves a member of a particular institution by their own will, unless the bylaws of that institution permit such an action. This does indeed happen - many movements grow simply by exhorting potential members to look at themselves or their situation and say "hey, I'm an insert-the-blank too!" This identity alone is rarely the meaning of worthwhile institutional membership, though. Usually the associations of people that become institutions entail many qualifying traits, and those qualifying traits are never totalizing or reduce the members to a ready-made facsimile of a man or woman provided by thought leaders telling you what you are. People typically associate as nations, tribes, cultures, and so on, because they have something

more than merely an identity token, but have already established some frequent relations with each other. Often the nations of modernity were united by the rule of a single sovereign, or a long history of conflict, peace, exchanges, and familiarity with each other. They often speak the same language or understand the languages common among them. It is not always the case, in that nations can be constructed from the most spurious evidence, or nations form not in any organic sense but were highly artificial because their prior national sense was destroyed. It is also not the case that "nation" and "polity" are identical. For most of history this was not the case. The United States or the American people were never constituted as a nation in any sense that word was socially meaningful, and this is very intentional in the design of American institutions and the conception of the polity and state as a whole. The nation as a concept does not carry any inherent political meaning, nor are members of a nation obligated to each other in any way. Very often, the thing uniting a nation most of all in modernity was the rule of a single sovereign, and this was a contributor to the French sense of nationalism. Absolutism as a doctrine of the French monarchy was a running battle between the crown and his preferred institutions against the lower nobility and their historical privileges, among other things that suggested the doctrine. That doctrine was recognized as a precursor to the sense that this one thing, France, was truly unitary, and as the commoners gained position in the country, they recognized that holding this thing together would be very much in their interest, without regard to the particular sovereign who eventually proved to be an asshole trying to kill them.^[15]

Associations that become institutions can be as small or large as imagined. It is possible to conceive of all mankind as a single thing and institutionalize it in some way. Mankind never has formed a persistent institution of all people, or even the valid of them, but there are those who claim to speak for mankind, much as fascist states have spoken for any nation or association of people. Associations like a family as small, and the structure of a family varies. A general model for "the family" has never been the reality of the family as an institution. Models are prescribed and some patterns are natural. For example, biological families require a mother, father, and at least one child to be constituted meaningfully as a family unit, and adoptive parents are distinguished from biological ones for all of the obvious reasons. The family as a formal institution is often a thing mandated by law rather than the dictation of a patriarch or matriarch. Given a choice, families often associate with extended networks and make relations outside of the household. The household itself is not always congruent with the family unit biologically, and it is entirely conceivable for children to be raised without biological parents, or to make association not with their biological parents but with a godfather or some alternative institution or structure. Generally, though, family units exist because of a need to rear children in environments that are not as alienating as some state institution, and this usually makes the mother at the least the most obvious candidate to lead the raising of children, and the father both needs to clean up his mess and sees biological offspring as something to pass on himself to the future. The genuine love of a child or

parent is not intrinsic to the institution or social information in any way, and that has been the great tragedy of society all along. We would be careful not to confuse associations with more formal structures. Formal structures are by their nature associations, but not all associations will be formalized as elaborate institutions. Often, associations have little structure beyond the identifying characteristics, and recognized similarities in practices that are grouped together. Tribes, for example, are united not as institutions or polities in the formal sense but are united by conditions which are not uniform to describe a "tribe", as if tribes were a singular proposition.^[16] Families often formalize little other than the head's authority to make decisions, which is always questioned unless the family is in a world unto itself. Very often associations and institutions with definition are subject to higher-level institutions and encouraged by them. Families exist in any familiar form because of legal and political obligations of the father, mother, and children, and rights pertaining to the family that are recognized not by the family's assertion but because the family is regarded by states as a useful and necessary unit. The declaration of families to be a thing has little weight in how states and large institutions regard them, as they will often learn if they think they can buck the dominant trends and traditional expectations of families and the relations therein. There is a genuine interest to maintain the familial relations, but this does not necessarily conform to any institutionalization of the family beyond the recognition that families tend to reside in the same household and maintain contact and recognition of their relations for obvious self-interest and sentiment among the members of the family. The family as an institution, as an icon, was never really the concern of the members of the family or defended what the members saw in the arrangement, if they saw anything. Institutional definitions might have been a guide to suggest what family life could or should be, but what the members defend is not the idea of the family but it's meaningful results. Those results are not really social information or institutional information at all, but the various things family life means for members like security, an environment fostering growth, and all of the things that are typically defended. Because no alternative institution suggests protecting those things, and because blood relations typically have an affinity for their relatives for reasons that are not institutional, the family is defended. Because the alternatives on offer attack the family not so much to destroy the institutional form, but because the ruling institutions and states wish to invade the relationships and take the kids from the home for god-knows-what, the defense of the family is among the battlegrounds for defense of the subordinated classes. This defense of the family too has been co-opted by those with false pretenses, so that the predatory and sadistic can claim that they are "defending the family" while upholding the vile customs and ideology typical of their kind. Those who claim to defend "traditional families" have been among the vanguard calling for invasion of private life to break up any family they don't like, doing so for clearly eugenic reasons with the typical filth of meddling busybodies who like to see the decent suffer. They don't even hide with any seriousness what their true intent is, and gleefully poison those they deem "sinners" when they get on the high horse that has become their defining feature.

The sophistication of institutions can vary, from loose understandings of people with a name, to cultures with a long history but nothing else unifying them as a single institution. The most basic form of an association would be to simply recognize a group of people together. This would not even require a name other than "that group over there", which may be defined as any number of people, including a solitary person. In short, any ability to group people would be the most basic form of the institution. This isn't usually what is considered an "institution", but it would be possible to envision some abstraction that multiple people regard as shared existence. So, associations can be arbitrarily defined, including where no meaningful association exists. This wouldn't be recognized by the members of this dubious "association", but it wouldn't stop someone from suggesting a conspiracy of disconnected agents or imagined agents. We will for the moment consider those imagined agents a "thing" without any real existence, but there is no rule against creating fictitious persons and assigning to them social information as if they were no different from actual humans. It is also possible, through institutions alone since identity is a characteristic of institutions rather than the actual humans or their relationships, to falsify identity or obscure the existence of an association. Secret societies as a rule obscure their members or surround membership with mystique, and recognize an old wise saying that to know the name of something is to hold power over it. The secret society, to be constituted as something more than a vague aspersion, is a formal institution with some executive, chain of command, and so on, even if it is arranged as disparate cells. There would be something suggesting how members of this society know of each other, or know what the society entails beyond membership and certain knowledge held by them which may be merely cultural. Generally, secret societies do not suggest directly that they have a "nation" or "culture" since that would give away their membership and secrets, but the mystique they possess is a tool for their use, and any truly effective secret society would surround itself not just with a story but an aura of fear that suggests they are something more than a rumor, and that to speak too openly of their existence at all is bad for the existence of the hoodwinked. This fear is accentuated when said hoodwinking, which is ubiquitous in societies dominated by a conspiracy, is repeated specifically to remind those out of the know that this will never, ever change.

We would do well to recall associations not as an identity group or a formal institution necessarily united in some conspiracy against all others, or even an implied executive. The association instead is a shared history, culture, or some association with a central defining trait, which would make it an association. As mentioned, associations are not mutually exclusive. The higher-level understanding of institutions, which must be exclusive with any competing institution, applies to the formal facing of the institution, its explicit bylaws or rules, which constitute the government of the institution. This is how an institution is typically understood - that they are not associations or nations vaguely defined or an imagined grouping of people, but bodies with executive functioning. This shares similarity with social groupings mentioned earlier at

the wider domain level, but unlike that where the executive is implied and always exists in some capacity, institutions need not be governed by any genuine executive to be formal institutions. What is consistent about the executive functioning of institutions is that it concerns not a loose and shifting number of associations with direct connections, but concerns the mechanisms of the institution itself. The institution's "person" is not a real entity with thoughts that must be abided, but a corporate person, with an organization chart, subordinates, defined roles, enforcement mechanisms, and so on. The parts of an institution may point to persons who are registered somewhere as employees or members in some list, and even when no such list of persons or things exists, there is a definite understanding of who is a member and what obligations are expected of them, and there is some mechanism to decide the position of persons in the institution, even if formally the rules claim that everyone is equal. Equality within the institution may be a principle governing it - for example, a democracy where one person has one vote - but the institution will likely mark their members as more or less virtuous or deserving in some way, and this is not incompatible with the principle of equality in membership or political equality of that sort. Institutions may consciously uphold social equality among the members. They may expect conduct towards non-members, judging who are friends and who are enemies, or different levels of access to the institution. That access can be to knowledge, resources, people, or anything else the institution claims as its property. It is at this level that property can become more than a conceit of one person or mere possession, and becomes a law that is enforceable. It is not at the highest level of institutions that this begins, nor is it settled by the polity or the state by decree. It is not decided by individuals, who on their own power present nothing but statements. If individuals are to claim property meaningfully, it would be because people are assembled and there is a framework to assert that property is a real thing, rather than a conceit or an imagined settlement. How that property claim is adjudicated may vary, and it may very well be that the institution where this is settled is war, or the expectation of the law of nature and no man's land.

War itself is a peculiar case in that it is always institutional. The participants in any war, any struggle, are always nameable and engaged in a definite relation, about which rules can be stated, if only in hindsight. The way the law of the war institution is settled is not by any formulation by any party involved, but by the conflict and competing formulations they fight for. It may be regarded by the participants of war that there are general laws of war, or laws pertaining to the current conflict. All wars and all struggles to be meaningful as true wars or struggles are institutions of this sort. In the natural world, absent thought, no "war" is recognized at all - to the world and to science, war appears no different than any other motion of things in the world. For individual knowledge, struggle and war are ultimately concepts they hold. They are only comprehensible in the context of society, where there are agents and things to contest. A war of one against the world is not a war or struggle, but a futile railing of a mortal against the heavens and all that exists. That condition is so clearly undesirable that few

will see their existence that way, and when they do, it is because "the world" has been substituted with total institutions. A war within social organizations between dyads of people is not war in any sense, but endemic violence with no seeming purpose - and in any event, war is conducted not between flesh and blood men or mere social information in an exchange, but between persons who already have a conception of institutions. If nothing else, they are institutions unto themselves, or perhaps a single person considers his institutional existence a struggle against a world of things outside of him. While internalizing the mindset of institutional war is fatal, a person can see himself at war with all around him in this sense and not succumb to the madness of the institution. War may be, when seen as institutional, a thing somewhat removed from his flesh and consequences. It is only when the law of war leads to a genuine exchange of violence that war ceases to be a game played in institutions. The violence itself, the death, the torture, the humiliation, and all that war entails is of no consequence to the institution of war, except as another potential asset to measure and impose. There are things other than war that can cause all of those things, and those who favor the war institution have always found ways to shield themselves from any of these consequences. Typically, the violence and suffering of war is pawned off entirely to those who had the least to do with this terrible institution, for whom war has been nothing more than a continuous atrocity against their class, their nation, their history, and anything they would actually want out of life. Those who are fond of war are invariably those who face none of these consequences with any seriousness, and the same people bray endlessly about "their sacrifice", when no commander worth a damn expects his soldiers to fall on their sword for any sacrifice. Sacrifice is for the losers, and any familiarity with war will tell you that wars are won when other poor bastards die for their cause. The poor bastards dying need not be the soldiers, and often soldiers are spared so that they can go home and parade as if they were glorious heroes. The real poor bastards are those dragged into this horseshit, whether by drawing the short straw and becoming the armies' bitch boys to be sent to die in the front lines for this retarded institution, or being civilians and slaves who have always been treated like cattle to slaughter by the war institution and the cult of war. There is some genuine grit and determination among those tasked with defending themselves against this aggression, but this is only done out of dire necessity, and any student of war knows that the defending side in war, fighting on their own territory and sacrificing the things they actually care about, suffers greatly and wins no reward without an ability to counter-attack. It is abiding trait of war as an institution to ensure that defenders never counter-attack, and this is followed in all militaristic conduct to the letter. We will have more to write about the institution of war in a later chapter, but I bring this up now because it is very relevant to understand what formal institutions and executives do, whether the institution concerns war in the genuine sense or competition of another sort.

War is not the sole basis for struggle or competition, nor are all struggles or competitions violent, nor is all violence an act of war. There is considerable

violence and cruelty without any war as such, conducted not for any warlike purpose but for various purposes which may seek to contend something, but could just as well be a proclivity of humans doing their usual stupid shit. It is not even the case that wars are conducted with violence or any of the traditional language of struggle. A "peace corps" invading space insidiously and killing with kindness uses all of the tactics of war and does them with a Midwestern-nice smile and cheery music. It is neither the case that executives inherently concern struggle at all, as if struggle were the foundational force of the universe or of human sociality. Far from it, most institutions and most executive functioning involves no struggle, but simple administration, management, discussions, and the sundry recordkeeping that recognizes society institutionally rather than society as a mere collection of individuals. So much of institutional life is completely fair and done with no malice, which is a remarkable achievement given the generally foul and wicked nature of the human race. It is unlikely humans would do anything other than kill each other and grunt without some institutional structure. This does not insist that men can only be governed by strong men ruling with an iron fist, in some Legalist doctrine where despotism is the natural law of all organization.^[17] Very often, large institutions with an executive understand that the best government of the institution comes from the rank and file, the grunts and peons who do any actual work that allows large institutions to persist. The best executive is someone with enough sense to let the little people work and aspire to be something better than immiserated peons. The terrible executives, and this is why managers and their petty-managerial slime followers encourage this behavior and train for it, emphasize overly complicated and pointless stamping and displays of pride, vanity, and all that we see as the awful face of neoliberal rot. Usually executives, however they are constituted, operate somewhere between these two ideals. The reasons to trend towards one or the other has more to do with influences exerted on institutions, rather than any law of institutions themselves. Institutions are run, ostensibly, for some purpose which necessitates that the conceits of ideal management are set aside so that their intended task is done. Rarely do institutions fulfill their stated purpose, but the corrupting influences are not always systemic or external, nor are institutions immune from the reality that all of their functions are passed to an actual factual world which never conformed to institutions as we would have them. It is also the case that building institutions in harmony with nature is an impossibility and obviates the need for most institutions. If we did build large institutions with executive functioning that was most harmonious with the natural conditions we live in, we would likely consider that the best way to govern institutional affairs would be to discourage the panoply of interests rather than institutionalize those interests, and to devolve knowledge to the members of the institution and encourage both scholarship and practice among the general populace, including the lowest class most of all. Even despite all that has happened, this is still a possible outcome for the world, but it would be checkered by the fact of what has been done already and how it came to be so. It is not that the dominance of interests and institutional feudalism has not been diagnosed - that has been understood since Antiquity as a persistent failure

of cities and states, and many fixes throughout history have been proposed with mixed success. It is that the sharing of knowledge and meaning has never been genuinely attempted nor desired, for reasons that are not institutional nor inherent to life, but require an understanding not just of the basic incentives but the states that did arise and ulterior motives of actors that are difficult to describe too shortly and without further development of a basic grounding. The sharing of knowledge alone would not solve the difficulty, for there is a great moral difficulty in any such plan. That is that the lower classes as a rule despise the cults of education and knowledge fetish, and have only undertaken those efforts because they had to do so to survive, or because they learned things that interested them and had no regard for the political or a concept of shared humanity. Human unity and brotherhood is not a given of nature nor self-evident, given the human race's known cruelty and the prevalence of its sadistic streak against all reason, and this is a fact borne out by history time and time again. That tends to be limiting, because anyone with goodwill encounters this and asks why any sane person would spend energy trying to change a race that refuses to change despite every reason that would be a very worthwhile thing for everyone. They would rather hate the lowest class than allow the carnage to stop in the end, and every effort to mitigate that failed despite clear warning of what would result.

The formal structure of institutions are mutually exclusive with others that compete in the same sphere of activity. It is possible for others to join other institutions that do not conflict with the aims of one, but to join competing institutions is recognized as a great faux pas. Nothing stops someone from serving two masters simultaneously, but if caught it invites suspicion at the least. Legal statuses imposed on a person do not permit with any seriousness a slave to violate their station or be claimed by two deeds. The same is true of property - if it is held jointly, it is either through a single institution or with all claimants explicitly named as shared owners and judged appropriate by an institution that governs property. This need not be done for any good reason, and deliberate contradictions of this may be a strategy to disrupt institutions which are hostile, or are pursued by the institutions themselves to catch their members or the ruled in a bind where they cannot not contradict themselves, thus allowing the institution to trap the subordinate - or, sometimes, trapping the very leader of the institution in a similar contradiction, or twisting the rules to contradict themselves. Nothing about institutions suggests any internal contradiction would be corrected, or that it should. The internal contradictions of institutions do not occur to it as insanity at all, because institutions do not think or know as we do. This makes philosophies celebrating contradiction particularly dangerous and this is used entirely for the purpose of institutional fuckery, or most charitably to explain the trap of flagrant and deliberate contradiction. Most people, though, see such flagrant contradiction not as strength, but as controlled insanity and something obnoxious which warrants a smiting or a punch to the face of anyone so insolent.

At the highest level of organization, "the institution" becomes not a formal

institution with proper executives or its less formal versions, but a force at the level of the political and society as a whole. The ruling institutions exist not just as formal institutions, if they are even formalized with an explicit organization chart. They exist as entities presumed to share the position of the polity and state itself. They often claim to be coequal with the polity's social system, such that the institutions are deemed universal. The institutions and the polity proper are always separate things and must be so. The polity at heart is only ever its actual agents and things. The polity, and thus the state, does not have any genuine existence without machinery affecting the real world. Institutions may assert that this machinery does what it is supposed to do, but without someone operating the machine or doing anything, there is no representation of the institution and thus no state. The state is not by default the sole institution of all institutions, unlike the polity in social systems which is definitionally exclusive with all other polities. The state is always a formal institution which claims transcendent properties, but it acknowledges the existence of other institutions that it does not inherently dominate. This, however, is the only thing that does balance the state's claim of authority over the polity. The state claims all people, all things, all lands, all ideas, and anything possibly construed as meaningful in its domain, but the institutions - those precious institutions which are in the end ideas in the mind and nothing more, just as the state is - are granted a special exemption from the state's claims. For one, the state as an institution often recognizes that it does not rule as a unitary entity, but as a thing which is constituted by people and things. Any state ruled by someone who thinks the emperor actually changes history by waving his mighty hand does not get how this operation has ever worked. Such an absurd statement made by leaders is a direct rebuke of any concept a reasonable adult would have about the state, institutions, or how any authority would operate. The state does not abide any institution which openly turns against it, and does not abide any actual human being under its rule turning against it with any seriousness. To truly turn against the state as an institution is not deemed an acceptable position, but one way to become politically insane and an unperson so far as the state and its allied institutions are concerned. States, and institutions at this level, wield power of life and death. The state in principle claims this power, but institutions in their highest form share in this power, and may contest in some way the state's imperium. It does not always work this way in legal form, but in practice, the holders of the state are disciplined by institutions that can, by their name alone, rise to challenge the central institution of the state. The state as a formal institution is, at heart, a very simple claim, which requires little explanation and need not be a unitary construct at all. Most of the time, states are not run from the top down in one big immaculate structure. States do not typically command bureaucracies directly, but institutionalize the bureaucracy and emphasize that the bureaucracy is an institution unto itself. The bureaucrats in principle serve at the emperor's pleasure, or the president's pleasure, but no president today believes he can fire bureaucrats without consequence. It was the same for the emperors of old, or anyone who believed the civil service could simply be terminated on sight. The army, while nominally under the commander-in-chief and the state and a

visible arm of the state, can have its own mind about what truly rules, and every general is a potential usurper. The generals are often checked not by fear of the president, who is for all of his prestige and the body of officers around him just a man and a glorified warlord, but by fear of the non-military institutions which are necessary to feed the army. This is what a wise president or emperor would hold over the army, rather than threats of violence, and the institutions of the producers, who comprise most of the population and do virtually everything that actually allows a state to do a thing other than throw wasteful parties and maximize their degenerate pleasure function, exert the most constant threat to the state's existence. This threat is virtually eliminated not because the army or the men behind the curtain who are shielded by the president are so much smarter and better or have great virtue, but because the producers as a rule are governed by officers whose loyalty is to the collective of ruling institutions more than the producers, who are systematically denied any institution to call their own. The productive classes, ranging from the wealthy commoners to the slaves and including in organizational principle the unproductive wretches, are rife with internal conflicts which are endlessly exploited, and just like anyone else, the producers need money and must think politically if they are to challenge anything. Uniting the producers or the commoners rarely ever works because the wealthy of the commoners and the better off of them see themselves tied not to a working class or a concept of "the people" or democracy, but to the same ruling institutions that the president and generals sit in and hobnob with. What do the lower of the producers offer except complaints and harangues about how the rich never have time for them, when the parasitic ruling institutions have all of the good parties, all of the good sex and drugs, hold all of the levers for social advancement, and see the favored of the productive classes as clear allies? No common working man ever deluded himself and actually believed he was a potential millionaire, and anyone suggesting such a thing is an asshole who should be ignored. It is instead the conceit of upwardly mobile commoners reaching into the good life with the aristocrats, who often got where they are because they identified with the values of the aristocracy or are themselves aristocrats of "lower quality" tasked with producing. Aristocracies in all cases despise any sign of democratic ideas or the idea of the little people taking back any part of this beast, and do everything possible to take the shit of anyone who won't play ball and accept the gift. Such is the nature of republics.

As with social organizations, these scales are present in many institutions, and in principle all of the institutions regard every level if they are to exist in the world of institutions. For associations with little further definition, their higher-level expression is "basically null", except for other such institutions to note their existence. We see here the chief difficulty with forming institutions organically. Any open formation of an independent institution is detected and snuffed out ruthlessly by a million different means. This requires anyone wishing to build an institution to change anything to operate in sneaky ways, and this is one of the ugly laws of institutions. The state and all of the ruling institutions are, in the end, associations and, whatever their nature, they will have a name, or they

will be named in some time and place, even if it is only at the end of time when all is revealed.

DEFINITION OF THE RATIONAL AGENT

If society is definitionally a network of information, then this comprises the entirety of all study of society in the eyes of any rational agent. "Rational agent" must be understood as the product of institutional society, rather than a natural status that is undeniable. All natural events, and anything indicating a system of material things that appears to engage in social behavior, would be subsumed by a society that is defined by information. Natural disasters, which are not part of society institutionally, are only understood by rational agents as a thing affecting institutions and the agents and things subsumed by them. It can be readily recognized by any sufficient intelligence that this definition of society lacks many of the moral values we normally associate with society, and this is by design. To rationally approach society, all of those things that are not informational and adjudicated in some way are considered invalid for the purpose of measuring anything that affects society and its institutions. If they are acknowledged as socially relevant, they are dismissed out of hand as insanity and do not receive a hearing in any court. Only that information which is relevant to institutions enters the purview of social thought for the rational agent. If some agent claimed by institutional society is deemed irrational, or disagrees with the judgement of rationality on some grounds, it has no say and cannot have any say. This, you may say, is clearly at odds with a scientific view, but it is true in all of the ways society can be rationalized. To exit this is to leave the world of rational agents, and by doing so, one faces the ultimate demotion. It is not merely that insanity or retardation make one an unperson, but that it becomes the deepest moral obligation of all social agents to shun such people, and attempts to work against this work against the institutions which adjudicate rationality. The institutions which can make this judgement may vary from time and place, but they will always exist if rational agents and society in this sense is to be spoken of. It also means that any information contradicting institutional adjudication will simply not exist, no matter the evidence presented for it. The institutions of society may acknowledge sources of information that regard a world outside of society, but nothing in society or rationality guarantees this. Only some sense of the agents, who are in the end actual humans who know and live in a world, would suggest that institutions, which have no such concern, would have any interest in a world outside of society. So far as the institutions accept this, it is always with the ulterior motive of rational agents to appropriate external information in some way, however benign it is. To speak of anything else is to undermine the claims of society as a construct of information. If we are to speak of society in any other way, it would speak of something very different, and rational agency and approaches to society would have created a much different understanding of the social and what we are here to do. This definition of who gets to be rational or not - who is sane and who is smart enough to meet the cutoffs demanded by education - is in the end not decided by anything fair, but by institutions which

have a built-in incentive to hoard information, to occult their knowledge, and see their concerns as territorial rather than forward-thinking. That has been the direction of society thus far, and without any other understanding, we would have no other basis to describe what we see.

All natural processes are, in the end, appropriated by society in some way to enter the purview of society, and thus all question of economic value that would be relevant to society. We may question whether this economic valuation is worth this much struggle and misery, and that is a very good question, but the only way to challenge institutions in the end will be struggle of some sort. We might wish humans were nicer and saw that the path they are on is hopeless, but if I have learned anything in this life, pleading with bullies works 0.000000000% of the time, and this is the behavior of any rational agent. To believe such people would be anything else is the greatest retardation of all. To believe such people wouldn't insinuate the dominance of each other from the first available opportunity is at odds with all of recorded history and the conduct of the human race. We might conclude, if we were miserablists, that because this is the way it turned out, that this is natural and good and the way it should turn out. Any child can see through this argument, because it is stupid and at odds with anything we would want out of this experience.

Economic value in the material sense could only be described by the goods in-kind, without any question of social or institutional conflicts that may arise. If we did conduct our affairs in that way, it would be ideal, and in practice, we do so because most of what we do that constitutes social and economic activity does not involve the market or any institution other than ourselves. In some sense, it is contingent on the existence of society that allows us to live, but this "allowance" would not be an issue if it were not for other social agents and institutions. Little about society is premised purely on mutual benefit, but instead on mutual security and the opportunity for attacking that security. Liberty in a genuine sense is for those who are secure against that attack, and the going price for liberty will always be set by society's hostile actors rather than its good-natured actors. Whether liberty is worthwhile depends on our view, but we have considerable experience with the alternative to suggest that slavery is never going to be a fun experience, even in the best possible case. Beyond that, moral aims we would treasure often speak to things outside of society that are not rationalizable nor are self-evident from the material world, and these are not merely conceits of knowledge obsessed with itself. Those things are multifarious and can never be described by and economic or political plan, nor is society the vehicle to realize them. The best we could do is not destroy each other, or minimize the influence of that on that which we wish to defend. The defense of the city only makes sense to those who rule the city, who are the sort of people who would launch an invasion of another city and the chief source of such antagonism. Wars rarely serve the commoners' genuine interests, as war typically means nothing more than an expense and drain of wealth they would use for luxury, contesting position, or nearly anything else but war. The soldiers who fight wars are motivated primarily by their paycheck rather than buy-in

with the belief that war will be glorious for the idea of it. Beyond that, war for soldiers means the potential for promotion, but it is often established that fighting men only rise so far through the ranks. Aristocracies are well established as a rule to suggest that the army is a toy for the aristocrats, and warriors' part in that arrangement is to suck up as much of the protection racket revenue as they can. This is not just taking what is handed to them, but taking anything that is not nailed down, including in most times and places human capital.

I write here to explain economic value not as a substance or a thing contested, but as both quantity and quality that is relevant. Economic behavior has never been a game of capturing some quantity, as if it were some mana of the universe. What has been desired, regardless of ideology, was the production of quantities and qualities that could be measured, and this measurement was not merely a desire of institutions or empires, but of everyone who has to work with a world where definite quantities and qualities are required to live or do anything in this world. If we would abandon this world altogether, or prefer a fantasy where we can clap our hands and believe the struggle will somehow solve our problems, then we can write a different book and forgo the economic question. Frankly, the managerial impulse doesn't allow for this problem to be resolved through any information, no matter how obvious it is that the institutions stultify both quantity and quality because it is in the interest of ruling institutions to denude the lives of those who were not selected to live. We are not able to prove, through any rational argument, that there is some quality to life which necessitates that we must hold it sacred. We could, though, regard the biopolitical thought that did arise, rather than act as if it were an unspeakable taboo and bray endlessly about ideologies far removed from the actual situation.^[18] The question of biology and life figured prominently in everything that has happened throughout modernity, and is in reality the true defining science of this time. It is in the biopolitical claims of fascism and eugenics that we see much of what came to pass in the past century, and part of my project is to explain why this worked. It was never an inevitable outcome, but instead was one suspiciously defended at key moments for reasons that probably make sense to those in the know, and happened for a reason, but did not have any good reason in nature or social thinking to suggest it had to be like this.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] If you want to know why Margaret Thatcher tells you there is no society, here is why. She is very aware of what needs to be said and the arguments at work, or at least the speechwriter gave her lines with this in mind.

[2] Yet. Billy Gates wants to do one better than Mr. Burns from that episode of The Simpsons...

[3] "Oops! Wrong planet!" was the slogan of the 1990s to announce the victory of the creed. There will be no more pretending, and what started then now extends to most of humanity.

[4] This, if you haven't figured out by now, is exactly what the data-driven authority in the United States built - a claim of perfect information to track everyone and everything, which was occulted by the state and used by agents selectively to impose a veil of secrecy on everything. The purpose here was not merely to shield information or disseminate falsehoods, but use the principle of information in society to make members comply with clearly absurd "laws". "Privacy agreements" were not worth the paper they were printed on, as the collection of information would be delivered to whomever wanted it, and this information was sold to data mining firms for the next stage of eugenic screening. That was the primary purpose of information networking in American healthcare. The insult was further exacerbated in that this "private" information, which everyone figured out was distributed to social agents tasked with enforcing a lockdown of the sick, was used as a pretext to pretend that this information could not be shared with anyone who actually wanted to help the sick, or for anyone who wished to appeal the record or file any lawsuit for malpractice. The extent of sadism at work is beyond the already-outrageous cash grab and looting that was the United States after 2008. This was the first step towards full eugenism, and a step beyond what Nazism could accomplish.

[5] This phrase "truck and barter" is cited specifically by Adam Smith in the Wealth of Nations as an origin of value in exchange. It is a phrase with negative connotations then and now, and the negative connotations are not accidental or a way to suggest that this propensity is praiseworthy. To speak of this propensity is to speak of a thing which is close enough to fact that we need not question it for too long. Nothing about this propensity is truly ingrained in rational thought, and it would be understood as highly irrational and pointless to follow that instinct to the doom of oneself or the whole society that makes trading possible, or trading occur in conditions that are favorable at all.

[6] The prevalence of information that became necessary for governing society in our time informed how this re-definition of the human race would be imposed. It is actually very uncommon to speak of "human nature" before modernity at all. That verbiage arose most of all with the modern vanguard rather than the traditional Right, and only later did the Right adopt this with increased vigor when a racial conception of humanism destroyed the spiritual concept. Far from embracing concepts of a general "human nature", the traditional Right embraced full anti-humanism as its preferred understanding, where the concept of uniting the world on any racial basis was anathema to their program. The Right's abhorrence of spiritual humanism was at the center of the rebrand of humanity as a purely racial and biopolitical project of the empire, which is the chief reason this verbiage is manipulated now. By the 21st century, the spiritual concept of humanism is nearly incomprehensible outside of circles of men and women familiar with the classical humanist literature, which is a small group and usually academics or among high elites. Ordinary people generally adopted, perhaps without understanding what they were saying, the anti-human views of the Right and came to view human not as a complimentary term but a mark of failure and inferiority. It is no secret that the Right's original anti-human vision

shifted to transhuman futurism, in which the human race will split forever to masters and cattle-slaves.

[7] Here I would like to expound upon a common lie in political narratives that gained currency in technocratic society. The story in vogue is that any event, no matter what, is part of some grand narrative and a "sign from God" of impending doom, unless all thought, authority, and wealth is handed to some expert class or cult leader. This is modeled on numerous millenarian movements in history. It has been weaponized and internalized, to teach people that any change, any policy, can only be a change for the worst. This is intended. It intends to teach people to be fearful not merely of any action of their own, but to be fearful of anything changing at all. It teaches ultimately that the internal thought process itself must be muted and commanded by total fear and terror. This, as you probably figured out, is the intended conditioning of the "Epsilon" caste - total, absolute, autistic fear, forever and ever, until they die. "All life dies screaming forever" is already the rule for the lowest class.

[8] The particulars of the German slave system during the Nazi period are interesting reading for any student of management, because the Nazi methods often did not conform to today's managerial practice, and were undertaken for multiple reasons rather than the simplified purposes neoliberal managerialism adopted. The slave system functioned to eliminate not just the residuum but political enemies of the Nazi regime, and it eliminated them not through simple death but through systematically stripping them of any sense of themselves. A crass retelling of Nazi atrocities portrays the Nazis as inefficient killers who had no system other than arbitrary violence, and this is where the silly retelling of the Holocaust suggests that there was no killing except through industrial gas chambers and that there was no other purpose, planning, or practice that the extermination of Jews and communists entailed. This is an intentional telling to first of all destroy historical understanding of why and how the Nazis did what they did, and to destroy the connection between this political violence and those British and American interests that funded it. It also destroys recognition of the Nazis' role in global eugenics, and the continuation of that program from before the Nazi period and after 1945. It is well known now, and was known at the time, that Nazi scientists and war criminals would insinuate themselves in every country in a great diaspora, and found their fellow travelers of whom there were many. This was especially the case in the Americas, the chief destination of ex-Nazis, with many donning the clothes of liberal humanism and acting as if all of that business were perfectly normal and as American as apple pie. Those who remember the events as they happened, who lived through it and saw precisely what the eugenic creed did to Europe, could see the same sorts at home, and active in the colonized parts of the world. So much had been revealed in 1945 that it became impossible to pretend that eugenics could be anything other than that, but the eugenic creed successfully rebranded itself, locked ranks inside the institutions, and the process to impose full eugenism continued despite this "speed bump" of the revelations war had to make. It is here where the mystifiers amplify their lies, writing stupid koans proclaiming

"war is the death of truth", as if the eugenic creed ever would allow such a thing as the truth to be admitted. The same eugenists are, in all reasonable estimations, the true instigators of both of the wars, and have always re-directed war guilt to subordinates or scapegoats. It is forbidden to acknowledge how these screaming eugenist retards, and they are retarded, slobbered over the image of Hitler and glorified everything that stoked war, out of some idiotic zeal that this war was for "freedom" as an abstraction. Everyone who had to suffer the consequences of the world wars and the wars afterwards always knew that these narratives were complete lies, as was the intellectuals' post-war narrative which brazenly absolved the parties chiefly responsible for the war itself and the greatest atrocities stemming from it. It was intellectual conceits which motivated the Nazi apparatus, which had no genuine cause for revanchism or any mission. Their sole material incentive was to perpetuate a finance scam, facilitate the plunder and cannibalization of productive industry so that it would be directed towards war, and find whatever decent things in the world they could find to sacrifice to feed this beast, so that sadistic retards could claim they were the master race or living gods, in addition to the usual cultic horseshit of that milieu. So obvious was the result of eugenist atrocities that it was impossible to speak of the word "eugenics" for decades without the disgust of the masses coming out. That did not stop the creed from torturing and killing more, and continuing their offensive transgression of anything decent, but it became necessary to obfuscate eugenism by claiming it was something entirely different. It is here where social information, which in the past had to be somewhat reliable and tied to a genuine material thing, would be played with and used to construct in full an alternative world-system. This project was already under construction during the interwar period. It took decades and the destruction of living memory that knew of this transition to insinuate the alternative facts of the post-war intelligentsia. The 1970s could begin once a very large generation of youth were indoctrinated to think in accord with the new institutions, and from there, the brain rot intensified and all material sense, regardless of ideology, would be lost. This appears in some ways like the mask of humanity slipping off to reveal what it always was, but it also required humanity to believe reality control was possible, and that flagrant lying created truth. It required truth to be institutional and unquestionable, and independent thought to be inadmissible. In every habit, down to the smallest iota, education and the practices of the past century were designed to accomplish no other goal, and the Nazis were one initiative to impose this filth on the world.

[9] If the example is not evident to readers, look up "object-oriented programming" as a paradigm in software engineering. Many an old-fashioned programmer from the ancient days has an axe to grind with the implementation of OOP, where information in objects is occulted and finicky to work with. This is done in accord with some principles which are, to those who study the matter, sensical and done for a reason. On the other hand, it leads to many situations where, instead of reading and writing directly to a variable, classes in OOP will only be read or written to by functions inherent in the class. This is obtuse if the

code of a program is interpreted literally, but sensical if the programmer takes the view that variables in a computer program are like philosophical objects and treated as such. It is so common to write these read/write functions for classes that a shorthand developed to do this quickly, which is interpreted by compilers to optimize programs. In machine code, the computer could never actually call the read/write functions of an object, and just replaces the function call with access to the variable directly. If, however, the object is intended to reject certain values for reading and writing, it would be necessary to filter any machine instruction that would input or output an illegal value, or handle them accordingly.

[10] Maggie the milk snatcher strikes again!

[11] We may see, and it probably is clear by now, that at heart, humans are killers. Men, women, children, are born killers and shameless in pursuit of it. Humanity as a race was born by killing and killing and glorifying the killing, and this declaration in the 20th century is the coda to a history full of killing with little to show for it. There was not one shred of innocence in them, and there never was a "fall of Man" which made this happen. It was what they always were. All that changed was the end of any pretense that it was going to be different, and the productive classes were to be treated with the utmost contempt. The reasons why can be reconstructed from this and the prior chapter, but will be elaborated on as we continue to ask the question why it did turn out this way. Nothing about this was ordained and at every point, it could have stopped immediately. It can still stop now.

[12] If you are familiar with the 21st century internet "debate" milieu, you probably heard of identity politics. This confused understanding of what is really happening is what I refer to. It is of course known to those who study society what the focus on "identity" is, and no one who champions identity politics is ignorant of why identity is deployed over historical truth or any substantive meaning. As there were those who had every reason to oppose this, a pseudo-opposition was contacted by thought leaders and influencers to forestall any genuine understanding of institutions, society, and why this appeal to identity works. I have explained the core modus operandi in describing the neoliberal offensive, and at the time, the neoliberals did not bother hiding what they were doing. Educated men and women knew damn well what they were doing, and part of doing this was to cut off the ladder of advancement and kick down the fools who were weeded out. That was the great project of the intellectuals and university, and those who passed through it knew damn well what they were about. No one could survive in those institutions without paying fealty to the creed.

[13] If you are wondering what so-called "evolutionary psychology" is, it's basically this - formalizing the petty conceits of retards, and they are retarded, who infest the institutions and insist that their retardation is sacred wisdom.

[14] The national question figures greatly into the working class movements of

history, for many reasons that will be gladly explained by honest communists, socialists, and anyone who wishes to study history seriously. This question did not conform to a particular conceit of "bourgeois nationalism" that took hold, though that form of nationalism is not really premised on the nation in a genuine sense and is itself misconstrued. The chief aim of neoliberal identity politics was, above all others, to destroy any consciousness of workers and the oppressed classes that would cross the nation-state boundaries that were established. "Proletarian internationalism" did not entail a destruction of national or cultural history or homogenization of the workers, but instead spoke to a truth Marx and any worker reading him recognized - that for all of the national movements thus far, the working class had no nation to call their own, and were in most cases barred from political participation or any of the rights that national republics entailed. The call was less to abolish the meaningful history of nations or races, which in that time and for a long time after was understood as what people "were" ancestrally and the most proximate associations they were likely to have. It is often forgotten that "nation" and "race" were not so conflated as they would become in the 20th century, as both spoke of different concepts, and both had concepts of history and culture implied in their vernacular usage. The call of the working class movement, which remains persistent up to now, has been the recognition that workers around the world, whatever their race or nation, were very similar to each other and shared obvious interests. Among those interests was an end to global war, which had always been a calamity for the workers, peasants, and oppressed classes. The great success of Nazism was to strip nation and race of any history or meaning that entailed the actual members of a nation and race, replacing the actual people with an institution purporting to be the corporate head of the nation and race. That the Nazis would proceed to abandon their own race, their own "volk" which was conceptually relevant to the German conception of themselves, is not at all surprising, and it was foreseen when the Nazis were elevated to serve establishment interests and the eugenic creed, which had its own global movement. As we will see, this elevation of identity is particularly necessary for the eugenic creed, and identity politics is not something proposed just because this works to undermine worker's solidarity. Identity politics in the past century always implied the eugenic ideology, and after the second world war, identity politics was the preferred vehicle in liberal societies to advance both the petty-managers, who were most of all motivated by rot and avarice and a disgusting ethos rewarding their perversion with little to show for it, and the eugenic creed which ran the tables and granted to identity politics the institutional force to make people accept it. Without the eugenic creed, identity politics would be rejected as some sort of cruel joke, and it would have been rejected on sight unless petty-managers, school administrators, and every predatory scumbag were not allowed to use it and enshrine such a foul bastardization of reason. The eugenic application is especially important because eugenics in its core conceit of life itself reduces the complexity of life and all history to the "genetic identity", or "biomarker", which is a watchword for the eugenic creed's institutional advance.

[15] Look up "Flight to Varennes" for an example of noble asininity and why a lot of people were happy to chop off Louis XVI's head. What is going on in France leading up to the revolution is a much more complicated story than some simple narrative, and since it is the defining event of modernity, it is something any student of history should learn.

[16] Morton Fried's "The Notion of Tribe" is a particularly interesting read on the nature of what are called tribes, and this concept has long been contentious in anthropology. There are numerous descriptions of tribes dating back to the 19th century, as there were anthropologists speaking to American Indian tribes which were still constituted as tribes in the older sense, and the tribes and confederations of the natives were varied and rarely conformed to polities in the sense that Old World empires and states were constituted. The tribes in America were not some racial group or an imagined large band, but entailed institutional development over peoples who typically retained their tribe or clan affiliation, rather than consolidating into city-states or empires that brought about modern states. Very often, Indian tribes did not conceive of "race" or blood quantum as politically necessary, and had processes for adopting members from other tribes, and an understanding of friendship with foreigners and intermarriage. Many early modern and current conceits about tribes have nothing to do with what tribes were and their remnants today, and have more to do with technocratic contempt for nation, tribe, family, and any other thing that would resist the ruling institutions necessary for the present form of government.

[17] Legalism and the Chinese political thought concerning despotism is often mangled in European and Christian conceptions, often because the European or Christian is too pigheaded and holds conceits that refuse to change, especially when the sacred rites of republicanism are at stake. To be fair, there is enough pigheadedness from the other places about European political history. Most of all, there is much misunderstanding of history generally due to the times we live in, where "history is bunk".

[18] If it sounds like I'm throwing too much shade on the older communists, you can look at the communist writers and particularly the polemics of Lenin and find many of them agree that the emphasis on ideology is absurd, and they engaged not with literalism and theological interpretations of Capital, but with the conditions of their time, which they believed the Marxist concept of economics and history described with insights that were worth writing about. The communist idea is, at heart, not an ideological one, and this is clear from Marx's writing on the matter in various ways. The communists around the world, in some way, fought for democracy in a world that was fast rejecting democracy as a condition they would ever abide even as a story, and communists who forget this undermine any form of communism that would be at all workable or desirable. If the communist of today can think of little more than grabbing positions and throwing away large swaths of humanity as worthless to their cause, they would have no cause, and this is one success eugenics had to ensure that communism in any form could not remain institutionally relevant. I would ask

communists not so much to look back to an ancient time where communism stood as a force in the world against this intericine war most of all and seek to repeat the past, but to do as many have and engage with the present situation, and find that democracy of any sort is not just in peril, but nearly inadmissible as even a concept in institutions. If there is to be any concept that communism pointed to at all, it would only be possible through democracy in the genuine sense - and I do not mean Athenian democracy or any past example, but something that has yet to be known in humanity, that would have to be conceived anew from the ruins we sit upon. I am not the person to write that tract, nor would my words be deemed credible, but I would hope and pray that there is someone in this terrible Earth that can contemplate what the loss of democracy as a concept will mean. They would do well to recall the spirit of socialism and know that it was always with the lowest class that the fate of humanity would be decided, rather than a game of political advantage-seeking. If that is abandoned openly, then there is no political advantage for a communist to gain. It is highly unlikely communists could unite the lowest class in their tent, but if they wished any relevance as an idea, they would allow the lowest class to speak plainly their interests instead of scoffing at them. They cannot resort to the shameless pandering that has characterized all of the discourse in the past century. Lenin didn't do that, Stalin didn't do that, Mao didn't do that, and the communists who meant anything worth a damn didn't do that. Letting that continue as it has did no one any favors. I do not expect this plea will be heard for a variety of reasons, but I would throw that out here...

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

5. The Living Agent and its Native Interests

The prior chapters have concerned a framework to describe agents not as humans but as knowing and rational agents generally. The description of society would apply to any social agent - animal, machine, simulation in a computer program, or abstract. It is inclusive not just of people but things, which is necessary to speak of society in any proper sense. The image of society as agents disconnected from things, including their environment, is a persistent error in the understanding of economy, even though every thing must inhabit some environment. A simulated agent in a computer program exists in memory and abstract agents in a void have nothing but each other. We have presumed many traits of humans in particular in examples of behaviors because humans are the most obvious example of an organic society with information processing. If we were to substitute a different type of agent in those conceptions, we would likely see a very different society with very different institutions, and many expectations of doom would either be different or would never have been the problem they are for us. The problem of humans in particular is not the result of life itself, or some inborn genetic legacy of humans. Humans to be humans are the product not just of living processes generally but of history. Humans did not always exist as they do now, and we

have visible historical record to suggest that in the past several centuries, humans did not freeze in place as if they were unchanging creatures. In a biological sense, humans changed due to deliberate selective pressures. A century of living under eugenics and social Darwinism guaranteed certain profound changes and the selection of predatory and venal behaviors over honesty and kindness that once upon a time was relied upon for the order of society. We see throughout history shifts in language, the abilities of people, and considerable drift in biological traits. At a basic level, the faculties of humans have largely stayed the same. Whatever their time and place or intellect, humans want largely similar things, most have an expected range of motion of their body, most will learn to speak and can easily learn to read letters if there is any incentive given and any instruction that is at all competent. They are largely aware of the social situation they were born in, and have never been really fooled by the political system and the conceits of its liars. For the most part, humans retain their cynicism and contempt for the history of their entire race, and this is completely justified given a cursory account of human cruelty. What optimism humans keep is never about the race, which has been understood to every religious tradition worthwhile to be basically evil at its core, but towards the world and a sense of goodness that can be found, but never quite held. Humans are typically aware of that nature and manage, so long as they are allowed to do so, good behavior in many of their aspirations, rather than the venality and rot that the aristocracy represents.

Living systems are not social systems or systems of the social agents' knowledge hardware or software so to speak. Those systems are information of a different sort, which was not inherently living. So much of social life, and the life of humans or any animal, involves not life but death and the non-living matter they absorb. Living systems are not even physical or chemical systems necessarily. The characteristics of life are not tied to any preferred type of physical matter or chemical reaction. The chemistry of living things is not defined by the materials themselves, but by which materials, if any, allow for the emergence of life as a process. Living systems are not tantamount to knowledge, as many living systems do not "know" or possess any process internal to them that thinks on their own power. Intelligent behavior is ascribed to life even when it is single-celled life that does nothing more than follow a largely scripted set of imperatives internal to its workings. The single-celled life-form is not a simple thing, for even the cell contains multiple parts that allow it to form any complex life, and would need those parts to even be constituted as a cell and a system we can call life. Viruses^[1] contain matter that is akin to matter seen in carbon-based life systems, that can be ascribed various biological effects, but are themselves not living and not indicative of any agency that is deemed equal to life. The virus conceptually can only be a fragment within living things, and this is seen through a view of life as an informational thought-form rather than life as a substantive and material "thing". A dirty secret is that the substantive things deemed living are largely dead matter animated by a force and organization that seems to defy natural laws in every way we acknowledge them. Nothing about life appears as if it was ordained by physical reality, and most of the world is hostile to any living

system or clumps of matter we would consider living. Far from it, life seems to stubbornly violate attempts to impede it like nothing else does. It is with life itself that the "hobgoblin pushing the world from the shadows" is most evident. This irrational approach to knowledge in the world, where the naive imagine some demon or angel moving all that exists, is not suggested by anything in the natural world or knowledge itself, which would default to view things in the world as things which are comprehensible. It makes sense for knowledge to view anything in it as operating on its own power, absent any mechanism suggesting that an external force acts on something. We do not believe effects occur without an associated cause, or that any of the mystifications where the world "just-so" exists and does things are credible. A child can see through those arguments from the moment they inquire about their own existence. Life has definite causes and effects and couldn't be anything else, but the root source of what "life" is appears as the most irrational thing. There is no particular reason why this system, which has no obvious center of operations, would move against the seeming impulses of physics, and would be able to stabilize chemical reactions with some willful exertion and complexity. The centralization evident in organs of life arises not because of an intrinsic design of the life-form, but emerged out of prior conditions where cells accumulated into organs. In the world, life developing cognitive function granted to animals or their precursors significant advantages in their spread. It is with this most primitive mobility that concepts of sociality and agency could find some expression. It did not need to occur to these animals that they were engaged in any social behavior in any way, nor did it need to be an impulse born into them to behave in any particular way. Advantages to doing this are evident. The sociality of animals recurs not so much because of any programming within them which is very basic, nor because of any will to power that is deliberate and oriented inexorably towards goals.

Life's existence is very inefficient at the goal of attaining victory in the struggle for existence, with ups, downs, and many absurdities. At no point does it occur to life that their "struggle for existence" is any great philosophical project or a crusade of the highest importance. It does not occur to most humans that such an aim would be the point of life, and humans are far more deliberate towards such an aim than any other life-form on Earth. Even the true believers in the philosophy of struggle and war for war's sake cannot stomach their religion if they ever have to face consequences for the religion's practice, or the war becomes too unpleasant to their sensibilities. Had the aristocracy faced the grinding torture of the war machine as the commoners do, they would never allow the cult of war to continue and would ruthlessly stamp out anyone suggesting that war was anything other than a disaster. If the aristocracy shared in the burdens of the typical soldiers and officers who are tested with any genuine struggle requiring competence or suffering, they would be far more hesitant to treat war as a casual exercise, recognize that their malfeasance is the true source of their woes, and that such activities would be a burden towards any stated aim of securing peace or any asset they would want to hold. It is an aristocratic mindset most of all that enshrines the "cult of life" and the "cult of war". They counteract that the

democratic mindset enshrines a cult of death that takes the correct cynical view on life itself and humanity's prospects, and that the democrats enshrine a cult of peace that fosters sickness, because democracy in a genuine sense implies a genuine comradeship and sense of shared suffering and struggle among all, and that is anathema to everything an aristocracy stands for. The rule of seniority and degraded merit and the rule of oligarchy are really just the degenerated forms of aristocracy, which follows an inexorable tendency matching the heart and soul of so-called philosopher-kings. The tyrant arises not because democracy by some fickleness of it allows the tyrant to rise, but because the schemes of would-be aristocrats hold advantages in information, and all that can unite the democrats is fear of the law and fear of the next plot to bring more suffering to humanity and the world. Were it the true choice of a democratic society to not do this, it would become clear that the arrangements of politics thus far are wholly inadequate and probably cannot be fixed. The world where that could take root and become something different was never allowed to exist. The attitudes of aristocracy and its various degenerated forms, of which democracy is one where the aristocratic wealth is temporarily clawed back and its values are emulated out of political necessity, are exported to the kingdom of life as a whole, and given the status of natural laws. Our view of life is colored by the political settlements we have come to accept, and this is not particular to the Greek example I am mimicking here. Political thought around the world has been used as a model for nature and the behavior of life generally, even though politics in any meaningful sense could never be internalized in any of the basic mechanisms of life as a process. Life as a process spawns knowledge, which out of necessity is wildly divergent from the living system or any system in the material world. Knowledge itself does not exist anywhere in physical space, but instead is conjured in some subjective virtual experience apart from that space. Knowledge would have to be so, and with it, our conceits of the world and history, and thus the question of life, deal not with the actual world we live in, but informational conceits that have more to do with what we want life to be and the dominant institutions of whatever society we belong to. Even if we have a mind of our own, human language is a product of a social existence to be anything more than a crude system for book-keeping and expressing through gestures what might appease the heavens or some other animal. We are beholden to ideas from others to even ask in formal language questions about life, and possess enough language to begin our own process of science. This native process of science too can be co-opted by wise elders or specialists, since we are not born with endless genius and must build our knowledge from more than our own sense experience and record. We would want to listen to those who might know more than us and be honest with us, and historically humans have found someone they trust enough to at least hold a dialogue, with the knowledge that anything humans say will have to be independently verified based on some simple rules that are too difficult to deny without destroying the basis for human language and cooperation.

Nothing appears to orient life in the first instance except one reality - it could

exist, and so it did. All of the imperatives of life arise from this and this alone. If it exists, it exists not in isolation, but in a world and environment which it can relate to. Life as a form is a novel thing and not ubiquitous to existence, or inherent to existence in any way. It arises as an alien to a dead world, and absorbs that world while releasing its products, offspring, and so on. Nothing about life is at all "natural". The default of nature is that the world is non-living, and no evidence to suggest a living force or living essence to matter exists. Far from it, the evidence is that life by its nature is scarce, and whether it possesses any sense of economics, competition, or cooperation with other agents, living processes are uncommon and parasitic upon the world. The world itself has no need of economics in that sense, for the procession of events in nature is of no consequence to any part of it. However much substance life might claim, life and life alone possesses this quality of substancelessness. Every other thing - the matter life absorbs to constitute itself, the knowledge process which allows thought and sense of the world to say that there is a world with life - is substantive. Life itself as a process is not substantive, and has no preferred form that can be discerned at all. It is not like physical matter, which occurs in very regular formations and abides the laws of physics. The laws of physics exist not because they were thought of by a simulator, but because the laws of physics model something physical matter did since time immemorial. Nothing about physics suggests that there would be a genesis or starting point where physics "started" ex nihilo. We may subjectively consider that there is a root of physics that we do not know and never know, or aspects of physics we do not ourselves understand. We cannot suggest that physics was the result of any mind imposing it on the world, either in one instance or in an ongoing way. Any mind that would do so would be the result of either physics, or some system from which physics as we know it could emerge, which would itself abide certain laws of motion. If there is some primordial root in nature for these systems, nothing about it would be "living" in the sense that we consider life in this world, nor would it possess any habit attributed to life. Such a genesis would be something altogether different. Of all of the systems that exist, not one of them appears "spontaneously" in a way that cannot be explained by other systems. Life as a process stands alone in that it instantiates for no particular reason in a world where things are never instantiated. Every other system arises from other systems, because those systems are in some way substantive or rooted in substance. The mind and knowledge is certainly substantive for us to speak of it. Life is a system that does not need to be rooted in physics at all. The processes we call life can pertain, in principle, to abstractions or information. It is possible to ascribe to systems of any type the qualities of life, because life at its root is nothing real or substantive. It is a ghost that stalks the world. We may develop theories of how physical or chemical processes brought about the behaviors of life, but that would only be one case of life emerging from a particular system. Life can emerge not from any particular system, but any imaginable system. We can, through strange reasoning, consider societies living entities, even though they are in their meaningful form purely informational. A society as a living entity would not be like organic life, and should not be

described with that language. Yet, this is exactly how societies and institutions have been treated, even though society is primarily informational content of relations, and institutions are specifically non-living entities displacing the living system.

It is not that all systems are truly living, for life is not merely defined by its ex nihilo appearance. The distinction of life is that it is the system of systems, yet it is not a system in the sense that other systems are traceable and mechanical. Life in its basic instantiation is not reducible to any particular mechanistic origin, but is some sort of demon arising from chaos. Whatever it claims, life inhabits a system and makes that system its own. It can possess physical matter, or it can possess information, and it treats both as interchangeable for its purposes. Indeed, it is an abiding characteristic of living things that they seek to assimilate any system for its purposes, regardless of the system that they originate from. They seek this not out of any inborn instinct or because a natural urge compelled it, but do so because this assimilation is itself the origin of life, and a thing it continues to do. Information or "mind" ultimately must take some definite form and arise from some substance to be what it is and appear with any regularity. Life feeds on substance and processes it by mechanisms peculiar to it, which defy any reason to suggest why such a thing would be necessary or inevitable. Life emerges, however frequently it does, as a freak accident. Complex life requires many occurrences to follow from its emergence, and is not the rule of life. Most life we have observed is simplistic, if it can qualify as "life" in the sense we regard it. Every step of evolution and every new life is another freak accident and a tragedy, and yet we carry on because there is not by any natural law a reason why life should not do this. We may experience anguish over this condition and expound on it, but when that is seen for what it is, it turns out that life, whatever its tragedy, is not in of itself such a bad thing. Life was not born out of malevolence or sin or abomination, and often those things are hostile to life's survival. Life is anguish, but there is no particular reason why it had to be so, and many reasons to suggest that the tragedy could be mitigated. There are many reasons more to suggest that life can find other moral purposes except suffering, and doing so is the only reason life could be other than what it is. It is not even the case that life is suffering - much that is living has no concept of pain or moral anguish, and those who live can easily imagine an existence without moping about suffering or existential angst. The inverse of suffering, though, is no absolute of the life-force. "Pleasure" is a fleeting master which has no meaning except "not pain", and the pursuit of it leads to nothing but a cowardly life-form indulgent in its vices, conceits, and depravity. Yet, life does not and cannot be reduced to that simple calculus. Life itself is emergent from any source that would allow it, and upon creation, it thrives on new emergence to do anything it does. Life is not unique in allowing the new to exist. Far from it, life as a force is stubborn and refuses to allow the new, working against it in some futile effort to arrest its form. At the same time, to seek this futile goal, life does things that are remarkable compared to the common events of nature, which recur like the orbit of planets and passing of seasons. Nowhere in genuine

nature is there a sense of "balance" or purpose, as if nature were arrested in any preferred form. The true natural order is that events proceed without regard to life's sense of balance and homeostasis. The events of nature may be simple mechanisms we describe with laws of science so easy a caveman could learn them, but they allow the new to exist and do not seek to stop the new in any way. It is rather that with simple events in nature, the new would not possess any more or less complexity by any natural law, or suggest any natural historical progress or teleology. Nothing in nature asked itself why it did what it did, as if it served some intelligent purpose. If there is such an intelligent purpose, it is not evident to any of our knowledge as the world of a divine mind with purposes comparable to ours. Life, though, does anything it does with intent, because the intent in living systems is something that defines life as a process.

If we were to speak of living systems as if they operated blindly and without any particular intent, it would not be appropriate to speak of them as alive at all, no matter what behaviors the substantive systems life invades perform. We would instead speak of some information, or some process that would be treated as we treat economic value or social value - that is, we would imagine in some way that this entity, neither living nor truly dead, can be commanded and cajoled. It would not be described with the language of life, but the language of information systems or physical systems, which are rendered not in the scientific sense which approaches the world materialistically, but with the sense of ideas in knowledge which substitute themselves for the actual world we live in. At the same time, this approach, which is intrinsically idealist in all ways, is deemed "hard science" by some bastardization of terminology, and this is somehow accepted despite the total lack of any scientific validity to the approaches, theories, and purpose of the inquiry. It is not that this economic and humanist view of life as an information system reified in physical form is pseudoscientific, in the sense that they are doing science wrong. Everything about science suggests that this is, on the surface, a valid approach to answer a question about the natural world. It is rather that any purpose of inquiring into LIFE, as opposed to some information system or crass interpretation of physicalism, is negated, and at the same time, the language of this curious "life" dominates the theory, as if it were something holy and sacred. It is here where a scientific inquiry, which might be conducted by honest men and women, became first scientism making grandiose predictions based on spurious theorycrafting, and then becomes a full blown cargo cult where the men and women of science sacrifice babies to Moloch or whatever in this Hell the spiritual authority truly guiding them is telling them the "in" thing is this time. Life is granted the status of an absolute and natural spiritual authority for its own sake, and at the same time, life in any genuine sense is replaced with a preferred model of one thought leader who would command the other living things. It only occasionally occurs to these men and women that the same thing can be done to them and more obviously so, but it is an article of faith that the conceit of knowledge, now held solely in an institution, somehow enshrines them and grants impunity to the lesser minds who are not allowed in the club. Those who command science proclaim that they are not merely lords but gods,

and those who do not know exist to be consumed utterly and completely, not even cattle but some sort of organic slurry which may be beaten and cajoled in any way. In that way, the mission of the scientific revolution is complete. An aristocracy is formed, and claims itself to be the final and permanent aristocracy. A mission that started long ago in the human race, where the smarter of the apes became Satanic apes and the dumber were eliminated or enslaved, became not just an occasional and tragic event, but the final word of the human race, made absolute and institutional. This purpose did not tie to any particular movement, or even to eugenics or the eugenic interest generally. It instead spoke of something that was latent in life that sought its own termination, for life itself is an absurdity, an error in the great work of the true nature of the world. Rather than accepting that, the people who could easily accept the absurdity of this existence were told they must be ashamed, while the ideologues with their zeal violently imposed their vision on humanity and all that exists, without anything to say for themselves except the same thing that began life in the first place - "we do it because we can." It then becomes the first and last word, and there will be nothing truly new if this aristocracy had its way. Such is, in a basic explanation, the origin of aristocracy in the human race, and it is a common story that repeats in miniature out of some perverse instinct in us. That instinct was not truly born in life, for life begins not with any teleology but potentials to go anywhere the faculties it claims will allow. It made great sense for nearly every life-form to not pursue any such insane aim, and do literally anything else. Yet, just as life existed because it could, this movement to command exists for the same reason - because it could. The institution became in its own mind a living thing, devouring parasitically all it came into contact with, cannibalizing other institutions, and cannibalizing the very substance and anything productive that would allow that institution to exist. The institution becomes "perfected" in the sense Herbert Spencer wanted, in that it is a slobbering beast with no regard for anything and everything it destroys, and this happens by the same freak chance that allowed life to exist at all.

In the prior book, I gave a crude definition of life. I would like to modify it considerably here, given what has been discussed. Moving forward, the concept of "life" must be narrowed to something usable but general enough to apply to it as a particular system, rather than rooting it in any other system or placing it subordinate to any other. As we will see, the notion of fixed "system hierarchies" is a flawed understanding of the system concept, yet one that was built into its original formulation. I shall define life with the following terms:

- **Genesis**, or the origin of life, where that which is non-living or not a thing functioning on its own power or purpose becomes living and possesses the intent of life. This story is repeated for each instantiation of a "life-form" which may be distinguished as some entity operating on its own power. The life-form proper is not the instantiation of the matter or substance, which is something assimilated from the world, nor any description of a physical system itself, but a description of life functions - that is, what life does to the matter, in some way that is construed as the behavior of life rather than a non-living thing.

- **Intent of life**, or a description of the functions it will pursue. This will vary based on the life-form, but they are things constructed if any life-form is to be given a name beyond "life" itself. It is possible then to speak of a nature of humans, dogs, or any other particular life-form, with proper caveats about what is meant by this nature. This nature is not truly a "natural law", but a comprehension of the intent that orients a particular life-form, such that we can speak of it as that type or class rather than another. The characteristics of a human or dog are not exoteric expressions or esoteric mysteries to be discovered, but spawn from an intent which must be deemed self-evident to speak of any distinction of life. The exoteric and esoteric conceptions of the life-form are not description of the life-form itself, but the substantive systems life utilizes for its functions. Where the genesis is passive and will not change, the intent of life is present and can change in ways that are possible.

- **Stasis**, or the tendency of life to retain its intent, which is expressed as its form. While life proceeds through a typical lifecycle that may be identified, that lifecycle is defined by its regularity absent any external modification suggesting the living thing would change that lifecycle. That is, life suggests that it is a thing that can be isolated from its environment and placed in another, and remain in intent the same thing. If placed in a new situation, life will stubbornly insist on remaining as it was, unlike most systems which do not repair themselves with intent. Without persistence - that is, if the faculties the life-form inherits are not continuously activated - they are not core life-functions, for they are not part of the stasis which defines life.

- **Interface**, or the particular "hardware" life possesses to carry out its functions. This would be organs, genetic material, bones, etc., that are persistently tied into the intent of life. The persistence necessary for life to be constituted is a critical distinction which provides certain boundaries to consider a life-form's processes contained. Therefore, for humans, the body, which is inherent in the intent of the life-form, is considered an interface, but the tools, language, technology, etc. that humans utilize has nothing to do with its core life-functions intrinsically. If for example we envision the human brain as a state machine with memory, none of that is in of itself a "life-function". The operations of the brain, and whatever it does to retrieve a particular memory or shift state, would be a function, but the particular "state of mind" would not be. In fact, knowledge as a process has nothing to do with the life-form, as knowledge as we see is a thing alien to life, and not a thing that can emerge solely from life, nor a thing that life always entails. I will use the term "biological faculties" to refer to these possessions, to distinguish them from faculties like tools, language, and the knowledge process which is not strictly speaking a "faculty" subordinated to life or economy but something altogether different.

- **System I/O** - the inputs that life assimilates to continue its functions, and the outputs of life as waste products, exertion of force possible through its organs. A life-form to continue existing is not merely a "consumer" of some quantity of substance, but consumes particular qualities which much be quantitative in

some sense to be substantive. The needs of a life-form are not merely material, but imply a hunger for information and knowledge if those features are emergent in the life-form. This input and output is considered the parasitic feeding of life, and its imposition on the outside world by virtue of being life. It does not speak intrinsically of any "lifecycle" or interaction with the environment. From the most basic premise of life, its input and output is not integrated in any society or even the world proper. It is, as mentioned, a life-form parasitically feeding on the world and imposing something which changes it through the intent of life.

If these five categories look familiar, then gold star for you. I use these categories not to describe life in its total complexity, but to suggest the basic purpose of "living systems" as a distinct area of study. These categories describe the *management* of life, which has sadly become the typical understanding of life in science. The only alternatives on offer make life into woo woo, or deny that life really exists except as flotsam. It should be clear that most systems do not need to be rooted in other systems to be meaningful concepts.

We may qualify the life we truly care about by recognizing life to specifically refer to a physical origin that would make it relevant to the part of the world where we recognize space, temporality, and consider ourselves to reside. That is, we are only concerned with life we regard as "real" on the same terms we are real. Life in a simulated space, or life in a model we imagined, is only relevant so far as it would have an expression in the material world where we recognize physical objects. And so, living systems typically inhabit physical constructs, and specifically regard chemistry since stable physical matter will likely take the form of chemical substances like carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, and oxygen. Life assimilates for its purposes many elements, and the elaborate molecular constructs in living systems are highly alien to non-living objects, such that those constructs and their more developed products are a sign of life's presence more often than not. Life in this way terraforms a world, which starts out as dead material to appropriate. For all of the effort of life to alter its environment, the Earth overwhelmingly remains a dead rock, and millions of years of life only claim so much of it. Far from life being an inevitability, life appears only to exist in concentrated developed forms for a period of time, before the life-form and the society of life declines, begins a die-off and diaspora from its community, and the survivors pick up the shattered remains of life to try, try again.

The hint of this sad fate of life can be seen in its defining characteristics as a unique form, rather than a rule of life that could be read by any scientific inquiry into its component materials. None of the core functions of life concern any concept of society or any imperative other than its most basic input and output. This, at its core, is what life is there to do. It consumes many things and emits waste, including the remains of its body. Life as a process, and this is true of every form of it, soaks up anything and everything for no purpose other than its intent, stasis, and the maintenance of its interface. There is no version of this which is actually stable in a philosophical sense, where life is every truly an ideal form matching its intent. If that were to happen, the entity

in question is understood as effectively dead. More than that, the intent of life and its genesis suggest that it never actually could be arrested, or hold any regard for its environment or any conceit we would hold about the "nature of life", as if life itself regulated the world of dead things by some virtue it and its alone commands. It is quite the opposite; life is commanded by the dead matter around it, which provides all of the true sustenance life feeds from. Life emits dead matter not out of any gratitude to the world, but because it cannot help but excrete, covering the Earth with its shit and piss and telling us this is some sort of gift. It may be a gift to other life-forms, for whom oxygen as a waste product is precious sustenance, but to the true natural world, which never asked for any of this imposition, life is another exhaustion of stored energy which accelerates the decay of energy in the fuel life consumes. Life cannot create. It can only corrupt and mutilate something into another thing, and we only consider this mutilation to be beneficial because of our bias. The Earth and the natural world, though is a champ about this. It's not going to complain about life's incessant parasitism, and even seems eager to protect life from its' own stupidity and contradictory existence. Natural laws humble life to prevent its most odious conceits from taking over the entire project, not because life suggested any balance for its own sake, but because the laws of physics would only abide so much of this abomination before it must, for the sake of heaven, go. Nature did not do this to teach life any lesson, because for one nature has no sense of teaching anything as we would or any intent and second life has refused to learn from this lesson despite ample warnings from the laws of nature time and time again. It did this because in some sense, life really is this anomaly, and not worth any of the moral value or regard that is held for it. It is only because knowledge emerged in life that we are as we are, and hold this strange conceit about it. When life does incredibly stupid things that it cannot keep doing due to a lack of natural substance to suck dry, stasis will be the result of the struggle of life against the world. The struggle of life against life is a futile attempt to take revenge against a world that never had any need of that construct, and life being a conceited bully could only think to take out its frustration on other life. It did not need to be this way, and since living things do not exist to be prey by any natural law, the first response of life is to resist and refuse to be prey. The aim of the predatory and the bully has always been to engineer a situation where they can fulfill a central, overall intent above the mere existence of life, and they take from this a story that doing this will somehow allow their pathetic forms to become co-equal with the world, or in their greater delusions, superior to the world and becoming gods that rule over the dead. The aim of every other life-form, which sees that this is absolutely fucking retarded, is to do literally anything else, for they didn't have it out for the world, any deity that may exist, or assign to this spurious struggle any moral value or worth, even in the most primitive way life could be oriented towards such a thing. The predatory tell a story that this predation started long long ago, and was not their individual idea, and so the prey should not take it personally. The prey have always known that there was never a "fall of Man" or anything of the sort. They knew the predators knew damn well, and the predators in some way possessed all of the

moral sense a life-form would need to know what they were doing and why they did it. Predation as a simple urge was never viable. Predators learn to stalk their prey, and expend their efforts finding new ways to hunt, torture, humiliate, and do all of the things the hunter ethos would do. Prey learn to negate those things, rather than accept the predators' philosophy and religion as their own. The true origin of predation, and predation acts on its own accord without any necessary prey, is the same as the genesis of life itself - that it existed because it could, and justified itself. This is irrational, but so too is their conceit of the godhead, which we will have to deal with in a future writing. The irrationality of life's origin and intent is unique to it. As said, nothing in nature suggests any of this is sensical. Life is unique among emergences in the world in that it didn't arise in any way that flowed peacefully, and once emergent, life went out of its way to ensure no new emergences were possible. A potential origin of predation found in the nature of life is that predation is a pre-emptive defense against corruption of its form that made sense, since life by its nature is autistic and does not concern itself with anyone or anything else. This, though, would fall apart as a sole explanation, because if that were the sole origin of predation, it would suggest passivity and cooperation in life that is not at all the experience of life, and life would be far more likely to learn of the threat of other life and threats of the world, even with meager intellectual capacity. It would be self-evident to life to never allow any of the things that did arise. Therefore, arguments about a "nature of life" that insisted on predation at all are ludicrous, and should be obviously so to a child. That is why the doctrine of eternal biological struggle knew from the start it must impose itself violently and forbid any deviation from its creed.

If this is the case, then we are left asking what we are to do with life, and what the purpose if any is. That is the great question. When all is done, the cost of maintaining life in stasis and the cost of defending life is nowhere near the full input of life, nor does it explain its output beyond the statement that something likely comes out of life. Much of what life takes in, does, and becomes in its faculties and the things created by life, has nothing to do with this barest minimum of survival and existence. It would be quite impossible for life to exist if it was entirely obsessed with those two acts for their own sake. How much of life's input allows for a surplus beyond those two things will vary dramatically, and this is a condition not just over long periods but at the smallest level life operates. We have spikes of abundance, crashes of want, and do with the world as we please. It is only because we could grow at all that we did. That happens both in the act of living for any individual life-form and in natural history. There is, in life, a surplus after input that is used for multifarious purposes. Those purposes do not fit any pre-ordained schema. Life will, with all of the biological faculties available to it, do anything in its potential, with sufficient inputs and with regard to its outputs not creating an environment imperiling this. To live always entails consequences, and once done, no act of life is ever undone. Sin, failure, foolishness, and everything bad is never forgotten and the mark stays for ever. The inverse is not the case. All of the things we consider virtuous, good,

decent, kind, nice, or any other thing we might associate with positivity, can be forgotten easily. Those things are always under threat, but the bad and the malicious do not face such a threat. Those things that are virtuous are never undone for good, for they did indeed happen, but they are always suspect and things deemed scarce amidst a general rule that life cares little for virtues, beyond what those virtues allow it to get away with in the future. The acts of malice are rarely valued as goods in their own right, but are a means to various ends that entail competition with other life and hostility towards the world. Those things are inherent to life due to life being, in the end, an alien. It is for that reason that miserablism has this persistent appeal, despite a total lack of any rational reason why we should accept such a dogma. The preference of life, if it were to seek its most basic function, would be to mitigate that ruinous practice of competition in favor of literally anything else it could do. Yet, the same surplus that allows life to grow feeds on a natural world, and eventually life finds itself in conflict with life over that natural world, in some way. It might seem nice to envision a world where life coexisted harmoniously, but such a cooperation is not won easily and is never something given freely. It would not withstand the first malevolent actor. In any aim that stems from this condition, where life must contend with a natural world which includes other entities co-opted by life, the growth of life allows for competitive, cooperative, isolationist, pro-social, and various other strategies, and these possibilities are not things life will do by some impulse within it, nor are they things the world will compel of life individually. Life, at its core, is an individual experience and can only be so. If two life-forms are to conjoin, this interplay is not a trivial thing. If it were trivial, then sexual reproduction would not lead to so many tragic mishaps and so much stupidity in sexed life-forms. We need not envision sex filling any special spiritual role, and for many of us males, sex is some sort of cruel joke. After enough rejection, we would rather forget about the matter entirely and find, once again, literally anything else that would be more fulfilling than an act that really means nothing and won't lead to anything good. It is not difficult to see that perpetuation of any legacy is not included in any intent of life. The most basic intent of life is that it persists for a time, and eventually will pass. That passing may be delayed, and perhaps it can be delayed indefinitely, but for as long as life exists, it will face the same questions and it will not arrive at any final resolution by thought alone or any action it would undertake that suggests a singular path to solve the problem of life. The interests of life then are multifarious, but not infinite, and they do not concern so much the impulses of life but what a reasonable life-form would consider interesting, given that they accept the fact that they are alive in this way, and that life entails certain conditions of existence. "Life for life's sake" is pointless in its naked form. A pursuit of death, out of some sense that life itself is the problem, is not just futile given that life re-appears eventually, but doesn't serve any purpose outside of individual sentiments. The death drive exists in many life-forms, but as a way of life, death-worship does not last long. The reason is obvious - to pursue that mission requires the death cultist to stay alive and outlive all rivals, and so the death cultist must pursue life, reproduction, in the most crass way possible to pursue this aim, which has

no more purpose than life itself. Neither of these are really relevant to what life does or what it would see as its genuine interests. It is acceptable enough to life that, at some point, it will no longer exist, and the life-form leaves to the world whatever legacy it does, such as offspring, deeds, or some sense that it changed the world in whatever way it set out to do. Perhaps it is simply enough to have lived, punch in the time in this world, and look to its free time and eventual passing as its journey to another world, where it didn't have to do this.^[2] If we must stay in this world and speak of those interests most evident for the question this book poses, I look at five interests that prevail in life. The first two concern the functions of life to fulfill all interests including the simple interest of living itself, and the competition to preserve life's intent and uphold its genesis, which is sadly what consumes far more of life's effort than it should. The third concerns the general surplus which would be interpreted as a technological interest, by which life-forms assimilate not mere quantities or qualities identified as necessary for survival, but considers new qualities, which correspond to what would be interpreted as knowledge. Even if the life-form is unknowing, its behavior can be seen by other knowing entities as adaptation, in line with some intent of life to adapt to its situation. This interest, though, can happen in isolation, and often does, as the conditions of competition or social obligation undermine the free time and space that allows for this development to occur. The fourth is something that arises from the recognition of life of its situation, and this is an interest which is particular to humans so far as I am aware. It corresponds to spiritual authority and the search for meaning beyond mere technological innovation. The fifth is the recognition, which often occurs in tandem with the emergence of the fourth, of a need to occult information and keep all knowledge private. This fifth interest corresponds to the full comprehension of symbolic language conceptually and the nature of lying and truth, and its development marks the interests becoming things which humans can now expound upon in full, and thus it becomes possible to truly answer questions regarding economic value and exchange as we know it. It should be noted that this schema applies only to living things, and so unliving entities in economic activity have no such apparent interests to speak of. If we were to imagine non-living things in some "economy of nature" the things do not possess any interest to suggest any outcome. We can easily see in nature that exchanges of substantive physical matter entail that a gain for one thing is a loss for another in equal proportion. That rule is not the rule of life itself, for life creates on its own power quantities and qualities beyond the input of the system. Life at its basic level consists of nothing at all, from which something is taken. Definitionally, living systems are always open systems, and based on this view of life as a parasite, they can be nothing else. Life is acutely aware of the nature of substance and its transfer, and so it is easy for living things like us to see in nature a contrast between void and substance. To the world, though, any economic calculation in nature is irrelevant, and there would be no force above the life-forms which has any preference whatsoever. In the model of Darwinian evolution, the "natural selector" is never truly nature, but the life-forms themselves which struggle for life in a game that is modeled after the social practice of war. The war is presented as a simple reality of

natural history which takes place over a given ecosystem, and though this model allows competition and a sense of peace, it is presented through and through as the dominance of an implied war which life must engage in to be "selected" - which is to say, not destroyed by other life, which does so not accidentally but very deliberately for the concept of "selection" to hold true. The questions of this model will arise many times in future chapters.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] There is consternation over whether viruses are "life", and the role of these viruses in living processes like disease. I have little interest in weighing in on a very large question, but will say that this entire "debate", like so many involving the biological sciences, is more ideological than anything else. At heart is a need to defend a paradigm of biology-as-information, which is technocratically controlled and adjudicated by an expert class, and the counter-claim to make biology a political matter under the purview of a different set of experts. None of this entails what a virus actually is or what life is or does. The absurdity of this debate kicked into overdrive with the drama of "COVID", where reasonable people insinuate that if I were to make contact with a diseased vagina that smelled funny, it would not actually transmit disease. On both sides, the matter of viruses, disease, and transmission is changed from an argument about nature, biology, or any concept of what anything does or is, to an argument about some bad moral fiber or who can cajole the world to move in accord with their preferred information. It's insane and I will not stand for such idiocy. It was long understood, though, that a virus is not "living". When life took on a strange moral purpose under the eugenic creed, this was no longer an acceptable answer, because the meaning of life changed from any scientific inquiry into biopolitical dogma at the center of states and institutions. If someone wished to fulfill Malthus' dictum to court the return of the plague, such a fake argument advances it. Reasonable people, like myself, will hesitate before touching diseased body parts, without entering into some ridiculous moral crusade about how she must be a horrible person for being sick, or I would be horrible for doing anything other than shunning her for eugenic purposes. I, unlike these cretins, have some sense of decency and fairness about these things, and I think anyone who has to live with venereal disease or any disease is horrified at this ideological shit-flinging.

[2] It may be decided that those who seek the afterlife do not seek a world after death, but a world outside of conventional awareness or concerns that they contact during life. I do not recommend anyone do this or try to, because doing this incurs great costs, but it is one of the copes desperate people resort to in a society gone horribly wrong. The world as it is does not need to be as it is, but perhaps it is preferable for those who have already gone that far into a different mindset to live in the next life, and consider their time in this world something that will pass. What happens in the next world, contacted through means outside the norm of knowledge and never encouraged by any pedagogy,

can be brought back here in some way. The product of such endeavors is a thing zealously attacked by all who uphold the ruling institutions, because it suggests a world and a way of life that is not beholden to the ruling interests or any of the carrots or sticks used to enforce rule. I will say when the time comes that the hermit, the beggar, and those who simply hold the entire cult of rule, war, and life in contempt are a more pernicious enemy than any revolutionary, whose aim will always be political and thus understandable to others in the great game of ruling. Those who are willing to do the truly desperate things the mad and the foolish do simply to tolerate society present the greatest danger of all, for they would be the most likely to suggest something new that emerged not from predictable mechanisms, but through visions of what we could be and what we could make the world. That outcome would mean, if the madman looks at this world and diagnoses correctly the nature of ruling institutions, chaos that undoes a game that has gone on for centuries, that those who claimed power never wish to see end. It would mean, if it were allowed to truly flourish, that aristocracy would be dead forever, never to return, and at long last an age of the world begins that was not part of any prophecy or scam to push most of humanity into holding pens.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

6. The Interest of Life Itself and Overriding Interest

The all-encompassing aim of life, in whatever it does, is to be able to serve all of its interests and maintain that which it must to continue living. Without this, no other interest and no other outcome of life is possible. This interest is not something which exerts its influence on any other interest, as if there were a genuine tug of war or contradiction in life. None of the interests life holds are truly contradictory by nature. It may be argued that life exhibits contradictory behavior that is peculiar to it. Life, which begins as nothing more than a spark for some reason we do not really know or suggest to be inevitable, is rife with contradictions. Those contradictions are particular to life, rather than the interests it holds. The interest of its own existence has no contradictions at all. For all interests, it is necessary to feed them with inputs that arise ultimately from the process of life. In addition, the most basic processes of life beyond its genesis must be fed raw material, which has nothing to do with any other interest. The other interests are mutually exclusive with each other. All aims that entail luxury and free time impede aims to compete, or aims to grow for spiritual purposes, or aims to develop systems which obscure or push the world by language and thought to do as we would like. The aims of life itself can be sacrificed to any of these interests, or another interest that arises from them, or interests that arise not out of any aim we would find relevant. There are interests other than those that serve our problem of survival and economy, that are not of a spiritual sort subsuming all interests within it and are not a game of trickery that turns into some empty baubles. Those interests do not

exist purely as an exercise of life, but are things pursued because they are seen as moral purposes in their own right, that are not beholden to the economic, spiritual, authority, or any obvious social condition. We do many things in life that entail purposes scarcely known, even to ourselves, and we do them not out of some impulse and not always for a random whim, but because there is in this world and our knowledge of it a sense that something more than a social or economic existence is necessary. I do not concern myself with any of those interests here as they are quite irrelevant to much of our further writing, but they do exist in their own right and do not serve any core interest of life or any want that we should expect or consider default. We could very well choose to subsume our existence to any of the five interests mentioned here, or some combination thereof that would create a balanced human. If we try to play such an economic game with all of our efforts, though, we will please none of those interests, no matter how clever we are in managing inflows and outflows. Before considering other interests, we should consider what is truly necessary for life to live at all, and what the other interests demand from this first interest as if they are owed sacrifice. If we considered life's economy to be nothing more than a resource calculation problem, the solution in any era is trivial, and all other concerns would be obviated. This fails spectacularly to note that life is not actually a point of primordial light or a chaos demon in its developed form, to which all life must regress or degenerate. For life to truly live entails some growth - otherwise, it regresses, withers, and does nothing more than what a manager commands it to do. It is no surprise that ideologies suggesting any such interest of life are favored by managers, and the petty-managers in particular, but do not accomplish a single thing whatsoever and have always been ruinous for anything we would want out of this world. They exist only as a screaming enthusiasm to kill, kill, kill any human that the instinct of a petty manager and the enablers of rot in the human race beyond its norm have always embraced. The degeneracy of the Austrian School and their Nazi friends are just the first symptom of a rot that had long lurked, but which in the age of media and information took on a life that would consume all other ideas wherever it could, and would seek to command all spaces, in celebration of the purest ideal of a Satanic ape that such a religion glorifies. That ideology could not insinuate itself from the mere recapitulation of an empty idea, but must work through mechanisms that are very elaborate and can only be described after considerable explanation of all mechanisms at work. It starts, though, from a problem inherent to the biopolitical conceits that came to the forefront in the 19th century, and idiotic claims pertaining to life that could inhabit institutions.

The beginnings of life in natural history and evolution are not something that must be explained to explain a general process of adaptation from genesis, as if that process were handed down in a single creative event by some managerial hand. We can view the life-form through the most obvious example to any of us, which is ourselves. A process begins at conception, and at first this life is little more than the lucky sperm meeting an egg, so tiny in size that it qualifies as little at all. This early life inhabits some protected space for weeks or months,

depending on the type of life in question. The formation of life from sexual reproduction is something I trust the reader to know the details of by now, but it never fails to amaze me how basic understanding of gestation and the very process of conception and life in the womb is mystified by assholes, doing the same sort of thing mentioned above - lying profusely about basic things in a mechanistic way to shout "retard, retard, retard" at someone selected to die. Any complex life would, from the transmission of seed and any genetic material we acknowledge at conception, develop far beyond its initial size. It must do so to emerge into the world in any condition allowing it to live in any appreciable sense. The nutrients available to the child in the womb, or chicken in the egg, are delivered by the mother's own metabolism, and so the conditions of the mother are jealously protected. An instinct in life is for mothers to be protected by mates and to protect themselves, and if they lay eggs, an instinct to protect nests develops. The impulse to do this did not require so many offspring to die by neglect before some genetic code "programmed" life-forms to do this for inborn purposes. Very likely, the protection of eggs or encasement in the womb made sense for life when sexual reproduction emerged in the living kingdom. It developed in the easiest way it could, and so too would the habits of mating. Those habits did not need to entail the survival of the male or the female, and in many species, the male dies after mating and this is one of life's cruelties and stupidities. The male, after all, is basically worthless in a basic sense once this act of ritual sacrifice called sex occurs. Life, as mentioned, cares little of such externalities as the feelings of men or women in its design, and it could only assert its intent in the means available to its starting conditions. Nothing about complex life suggests many inexorable trends that would make it ubiquitous once an environment can support life. It is more likely the case that smaller organisms, with shorter lifecycles and less effort consumed in competitive pressure, would adapt and mutate in many different directions, be subsumed or normalize into forms that optimized intents that were successful, and death for such simple life appears as little. If life had to develop purely off the principle of fitness in natural selection, it could only have proceeded in the most miserable and laggard way possible.

We see here one of the central tensions that will go on to define the struggle for life. That is that competitive pressures do not enhance in any way life-forms by some virtue of war and struggle, but instead mark the retardation of anything that would allow speciation. The initial process by which anything new can happen could not be the result of dumb luck that is culled by the god of malevolence. Much of life, and this will be observed in any living thing, occurs as simply as it could given what is available to the life-form. There was never a time where this life appeared as if it were a form in a void. Genesis of life in any possible scenario would have operated in the conditions where genesis happened, however it did happen.^[1] Upon genesis, life - and this likely happened at various times in natural history from the coalescence of organic compounds and energetic sources - proceeds by the most primitive intent that allows anything more complex to arise, which develops a new intent, and so on. If this didn't happen, there would

be no species for competition to cull. Any new traits would be impossible except as more freak accidents which happen as "birth defects", and this would eliminate the realities of mating. That is to say, any life-forms that would mate did not do so because of some passive force of nature above life, but because man meets woman or the equivalent for other species. There is a way in which such events happen, rather than it being a thing unfit for print or television and therefore outside of all inquiry. The same is true of everything that would lead up to the moments of struggle. Struggle to be understood is not an inchoate pressing without definition, but comprehensible events which will be recorded.^[2] If there is to be a world of nothing but struggle, it would be because life-forms in some sense choose it, or some agent could create struggle by some working which can be informationally understood. If our prior discussion on information systems is understood, then we know what that agent is, and it implies management of a deliberate sort. Yet, the pressure to struggle incessantly is not found in some organic source, and nearly all evidence of life suggests the opposite. The default is that life is lazy and pursues struggle because it has to, not because of some inborn thirst to fight aimlessly. Those who do proactively hunt do so not to the ends of the Earth but because they see something to gain from the act, and that is how any hunter, up to today's coddled manager who believes he's secretly a Viking warrior, approaches the hunt. The manager does their dirty business because the incentives of superiors insist on it, and the manager's position is where pointless struggle thrives. It is only possible if institutional thought so highly developed is presumed to be in nature itself. A technocratic assumption is placed at the genesis of not just life but all existence, to claim that it is an inexorable rule and the ultimate just-so story.

This struggle is not at all free. Every struggle is an event with definite costs, which must be drawn from the natural world which is known to be finite in resources. The same is true of any other interest outside of struggle, such as the pursuit of knowledge or technology or any consciousness of a higher purpose. It ultimately consumes the very information that would be used to sense this struggle with any information, and retain any symbolic representation of information of ones' own. All of those things cost definite resources, and they are all subsumed in this inchoate struggle which just-so happens. It all ultimately cannibalizes the core processes of life itself, and the end result is the dissolution and degeneration of the organs. That is one thing seen from internalizing the ideology of the eugenic creed. When that was insufficient, it turned to violent biological interventions with drugs and the use of violence, all of it calculated to not merely destroy, but to put the torture on public display to whip public opinion in favor of the creed, not by any reason but by an incessant threat of violence.

There is purpose to struggle in that struggles will occur. The natural resources of the world make such a prospect likely, whether the struggle is fought directly or by indirect means. It is unsurprising that war and struggle are often fought indirectly, rather than in pitched battles. Even so, the cost of denying territory and controlling positions is evident to anyone commanding men to do so. This

would take place in the natural world, but without any strong impulse in life to do so as there wouldn't be any theory in wolves to do this so elaborately. Since this is purely a problem for humans who have this political and economic thought, and never was a great concern in the animal kingdom, I will spend effort focusing on this problem for humans. For animals, the thought of doing other than hunting doesn't occur to them as a reasoned position, because they had done so since time immemorial and this was something life did to feed on the world. Only in the most egregious extremes do animals stay their hand, not out of any probity but because fighting for too long would be exhausting. Only extreme hunger would push an animal to abandon everything. That didn't stop many animals from a willingness to be as nasty as would be normal for a species, but the willingness for deliberate torture has not been observed in any animal. It is common as dirt among humans, who are aware of how to use such methods and for whom it is a founding element in every social system they have known. Whatever the case, there will be at some point finite resources and too many life-forms contesting them, and this can play out in a fight, economic competition, or life mulling around until the food runs out and it has no option but the inevitable one, and whatever happens will happen. There is one truth of the world that imperious scientists will never acknowledge. Terrible random things happen and death claims life not for any lack of virtue but because some asshole decided you were going to die today, and there is nothing to be done about it. In all theories of natural history or history generally, the scientist abhors thoughts that suggest these terrible events happen for reasons that are rationalizable, but that do not fit some preferred schema of behavior where all things operate in a grand, immaculate totality. That has never been the world, but the only other extreme is stochastic events which appear as if they were random. Both mentalities are exploited to confuse those out of the know of conspiracy and the typical mode of politics. It is simple to overcome this, but by disallowing institutional acknowledgement that there are conspiracies, conspiracies to do exactly this are defended, and the thrill of keeping losers out of the know itself becomes a reward. And so, knowledge and technology become allies in the struggle for life, and the key alliance of modernity became clear to enough people. The only problem with this is that the entire biopolitical premise and the theory suggesting this works was based on multiple flagrant lies and things that a child could see through.

At a basic level, mere sustenance of life functions to continue breathing, eating at a basic level in peaceful conditions, and a mostly sedentary life is so cheap that it barely registers. Here we see the thrill of the Malthusian sadist. Whenever there is some basic condition of life that is not merely a quantity but a specific quality, the Sodomites who embrace Malthus take delight in denying specifically that quality. Someone is allowed quantities of meaningless things, to drive home the point that they will be denied specifically any quality that would be necessary for life functions to continue beyond the grimmest and most miserable. The quantities of consumed food are reduced, while food sits unsold in stores. The qualities of food which were once varied are attacked and replaced with Bill

Gates' fake meat that tastes like styrofoam. The quantities of this vague matter are reduced as well. It is the Malthusian and Fabian that Orwell wrote for that did the crimes of falsifying production statistics and cheerily claim that Big Brother increased the ration. This is done not to fool anyone, but to insult the masses and force them to praise Big Brother for starving them. Orwell, in typical clumsy fashion, uses this as a slander against Stalin and the Soviet Union, who could not afford such stupidity even if they wanted to do such a thing. All of this is intended to project the British mental disease onto the world and onto the people. If we did tally the quantities of each quantity which served the functions of life, in a way that was compatible with a generally comfortable if sedentary and placid existence, they would all put together amount to not much at all. This would not be a measure of the barest minimum to claim life functions persist, but would instead be the daily bread, water, and substance like proteins and vitamins that are common fare despite the efforts to denude food supplies. The cost of a healthier living still, where the functions of the body are very effective by useful metrics, is no great expense. At the higher end, health fads and gurus insinuate that healthy living is an aristocratic luxury, but the wise self-taught health nuts with a mind towards the task and some self-awareness have found ways to live well in at least some of the regards that can be known. In any event, human beings know quite well what they would need for their bodies to function, and what they like. This isn't a great confusion.^[3] Because we cannot have the bodies that do everything possible or immortality, there are tradeoffs to make and specializations of one's own form compared to other life-forms of similar type. The idea of "conformity" never really existed as a social value until the technocratic period, where humans were to be standardized in accord with a completely unrealistic model of the "common man", intentionally divorced from historical conditions or any purpose why this model was desirable. Far from it, the common man was described as venal, petty, eager to shmooze and play the game Carnegie played to sell his scams, and an incredulous follower of whatever was put in front of him. Variants would be given to people to suggest with a wink that they could get ahead of some other caste, but they all pointed to the same general idea. The sole exception was the lowest class, for whom "die die die die die" was the model supplied to them, either by shouting the threat outright or providing a model of a living abortion and being told "this is you, forever". In all cases, a model of universality suggests that a common man had to be all things, even things that contradicted other things, and similar models were given to women though usually with different intents in mind. That humans have never been universal in abilities or behaviors in this way would be deliberately suspended as an admissible idea. The idea of eugenics is that difference in ability, or even difference in any sentiment, is inherent, natural, and total political inequality, and if someone did not engage in this sameness, they were insane or stupid or both. Any expression inimical to this standard was treason against eugenics. As time passed, a dual system was promoted. The boundaries of acceptable behavior tightened, as managers and technocrats could demand more sacrifices from the wageslaves. At the same time, all standards were dropped so long as transgressions in some way fed into eugenics or made fools of the

people. Never would those opposing eugenics be allowed to be anything other than fools, and any retaliation against the creed would be ruthlessly punished with a vigor never summoned for any other purpose. The creed made it clear what really ruled and that their enablers will always be sacrosanct. All of this was intended to suggest a default that was amenable to a eugenic society, and that any variation meant falling short of the universal standard. It had long been known that humans are distinct in ability and manners, come from distinct races and religions, and will do different things. What was under attack was a democratic idea where distinctions in ability did not entail political punishments, and superior ability was rewarded not with political privileges denied to the commoners but with esteem and due compensation. The rule of a democratic society was that those with ability would be highly regarded and promoted, but no more, and that the objective would be for anyone to contribute in whatever way they could. An aristocracy reverses this. In aristocracy, the able praise themselves for their personal austerity and flaunt luxuries as a grand status symbol, making out of a lump of horseflesh great prestige. This is only possible through the punishment of the masses, who are told they are unworthy of anything their so-called betters gave them. This is done as the exploitation of most of the people is intensified, and aristocrats make a point of visibly working less, while sending managers and petty-managers to terrorize the democratic entity in total.

We see how managerialism continually both underestimates the peoples' wants and invents spurious qualities that they should want, like a mother insisting a kid like food he finds disgusting but that his mother prefers. This distortion is always evident because life and the world both exist in flux, and information is never perfect. It is also a simple reality that as the situation of a life-form changes, so will its basic wants and what it can do. As life progresses, values to aspire to will change. The wants of a child who does not know much about the world are much different from a middle-aged adult, and they encounter a different situation than an elder close to the end of their natural life. This is not something entailed by struggle or society, but it is simply the reality of life in any situation it could be in. Nothing about the intent of life suggests that these needs or wants are fixed for the purpose of optimizing the functions of the body. As mentioned, specialization of life-forms is common and typical. The expectation of uniformity was never thoroughgoing in the sense it was during the 20th century, and that was a product of very particular conceits about society and humans that were intended to advance a eugenic belief that believed that humans were permanently and hereditarily unequal and thus politically unequal. Past uniformity of humans in society was premised not on any such eugenic purpose, but was premised on both the need for functions in some institution that were substantive needs, and many organizational tactics operating with mass formations where specialization had to be limited and manageable. In a phalanx or a legion, the soldiers must fit specifications appropriate to the formation for the concept to work. For the phalanx, the soldiers were equal in function and the formation relied upon it. For the legion, specializations were

measured both by the military science of the Romans, which changed as the tactics of the legions were revamped by commanders and by the availability of auxiliaries. The use of combined arms is demonstrated from Alexander onward and the Romans are experts at co-opting this and adapting any military tactic to their situation, which changed considerably during the centuries. Outside of the military, little effort at standardizing the subjects was taken or desirable. Slaves were often specialized in their functions rather than general purpose slaves, and any balanced development in slaves or freedmen was not seen as relevant to anyone except the slave or freedman in question. The merchants and men who hoped to rise only had to conform to the expectations of what thou shalt not do, rather than any standard that was upheld as the default. There were acts deemed meritorious and acts deemed shameful, but the meritorious professions were by their nature exclusive and access to them was limited. One usually rose by being a great military officer or a great orator and lawyer, both of which suggest the typical path to merit was through the state and violent professions. Bureaucrats, state-supported scholars, priests which often merged spiritual and temporal power of the state, and a number of other professions were paths to merit in different societies. We see here that the drive for sameification as an ideal was historically driven by military demands, but those demands had less to do with some economic ideal and more to do with those demands suiting some purpose for the societies. Generally, societies desired to produce fighting men and those fighting men would be the politicians and professionals, and this pattern is observed both in civilized and barbarous societies, adapted to the forms of their societies.^[4] The militarization of the whole society was not merely undesirable, but a dangerous development. Democratization meant that mass armies became the norm, and in their place aristocratic command of society in total would assert itself out of the conditions that expression of democracy created. That is, the language of patriotism and society would be used to uphold a wildly outrageous aristocratic project on every front, and a faux version of "military efficiency" would be praised in the productive sector, which really just served to install managers, petty-managers, and administrative staff that served eugenics above all, with absolute disdain for the people and any concept that the state or the institutions were obligated towards any defensive purpose. This militarization is only a pretext for a new war against any democratic force at all, and has been conducted with that in mind. In typical aristocratic military fashion, the war is a series of blunders waged by grunts and officers with low morale and reveling in atrocity for its own sake.

For every interest which is taken on, new requirements are added first to maintain the interest itself, and then to maintain the life functions of a body capable of handling them. These interests did not need to be induced to change anything in the core interest. It would be enough for someone to change their body for reasons of life itself, or because that was something they wanted to do. Competing interests never ask nicely for these changes, no matter how cordial the conversation may be and however the competing interest can be sold as your own or the interest of life. This is not merely a question of social self-interest

giving way to the interests of others in society. Competing interests pull the life-form itself in different directions, and this includes interests that appear innocuous and not involved in any of the interests mentioned here. Often the way these interests are sold is that someone is told this IS in the interest of life, and we might tell ourselves that when the matter concerns our life or our person with the interest. When it comes down to it, though, these interests compete with the basic interest of life itself, which is to simply be able to live as a life-form would please. The biological faculties require rest, nourishment, and recreation at the least, and may seek growth not for any interest but because such an exercise is pleasing to it and becomes a habit or hobby. We often do things that appear to serve an alien interest not for the interest, but because we like it. The sadist embraces the interest of struggle and the eugenic interest not so much for a eugenic purpose, but because the eugenic interest - both in the purer form I will write of next chapter and Galtonite eugenics as the ruling institution today - is a great vehicle to do what the sadist always wanted to do in the first place. If eugenics did not exist, or there weren't an interest in drugs or sex or some other culture were sadists thrive, they would invent a culture or a pretext that enables this core want. All of our other interests ultimately derive from us wanting to do them at some level, or believing that doing them is better than the alternative, so long as those interests were genuinely our own. When the interests of other life-forms or institutions are imposed, the sense is much different, because none of that was intrinsically what we wanted to do. There may be those with a desire to serve others in some way, or who enjoy relating with other life-forms not in the sense that social information is great but because the actual company with other humans is a good time and they are willing to give a little to gain the shared experience. There are certainly those who join institutions and see them in some way as a force for good in the world that outlives them or any particular person. It is always the case though that to pursue any of those, we must live not just in principle, but live in a way that allows any of this to happen. In short, life can only live if it is ALLOWED to live, and this is often forgotten. The idea that someone shouldn't ask permission to live is missing the point that no one can live if another life-form believes it is their god-given right to disallow you to live. It is even more harrowing when not just another life-form but large institutions will scream at maximum volume "die die die die die" and the great cycle of ritual sacrifice and absolute humiliation begins. There aren't many humans alive today who don't see that when it is coming, and we've always known this is what humans were when all is said and done. The thing keeping us alive and hopeful is that we hold on to some fool's hope that, whatever humans really are, we have to be something else if we would like this existence to entail anything other than an endless orgy of sacrifice and lurid cults.

If it is concluded that the sacrifice must continue out of some belief that it is human nature, and that it is forbidden to even walk away from it with what space one can keep, then this leads to some very obvious moral decisions for those who face the Satanic cycle. At the very least, the life-form will have no reason

to ever work with another human again, and will feel no particular purpose to not doing to the Satanic race of apes whatever is expedient to put down such an abomination. That would become an incontrovertible fact the moment it is accepted that a right of absolute predation is sacred and enshrined in law. Whether the damned life-form to be humiliated will see any point to retaliation for its own sake doesn't change that, in moral principle, the life of those who would revel in such a sacrifice and torture is no longer of any value. This, as you probably guess, is intended. The Malthusian wishes to impose their sick perverse mindset on anyone else, and by repeating transgression and glorifying torture, it places the rest of the human race immediately on the defensive and suggests to the subjects that they must always react to the Satanic entity lording over them. Not only do the sadists not care that you would gladly kill them at the first opportunity, but they want you to think that, and then tell you with a laugh that "hatred is wrong", as if hatred of such an abomination were itself a sign of weakness. They want you to be pushed to violence in some rash scenario, which they gamed in such a way that the sadist is never a target. The moment that sense of hatred is detected is enough to start an inquisition and any insinuation the sadist wants. Simply by reveling in torture and glorifying sacrifice and thrill of doing so, the sadist gains for free incredible advantage. The only danger in doing this would be a revolt unlike any humanity has sustained, in which a terrible retribution reverses the entire history of the human race. Since they bank on that never happening, the glorification of torture will continue indefinitely. The worse conditions get for the subjects, the stronger the hand of the sadist, and the more their values are impressed on everyone else as inevitable and inexorable. All of this is calculated to the smallest detail, with great enjoyment in the entire process of those who are safe from the ritual sacrifice. Such is what the human race chose to be, and now it is absolute. The only question, if any, is what the rest of us, who do not stand to benefit from this in the end, do. The sadism is not merely a question of struggle and the eugenic interest, as if it were a reactive strategy of the sadist or something pursued with crass reasons as humans have long done. All technology, all knowledge, all spiritual thought, and the most minute expression of language and information must conform to the sadist's vision of the world. There are of course many known defenses against this transgression, and the expression alone does not grant the sacrifice any true power in nature, spirituality, or anything worthwhile. It is a well-known geist that is conjured time and time again, used in humanity's incessant intericine conflict with its own race and in siege tactics in developed form. There are only so many torture chambers that can be created and enacted, and so much propaganda that can be spewed to advance such an odious plan. The difficulty is with the nature of "defense", which already presupposes a reactive stance.

The only real way to defend against this is to never let it start, and make clear before it begins the consequences of escalating such a strategy. This, in the highest form, escalates to a simple declaration I have made and come to internalize fully.

"If you unwilling to destroy the world for your cause, then you are not serious."

That is the only endgame of the strategy of tension, and the truth of its power lies not in any inherent value of violence or the symbols which are granted the power of idols. It is not inherent to any knowledge or technology^[5] which would bring the destruction. No known weapon or deployment would come close to actually exterminating all human life, nor is such a plan the desire of any who rule. The threat of death is never a general slaughter to summon at will, but a plan from above that would arrange the peoples of the world in sacrifice pits, as elites and intellectuals and all those selected to live move to secure bunkers and make sure to lock the sacrifices in the cities. After the nukes fly, all those selected to live walk out, having eliminated their sworn enemy above all others. Those fleeing to the countryside would be disparate and face a phalanx of trained experts who they have, in one way or another, supplicated to for a century at the time of this writing. The conservative has always been a slavering dog, reveling in self-abasement and being trained to follow any incentive with the most blatant psychological conditioning, and those people were seeded in the countryside to terrorize anyone, being aware enough that this would be the general outcome if the option of "destroy the world" were imposed. For the ruling interest, it would not be the nuclear weapons or some novel technology that destroyed the world. It would not be some AI-driven tyranny turning those selected to die into gray goo. The will to destroy the world was nothing less than a thoroughgoing mission that anyone who truly aspired to rule would have known to be on the table from the moment they set eyes on power. To wield that threat effectively, it must be held that only those who rule can make this threat openly, and they do so often enough. In earlier times, the drive for war and celebrations of glory were all efforts to do what nuclear weapons do today. A Roman triumph, with ritual sacrifice on the spot for the masses, is a sign to all who would dare oppose the consul and the republican spirit - "if you dare to fight us, we will do this to you and enjoy every second of it". Public executions, hangings, humiliations of the traditional ritual sacrifices of the retarded, were open and signs of pride. They could only be part-done in the past. Not once would these leaders have considered a true limit to their ambition, when it came down to what it meant to rule. If someone stepped down from office and retired, it could only be done so long as he saved face and went down in history as good. Whether he got that was another question, but to be humiliated and lose face in life was worse than death to anyone who wished to play this game. It is the same in any human society, from the civilized to the barbarous, and it is true in savage society in the small ways that honor and pride can impose fear in such a world. The reason why is because it is the ultimate development of life's prime and overriding interest. If life must be able to actually live, then nothing short of total death can be proposed in defense of that life. If the line for defending life is anything less, than those who are willing to go to that length will always be willing to play that card. If you the subject say from the start that you cannot cross that line out of fear alone, then you have lost before you set out to do anything. If that is ever something you are made to publicly admit, it is a mark of great shame and self-abasement. It suggests to any sadist and those who rule that you are fair game, and the process of cattlefication can begin. It is by this mentality that the

great hunt begins, which became herding and then the enslavement of animals. If that is established, then it does not take long to make the obvious connection that this can be done to humans too, if the right pressures are introduced to make it happen. Whether you will actually destroy the world, or can do so, is not relevant. There are those who will accept the shame of being humiliated and give up power for reasons they might hold dear, but the moment they even think that there is a line where they will give up, any asshole thinking to transgress to the maximum will know they can push, and they will do so. No decency has prevented a politician from doing what politicians do, and politics in any form is not a nice game.

Most of us will never be able to seriously make this threat, and I don't suggest you go out thinking this if you aren't willing to back it up. Unless you have an army and a means to fund it, you probably shouldn't talk like this. Those who attach to this mentality because it suits them usually do not have their own army, but they see the army of some great man (and it will always be a man) and attach to that man sycophantically. It is an instinct inherited from the ape world. Such people have an instinctive sense of sucking up to power. I would compare it to the Orks of Warhammer 40k lore who have a psychic sense of who is "bigga", but I would not besmirch the good name of the Ork by comparing Orks to these people. It is those who rush to supplicate who make the threat of transgression that much worse. In a decent world, such supplication would be met with a spanking.^[6] If it weren't for the large number of enablers, who respond to sadism not so much out of fear or necessity but with some sick admiration and magnetism towards sadists, our problem today would not be what it is. Those who start the cycle of humiliation against someone would be met with glares of absolute contempt, simply by the threat posed by such actions. Those who were downtrodden would be allowed to restore dignity, not out of kindness or mercy but because of an understanding of all in society that glorifying such behavior leads to a conclusion humanity has known the whole way through. Even if someone didn't like the downtrodden, a reasonable person would not look at the victim as the source of any serious problem, particularly if the downtrodden lacks any lever to even present a significant threat. A sense of proper mathematical scale and proximity of cause and effect would tell this to anyone.^[7]

The tax from the technological interest itself, if it is unfettered by the conditions of struggle from society, is that knowledge and the ideas it portends to, and the contemplation of meaning which is a vast undertaking, promotes absent-mindedness and leads someone to lose grounding in the reality of life, which would be necessary for the overriding interest. Even if technology is necessary, an obsession with knowledge and meaning leads to a denuding of more base level knowledge, and the body adapts to technology and knowledge more than its genuine situation. This is a complex problem which will be revisited in a later chapter.

The tax from the spiritual interest is much the same, but with a different

set of failings. Rather than bookishness or obsessive curiosity or too much contemplation, the spiritual devout tends to become a true believer, fanatical in search of some holy truth and often looking outside of life or reality for answers. This would be necessary, as spiritual authority always arises from a source outside of life and its wants. It does not require much insight to see that the human condition of struggle, which occurs in large part because we are living things, is generally bad and futile. Many times those seeking spiritual authority do not find a way out, but run headlong into an even worse form of cults, with greater struggle sessions and intensification of dark knowledge.

The tax from the occult interest is fairly clear - symbols and esoteric deception work against anything in life that would be useful in a meaningful sense, which has no regard for such games. Here we see another tax that is intensified. Simply by making someone remember so many details of obscure knowledge to get by in society, so many laws that are designed to confuse and unwritten laws and taboos, it becomes increasingly difficult to live as we would want. This constitutes a considerable tax on the demands of life, simply by suggesting in coded language that the conspiracy against a life-form is everywhere and there is no knowing where it will strike next. Fear, uncertainty, and doubt is an old strategy, used by all secret societies and secret police. It is used by cults to befuddle anyone who would frustrate their exterior activities, and within cults to inculcate the initiates in a whole world apart from life and meaning, but also lock them away from any interest that was outside of cultism and any standard approach to the world. The symbols of the occult and lust for vanity become more important than what we actually wanted out of any of this.

Finally, there is an overriding interest of life. When push comes to shove, all interests give way to a truth about life. That is that life does not what we would wish it to do, but what it will do. Life and knowledge are separate, and the demands of life work against our concepts of ourselves and the need for autonomy. In some sense, life works against our sense of self, and does so in the name of both life and the self that life through its actions generated. There is no force that truly commands life at all levels. The hardware of life may be commanded, such that a brain shocking chip is installed to push life to obey. This is likely to be nothing but another torture device. Life as the original intent and spirit is very stubborn against resistance, and this includes the intrigues of other life-forms. If the command of life were so easy and natural, there would not be this much expense spent struggling to command it. For all the expense, we continue to live and in many ways all of these machinations only extend to controlled spaces. Simply by refusing to play that game for as long as possible, and refusing to align with clearly ruinous social practices, the efforts to command life underway now can be stymied significantly. This requires little energy in of itself. The factors working against it are numerous, but at a basic level, the intent of life resists domination. This is something common to animals out of necessity, whatever their sociality and arrangements of servility. Life with a natural inclination to serve can only do so in a few ways that are predefined. That is why the efforts to command life in this managerial way have always

resorted to the bottom of the barrel and the worst of humanity. Those are the only traits that can be commanded easily, and elevating those traits has an effect of promoting the worst in the whole society.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] There are beliefs that life is so uncommon it was likely originated on another planet, and by meteors traveled to Earth. I will not weigh in on that with any finality, but suggest that if life is uncommon in the universe, it would be even more uncommon for the one planet with life to strike a random planet like Earth out of all of the planets, or for ejected meteorites to be common enough to spread life given the irregularity of its appearance. It would make more sense if life appears much as life grows, and this is the prevailing belief. That is that life appeared in the geologic period where it was first possible, almost as soon as it was possible. That suggests any process bringing life into existence from raw matter is probably common. We are hampered today because the faith in genetics insinuates that life can only exist with genetic material to "seed the cosmos", and this is more of the eugenic religion than anything that would be necessary for life as a process described here to begin.

[2] The "pressing of the nerve of power" that is the philosophy of struggle and eugenics is cognizant of this in full. Darwin's thinking is premised on Lamarck's theory of acquired characters rather than the later genetic theory, because at the time it was plausible. And so, it is clear in Darwin's thinking, where political thought is imported into natural history, that the Malthusian selection process is something done after all such acquired characters would develop in life and pass to pffspring in the way I describe. The two work off each other. The acquisition of traits would be the initial force by which species diverge, and the struggle for life would cull intermediate forms and numbers, which compete in the same niche. This thought has been elaborated upon since then by those who took the matter of natural history seriously. Genetics would only be able to trace the hereditary traits, and did not have in of itself any explanatory power. The reason for forcing genetics into this was purely political. The origins of any gene would themselves be something that arose by living processes. Genetics would describe only the transmission of seed material, rather than "drive evolution". Mendel's original theory specifically forestalled any talk that evolution in the Lamarckian sense was possible, and suggested life could only exchange pre-existing information from some state that was created - in other words, a God did it. The philosophical sleight of hand here is not a genuine scientific claim anyone made, but arose as a way to rescue the eugenics movement and ensure it's imperial form was victorious over any other. What is done here is to take every resource that would be in the interest of life itself, including anything new, and consume it in pure, meaningless struggle. The implications are clear - that the struggle would choke the basic living conditions of life itself, and choke the whole of the surplus that life would access. In other words, "War is Peace" - because the Peace is pure death. It has worked with predictable results, foreseen when it was advanced as

a ruling idea first among the screamingest reactionaries. The German philosophy, flipped on it heads by Marx and appropriated by the reactionaries, turned up into down and effect into cause, and did so with full knowledge that it would consume all that exists in struggle and shouting over retarded shit.

[3] Enter Maslow's "hierarchy of needs", a direct assault on the peoples' former sense of their wants and desires. Now, the concept of self that many people held would be replaced with a technocratic model, placing specifically the impulses favorable to the new ruling institutions at the base of human needs, while placing basic concepts of the self relating to nature at an unreachable pinnacle which can be with-held from the subject. The idea is that the new technocratic subjects would need to beseech the institutions for approval, and be told by the experts that their lives were good by some alien standard. This is combined with habitual lying and confusion about basic health and anatomical facts, done deliberately to disorient a sense of themselves that the common workers held. Adoption of the new mores of the expert class was upheld as a vehicle for social advancement, with the implication that sharing the values of a narrow sector of the bourgeoisie was obligatory and associated with general intelligence. That none of these values worked, and usually left the subjects miserable and empty inside, was intended from the start. As this was done, the people would be violently stripped from their past, and the eugenic creed institutionalized outliers who would be too troublesome or were simply unsightly to their moral values.

[4] The 20th century promoted a parodic exaggeration of military efficiency, but without any actual war to fight. When wars were serious, the side that represented a democratic mass army, usually out of necessity, fought with determination, and the side representing aristocratic militarization fought in ass-backward manners with the intent of punishing their own soldiers, usually drawn from the lower classes and sacrificed as yet another gift to the eugenic creed. The democratic armies, in the end, would have to relent, not by any virtue of aristocratic strategy or tactics but because the empire could afford to continue wars no matter how many were sacrificed for such an odious cause as aristocracy. To speak of the armies as representing "democracies" in the liberal or any sense is not identical to the basis of the armies - that is, that the armies associated with communist countries were usually drawn from the men and women who had to fight because the fight had come to them. Yet, the countries they fought also used mass armies drawn from the men of fighting age, where conscription was the law, and they usually entailed some form of democratic government or at least the regime could enforce mass loyalty and made some pretense that the government was comprised of the people. The most evident exception of the Nazis still relied on a nationalist conception of the "volk" to justify everything the Party did, and faced little difficulty with conscription until the bitter end. The distinction had always been that aristocratic mindsets are a terrible way to conduct war and conduct society generally. They could only prevail because the weight of human society had turned towards aristocracy in a way that was nearly impossible to stop, no matter how incompetent the aristocrats were at actually fighting anything. The United States could in theory have stayed in Vietnam indefinitely

and the Vietnamese expected that to be the outcome. It would be in the end decided not by any valor, because that is not how any war in human history has been settled. It would be decided instead by powerful aristocrats wining and dining, setting up what would become the new world order in the 1970s after enough fighting and turmoil allowed Nixon to get his way and the world would go along with it - or else.

[5] This idea that technology has an ineffable power, found in Marshall McLuhan's work on communications theory among other things, is the go-to trope of futurists and a sincere belief of the eugenic creed. I would not throw shade on McLuhan here, who is making a very prescient point about the nature of communication given the knowledge at his time, and made very clear what communication in the past century meant for war and society. There are many reasons WHY the medium has the power of sending messages on its own, and by its mere existence places all life and social actors on notice that something new is possible. This power is not inexplicable, as it is often reduced to, and any serious investigation of social psychology going back to the early 20th century makes it clear the men suggesting this is possible have very elaborate thought to suggest they can indeed do what they're about to do. It did not need to be born out of some inexplicable sadistic urge to do so, but it was done because it worked, and history had shown that such approaches were the only thing that could work. The only question was how far this pressure could go, and whether there would be a breaking point where the ruled simply refuse to play any longer and do things the thought leaders would not expect. The Marxist view of history is that science is the driver of history, and with new technology come changes in economic activity. This science and thus technology in my view has never been a passive process nor a thing proceeding by some inexorable or unknowable force. The qualities pursued in science and the technology that is allowed to exist is a thing chosen by those who hold the levers, and this is not merely a question of who holds money. The Marxist view did not have a conception of the systems thought I reference often or any theory of emergence, and often used the political language of contradiction to hint at what they really were saying. The liberals were able to take that theory from Marx and fit it into a different view of the world, but did so in a way that elided the origin of technology in actual humans. It instead placed technology and science as the domain of the ruling interest and aristocracy, and so by controlling that, it would be possible to control all of the relevant levers of wealth, promotion, and so on that could feed that interest. It helped that this was something the smart capitalists knew to be the future. No capitalist with any sense has ever been a technophobe, and futurism was the great craze that rose alongside eugenics.

[6] And this is why you aren't allowed to spank or belt your kids.

[7] And this is why destroying all standards of comparison and scale is deliberate, beyond merely the informational confusion this creates. The informational confusion works not because the rational process cannot process the information, but because of this impulse in life which isn't rational at all.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

7. The Eugenic Interest and the Proprietor

So far in this writing, I have referred to "eugenics" with nothing but the utmost contempt. For this chapter and this chapter only, I wish to drop that to speak of the "eugenic" interest generally, or the interest of life in good genesis and the defense of its original intent. For reasons that might become clear, "eugenics" of the modern variety has little resemblance to any good birth or intent, as its purpose has been entirely negative towards an enemy population, and its advocates have little merit or evidence of "good genes" or "good birth" to show for all the nightmares they have created. The eugenic interest in life is by its nature a hostile one, though not without certain merits. It is expected for life to protect its original mission and seek out conditions to repeat itself. The typical aim of the eugenic interest of life is to arrest the procession of events so that the original intent of the form may spread, and so it concerns itself with amassing quantities of itself, and all qualities and associated quantities of them that affect this struggle. It is not necessarily an interest in hostility that concerns other life-forms at all, and it is like all of life's interests at a base level a selfish interest. The eugenic interest is aligned with the social institution of property, and since politics and states concern themselves with property more than anything else in history, it is almost always found among the holders of the state, and thus the aristocracy. It usually requires struggle to arrest history, as the typical procession of events in the world is to move forward and adapt rather than arrest and attack that which is deemed a threat to pure intent. In many ways, the eugenic interest, though it fits second in the schema I have chosen, resembles more the primordial light than the first interest of life in its own sake. Life for its own sake, once it begins its procession, is on its own and must live in the world of the present. The eugenic interest, though it only appears in earnest as life develops enough form to constitute itself persistently and with longer lifespans, appears in the first case for no other reason than the difficulty for something new to arise in extant systems of greater complexity. This tendency is counteracted by life as it attains mobility and must, in various ways, adopt technology and knowledge and make active decisions rather than passive ones. The eugenic interest also aligns with managerialism, which concerns less technology or any science that commands information. The eugenic interest today is extremely hostile to science in the sense it used to be practiced, and this is one of the great weaknesses of the present alliance of eugenics, property, capital, science, and intellectual mystics.

I refer to the "eugenic" interest not as a reference to genetic material, but to the conditions of genesis in total. That is, it is implied in life's intent that its genesis suggests the future of life, for life-forms cannot change their past and the genesis is the first indicator of what this thing, life, will do. It is for this reason that general theories of the origin of life and the conception of every new

life-form become so controversial, and why the question of evolution from prior life-forms took on the importance it did. Assertions of genealogy are seen in many religions, like Judaism and religions referring to it. Sin at conception is omnipresent throughout the concept of Christianity and Islam, for whom the question was not merely a question of individual sin but a doctrine regarding human nature which has been the great argument for why Christians believe and do what they do. This concept of original sin is not merely informational, as if it were possible to adjudicate in a scientific model how much sin was inherited and who gets to be among the elect. It is not a great secret that according to the religion, nearly everyone who exists is sinful, or every human being is sinful and absolutely depraved. This matter is debated to determine how evil humans are according to one church leader or another, but it is universal among Christians that all of mankind is sinful and, if they believe in the concepts of Hell or damnation, mankind is cursed to burn and suffer forever in this world and the next. Only an elect, a small number of people, are chosen to receive God's favor, and this is only made clear at some time in the future, which is foreseen and prophesized. A few believers will prepare for this coming by throwing away their possessions and entering into some congregation that is preparing for the Big Happening, like a fascist rally waiting for the event where all is revealed.^[1] The interest is obvious - who controls the past controls the present, and who controls the present controls the future. This is very different from the formulation of Ingsoc, where controlling the present controls the past, or the formulation of Eugenics in its full form, where they claim to control the future and do so by claiming the future was predestined by the past, so the present can be obliterated in total. There is in recognizing temporality always a claim to grant temporal authority legitimacy, and the genesis of anything is the most obvious candidate for this. For life in particular, this is acutely felt, because life in its most basic genesis is nothing but a chaotic disturbance, a thing born seemingly in conflict with the general procession of the world, which cares not about any knowing concept of authority. This concept would appear to non-living knowing entities as something absurd, for the world would be recognized as something doing whatever it does, and we just live here. Spiritual authority generally does not stake its claim on any temporal period, but on something which is outside of the normal procession of time or any historical claim. History to spiritual authority is a thing to be recognized not as legitimate on its own grounds, but something with explanatory power to explain why the world is as it is today.

History to personal authority of ourselves is merely a recognition of the environment, and nothing more. It makes no inherent difference to us what happened in the past, or who claims the present. For our personal experience, the future is yet to be claimed by anyone, and we look to the future not as something pre-ordained by a thought leader but as all of the potentials we would possess. The future for us is not a thing confined by definitions of life or the intent or genesis. Merely by living in the world, we accept that this life co-opts the non-living to continue. For personal purposes, life-forms can accept that there is more to life than life itself, and that life entails co-existence with the non-living,

the void, and eventually the end of life. To sense death or the presence of the non-living does not itself violate what it means to live or the core intent of life. It is only in society, where command of others and the world is contested, that life takes on this meaning that to our individual experience is quite strange, even as living entities. It would not need to be so. Society will out of necessity value life differently from entities for whom life is their genuine condition, for society itself as an informational construct or an idea in our minds does not truly live nor die. Society to be society commands life, just as life exists by possessing something substantive. While society has a greater basis in a real world than life, for society exists as information pointing to real events and life at a basic level is just a sense of life's intent which appeared for no necessary reason, society's treatment of life is very alien to what life-forms like ourselves understand intuitively, given some faculty of knowledge that allows the question to be asked or sensed in some primitive way.

It is the meaning of genesis and its implications that is defended more than the actual origins of life. It is not important to any interest if humans derived from monkeys or were created out of dirt or clay by God, as if the material were somehow spiritually important. The real question asked is the intent evident in genesis. An origin in Darwinian evolution suggested that humanity was the product of interline warfare and some error of nature, and it was the interline warfare implied by the export of Malthus to nature that made Darwinian evolution offensive. Otherwise, the origin of life being the result of gradual changes from one species to another had no intrinsic conflict with the intent that the story of Genesis in the Bible conveyed. The Biblical story of creation almost entirely treated the origin of non-human life as an afterthought, and the purpose of the story in Genesis was to explain the origin of Man's mind and spiritual orientation, more than a theory of natural origins and chemistry which suggested that God "encoded" humanity to act in certain ways. If that were the case, then any story of Man's free will would be nonsensical, as would the story of serpents corrupting Woman and Woman corrupting Man, which tells a very particular story of why we wound up this way.^[2] Living creatures to proceed through life entail history, and living knowledge would be particularly attached to concepts of historical progression compared to a "neutral knower" for whom the procession of events is merely a question of facts. History for living entities is a matter of their intent being followed, and a condition of survival. Without a future, the intent of life from present and past is meaningless. Without a past, there is no indicator of what the present is or what the future could be. All three must be held as meaningful not just as facts but as things which allow life to have immediate purpose. The purposes and intents of life are not confined to this temporal procession, and it is not a rule that this procession of events follows any inexorable tendency that must be obeyed. Those who treat history as inexorable historical progress seek to capture the whole line of procession from past to future and arrest it. Invariably, the genesis of intent, or claims about it, are the ultimate past from which all futures must derive, and the eugenic interest in life seeks to make that genesis stand. It may stand

as an absolute, which the life-form defends to the bitter end, or it may be a recognition of some truth of what the life-form is and will do, to which it is beholden whether it would like to be or not. What can never truly happen is a rewriting of the past, as if life were actually ignorant of history. If there is a taboo against acknowledging the past, someone will recall the genuine past and use it as leverage against any other life-form. This is an inescapable consequence of life itself, for life as a process starts with some intent from its genesis. If it changes its intent or becomes something else, it is still beholden to its genesis in some way. Humans today inherit the legacy of their forebears and would do well to remember it, even if they do so with disgust at what we were and have been for so long. The depraved revel in past atrocities and seek to repeat them, and have always sought an "End of History" where they never face accountability ever or the threat of anyone who will tell them no. Those who defend the decent and good often turn to the past when they see a present dominated by the wicked, and a future where "die die die die die" is shouted by the wicked who believe for good reason they will triumph. The decent face the difficulty of attempting to change the world in some way, given what history has been. The false hope given to the decent is that the present and future can be different if the past is ignored, while any example of decency in the past is systematically destroyed or, worse, turned into a vehicle for the wicked to advance their predation. The wicked defend their past strength while editing out reference to any weakness or mistakes, or anything that would make the truth public knowledge. When the truth comes out, the eugenic interest encourages the most brazen hypocrisy. There is no charity or kindness for a truthful admission of failure. This arises not because it is politically sensical. The lies to protect politicians eventually become so obvious that it destroys the political settlement.^[3] It arises because this defense of the eugenic interest in life is inherent in some way for life to constitute itself.

How much this interest consumes the resources life siphons and the functions of life itself compared to its other interests may vary, but it is always evident because it is impossible for life to escape its past, and it will have some future until it dies. The present, on the other hand, need not be a trap for life. That is a choice in the end. There is nothing in the present that is within life that pushes it like a hobgoblin to do anything. In the present, we are free to act as any faculty available to life will allow. What is not possible is for life to act in conditions which it has no prior condition to draw from, nor is it possible for life to forestall the future forever. This procession of life as an event from conception to its passing or transformation to something else is not a rule of all nature or knowledge itself. It is a procession life in particular entails. In the present, life looks to its future, given its memory of the past. More particularly, life looks to its holdings.

It is thus that the eugenic interest of life entails its property. Property conceptually must draw not from the moment, but from past claims. Those claims ultimately derive from a birthright or genesis which claims that it is an entity that can claim property. The origin of property is not in nature or any process

in the world regarded as scientific or informational, but in life's genesis and its claim to history. Property exists not as a present fact at all, but claims which are recorded and can only be recorded as something in the past. Property suggests future claims will remain valid because they were documented in the past, and until property is challenged, there is no force in the world to suggest property would vanish. Life's claim to property is not at heart a legal convention freely ignored, as if the property were just a fiction to be violated freely. If property is violated, it can only be violated by active measures. This of course is entirely possible and happens all of the time. Property is never an absolute of nature, nor is property a commitment life will defend in all cases to the death. Many times property is abandoned, and in the end, death of the life-form is the end of its living claim to property. Upon death, property will either become *terra nullius* or something similar, or it will pass to some other living successor, or an institution that is created by living entities. The concept of the non-living holding property in this sense is only possible if the non-living are institutions with a valid right to do so in the minds of the living. If we were to imagine a society of robots, for whom existence does not entail any eugenic interest, then property rights appear as some absurdity. Nothing in the natural world mandates any property right, prevents property from violent seizure, or suggests the deed to property would not be violated at the first opportunity someone else decides they will take the deed, cross out the institutional name of the claimant, and declare that the institutional name of someone else now commands property. The right to property being institutional in the law today is not a state of affairs that was at all natural, nor is it the intent of the law to make property nothing more than a convention of social institutions, in a way that suggests that life wouldn't really want or need property. Property to be meaningful is in the first case a claim of life to its past and birthright. Absent any institution other than oneself, a life-form will see its claim to the past as valid and defend it for reasons that are not difficult to understand. Living things do not abandon their home, their livelihood, or the food they intend to eat so their life can continue. That is the reason why any institution regarding property rights could exist in the first place. Property as purely an institutional convention is meaningless, and very often the law's involvement in property and disputes over it specifically mediates the claims of living entities to property. That claim of of the institution adjudicating property rights itself implies there is a living entity somewhere in the institution that itself claims power to make this judgement - that is, there is someone that holds imperium, or power of life and death. It is with imperium that the legal institution as we know it can originate, so far as it rests on temporal authority as it must do to be able to enact anything the institution does. If the law were merely an intellectual or scientific matter, judged not by laws of men but by "The Science", it ceases to be law. Because that intellect and science is itself commanded by living men and women, such a declaration is tantamount to declaring that the intellectual or scientist holds this imperium. That is effectively what Galton's Eugenics did declare in their "Jehad" - that eugenic law would overwrite all other law, and do so on the basis of eugenic property rather than private property, public property, or any other claim to

property. It is a claim to property that can be made because property itself is rooted in this interest of life, which stems ultimately from its genesis. It was for this reason that the matter of heredity, which really had little to do with the development of general intelligence in the way Galton insinuated, became the chief political obsession. Imperium and the basis for states as we know them, and thus laws pertaining to property, are so familiar to us that we often take them for granted.

We are also familiar with possession, which can ultimately only be a recognition of the present and is not inherent to life in this sense. Possession conceptually does not entail anything life has any right to, but a declaration of fact in the natural world and by science and reason, and so while possession is 9/10th of the law, it is only so because possession is seen as the realization of property. Property at a basic level, and why we would possess things as property rather than possessing things for any other purpose, stems from this interest in life. The proprietors, naturally, have always been advocates for empire and genetic legacies. They usually owe what they have not just to their birthright but to their ancestors, and intend to pass their property to descendants or some chain of succession they value. Property is ultimately a local event, and any shared or public property is seen not as a state of affairs in line with life, but a state of affairs for institutions which ultimately serve the local eugenic interest I have described. It is for that reason that the commons has always been under attack and could never be taken for granted in a naive sense. The commons were defended not because of any natural right or right of life, but because defending the commons made sense to a lot of people, who saw correctly the threat of aristocracy to their lives. The claims of aristocracy against the commons were always made on the most spurious grounds possible, because the aristocrat never needed any reason to do anything. The aristocrat, by nature, is an advocate for the eugenic interest above all, first of all for itself and then for its class which has always been able to find each other and their enablers and fellow travelers. It is for that reason that a republic premised on the eugenic interest, which aligns with the technological interest and makes it their own, is doomed to be a beast rife with infighting.^[4]

The eugenic interest concerns property, the individual intent of life-forms, and the foundation of social groupings which suggest a shared intent, as if the social grouping were a singular life-form. It should be noted that sociality is not premised on identity or any eugenic intent to be meaningful. Social associations can be made entirely as adoptive entities, which do not necessarily care about any eugenic intent of the whole. The invocation of eugenic intent at the level of society has clear utility to those who would see the collective of society as a vehicle for individual property. By making property collective, the commonwealth effectively enshrines individual property-holders as individuals, while forestalling any genuinely cooperative enterprise. Only through the state, which is held by an executive that individuals contest, does cooperation become conceivable. This is clearly at odds with a functioning government or any sociality where cooperation towards tasks is accomplished, but the eugenic intent of life insists that it must

cajole and demean the ruled. This is done not for any genuine purpose, but because the eugenic intent of property favors overbearing managerialism, and insists that this is the true function of institutions, rather than the purpose someone might have found in institutions. In this way, the eugenic interest is the true defense of individualism, rather than any ideology or natural purpose for the individual. It is very easy to discount the individual and continue living, and in some way, the intent of a shared society requires individuals to give up some of their freedom for the sake of the shared enterprise. The eugenic interest insists that this cooperation is only possible through competing eugenic interests, and that society must be comprised of individuals, who become institutional. It is possible for societies to develop institutions favoring cooperation, but this runs counter to the eugenic interest if that interest is allowed to run rampant. Because the eugenic interest is tied to property and property is necessary for life to hold much of anything, arguments for genuine cooperation are always attacked by the eugenic interest simply because they do not want any such thing. It is for this reason that the asinine petty-managerial serfdom of assholes like Mises is given any credence, when their claims are spurious and stupid if anyone thought about their meaning for five minutes. The eugenic interest is not a rational interest in the sense that rational agents in society, judging economic behavior, would regard it. It is quite the opposite. A rational interest would see right away that such a eugenic interest is contrary to the aims of a cooperative productive enterprise. The eugenic interest does not care about this at all. The eugenic interest as a rule only considers productivity relevant if it defends property and the objectives of rule and management. Productivity for any other purpose is always beholden to property and a defense of it, and so the eugenic interest adopts another habit almost axiomatically - war and struggle for its own sake.

If property and struggle is seen purely as an individual matter, then this seems like nothing too great. Life, at a basic level, is not obligated to anything in nature or society, and life-forms always are constituted as singular intents rather than competing intents. The life-form is not intrinsically under any social obligation that would compel kindness. Any such kindness would itself be among the property of individuals who would have had some standing relationship. It may seem simple enough to circumvent this by pronouncing that all men are created equal in a political sense, or that all men regardless of ability should for the purposes of the peace be allowed certain inalienable rights, on the premise that it is expected that men would defend themselves just as anyone would against egregious attacks. If life were truly operating in rational interests, this would make a lot of sense, and it would also make rational sense to discourage inter-cine conflict over nothing. This would have made socialism and communism seem like natural propositions to a certain mind, who saw them as the most reasonable outcome and in line with human development. In various forms, this is what socialists and communists would proclaim, and to some extent they were successful. Yet, men never were equal in the conditions they found themselves in. They were born into political inequality, because the eugenic interest which considered freedom proclaimed beforehand that "freedom isn't free", and this

political inequality was never seriously contested by anyone. A familiarity with Marx, who was among those who came the closest to suggesting the problem with liberal concepts of equality, suggests that Marx did not hold political equality to be desirable or a worthwhile pursuit at all. The later contempt Marxists show to anyone who didn't "get it" is indicative of where political equality as a concept stood, and this was picked up by their critics. More importantly, political equality even in form would be attacked on biopolitical grounds, and on grounds of ability. Whether someone could have been anything at all was less relevant than whether someone fit a bar for humanity that was set by the ruling institutions alone. When someone managed to play by those rules and make himself able to participate, the bar could be raised arbitrarily. The eugenic interest understood that once claimed, this property was never to be dealt with honestly. Nothing about humanity up to that point or since suggested humanity had any obligation to be honest, and the deception and malice of the race that had always been there would be recapitulated. This is the same as the liberals themselves, who recapitulated that if the poor starve or waves of death resume as had been the tradition of the human race, then it was simply the natural order of things. Even more offensive were the conservative forces who suggested this wave of death was some sort of progress, sorting out the residue of society which "just so" die off. It's progress, see, to not merely let them die, but lock them in workhouses and cut up their brains. "Science" certainly reveled in doing this, and has done so up to the early 21st century when I write this. It is an abiding trait of all who defend the eugenic interest to claim its conduct is passive, and their victims are always somehow at fault. At the same time, the deeds of the "criminals" are always vaguely specified, not because the criminals did nothing, but because acknowledging that deeds are the cause of eugenic purges is anathema to this eugenic interest. The eugenic interest revels in hypocrisy and double-standards, and expects it. What is criminal for the lower class and the outside is lauded for those "in the know" and connected to the eugenic interest. This behavior is replicated in the individual conduct of life, unless it is disciplined by some influence that would sober it. The eugenic interest compels this, and does so for no rational reason. Unless there is some other interest in life suggesting to not do this, then the default behavior of life is to "return to genesis" and recapitulate every contradiction of life willfully and proudly. And so, it is, if one cares to elaborate the argument from start to finish, impossible to justify a cooperative union of individuals so long as eugenic interests prevail, and impossible to justify a cooperative enterprise on any basis of property. Whatever property exists, it will be contested by this interest, whether it is private, public, or any other type of property. The true difficulty with cooperative enterprises and institutions has little to do with property at all, but stems from the total lack of any alternative that is permissible in human society. There is no rational calculation problem, as the dishonest will claim is the problem with socialism. It is very easy to calculate the inflow and outflow of resources, and account for political disagreements between the participants without dicker over minute substances. It is actually very easy to conceive of a socialist society on the basis of sharing the wealth, out of a sense that doing this would serve everyone's

self-interests in total. That was determined long ago and understood by the philosophers of every trend. The reactionaries and hardliners of the Right simply recapitulated that they did not care to see this ever happen, and did so purely for their sentimental hatred and the thrill their race feels when they kick down the weak.

This had long been understood as the difficulty of any commonwealth - that an intriguer could insinuate, based on nothing, anything that would disrupt the interests that allow this construct to work, and do so until the structure broke down completely. Nothing would stop this, because the eugenic interest and "me wantee" will always appeal to enough living creatures to sway someone, and once enabled, they would be able to push and prod the public until the public or a member thereof is weak enough to attack openly. Those who wanted something decent would always be defending property, which itself requires them to acknowledge a eugenic interest. Even if the intrigues and games are unsuccessful in the first pass, it seeds enough of a threat in the minds of the public that they must turn to their individual concerns over any collective enterprise. The shared self-interest of the commonwealth will always be threatened, and this construct was assembled not by a hive mind but by individuals who saw the construct as serving some interest in the first place. The first fear of any such construct is counter-revolution, and it is established in a revolution which consciously co-opts the lower orders and thrusts them back into servitude once the new aristocracy establishes its plot. The old order attempts immediately to channel the disgust of those who were thrust down the hardest, along with the usual suspects who just enjoy an excuse to destroy the new government and take the wealth of the former aristocrats. Whether such a counter-revolution exists or not, the revolutionaries will suggest counter-revolutionaries must be dealt with ruthlessly. If they read their Machiavelli, they would know why you do this.

I can only describe political consciousness at such length, as this is written by men with far more knowledge of history and the intrigues of that world than I. I do not intend to write a political book, but many such books exist and explain very well what is at stake and how aristocrats think of this matter. Aristocrats have rarely ever had to hide their intentions. They simply assume that the default of humanity is aristocracy. The eugenic interest, in every form, is why they can do so confidently. What they could not abide is someone who rejects wholly and knowingly the eugenic interest in favor of another, and does so in a way that would not merely break the cycle of aristocracy, but regards the entire process with contempt no aristocrat can summon in their fickle enterprises, and they are always in the end fickle and stupid exercises in pointless posturing. The dream of creating some Ingsoc-tier dystopian terror state is no less fickle than any other aristocratic scheme in history. It only presents strength because it vampirically feeds off every resource and violently ensures no one can ever oppose it, to the bitter end. This is not merely the result of modern eugenics, as if any alternative were seriously proposed. It is a consequence of how humanity has conducted political matters, because humans really were at heart little more

than apes that figured out how to screech in particular ways that allowed them their present level of technology. Every interest other than the eugenic interest has in some way been belittled or subordinated, or is a thing actively mocked and denigrated. That is the origin of all hitherto existing political thought, which only sometimes adopts technical knowledge from science and only in the ways that are amenable to this eugenic interest and the proprietors.

If that is the case, then it seems like I'm saying the eugenic interest is somehow inexorable, right? The only problem with this statement is that it really isn't. For all the pretenses states have maintained, the eugenic interest really doesn't resonate with the vast majority of humans, and is barely registered in non-human life as a thing which constitutes "politics". Far from it, the eugenic interest promotes ideologies that are almost wholly incompatible with what most people actually want. It always must insinuate that the eugenic interest is actually something else, and that even the proprietors are in some way obliged to something other than themselves for more purposes than a need to keep the peace. Viewed nakedly, the eugenic interest and its modern creed is so abominable that it knows from the outset it could only sell itself in the most violent manner possible, and resorts immediately to threats and terror, even when those threats are clearly counterproductive. The eugenic interest takes on a life of its own, beyond anything that the interests of life or even its genetic origins would suggest is needed. This only happens because the eugenic interest becomes less about any actual past, which most people agree is necessary to speak of life holding property and thus relevance in the world, and more about a preferred model of the past. The eugenic interest finds the technological interest to be its natural ally, and it is science and technology which grants to the eugenicist everything it requires to actually rule. Without science and technology, eugenics and its baser forms would only be sustained by war and a cult suggesting lurid rituals justify all of this for fun and thrill. Even the most basic form of the eugenic interest requires more than its starting conditions to feed it, and carry out the initial intent. The eugenic interest is at heart so malleable that life-forms could in principle be changed by anyone with a mind to do so, who proceeds to use fairly cheap methods to reconstruct the life-form. This can be done by the life-form itself if it so chooses. What cannot change is the past, which has already happened and isn't going away no matter what new technology is invented. I do not wish to spend the next chapter coming back to the eugenic interest's historical alliance, since the technological interest entails much more than a defense of the old and recapitulation of old memes taught by pedagogues.

This interest being peculiar to life has led to it being identified with life itself, in describing life as following inexorably certain imperatives. For example, the imperative to reproduce, consume resources, and all of the things commonly deemed the behavior of life are considered just so and definitional of life. The truth of life is that it has no true hardcoded imperatives that compel any behavior. It is rather that what starts at its genesis is likely to continue in accord with principles that have perpetuated generation after generation. Life, which begins as little more than a chaotic whim in the world, continues as it

started because for a long time, life is nothing more than simple mechanisms, for whom any drive to evolve only exists because of ample resources to feed from, and because there was nothing preventing life from changing in ways that favored it. It is far more likely that life diversified considerably before any refinement into more complex forms came about, and it was only when life developed enough complexity that further "random" changes were difficult that its forms changed more in line with its competitive conditions and fitness. Even here, "fitness" had less to do with life's active changes, which would be the result of happenstance and selection that was part of life's tendency to seek partners desirable to its drive to reproduce. There is ample evidence that lust for reproduction is not blind, nor does it follow any prescribed eugenic intent to find "the best genes", such that the position of losers like the Optimates is naturalized in a gigantic pseudoscientific cope.^[5] It is rather that there are conditions other than mere survival or the starting conditions of life that inform the conception of new life, which begins its own genesis from those conditions. The eugenic interest would desire to forestall that, because it represents the most obvious living threat to their interest. Only for themselves does it become possible to rise from beginnings, and to the outsiders, any development must be deemed natural, despite no reason to believe any inborn trait destined them for greatness. To enemies, the eugenic interest demands grinding down their conditions and imposing a "truth" that they are cursed with the sin they inherited and will go down further by some inexorable force. Little of this seems to have much to do with life, and it is a koan of such people that life and death exist in a cycle that reproduce each other. This is stupid if you think at all about the situation, but the concept holds power because of the eugenic interest, the interest of property, and fetish cults surrounding it.

Little good can be said of this, except that life to exist must defend itself. This has been the oldest trick to run any protection racket. Life is always presented as fragile, except for that which is able to emphasize the eugenic interest above all, which is somehow vital even though it exists entirely on parasitism. This sadly is the natural condition of life, in that all that we do can be subordinated to the past. Those in the present and all the future are given to this past property which asserts that it must be a thing. It does so because life to be life is defined by some intent orienting it, rather than life being a quintessential force allowing dynamism or life being premised on knowledge or wisdom. Life to rise past this in some way becomes non-living, and "pure life" and the veneration of life itself serves not the overriding core interest, but this eugenic interest. The great difficulty for any other entity in the universe - and this would apply to non-living knowing entities which possess some purpose of their own - is that defense against this is necessary for anything else to exist. If we did not regard this, we would be very different creatures, and the prospect of a world where we did not do this appear eerie to our sense of ourselves. This is because, as living creatures, we have inherited conditions that were strongly informed by this eugenic interest and the concept of property it spawned. There is no way to easily abandon property, even when property no longer serves any interest

we would hold dear in any serious way. We could easily abandon property and this attachment to the past and continue living, while remaining aware of the intent of other life-forms to disrupt this because it would just be too decent. When doing so, though, we would remain cognizant of that which we can control and that which is the property claimed by others. In doing so, we would in effect reproduce some concept of property just to defend ourselves. The eugenic interest always favors the aggressor, and in modernity, the cult of war and the eugenic interest always prefers to take the offensive, as is customary of imperial interests. Never has a defensive war been a condition anyone wishes to fight, for all the reasons that makes sense. The eugenic interest always embraces this instinct to attack and makes it internal to its practices, and then seeks to impose that on the other faculties of life. This is incompatible with anything life needs to do to actually win a struggle, and those who hold this interest are cognizant of that. It is why the advocates of the interest will privately indulge in luxury and technology and spiritual meaning. Austerity and deprivation are only conditions of the producers and the slaves, and this distinction of the haves and have-nots is thrown in the face of those who are made to suffer. The eugenic interest might discipline its believers in certain ways, where all luxuries and technology are made to serve eugenic aims rather than any other. All other property in the purest eugenic interest exists only to serve further accumulation, in preparation for a struggle of life and death. It is for this reason that Malthus invents his vision of the lower classes as mindless breeders, and the inheritors of Malthus transpose this mentality on the capitalists they wish to expropriate. This drive to expropriate the capitalists is of course only applied to the lower orders of capital, who have long been in conflict with the apex of the alliance ruling the oligarchy. The promise the oligarchs made to the lower orders of capital was that the workers would be ground down and labor would remain as cheap as possible, and fantasies of perpetual economic growth were presented to tell the lower orders of capital that nothing would fundamentally change. As this promise was made, the lower orders of capital and the petty bourgeois would be taxed, undermined, attacked, humiliated, and prepared for the expropriation taking place in the 21st century, finishing up a century of backsliding in which all of the producers, the property-holders and the working class alike, are broken down. It was imperative that at the crucial moment that is playing out now, the producers would turn to blame not those who brought the nightmare to them, but the lowest class, who must be despised by all with a vigor scarcely imagined. That is what we live through today. The final question posed to all is if they will do as humanity had been entrained to do, and carry out the war against the weak to the end. Many in the human race have chosen their side of the war a long time ago, and so what happens next is a foregone conclusion. Those who rejected the call of the eugenic creed face continued expropriation and terror, and the eugenic creed attracts all to a singular interest which must always march in lockstep.

That is what we live through today. That is what we must defend against. The greatest lie of the eugenic interest has been that self-defense is the sole property

of the eugenists and the creed, and that all other interests and anything else we wanted in life must die, die, die. It is for that reason that eugenics could only ever create a screaming, fanatical cohort whose lust for sadism and blood overrides anything else it would preserve. This was foreseen and obvious, but the eugenic interest in life never cared once about any reason or purpose. Now it exists only to feed itself, damning us all as it has from the moment it could assert itself in the earliest rites of the human race. From that time, the eugenic interest has sought for itself a world-historical mission particular to it, and asserts that all other interests should adopt its mentality. In time, the eugenic interest attracts sadists, futurists, cult leaders, fanatics driven by zeal, occultists who revel in trickery, thugs given over to cheaper thrills and easily induced to follow anything, and so on. The common thread in all of these people is a sickening love of depravity, coupled with a faux moralist crusade where superficial appearances must rule and all meaning and genuine purpose is annihilated.

I must cut short this chapter, as much of what we write concerns this interest. The remaining interests, and those that develop from the basic interests of life when living is not merely an individual experience but a social existence and the reality we live in with technology and material incentives and conditions, all have their place, and must be recognized as valid and worthwhile. Much of what is written today is deliberately degenerated to emphasize the eugenic interest, and claim that this interest is eternal and the only true interest. So common is this interest that it supplants the core interests of life. This is intended, so that the overriding interest of life, which would preserve all of its interests, is re-written to serve the intent of managers. The ultimate goal of the eugenic interest is not to kill opponents, but over-write their "programming" in every way possible, so that the eugenic interest produces slaves in ways that past economic thought never could.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] It should be noted that this practice of the Nazi Party to emphasize the Big Happening is inherited from Christianity, and it was particular to the German interpretation before it became the standard of fascist ideology. Like Christians, fascists have varying views on this, with some being consumed by the grand narrative and others seeing it as a tool for the rubes or a joke they play while they care about their actual objectives. In the fascist example, futurism and an obsession with progress is a constant feature and inherent to the ideology and political project pursued. For Christianity, the Big Happening is not part of a futurist project that should be hastened, but a reaction to suggest that the future, whatever it is, is bad because it veers from the plan of society given to them. Only at the "right time" does the heavenly kingdom arise, and millenarian predictions of doom are typically responses to the events of modernity which were indeed the end of the world for many people, which were effectively the end of old religious spiritual authority. The implosion of many Christian churches is deliberate, with priests and pastors taking bribes to "throw the match" to the

so-called religion of science. That "religion of science" was Eugenics, rather than science proper, and so the religious often saw Eugenics as an ally and a vehicle for potential revanchism. That was certainly the take of the Religious Right, who are shameless in abandoning anything Christianity suggested institutionally and embrace every part of the eugenic creed and ecstatic sacrifice of the "sinners". It is unsurprising that among Christian doctrines is that your deeds mean nothing about sin, and sinfulness is entirely a crime of Being or indicated by the ugliness of Form, which prompts the Christian to get on a high horse and shriek like a retard at anyone who is unsightly. That tells you a lot about the religion's nature and purpose, and it is unsurprising to learn the influence of Greek philosophy on the religion's practical tenets, and in particular philosophical conceits which reference a eugenic mission in republicanism. That history is part of modern eugenics, preserved specifically because it resembled existing institutions and conceits. In other words, the new way of life bears the birthmarks of the previous.

[2] I leave it as an exercise for the reader to figure out why Galtonites specifically wished to target this understanding from Biblical Genesis when advancing their creed.

[3] The destruction of the current political settlement in the United States is intentional, because the hidden power has always made a mockery of the democratic facade and the forms of the republic for public consumption. In private, the republic and its successor makes abundantly clear that any attack on the prestige of true rulers is unacceptable and inadmissible. To speak plainly of the men and women behind the curtain is death.

[4] Thus far I have been attacking republican sentiments. I am unfair, and do this in part to break the expectation seeded by republics that they are founded on any virtue other than the virtue of social climbing and backstabbing, and there was no "golden age" of republics. They were always designed to defend the opulent, who made no bones about doing whatever it took to defend their keep. Let us suppose there were a form of power-sharing like a republic that was not premised on this eugenic interest. What would it be, and what could it be based on? The technological interest, as we will see, is given over to inner vanity, and almost pathologically makes an alliance with the eugenic interest and the interest in property. The intellectuals seek to be the eugenic interest, and the eugenic interest claims that they attained position because they were smarter or better by some spurious metric. It is an alliance made in heaven, and the fastest way to secure the state against the multitude, which is what a republic meant in every form it has ever taken. It has been the rule for most of humanity that the first three interests are recognized as the only natural interests of life, and so the alternative - a public rule of the commoners in their own right, without the intermediary of proprietors or intellectuals - is the only thing suggested. This conception is countered by a belief that some fickleness in the masses will be discovered, and that a natural aristocracy inexorably arises. This concept ultimately arises from limited information and technology, which would mean that so far as knowledge itself is presumed to be the crown of the

state, it will inevitably select uneven development and break human society into cells and organizations, and the favored groups will declare unilaterally their merit permits them to lead. They then, through insinuations and tricks, lock those who are out of the know into some form of debt or servitude, recreating the aristocratic government. This is the thinking I hope to demonstrate here and in future writings.

The alternatives entail the fourth and fifth interests, which historically have never been allowed to rule or even manifest with any genuine independence. Spiritual authority has long been used as an ally of the eugenic and technological interest, because the commoners have only been expected to obey in one way or another. Where the commoners do embrace religion, it is always in a race to emulate the eugenic interest or the technological interest or both, so that they may in some sick way suggest that the people have a great attachment not to their own political interests or knowledge, but to institutions which claim the political and knowledge, and by extension, seek to turn the commoners first into subordinated workers and then, in the long term, into cattle. Religion made alliance with serfdom, which has long been the dream to place a section of the commoners in some subordinated designation. And so, the commoners split into two groups - the favored commoners who retain freedom and property which is beholden to the eugenic and technological interest of institutions, and the disfavored who all interests are arrayed against. This division is named many things, but in modern Europe, it is the distinction between the property-holding bourgeois or "active citizens" and the proletarians who only own their body but lack any political rights. From the proletarians, another split is engineered between the favored of the class, who are promised survival and petty distinctions, and disfavored, who become the residuum or "lumpenproletariat". It is this fifth class that would be the only ones desperate enough to truly consider a shared society, because they have no buy-in with any of the ruling interest, and they recognize that the ruling interest is and always has been predatory through and through. Many of the fifth class are rented as thugs or an expendable reserve army to threaten the proletarian, and so all classes are instructed to hate and revile the lowest class with a vigor scarcely imaginable. You see here the endgame of modernity - a society segregated into five castes, which I have alluded to throughout this writing so far. This is intentional and modeled after such segregation of societies historically, which is given institutional support despite the obvious ruination such an arrangement entails. The only people who would have any strong incentive to organize a collective society for overall benefit are the fourth and fifth classes, and those two classes are made to kill each other most of all, while the bourgeois laugh at creating this and sit in comfortable technical positions over the common grunts and workers. In principle, the caste system is not a singular formation, but recreated among each grouping in society. Therefore, the true "second caste" would not be proprietors generally, but those close to the "haute bourgeoisie" or the commanding heights of capital, who make an alliance with intellectuals of high renown who effectively rule from the shadows. Said intellectuals include the richest who have a large say in what "smart" entails and

have always lavishly funded intelligent functionaries who join them, where they compete in their own world for the leading position. The "best and brightest" presented to the public rarely are the true leading interest, but are often drawn from the bourgeois commoners and not even the best of them. The "high ranking" managers presented as bosses are often little better than proletarians, and given a lump of horseflesh to engage in petty-managerial tyranny against other proles and particularly the lumpen. Of the lumpen, whatever leadership group exists among them will be given baubles of some sort and put up as Judas goats to lead the rest to doom, as this is the only way to get paid. Generally, though, the "lumpen" are ill-defined, and the leaders of organized crime are themselves not "lumpen" at all, but drawn from the proletarians or bourgeois. Organized crime has always maintained friendly relations with ruling interests, who have never moved against criminals with any seriousness and have no intention to. Criminals may be purged in the transition to a new type of government, where they cannot adapt to the new situation and would be thrown away. Many times, though, a new criminal element arises, and picks up where the old left off. There is also a known revolving door where "good and honest worker" or their equivalent in another class becomes "enforcer and thug", and this is expected and glorified.

Only the lowest of each class suggest that this is wrong, and they are disciplined within their class rather than with each other. The lowest class, in the end, is filled with enablers, informants, and generally vile people who have no interest in any collective agreement. It is only a strange sort in the lowest class who truly believes a collective, happy society is in the interests of everyone, and they find that they are all alone in a world gone horribly wrong. In the past, the castoffs of other classes, who have nothing left to gain by participation in this farce, have occasionally embraced ideas that humanity did not need to be this, and that there was some reason to do other than the predation that a republic entailed. They would, in the end, remain beholden to their core class convictions, with the threat that stepping out of line meant losing everything for real and subjection to torture. The possibility of any meeting across class lines had been effectively eliminated by the start of the 21st century, and this was reflected in daily behavior of the classes, which were more and more becoming castes. It became nearly impossible for certain class lines to be crossed even in casual conversation, and this was enforced in all pedagogy. The vanguard of intellectuals and their institutions were way ahead of the curve on this, and by the 1950s, eugenics reigned supreme in the universities of the world. There was nothing else. Imposing it as a general rule would require three generations of aggressive conditioning, while the remnant of living memory before this died off and would be written out of history books. The truth of the past is not actually "lost" - it is actually freely available to read of what humanity was in the 18th and 19th centuries, and there are groups who discuss how people thought in that time. It is simply recognized that this past form of human society is no longer admissible, and the doctrine of historical progress establishes a conceit that the zeitgeist moves not by real events, but only when thought leaders declare that history has in fact moved, only as they declare it has. It becomes inadmissible to

suggest that historical progress works in any way other than towards preplanned objectives. This is carried out in miniature, and violent force is deployed to ensure that "progress" occurs in accord with the plan. The root institution to enforce this is education, and they are joined by numerous violent interventions which claim not temporal authority, but claim to rule through scientific means and expert opinion. In this way, the fate of humanity has been sealed. That is what I hope to explain in writing these books, and it has an endgame beyond technocracy and eugenics that was foreseen by its true visionaries.

I do not believe there is a way to salvage any conception of "the public" in a large society, and its existence even at smaller scales is persistently attacked. It is indeed the case that small societies are attacked more viciously than the concept of a general public, as the general public or civil society is presented as a mechanism to subsume any organic development that would constitute socialism or any organization of the fourth or fifth classes, or any organization that would cross class lines altogether out of dire necessity. It is suppressing that which is at the heart of both "class consciousness" of the sort dumb college students promote in recent decades, and "class collaboration" that fascists propose which suggests the only possible collaboration of classes is through abasement to the ruling institutions. If there is a way to overcome this, it is only possible provided very drastic changes to how the contending interests conduct themselves, and likely requires humans to be very different creatures than they are presently. Even the conception of "transhumanism" exists to forestall this, and direct humanity's biological traits so that they remain in line with the eugenic interest above all. If that is true, then there is only one endgame, so long as science remains the most effective mechanism for practical rule. That is scientific despotism without any remorse or further qualification. The last stage before this would be an attempt to restore traditional monarchy, but this will fail spectacularly, whatever conceits aristocrats hold about their supremacy and thousand-year reichs. It is very clearly the intent of the British aristocracy, which has never given up the conceits of eugenic monarchism and possesses the most visibly disgusting nobility and aristocracy humanity can summon, which says a lot.

[5] Yet again the curse of transposing modern conceits on Roman history often colors our understanding of what happened, since the position of the "optimates" is conflated with modern republican conceits that favored the nascent bourgeois intellectual interest. Most of the optimates would do exactly as Caesar did if they had the opportunity, and had no qualms about doing so. Moral stances at this stage of Roman history have a lot less pull with anyone relevant. In many cases, the actions of Caesar are not wildly transgressive given the situation of the time. Caesar's actions are largely a consequence of necessity to do so, rather than any ideological commitment to despotism or any ideology at all. Placating the Roman mob was something that politicians would do in various ways, and this usually took the form of backing street gangs rather than mass politics in a modern sense. That was for the Romans what was coveted, and the idea that politicians had any "ideology" or "party" was alien to Roman politics. The republic had always been premised on individual glory, through which the state

would rise so long as one man did not become too powerful. It had always been not a matter of if a Caesar would rise, but when it would happen. Far from any sense of virtue that upheld collective rule, would-be pretenders would either be knocked down by everyone else who sought to climb the ranks, or brought down by scandal because no one man could consolidate the army. The raising of professional armies did not so much "corrupt" republican virtue, but made clear what had always been evident. In the past, armies relied on conscripts with property, and after fighting was over, the legions returned to private life. Conscripted tended to serve the interests of property, and as aristocrats gathered slaves and land to build their estates, the ambition the republic implied willfully cannibalized its base of small property holders. Before this, the republic survived not because of any temperance, but because the Romans had yet to acquire their economic windfalls, that were always sought by the Romans from the moment the republic was founded. The only thing holding the republic together was that there weren't any other things going for the Romans, who didn't hold much at all except men who could fight well. The corruption, the mob bosses, the crime family behavior, had always been the Roman project. Those bemoaning it too much were only conjuring a cope because they finally lost. When looking at the writing of those who were on the optimate side though, there doesn't appear to be any great hand-wringing about moral virtue and kindness, or a belief that Caesar was a bad man for wanting power. All of them wanted power - it was a requirement to get anywhere in politics. Caesar's grandiose posturing rubbed them a wrong way, but was also known to be a way the general would stick it to his rivals, just as they would have done to Caesar given the opportunity. When push came to shove, the optimates knew that whining would not win them any favors from history. They fought, they lost, and they either reconciled with the future Augustus or fell on their sword after taking their attempt to piss in the winds of fate. Anything like today's conservative bullycowardice and fake virtue would have been highly offensive to the Romans' sense of themselves and to others, who despised shit like that. It didn't stop Romans from being nasty to each other, but the moral high horse of today was not something that Romans did regularly. When Romans bemoaned the state of their country and the culture, it had less to do with "Make Rome Great Again", and more to do with a disgust at what the Roman people and their leading men became as the empire kept going. It bemoaned with self-criticism the class of the aristocrats just as much as it bemoaned the poor and their vices.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

8. The Technological Interest and Science

So far the interests of life have concerned things that are neither material nor ideal, but are instead a thing inherent in the very possibility that life exists. Life has both a genesis and procession, but it has no preferred form nor any intrinsic substance that is uniquely identified with life. The products of living

processes are things identifiable, but never has any substance of life itself, nor does life prefer any form at all. There is not, and never will be, any formal definition of "life" that is suitable for the purpose of describing this phenomenon. The reason for this is that life, as I say, is a parasite and a ghost animating matter that, by itself, should not do anything in particular. Nothing about the components of life suggests any reason why the formation of life proceeds from simple events. This is unlike the formation of stars and planets, which proceed from very regular motion of matter, or the procession of natural events like the flow of water or hardness of rocks. Life at its most basic level is not a natural thing at all, but something between the natural world and the artificial intent of knowledge. Knowledge in theory did not need life to exist, but life seemed to imply by the very formulation of an intent some will that is treated as knowing. There is no actual "thought" of an amoeba or a plant at work, but the behaviors of even simple life conform to intents that are evident not in the forms it adopts, but in what living things must do to remain constituted as living. Life does not appear in any material system, but is only stable in particular systems. There is no rule suggesting that these systems can't form, as if life could only be created or imposed on the world by a thought leader, but there is also no rule suggesting any regular mechanism that gives rise to life. It is very likely that life arises in any way it can do so, and absent a compelling reason for it to stop, life will continue through any cycle until it is exhausted. It may be very likely that life on one planet formed and died many times before it could begin a steady cycle. Life begins anew from the smallest seed and a seemingly insignificant genesis, regardless of what other life may exist. There is never any evidence of a planet-wide mind of capital-N "Nature" guiding this process. The sum total of living systems on Earth do not appear oriented towards survival of the whole or any particular balance at all.^[1] In total, life appears to fritter away all it consumes without any particular purpose, and the technological advance of life - which is to say, its assimilation of the natural world to serve its intent - appears sporadically with rises and falls. It is an abiding characteristic of human knowledge, which is often communicated in language, written down, or evident in tools and objects which humans reverse-engineer with a cleverness surprising for such a deformed race, that knowledge and meaning once established does not die easily. In life before humanity, where there is no symbolic language to communicate ideas so compactly, life destroys its own knowledge base recklessly and without regard to any conceit that the technology of life should grow at all, let alone towards any end that Whig History would imply.

The technology of life is not limited to knowledge of an ephemeral consciousness, but all of the substance and form that life inhabits to make true its intent, its functions, and follow all of its interests, which include at a basic level all of the matter, energy, spirit, and qualities granting form that life entails to continue being a real thing. Not all life is conscious in any way we would appreciate the concept, but all that life inhabits behaves as if its intent were something consciously pursued, rather than pursued in a way that is blind or inherent solely in the substances life absorbs. If a living thing were beholden to natural

events in their raw form, it would be a thing hostile to that life-form in some way. Living things to command their faculties always appropriate them in some way, to suggest that this process is somehow incorporated into its overall life functions. Even if the thing is mostly preserved intact, like a fragment of matter grafted into the life-form by some strange fusion, it becomes a thing assimilated by life. It could very well be a malignant thing, like a cancer which arose in life and weakened the life-form from within, but that cancer is not a thing alien to the life-form. If it were, the cancer could be easily excised and alienated completely from life, such that it was not a problem to cut it out and be done with it. This may indeed be done, but not without consequence. Cancer must be purged in some way to no longer be malignant, or life will just have to live with its presence, or life will have to find a way to remove the cancer without any surgery and restore the functions of life to what was wanted.

Just as politics' relation to the eugenic interest is far too vast a topic to cover here, about which much is written, the large body of writing on biology, anatomy, basic machinery, and so on, is far too much to summarize in one chapter. I will summarize only briefly biology and anatomy as it relates to this interest, before moving on to tool use generally and then the paradigms of knowledge particular to life. As this will be a recurring topic throughout the rest of this writing, I will be brief in all of these categories.

I leave out the question of abiogenesis for now, which deserves mention in a later chapter, and the formation of stable cellular life which arose for reasons unknown. What can be said about cellular life is that it reproduces quickly and non-sexually, and is simple enough that adaptations of it occur within a short time. With known bacteria and things believed to be pathogens of disease, they are rarely fixed things, but things arising in new forms even today. There is no reason to believe that life reproducing so rapidly that is small enough to fluctuate, and versatile enough to assimilate alien matter into novel forms, wouldn't change its composition in a very short timeframe compared to geologic timescales. With all of this, early life could not transform into any complex life for billions of years, and likely this early life rose and fell many times without stabilizing into any global ecosystem. Simple life is not known to travel far. What is guessed at is that algae and the precursors of plant life arise long before animal life. Reliance on fossil records, which are always in short supply and obviously require something that can be fossilized to arrive to us, makes the origin of animals guesswork until someone invents a time machine to solve the problem, which we suppose to be impossible. In this time span that brings about the earliest known animals, and eventually aquatic animals like fish, so much would have had to happen to make the humble, simple fish a thing. Yet, the simplicity of life and the lack of predatory pressures culling life before it grew likely allowed for life to experiment with anything and everything that worked, so long as it was able to move and succeed at reproduction. We will see here a recurring theme in all interests that stems from the first interest of life - that it grew and developed because it was allowed to and did so, and there was no eugenic overlord asserting life could not do that. Extinction events, culls, and

all of the predation in nature are always factors which disfavor any change in life, rather than promote its development. The development of life, and thus the development of intents beyond mere reproduction of its primitive forms, follows from the technological interest almost immediately from conception. Life feeds its basic sustenance, and in most circumstances it is not under a constant eugenic pressing to compel any of its behavior. It is in this environment that life's biological faculties can develop, and it can do with those faculties all of the other things that life can do. The surplus available to life may be spent for whatever life does to recreate itself, absent one of the first two interests pressing against this. Every new substance or quality life assimilates is a thing it must support, adding to its basic cost of life support. A new feature requires food to supply it, for example. Generally, features which emphasize economic efficiency are not evolutionary priorities at all. The technology of life before creatures like us with economic sense is remarkably inefficient and wasteful, and there is nothing in the animal mind which suggests it should favor economism of the Malthusian sort, where life starves itself and celebrates this anorexic approach to living. Since the Malthusians themselves do not practice what they preach, throwing lavish parties and indulging in all of their sick fetishes^[2], this is not surprising. The seeming economism of life is that a drive to accumulate mindlessly or reproduce mindlessly does not appear to be anything living creatures do. The greater tendency is for life to form some colony, or some grouping which is familiar, and stick to it rather than operate as the imagined liberal free agent. As mentioned before, lone life-forms tend not to be prolific breeders, and they do not appear to be particularly interested in accumulation at all. The greatest drive that would favor solitude is that the loner desires most of all space to develop, recreate, and enjoy to the fullest whatever food it consumes. Usually, life as a solitary creature is not going to end well. "Sociality" though is not something that is so much an inborn or hardcoded thing, but a thing that makes sense to an animal given its situation. It would have been born in some habit of reproduction, and in its youth it would look to elders like itself or note its environs over time if it struggles alone. It might have struggled for life by killing its siblings, a common fate in the natural order of things, and one that is far from alien for humans.

It is well attested that the development of limbs and particular features in animals occurs because particular traits are selected not in survival of the fittest against death, but because particular traits are selected by some process which would make mates desirable regardless of whether they survive. The choice of traits at a basic level does not appear to serve any adaptive purpose. If it did, the adaptation of traits would appear much more rapidly.^[3] There is a drift in life towards normalization of certain outcomes, and it appears almost as an inexorable trend that life will, absent anything limiting its size, grow somewhat larger in faculties that present opportunities of some sort. The closer those faculties are to some utility in life, the more likely they become a thing selected for, and the greater their development in the processes of life.^[4] It may be that a particular trait that is unusual but beneficial enters the population and splits off, and the process of normalization splits off by niche. Further,

mating populations tend to concentrate in particular regions, which would select for traits peculiar to their domain. The effect of a cull would not be needed to eliminate transitional forms. It would instead act as a sobering influence against the excess of mating for vanity, if it accomplishes that, which it does very poorly. Most likely, clearly maladaptive traits simply never reproduce and produce in animals the same visceral disgust they produce in humans. Females with maladaptive traits would be both hard-pressed to defend their offspring, if they possess maternal instincts, and under attack themselves, and produce the same visceral disgust in males for reasons that are not difficult to discern. The particular psychology of a species would play some part in this, and there is nothing to suggest that the visceral disgust or any psychological trait is easily discerned by the superficial traits mating rituals prefer.^[5] The more likely origin of psychological traits was a normalization and adaptation to changing situations, which proceeded at a plodding pace without a particular preference for outcomes, as if the natural world which had no interest whatsoever in this bizarre contortion of itself called "life" would encode any moral sentiment in biological hardware. The most likely preference in selective pressures, so far as they existed, would be that which favored general intelligence and general functioning, with certain variations becoming common in the mating populations which usually remained insular rather than general. The reach of life-forms absent transport was not much, and movement over long distances would often be carried out in group migrations rather than by individuals. As mentioned, loner life-forms tend not to be prolific breeders, and the species which demonstrate the most sophisticated neurological development tend to be those with social behavior and elaborate mating rituals, and those whose offspring are gestated in female parents' wombs. This development suggests a number of things, and it is an error to impose a false egalitarianism of all species, as if they all followed the simplest principles or universal principles at all.^[6] For humans, there are peculiarities which would make many of our presumptions of selection by any natural principle moot. Among them are that humans, being tool-using animals, are affected far more by artifices of willful creation, and the traits which allow humans this faculty are at odds with virtually everything that another species would value. The large size of the human brain for instance would be a gigantic liability, with support costs beyond anything that it was worth, if it did not lead to any meaningful results. The human features in the rest of their body have faced regular atrophy as their tool use became more elaborate, because those features were largely superfluous. If they were to be optimized in the current niche in a way that was functional or desirable or just aesthetically appealing, they would become something very different from anything humans have been historically. For some practical-minded humans, this has been something they seek in partners, whether they are male or female. It has been the eugenic interest to forestall this decision being made independently.^[7] It remains something that arises independently, largely because it is impossible to control everyone as much as imperious assholes would like, but also because it is recognized in human society that some productive aim must be attained if families, or any reproductive arrangement, can continue. Since all attempts to engineer human child-rearing

in institutions have been disastrous failures, they will have to accept the family at some level for the time being. The questions of why life developed as it did up to the development of settled society with language, extensive tool use, ritual, and so on are better left for another time, and really are better answered by those with more extensive knowledge in the area than I can gather. I would suggest in principle that any question of evolution should be considered not as a recreation of human conceits.^[8]

It is with the full development of tool use that humans begin to hone their body, their tools, their language, and all biological faculties in ways no other animal does. All of these processes work with each other to produce the humans of today, and they would have had to operate over a short time-span. The likely spark for this was the development of language proper, which allow not only systematization of knowledge on how to do this, but communication with other humans who could pass this knowledge to another human, and eventually to offspring who would be taught to speak when young, thus accelerating considerably the acquisition of primitive knowledge, diversification of tool use, and then the honing of the body that adapts to all of this. The upright posture of humans, which likely existed long before this, is refined to remove most of the human tendency to slouch, and to this day, the habit of slouching is discouraged and discipline seeks to correct posture.^[9] It is through this process that humans can begin formally the first signs of the technological interest. This at first is limited, proceeding only in the limited way savage society would allow it to happen. Among the demands of savage society was primitive egalitarianism among those deemed valid. Without any organized institutions that could press against the residuum, if a child survived long enough to fend for itself, it was too much work to ritually sacrifice him or her, and likely a burden to waste someone who was a perfectly usable set of hands and tools that could be put to some use. Primitive society would have entailed bands of small size, and larger formations of human sociality would never have been tight units. While a human band could number between 50 to 200 and everyone would know who the others are, this knowledge would not have entailed too many close associations. For most people, a few immediate relations were their "political society", and the larger band stuck together not as any political unit or a formation with any spiritual authority, but because doing so was expedient enough without causing too much strife. Larger formations would face difficulty migrating in order, forming war parties, sharing the product of extraction without turmoil, and would face greater threat from endemic violence that had been an accepted reality of the race. Nothing suggests this stayed together out of a vague sense that "humans are social creatures" in some preferred way. It was in reality quite the opposite - humans valued their solitude too much that they found anything that resembled state society oppressive and offensive to their sense of reality and values. In turn, chiefs, elders, and those who would lead valued those who were independent rather than those who were obedient, because that independence was the condition in which people could learn and be useful for any enterprise. The warbands of the time disfavored drilling or the concerns of later military institutions, and instead

encouraged drinking, slaughtering merrily, and generally being the toughest gang in the land. The law of war at the time was not any pretense of the state, but the strong fucking over the weak, having their way with the women who often obliged and valued this and humiliating the defeated men before putting them out of their misery. The only thing preventing the cult of war from growing out of control was that such affairs were expensive to maintain, and without any tax or levy system, a warband could only be sustained so long as they won and there was some purpose to fight for. A permanent standing army, beyond the body of those who could use a weapon and the general state of battle readiness among males that was expected, was not a possibility, and so the trappings of state society and the dull, dreary grind could not exist. This will be revisited in a later chapter.

THE TECHNOLOGICAL INTEREST TO PRODUCE QUANTITIES FOR COOPERATIVE BENEFIT WITHOUT REGARD TO PROPERTY OR INTERCINE COMPETITION

It seems reasonable and expected for life to consume quantities. It is so obvious that it seems reasonable to any knowledge and any faculty that more, typically, is better, so long as there is some quality that the substance feeds that is useful. This is rephrased in many moral philosophies to suggest some logic by which goods can be judged. It need not be economic in the sense we have written, but it is simple arithmetic that more is greater than less, and that in some way this would be desirable, presuming we have qualities that are worth building. With the surplus available to life, it does not always make sense to consume all that exists, but it does not make any more sense to live an austere existence out of some sense that this is what it means to live a good life. Generally, though, a knowledgeable mind can find with any surplus something it can do, or potentially do, or will do in the future. This can apply individually or to life in general. The reasons for social existence and the formation of institutions are usually not given to serve any technological interest, but the technological interest will always take an interest in whatever conditions they live in, and so it is a common trait of technocrats to suggest that the goal of productive enterprises would be to produce the needs of society in desired abundance. These needs serve some purpose of knowledge which both supplies the means by which anything from the natural world would be appropriated by life, and which requires that need for the sake of more knowledge. This refers to both the material system that is capable of producing anything, such as the body, tools, machines, infrastructure, and so on, and to the knowledge process itself which requires a number of conditions to operate freely. The other interests may have different ideas, but for the purposes of knowledge, resources exist to be consumed - if not by us, then by some future generation. If they are to be consumed, they would be consumed not out of some sense of property or a haughty faith in merit, but on the basis of what would be good for all parties and suggested an equitable distribution towards the common good.

The technological interest views the substance to be consumed essentially as equivalent to another thing. However much qualities cannot be compared, they always entail some substantive input and output which can be compared by a unit. This unit is effectively whatever energy is suitable for life and specifically the processes of knowledge, rather than any unit of exchange or a utility that may be imagined subjectively. Technology does not have a concept of utility, which is entirely a subjective conceit. Whatever the utility of things, they always entail some substance, and that substance is not an abstract thing like a social relation. It is instead whatever sense allows things to be compared. Here, the generative force of "labor" in the intellectual sense is considered. It is important that this is judged not by some substance of human effort, but by what knowledge and intellect would consider the right expenditure of energy for some labor. The standard for comparing labor would not be socially necessary, as that concept implies a whole market which creates the social necessity. Who judges in the end is the technological interest itself. This means, at a basic level, that those who command the machine decide what a proper expenditure is. For the worker employing his own body and his own tools, this valuation is something he cannot make unilaterally based on his whims, but an honest reckoning of some energy input or output. When considering a whole society, it is inherent to technology and its interest to view the society as a collective unit. This would not entail any individual breakdown by property or fairness, but considers the society as a commonwealth where the product is presumably in one pool, delivered to individuals by need. Who, precisely, commands this distribution, is once again whomever holds the machine of distribution, which is itself some technology. There is no concept of any institution or politics which would regulate this in a technocratic view of society.

If this sounds like communism to you, then gold star for you. This is precisely the most basic formulation of a communist settlement, whether it is in a lesser form that is less-than-perfect but approaching acceptability, or the more basic conception of a commonwealth - i.e., a republic. This is the idealized version of republican government, where the people are treated fairly and the command of product is held by the virtuous, or by something that is incorruptible and not beholden to the petty interests of life. In modern times, the vision is of a cybernetic planner who accounts for all needs in a just manner that is known to everyone in the society. This is a tough sell, because knowledge is not transmitted instantly nor evenly, and not everyone will understand the plan. But, it is perfectly plausible that an agreed-upon plan for distribution of quantities is published, and this is agreeable to all of the people. At least, it would be agreeable to enough people to suggest that this method of distribution is far superior to the others on offer, and the malcontents will be dealt with in the most just way possible. There is no pleasing all of the people all of the time, but if you can please most of the people all of the time, that is far better than any politician has managed to accomplish in human history, and there is no rule that the malcontents have to be treated so horribly. After all, whatever their discontent, the good of the whole is the most important thing, and the

malcontents can still have something to call their own and be left to grumble about how unfair it is. The disputes of the malcontents are, in the grand scheme of all the horrible things life has done, the most trifling and petty concerns. I write this with full seriousness. The petulant whining of bourgeois neoliberals during the 1980s and 1990s was something out of this world, difficult to believe unless their simpering whining were allowed to be elevated, even as so many in human society faced much worse. The arguments of the capitalist against communism were infantile and idiotic, divorced from any objection a reasonable person would have with any form of socialism. The more brazen the stupidity of capitalist arguments, the more the Reaganite recapitulated them, taking a perverse pride in saying things so odiously stupid. These whiners would be elevated deliberately at first to destabilize the remnants of the Soviet system and what communist spirit remained in China, and then to destabilize Europe and America itself, in their continuous campaign to shit up everything they touch for no good reason whatsoever. Many times, they exemplified the racist angle in the most shameless iteration possible, which was just another affront against decency of this foul, retarded, evil, and just plain wrong movement of assholes. What else is to be expected of the inheritors of Hitlerism and the Austrian School that was so awful even Nazis disowned them? I have truly in my life not met a lower creature than the American conservative, and this is why.

The problem with this was not that sharing quantities is technologically impossible, or that human greed is eternal and natural to the universe or to life. The interests of life imply the opposite - that sharing wealth in this way would be almost impossible to avoid, without resorting to controlled insanity. It would seem ideal to share wealth within a genuinely cooperative association of people, without that association being in the same "volk" or some identity group and deemed worthy by spurious moral criteria. In primitive society, "primitive communism" had nothing to do with any ideology or forceful imposition of the idea, as if it violated nature. Cooperative sharing was and remains a condition of survival, and was never premised on this faux-honorable moral posturing of fools. Cooperation did not even require love of your fellow man. Far from it, primitive society was one rife with distrust, where there was no institution to enforce contracts. Yet, nothing like the capitalist lust for property was used to advance a fickle, stupid, and pointless ideology like Reaganism. Reaganism could only exist because it could cannibalize everything society produced. It relies entirely on exploiting the decency that a republican society required to function in any productive sense. The Reaganites were cowards and cravens to a man and woman, who mocked anyone dumb enough to fight for them. Yet, they were able to succeed largely for the same reasons a technocratic interest could build up in a first place. Among their own, they are generous in one sense - they recognize each other and seek to protect each other, and through this, they collaborate for the task of plundering everything in sight and promoting their rot and filth. The idea of sharing the wealth can just as well be applied to those who seek to hoard it for a nefarious purpose. Nothing the Reaganites do is truly "selfish" in a crass sense. Selfishness instead is calculated and becomes the basis

for a new cooperation, based on hatred of any kindness or productivity. This is intended because their true religion was not simple greed, but depopulation and the thrill of torturing others. No such motive could be consistently held in the past and institutionalized in the democratic sector of society, the way Reaganism poisoned public consciousness and promoted a bizarre rot and contortion of the prior society, where socialist thought informed much of what was built in the 20th century. In the past, the brazen transgression of the Hitlerites would have been met with blank stares, and anyone suggesting such an abomination would have been dragged out and hanged for insolence. Only because such a movement could insinuate that it is sacrosanct and protected could it survive, and this was only possible through the rule of technology and its interest. The past forms of democide and cruelty were either confined to a predatory interest which had to operate without impunity, or were the interest of nobles and aristocracies that fought wars, and so the primary method of democide and viciousness of that sort in the past was war. War, however, carries risks and limitations, and not everyone can fight or is willing to fight. The people would reject a permanent inter-cine war that masked itself as a normal day, and would reject people who brag of their dream to exterminate 80% of the human population in the open. Reaganism is only possible if "there is no alternative", and they are propped up by opposition parties which tacitly approve of the democide and humiliation of designated losers. Such a situation could only have been done at the level of society once enough knowledge and science about society and the mechanisms at work were available to a single person or to institutions. By the late 20th century, the naive tendency of sharing and productivity in the human race, which had been the sole reason humans ever became more than slightly elevated sadistic apes killing each other, turned completely against the idea that such productivity was even possible theoretically. Without knowledge, it wouldn't even be possible for the sadistic ape of low cunning to become the familiar Satanic ape we recognize today. Such creatures survive on the goodwill of those who didn't produce for predation or fear, but out of a sense that productive labor was a necessary purpose in life. There was nothing preventing a predator from exploiting this, and this would be true in any imaginable arrangement of life and the affairs of the world. No institution is immune to predation or the competing interests of life. At heart, the productive work is a technological enterprise. Even the basic constitution of bodies, the thing that allows life to be anything other than an urge, is a form of technology which can be utilized or appropriated. On its own, technology has its own interests, so far as it is a thing wielded by life. The machines in of themselves do not assert anything by their predictable mechanisms. Only their employment for the interests of life does this, and the interest of life in its tools, which include its own body and health, is one interest which can feed itself. Everything about modern society is premised on this technological interest asserting itself as a force with its own aims, independent of the aims of property or the conceits of pigheaded people, and independent of any primary interest of life to simply live.

THE TECHNOLOGICAL INTEREST TO PRODUCE QUALITIES OF INTEREST WITHOUT REGARD TO ULTERIOR MOTIVES, OR KNOWLEDGE FOR ITS OWN SAKE

It is only in the technological interest that everything in the natural world can be compared to some general substance of utility or energy that is important to such an interest. The raw interests of life need distinct utilities which are not exchangeable, and the interests of property specifically mark qualities and demarcate quantities for life-forms. The second of these imagines a world where property arrests the world violently, and any change in the world is nothing more than a competition to defeat opponents and take their property, without any mindset of utilizing it or developing it. The first interest of life would consider any competition for resources or plan to drag the world into technology to be the primary threat to it, which impedes anything the life-form individually wanted to do in the first place. The technological interest is conflated with materialism, but materialism never suggested that all that exists is some mana to be absorbed and utilized to feed machines. Far from it, a materialist view of the world suggests a variety of distinct objects exist and that their utilities cannot be linked in any technocratic scheme. It is instead necessary for the technological interest in life to want this, to view all that exists as a machine that can be reconstructed for whatever purpose life has, and to perpetuate the very machine that is life. The technological interest is not a philosophical or spiritual pursuit, nor is it inherent to the world in a way that makes its procession inexorable. It is not difficult for a reasonable person to see that technology has no preferred teleology dictating future events, but only suggests the means by which anyone can act in the world.

Intrinsically, this technology of life serves no master other than itself. Being the only substantive part of life, the technological interest could see its own preservation as an imperative not for the sake of life or property, but as a sense of its intent as a trend in the world which can be generalized, universalized, and compared with all other things. All that is not the life-form would be brought in line with these scheme, and this in some sense is necessary for life. It must be able to assert its natural form and means in the world if it is to be a thing, and in principle, there is no reconciliation with the world or the other interests it is obligated to abide. If it is to operate, though, it can only do so by pursuing qualities of the universal substance that are of interest to technology and knowledge itself, and it must place knowledge, science, and technology as an imperative that is neutral and above the common political sense. In humans, this appears to be a new thing. For life generally, it presents as a type of material interest or realism that is the first sense that life can rise above being merely life, and can incorporate both the non-living world and other life-forms in whatever relations it can maintain. This interest would manifest in any life due to its intent, and so non-thinking life exhibits behaviors as if it seeks these qualities "by some invisible hand", and seeks quantities much as we would do by deliberate effort.

The discernment of all qualities, including knowledge of life itself and its most

basic purpose, is pursued by the technological interest. In short, it must assemble science pertaining to qualities of all things and all ideas without any ulterior motive. Life to do this must maintain some intellectual integrity, so far as life is considered a machine operating on scientific principles. This is a fatal misunderstanding of what knowledge is and does outside of life, but it is easy to see why a technocrat would view science as a thing with no ulterior motive. It would have to do so if it is to live through technology and know itself beyond an assertion of property or will. This makes a lot of sense, and so the qualities of the world are ascribed values that are in line with the pursuit of knowledge and the protection of it. All that would be described as "biological nature" as a motive for life's behavior would be seen through the technological interest, even if that interest were co-opted by an ulterior motive. For those whose primary function is to live through science and technology, it is much easier to pursue this knowledge for its own sake, and resent any other interest that would impugn on it. This includes, in the end, the basic interest of life itself, which must be questioned if we are to approach life honestly and regard it as something alien to nature, a thing born out of what appears to be some cosmic mistake and left on this Earth which did nothing to warrant such a curse.

It is not that technology is some sort of "Nature god" or "godless gangster computer god".^[10] Knowledge can easily assess that it must abide other interests and that those interest have meaning, and that the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake is futile for proving meaning or a moral justification. An extreme of technocracy is its amorality, but this is readily recognized by any life-form that can think for five minutes. An animal does not sink to the depravity of teenaged pissants indulgent in trashy parodies of philosophy, even at their worst. That perversion only exists because of a very particular confluence of interests which can co-opt technology for the present mission. What the technological interest can do is humble moral sentiments in light of a stark reality technology suggests - that life really is at heart a machine, and it is only out of necessity that moral sentiments rise above basic wants. It may seem simple enough that we would want material things because of a utility that feeds the body and its faculties, and that this can be enough. If so, the circle of genesis, the property of life, and its means of production can be completed, and we would do with any remaining surplus that which serves our wishes, individually and collectively. The same surplus, though, may claim any extra quantity and any quality of the world in service of something baser, or in service to some moral aim that is clearly at odds with this obvious aim of life. Life requires both substance and particular qualities from it to persist, and this can be taken to its maximum to consume all that exists. The only barrier to this is a will to not do so.

THE TECHNOLOGICAL INTEREST TO DEVELOP METHODS OF LEARNING AND TRANSMISSION OF KNOWLEDGE AS A FORM OF TECHNOLOGY

Among the substance and qualities the technological interest must pursue are the means to reproduce it. This substance appears as if it is completely wasted, for it invests in things that are not directly productive in nature, but instead feed the process that allows economic decisions regarding substance to be made. It has long been known that of all the tasks that can be automated and minimized, this task is the easiest of all to automate. Not only does this concern the management of resources in a grand calculation problem, which is easy to solve in any era given sufficient information. It also concerns automating the process of learning, so that every life-form can learn as efficiently as possible and with the fewest barriers to acquiring both information which allows economic decision making, and allows someone to draw meaning and purpose from learning. For us, the vehicle to learn is some sort of symbolic representation. This is often conflated with spoken or written language, but also includes the things we interact with and reverse-engineer. The default method of learning is not pedagogy, but this reverse-engineering. It is so evident that the best pedagogy typically encourages reverse-engineering known facts and things, rather than explaining a theory that does not comport with more readily accessible and incontrovertible facts that are confirmed by eyes and ears. This, though, faces difficulty because much of human knowledge cannot be inferred by reverse-engineering. Political knowledge, for instance, works specifically on the premise that it shouldn't be "figured out yourself". Politicians, and thus humans, lie early and often and revel in the lie. This knowledge is no less important to navigating the world, for nothing in nature stops humans or anything else from lying. Here we see the central problem with knowledge for its own sake, and the central source for genuine economic information. This is a very simple truth that is readily accessible, and finally grants for us a true origin for economic value that is not the result of social convention, conceits we hold of a petty nature, or some aspect of nature that is latched onto as a fad or a self-serving explanation.

There are two obvious vehicles for learning which can become machines in their own right. The first is the faculty of reproduction, carried out by the mother and biological father as sperm donor, and the rearing of offspring which is in some way intended to introduce life to society and the world. The second is pedagogy, or methods of education which become institutions with their own interest. The stated function of pedagogy is to assist this reproductive function, so that new life-forms are viable in the world. The true function of pedagogy, understood immediately, is that it would adjudicate who was in, who was out, and what to do with every life-form that passed through it. The task of pedagogy would extend to mothers who would be obliged to carry out this pedagogy from conception of new life. The machine of our own native faculties was shown to be unreliable not because it produced false knowledge, but because it implied independence and thus an alien interest that was anathema to the purpose of

technology and the rule of knowledge.

It is this that was seized upon immediately, and it is this that forms the first distinction of class in any society. Membership in any class is dependent on knowledge alone, or an adjudication that someone knows their property rights, so far as they are respected by knowledge. Knowledge, as a rule, holds both property and the right of individual life in contempt. Only those who know are granted liberty, and that bar can be set as high as those who command knowledge dictate. This command of knowledge at first could only take place for individuals. No society-wide institution of knowledge could make true its damnation of those cast out. That, though, was only a matter of time.

It is through education that moral values for anything are determined for society, rather than any natural right suggesting anything is worth anything, if the technological interest of life is taken as dominant. This would differ from the moral thought of developed society, where moral values are contingent on the real participants and pedagogy has no such monopoly. It is not the right to property itself that is asserted through force or violence that makes anything worthwhile in a general sense. All property can entail is the claim of an individual, who is always wary of other individuals. The only language for a proprietor that allows them to comprehend society is mutual distrust and alliances of convenience, in which one lord eventually rules all and subordinates all other life as slaves. The interest of life itself sees correctly that this bickering over value is senseless and contrary to anything they wanted to do in life. There was no rule of life that mandated society or any appeal to nature, or that we were to engage in general interline competition. The stated aim of the technological interest is that it alone can resolve general interline competition in any way other than force or simply ignoring the competition. Since no one could hide from this competition the moment another individual wished to take from another, it was resolved that knowledge and knowledge alone could resolve this matter. Individuals may think whatever they want about what is valuable, in accord with all of their interests. For society as a whole at the level of politics, value could only be a claim to know some thing. Property deeds are not written with the blood or genesis of claimants, but are written documents that must be attested to and verified as fact. The more primitive claims to property are still premised on an understanding between people where the rules are known. Those who do not know the rules - that is, those without the mark of social proof permitting them to even hold property - can be attacked with absolute impunity. In pure technocracy, those who do not know are not merely attacked with impunity, but attacking them becomes the chief social obligation above all others. There is no way for a technocratic society to not do this. In some way, this is adopted by life as the "rule of nature", even though the world and the actual nature makes clear that this arrangement has always been ruinous and never produces anything.

In this way, the stated aims of any technocratic society - the basic conception of any republic that claims non-domination as its goal - are negated the moment someone is too stupid to live. This judgement in the end is enforced only by

the rule of knowledge itself. Those who can insist that they alone adjudicate knowledge, by trick or threat, will be the true governing power, regardless of any economic logic or any institution which purports to mitigate it. It does not gradually decay from an ideal state set by a philosopher-king. It is rotten from the start, built to do exactly this and planned to do so from the outset. That is the true origin of civil society, and all of the assumptions of general value that humanity has held. We are only told that this is better than arbitrary authority or the claims of proprietors. Yet, the basic aim of the proprietor above all is to truly defend holdings, and no more. The proprietor's view at a basic level is that so long as he has his, the rest of the world and humanity can piss off. A proprietor's idealized view of the state imagines a state arrested in parcels of property that somehow works out, and this is not very different from how a technocratic society or communism would appear on the surface. There is no "us" that has any natural right over individuals, where the collective thinks and feels in the way individual humans would. There is no collective conscious experience that we would regard. If that were the case, humans would be very different creatures, and the question would merely be punted to this collective consciousness which must deal with other entities like it or individuals not yet absorbed into it. It is also the case that technocratic thought always worked through property, rather than against it. Anarchism, Marxism, socialism in its earlier forms, and the liberal idea all understood property as the foundation of the state, and the violence inherent in property also granted the state temporal authority to dictate any of the things that technocratic thought would enforce. The sop of technocrats is that this temporal authority would be muted and delivered to neutral experts, who are trained by pedagogy to be above this and have all of the correct ideas. This has not worked at all. Far from it, it realizes an alliance foreseen between the eugenic interest and the technocrats, which has been the sad fate of all such experiments. It is impossible to negate property by pretending it doesn't exist, when the holders of office and knowledge treat their knowledge as property. This makes most sense because all property and all value assertions held socially would be developed by knowledge alone. What it commands - labor, land, energy, or some resource judged as a metric of importance - is irrelevant. The tokens knowledge uses to command anything always presume quantities can be exchanged regardless of quality, because it needs to do this and does not intrinsically see any reason why distinct qualities should exist at all. In the main, the aim of the technocrat is to transform the world into pure "mind", some substance of thought itself which never existed in nature or in life. It will, as we would expect, destroy the world for its cause. The tendency of technocrats to use this threat of total death, and then measure out exactly pleasure and torture to impose its program, is the only natural conclusion of such an interest, if it rules with untrammelled authority and claims a monopoly on reality and truth.

THE TECHNOLOGICAL INTEREST TO ASSERT SPIRITUAL AUTHORITY THROUGH KNOWLEDGE

It does not require much knowledge to sense that this is absurd. For most life, there is no questioning that it is beholden to whatever conditions it inherits and lives in, and whatever may happen to it. There isn't anything like education, save for the habits of mating and rearing offspring, and whatever learning the animals may accomplish in their space and time. Spiritual authority is not a question that can be asked there, except for a dim sense that something is wrong in them and the world. To an animal, there is little way for them to conceive of anything being different. Humans, for all of their knowledge, are little better in this regard, but we have figured out enough to at least suggest that there is something other than this concept of value, rooted only in the interests of nature and some technology we developed. We have the capacity to ask "why", while animals so far as we know never ask that question and can only guess at their motives, most of which involve "need food" and "avoid predators". In animals, predation is almost entirely a matter of finding food, and little interest is shown in predatory behavior as a general trend. So far as animals engage in cruelty, it is towards their own kind, and usually does not extend to fatality. With little to gain from killing other than revenge for some immediate slight or a willingness to eat the own kind like any other food, anything we would construe as murder or the animal equivalent of manslaughter is barely recognized in the animal kingdom. I give no guarantees on this, as I am not well acquainted with animal psychology, but if there were dogs or cows with a penchant for murder and some of the old ultraviolence, we'd hear no end about it as a justification for human dominance, despite the endemic violence of human society that never seems to go away. Someone will ask a question about that violence which served nothing, and no intellectual inquiry can solve the problem technocratically so far as we have ever known. We could only at best manage the worst excesses of such vices, and often the technocrat chooses to willfully exacerbate such cruelty or simply elide it completely in their models of human society.

If the transmission of knowledge is most necessary for this interest to work, education becomes almost immediately the key division within society and the marker to decide who can be in the "human" club. It becomes clear that any incipient movement within humanity to teach themselves must be sabotaged at the earliest possible event. Since the mother's tie to the infant is natural and physically proximate, this is the most obvious entry point to begin entry point. The first conspirator is the mother herself, who sees the child either as a vehicle for her own purposes or some parasite that she hosted for many months and now won't go away. Only a fool believes a mother's love is a universal or something that can be taken for granted. Very often this love does not extend far, and it is the mark of a fool to tell him or her that the mother unconditionally loves them. Such affection is always conditional, and this is something all new mothers will learn. If they do not figure it out, they will be cruelly reminded of what unfettered love means in social obligations. This, of course, runs counter

to a basic sense in life's overriding interest that offspring need to be protected, and further the infant did nothing and could not seriously be accused of any crime. The crimes of Being that are the chief diagnosis of education, always ready, are the only tools that can be used to assign shame to the infant, who at this point does not know the horrible race he or she is a member of. At an early point, the race is not yet a Satanic race, and never will completely become that despite the insinuation of that being its inevitable nature by the most committed pedagogues. It is very uncommon for sentiment towards life to be so thoroughly annihilated, but it is common in the past century and has become the rule of humanity in technocratic society, with or without eugenics. Where eugenics dominates, hatred towards the newborn is institutional and put into practice by mothers who are true believers. To do otherwise is anathema to everything drilled in them. Yet, no system, not even eugenics, removes many of the obvious purposes for nurturing a child. It is not difficult to see that human infants need an environment that will not kill them, and so the first ritual that is sacrosanct, and that which made the human race distinct, is ritual sacrifice of the child, practiced in nearly every human society in one way or another. Today, one of those rituals is abortion, granted sacrosanct status. Another is the common ritual abuse of children which is known and recorded but never allowed to stop. Once the cycle of abuse starts, it is a great taboo to stop it, and those who try learn over time that they cannot stop something with such inertia. It has been the great mission of Galton's eugenic creed to maximize this, make it total, make it universal, and then tell all humans that the eugenic religion is the only possible religion and the social obligation of all. Most people who are not Satanic retards like Galton will not subscribe to this, and even the coldest technocrat has enough sense that making all children into Satanic bastards and vessels for such a creed is counterproductive. Because it is well known that humans do not do well without affection, and because immaculately calculated cruelty and malice of the eugenic sort is difficult to maintain unless one is a true believer, it is almost natural for children to find some affection. If nothing else, the infant finds some time and space away from the cruelty of other humans, for humans can only travel so far without institutional violence to allow them entry and an ever-watchful malicious eye on the newborn. It is nearly impossible to prevent an infant from finding some source of affection, even if that must come from the air and the wind as the last companions for the child. A naive hope and curiosity in the infant drives it to attempt to learn what the other humans are saying, or find some meaning in the symbols and objects the infant encounters. Very often, infants learn not by any extensive pedagogy, but by simply having an environment that is at all stable and allows it to grow. Because this very easy approach has worked for a very long time, it is the first and most obvious thing for a parent to do, so much that they can't find a way to fuck this up unless they're trying.

Naturally, the duller technocrat finds a way to fuck this up, and suggests that because malice is a fact of the race's existence, the growth of an infant is entirely passive, so that the problem of growth can be automated and worked out in some

stages of development and model which takes away any duty of an actual person. Perhaps this is better than many of the alternatives, but usually, infants will engage with other humans as part of this learning, and if they're allowed to have friends, that is decided before they meet wider society. If they are not selected to be allowed friendship, the conditioning begins before the infant can speak, and trying to violate the cycle of rejection will just make the pain worse. It might be possible to reject this conditioning, but when a technocrat decides the fate of a life, it is decided early and finally. A technocrat will never, ever acknowledge for a moment that the theory was wrong. That is anathema to their entire concept of knowledge and intelligence, no matter how spurious it is. We see here one early chink in the armor of technocracy - that knowledge only ever advances in spite of the stubborn who hold the institutions, no matter how much they are aware of this problem. Even if a technocrat would submit to a second opinion, he or she only does so because that practice is institutionalized. To admit the theory is wrong requires the technocrat to revise their adjudication of science, and questions their intelligence and legitimacy in making these judgements. This is a pattern which is necessary for education. Once a judgement is made about a child, that position is locked in, and all initiative of anyone else to violate it is to be attacked. This, of course, is absurd, but we must remember we are speaking of the technological interest in its purest expression. If the procession of life is measured in stages that are dictated by education, the institution of education possesses something that it cannot give up under any circumstances. The only way it could change is if the institution of education itself is questioned, or is able to adopt a model of knowledge and pedagogy that is alien to the technocratic way of life. In short, it would mean that any educational model which doesn't do this would give up on the supremacy of knowledge for its own sake, and thus the legitimacy of technocracy is destroyed. The legitimacy of a republic, and the legitimacy of a commonwealth is destroyed if the theory is wrong. It seems silly to bank everything on a theory when it has been demonstrated as erroneous, but any institution which questions the supremacy of education is anathema to the entire setup of the society, and suggests that science does not possess this spiritual authority nor do institutions substitute for this authority adequately. This is where the trinitarian view breaks down and inevitably reverts to either the eugenic interest or a fickle selfishness, both of which are either manipulated by technocrats in a bid to stay relevant, or which eventually overruns them. This is why revolution is central to the theory of technocrats, but revolution as a concept is particular to such a mindset and is only ever recognized as such in modernity.^[11] It is not a question of the revolution actually happening, but that a peculiar faith about "the revolution" is divorced from how politics actually works, and this idea is modeled off a theory that prescribes stages of controlled development like a pedagogue's conceit about the child. It's insulting and intended to be so, but it is always a story told to those who are not allowed to participate in meaningful politics. Those with a working brain have always known the revolutionary myths to be just that, and that so far as the revolution was worth anything, it was either to keep the peace or uphold the property the interests in charge had won. The interests of actual societies do not conform

to the interests of life in their basest form, but a technocratic mindset suggests all such interests must be rooted in "nature" - which is to say, the technocrat's preferred conceit about biology, whatever it may be. Because of this, it would be in the study of life that technocrats would find spiritual authority, and here they made the most fatal blunder of human history. I do not say this lightly, but then, I do have a suspicion, just a suspicion, that many of the technocrats knew they had made no "blunder" at all.

THE TECHNOLOGICAL INTEREST TO OCCULT THEIR KNOWLEDGE FOR THE PURPOSE OF THEIR INSTITUTION, CLASS, AND LIFE THAT SPECIALIZES IN THE INTEREST

In every event, the technological interest defaults to appeals to nature, even when it is clear life isn't entirely natural, nor are we entirely defined by life. This really is an appeal to scientism, rather than "science" in the sense that the natural world contains events that can be understood. If the technological interest wishes to adjudicate honesty, it can only do so either through a spiritual authority which is alien to it and thus undermines it in some way, or it can only resort to bland tautologies. This thinking is ascribed to particular philosophies, but it is really the technocratic mindset itself with this illness. I have written in notes about the positivists, who are often misunderstood, and the "logical positivists" who are neither logical, positivist, or really saying anything except idiotic lies. The same scientism is found throughout the tradition of all ideologies, and ideology itself is a creature of scientism.^[12] We would not hold ideology in any regard if not for the scientism inherent in technocratic conceits, and then ideology can only exist when it can make itself real, despite everyone in history seeing ideology as a bunch of horseshit. The only reason ideology came to the forefront is because of totalizing societies that destroyed all standards of comparison and meaning. This is only possible because knowledge was now occulted and held by a technocratic elite. This elite claims that it pursues the optimization of production in quantity and quality, and that only the elite can determine qualities or meanings. This may seem fair to the naive, but there are enough misgivings if any technocratic polity is viewed in action. Further experience suggests that everything a technocrat says, even if it would make sense for the technocrat to reckon with a reality outside of his or her preferred theory or conceit, is at odds with the most basic mechanisms put into practice. Why is simple - everything in technocracy entails everyone who holds the machines occulting their function, pretending to work for pretend pay, and those who rule reveling in symbolic representation and lies. There is no other basis for the rule of thought alone and the rule of "nature" to proceed. It is here that the promise of any commonwealth, which might have seemed much better than the alternatives on offer, turns on itself and begins undoing all promises they made. There is no other way for such a construct in its purest form to not do this. The only barrier is whatever interest lingers in society that has no reason to go along with it, and the technocrat holds all relevant cards. The only danger to a technocrat are any allies they must accept for the time being. If,

however, the rule of science is established not in theory but in fact - when the technology available to a life-form qualitatively does something that would allow the machine to come into its own and override life and the true nature of the world - then no interest can truly win against the technocrat, and is increasingly subordinated to it. The last resort of the former ruling interest, which typically makes peace with the leading technocrats, is to embrace the blackest reaction, which the technocrats really have no problem with so long as the targets of this reaction are the technocrat's true enemies - the multitudes of poor workers and lumpens who don't get with the program, can't get with the program, and never have any reason to get with the program. Even if the poor were willing to submit to abject slavery, none of the rulers want them. The only question is how to do this.

If the technocratic interest remains wholly biopolitical and obsessed with life, then there is only one form of government, one economic model, and one idea which will gradually invade all others, and dominate all institutions. That, sadly, is eugenism, seen in the Nazis. The most elaborate and evil form of it was the form that won, the religion of Francis Galton. That said, the biopolitical interest is not the only one, and the obsession with life has less to do with the truth of life or the natural world, but with an intellectual conceit of life. This is the final answer and why the technocratic polity can NEVER work on its own terms. All other barriers to its success could be understood, foreseen in advance, and recognized as long-term errors in the project. It might have been possible for a technocrat to conceive that, however bad their rule actually is, the potential for good outweighs the loss. It is further made clear that the past was not significantly better, and past rulers given the machines of a technocrat would do everything a technocrat would do if they were at all competent. The technocrat's disdain for the past leads to their belief that history is bunk, and the conceits of Whig History where the imperial future is always bright. Other versions of this are that communism is just around the corner, if the workers sacrifice just a little more to the Party. In the communist example, there was a concept of history and truth that guided the communist idea, and so the socialist attempt to resolve technocratic errors was as far as humanity ever got to a different type of world. It did not accomplish much, and only sporadically could do so. Promotion and success was always premised on accepting the technocratic idea, and leaving behind anyone who didn't "get it". Class mobility was no longer about personal improvement, but a society-wide contempt for those who didn't get it, and a crass indulgence in symbolic knowledge. This disease afflicted everyone, and no society was more ravaged by this disease than that of the United States.^[13]

If biopolitics is to be the chief institution of technocratic rule, then technocracy is deployed for the Big Lie and nothing else. This did not need to conform to fascism or even an oligarchy of capital and private property. Even if the eugenic interest were entirely subsumed by the intellectual and technological interest, and the wise philosopher-kings and philosopher-queens could mind control us to accept anything, the mind control would still emphasize lies. It stems from using the language of life, which is conflated with nature and economics, as the

primary vehicle of control. Command of public health, education, and every other institution which commands life - as the holder of imperium must do - becomes obsessed with lying. Life must die. Health must be monopolized and associated with the intellectual class alone. Education is to be limited, and all other classes will be lied to about everything. A habit of lying consumes the whole country. The greater the rule of the intellectual elite, the greater the lying. The technocrats who promise love and kindness and prosperity and quality of life turn to hatred of the lower class more than any capitalist ever could manage. It is this that the ruling capitalists knew to align with and maximize for as long as they could. The capitalists did not need to encourage the intellectuals to get it, though. The intellectuals by and large were way ahead of the capitalists when it came to killing the poor. For the capitalist, the hatred of workers was merely a business transaction. Whatever the capitalist thought of the lower classes in the end had no relevance to his genuine feelings, because the capitalist cares more about his wealth. It would be conceivable for a capitalist to simply pay off the poor and bar them from reproducing, and wait for their numbers to deplete. Nothing about capitalism suggests that they are in any way married to a large workforce. Far from it, capitalism suggested to employ as few workers as possible and work them for as long as possible, and only that. The residuum to a capitalist is safe to ignore, and might amuse the capitalist in some principle. Further, it is not at all out of character for a capitalist oligarch to become a Caesar, knowing the historical example but considering his options and believing that the true end of the republic is worth more than maintaining its pretenses. For the technocrat, hatred of the worker is a personal vendetta. The technocrat had nothing but his or her determination to rise and claw up in the great game, and pursued pure power rather than opulence or any marker. The sight of the underclass who were not smart is an affront to everything the technocrat stands for. Hatred of the stupid is not just implied by the technocrat's motivation. It is their highest social obligation above all.

It is for that reason that I chose the title of this book - "The Retarded Ideology". This above all is the final word of any technocratic arrangement of economic and political life. **"Once retarded, ALWAYS retarded."** The technocrat never forgets that, and he or she never wants anyone else to forget it. They hate all opponents - the stupid, the capitalists who obstruct their rise with their pithy whining about luxuries, the workers who had it too easy and didn't earn their keep. But most of all, they hate that which their own soul resembles - the retarded, the foolish, the insane, the crippled, and those who were damned from birth in the most ancient ritual humanity ever knew. When this is accepted, the technocrat's true preferred spirituality is not science or reason or any of the enlightened goals they might have pursued. It is instead a Luciferian conceit where the technocrat jumps up and down like a madman or harridan, convinced they will become a god through knowledge alone. No matter how it is done - individually or through the collective - this is the only endgame of technocracy. It cannot be stopped and cannot change within the laws of technocracy. The only way out would be to look outside of the superficial veneer of nature, and to

that which is meaningful in the genuine sense. This has been understood the whole time, and followed even now. Very often, the intelligent are fully aware that this is what they have created, and they have nothing else to offer, but because it has gone on for this long and there are many interests clawing for influence, there is no time or space for any spiritual goal or any sense that it could be different.

This of course applies not to the actual governments that exist, which are necessarily not "pure technocracies" and are aware of this defect. It instead points to the tendencies of "true believers" who have always been given over to such a program, and likely knew from their teenaged years that their ambition was to hide behind the man with the crown and govern through him. That would be the smart play, after all. Visible prestige is the worst position for someone to cajole the world to be what he or she desired. The institutions today give such true believers with a mind to claim what is possible an inroad that did not exist in the past, and also lead other true believers to follow insane beliefs. An example of this is the recurring motifs of science fiction like mind uploading and the most idiotic myths of the eugenic creed, which are believed unironically by people who indulge in the cult of education and "The Science". The incentives of rule through science promote such maladaptive behavior, and give an inroad to those with just enough cleverness to make the rest of us miserable. In the main, though, the officers of governments today out of necessity limit the worst excesses, or care only for their more petty corruption and venal office. Often, the officers of government - both the formal figureheads and the officers behind the curtain - only do what is needed to root out dissent, operating only as effectively as they must to ensure the grift never ends. Few institutions in such a society function well, and none function with any of the promised-for efficiency. Those who believe the Thought Police in Oceania is efficient have never seen such a thing in motion. The malice of such people is zealously pursued, but even in this malice they operate with gross inefficiencies and rank incompetence. The only requirement of the core functions which truly rule is to ensure that no one is allowed to challenge them. Beyond that, even the most sacred control mechanisms are only as effective as they need to be, and they are rife with laziness. Their lust for violence can never be as absolute as they want the lower orders to believe, because their conceit of controlling reality at all levels is far from anything they can actually attain. The only way to make it true, which has come to pass, is mass poisoning and degradation of the people, destroying the very thing which made their society possible. First it cannibalizes the base for recruitment, promising those who won that they will be a superior caste. Then, as the sacrifices are exhausted, it cannibalizes the very officer core who believed they would win, while placing all inside the halls of power under pressure to conform. The ruling elite degenerates into a pure viper's nest, only functioning to ensure no new elite can rise without paying homage to the rot of it all. The bottom of the well, the absolute last resort of technocracy, is scientific despotism of the truest kind. This is the final phase before the arrangement winks out of existence, ensuring the worst form of the barbarism - one that follows from their

own principles and becomes a thing embraced by them as the last vestiges of the intellectuals claw at anyone and everyone, and everyone is left stupid and desperate. The dream of the technocrats is that, after so much time passes, the larger cycle will re-emerge, repeating exactly every 800 years or so, and here we see the cyclical view of history and time overtake the model of totalizing historical progress that they pretend to believe in, and which remains a shibboleth of the true believers.

It appears from this that the technocrat is so malicious that eugenics is a foregone conclusion. I warn the reader that eugenism was only one way this could have turned out, and that even if eugenism were somehow defeated, the same impulse of knowledge in life asserts itself. The technocrat's intentions and moral code do not need to conform to the most base mechanisms of the technological interest. There was, in all of the technocratic polities, some sense that whatever came out of the other end of policy was intended to produce something better, however that was construed. A technocrat could easily see that some day, technocratic settlements would be questioned, and the policies and aims of a technocratic society are adaptable to their environment. There may have come a time where dickering over intelligence or some lump of horseflesh was secondary, and even dull men and women could be employed and live out their lives, whatever good that would do. That seemed to the naive like the trajectory of human society - that the stupid would still improve in some sense, though the stupid would be marked and tracked and never allowed to escape the purview assigned to them. This is nothing new for the human race, and so it appears as an improvement and something that could be improved upon further. The naive view of the stupid in technocratic society, and one that was promoted, is that so long as someone could be useful enough for production, there would be enough self-interest of those who employed labor to keep a body around, or find some other use for the flesh if labor was no longer needed. It is not a rule that medical or social experiments are conducted with the Galtonite's penchant for maximal humiliation, or the alienation inherent in the technocratic philosophies that did arise, where conceited and stupid scientists treat their human livestock and lab rats with gratuitous disdain. It is entirely conceivable that these scientific experiments could have been in line with some sort of science that the lab rat would appreciate. It would have seemed reasonable for the lab rat to be a willing participant if that was his fate in this sad society, so long as the experiment was not grotesque. It is the particular philosophies of science that humans developed that ensured the human scientist was more malevolent than a naive mind would have expected. The scientist of the human race drips with contempt for their inferiors, carrying all of the vices of bourgeois and aristocratic ideology and centuries of bigotry. The human race, by all objective measurements, is a slobbering beast, half-aware of anything it is doing and consumed with a lust for opiates, orgies, and depravities that do not require any great intelligence to see past. The ruling philosophies of the human race, which are not universal even among animals on Earth, revel in such thoughtless cruelties, and the theories of knowledge and spiritual authority allowed to flourish encourage this stupidity.

The world where this didn't happen would likely not have allowed most of the world religions to go on as they have, and in some sense, modernity was the end of those traditional religions. Many times, the priests, monks, and people who studied religion developed the greatest contempt for the tradition, as they saw correctly that the religions and philosophies of humanity were premised on lies and cheats and nothing more. Ultimately, the institutions of religion could be abandoned because they never held the spiritual authority that they pretended to wield, and the church's role in promoting moral probity or social order was both superceded by the rising technological interest found in the bourgeois, and by a long-stand disgust of the common down to the poorest towards the dogmas of aristocratic religion. Religion would attempt to appeal to mass audiences but could only do so because the philosophical core of religions would be obscured or rendered in alien language, while the esoteric secrets of all religions glorified war and aristocracy. What common people would have found in religion or spiritual thought was smothered on sight. This was not always the case - ancient paganism was more often than not no more than folk religions for the rural and smallfolk. The cults of Saturn, Jupiter, and so on were never true religions with any mass following, and very obviously the gods of the Romans, like many polytheistic systems, were avatars for the aristocracy and their officers. Fealty to Jupiter, Concord, and the superstitions of Rome was not about fervent belief in the system, but loyalty to what was considered political thought and spiritual authority. You didn't need to know the theory of why you follow Concord or the rituals it entailed. You only had to know that Concord meant it was time to drop hostilities and abide the ritual. Most common people were simply never religious in that way, but they knew the names and functions of the Roman pantheon and had some sense of why you would abide this, regardless of their own beliefs. Roman cults even at the top never had any singular ideology or command structure, and different emperors or families invested in different deities as their preferred representation. Usually the leaders of Rome for a lot of reasons stuck with Jupiter, greatest and best, but this had less to do with any ideology or fervent belief that Jupiter was intellectually right, and more to do with the reality that Jupiter was the symbol of state authority in most cases. The rise of Christian orthodoxy, then modern faith in Reason which took various stances based on which philosophy one followed, and finally the rise of institutional orthodoxy dominated by eugenics, are all different iterations of the same mechanism, in that loyalty to the theory was not due to a full intellectual or spiritual understanding, but due to the expectation in society that following this was the way things are done. Religion proper is far more than an intellectual project or a theory adjudicated by thought alone, but all religions spread through knowledge and practices which can be intellectually understood. Reconstructing a model of the religion's spread is not difficult, and it is expected in society if anyone is to regard a religion as socially meaningful. There is some reason people can pick up suggesting that this works, even if the deeper causes are not things that rationally hold any value; religion for example often entails a history that is more than some theory or spurious claim.

The point of this discursion is to make clear that even as humans recognize the failure of pure reason, they cannot be much more than what they were at the start. It does not take a great genius to see, without the fetters of humanity's total society, that humans are not particularly smart or effective, and do not have any built-in purpose or destiny that is intellectually appreciated. Even a child can see the clear malice and stupidity of elders, who insist that this stupidity is some sort of genius or meritorious. This doesn't change as we become adults, and the very poor management of society is made clear, despite people making the intellectual connection that none of that suffering is necessary or desirable. We can easily see that we can be better than this, and better than any religious tradition thus far has allowed. We are also aware, if we are not blinded by ideology, that technological progress does not turn humans into a perfected being of light and pure power, as if teleology implied that such a state is the purpose of existence. Those who are obsessed with the technological interest above all others default to this fundamentally insane view - and so they will in the end lapse into the thinking of the worst aristocracy, feeding the beast and reverting as aristocrats do to the primordial light. This is something that many humans, even the dullest, see as an obvious trap. Technocratic society is acutely aware of this deficiency, and yet, the institutions and practices of such a society cannot help but encourage the spread of such aristocratic vice. That, after all, is seen as natural, so long as no one and nothing is around to impose a sobering influence on a cloistered genius.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] "Self-regulating" markets and systems are themselves a fiction that serves ideological purposes, and this is extended to the kingdom of life, which is made identical with nature as a whole, since non-living parts of the natural world are deemed inadmissible to the ruling ideas. Nothing about nature "regulates" anything at all. The supposed balance of life in total is not corrected by "kind killing", and this idea is nothing more than a recapitulation of Malthus' hideous faith in destroying the poor. The corrections of societies of living systems are violent corrections, in which mass death happens for no good reason, and little arises out of the process. Somewhere, a petty-manager inserts him or herself as capital-N "Nature", and it is here where the conceit of "natural order" is laid bare for what it always was. An aristocrat and their running dogs see this as some passive act, but we know it is always active from the agents themselves, or a desperate lashing out as the environment of some natural resource depletes. Usually, though, long before any true resource shortage, the eugenic interest in life asserts the drive for competition, and so the living agents take it upon themselves to follow "nature's law". If the Malthusian belief about natural limits to growth were true, the Earth would have been rapidly exhausted by the explosion of single-celled life. There would not be any natural check on the growth of this single-celled life, if it were indeed a mindless consumer and breeder that was only checked by the elimination of their numbers. It is far more likely

that life expands not mindlessly and inexorably, but that life forms some colony and that is its preferred establishment. After establishment, the inhabitants of a colony, whatever they are, tend not to roam far from that colony. Lone life-forms tend not to be prolific breeders at all, and this has less to do with any resource shortage or adaptation to survive, but exists rather because life never was "mindlessly breeding" in this sense that Malthus' predictions require. If that prediction is untrue, and I believe that has been proven time and time again, then Darwin's mechanism of natural selection is thrown into serious doubt at a basic level, and we would look at mechanisms that would drive evolution other than it. To counteract this, the eugenist ideologues invented a "fake opposition" of various motley fools, who make the claim that it either is 100% "nature" or 100% "there is no nature". That is to say, the fake opposition claims the most idiotic sops to claim that nature is somehow nice or demands that life be inherently "communist" in some foolish sense, which has always been a Fabian ploy to insult anyone who would criticize the eugenic creed. In the eugenic mindset, violence and natural correction must become the sole property of the creed, and to accomplish this, it naturalizes its sentiments and places them in all things, all places, and redefines nature as a god in their image. As we have made clear, there is nothing "natural" about life at all, which insists that nature and life are functionally identical. This is anathema to everything the eugenic interest stands for, including earlier philosophies which were predominantly driven by cults of life or death cults. The most likely explanation, suggested not long after Darwin's writing, is that this theory must be modified considerably to be a workable understanding of natural history. Darwin's actual theory of natural selection is more complicated than the crass version that came to be promoted, in which cooperation was a possibility of life, and Darwin himself acknowledges difficulties with the theory. His writing was the first effort to import political economy into the question of natural history, where before natural history had to work off of best guesses. I would argue that political economy is inappropriate to the question of the history of life, and my arguments here would be an explanation of what life actually is and does. I do not purport to solve the question of natural history, which properly speaking is a question of the technological interest in life. It is very attractive to a would-be technocrat to view the struggle for life as something that can be arrested and documented by scientists, rather than the way political economy usually settled things with violence and ugliness. Above all, scientists never like to hear an answer that is anathema to their faith but that us scum experience every day of our lives - "shit happens". Since "shit happens" has little explanatory power, it is understandable why this is not featured in natural history, but it does indeed happen for reasons unknown. The very existence of life itself is an anomaly in a universe that is almost entirely dead, and yet, the universe is not particularly hostile to the idea of life. Life itself simply cannot occupy the vacuum of outer space, and life being what it is would need some medium to conduct its workings, which itself is not too common in the universe. It is therefore inappropriate to identify nature, which entails everything, with life that only occupies a small niche of nature and imperfectly at that.

[2] If you doubt me, read up on the social circles these assholes travel in, and you will see that they love a good thrill. They just have a different concept of what is exhilarating, and what pleasure entails in their ethos. It is not pleasant, and when it comes to their comforts, they are extravagant in pursuing them, and never want to hear anyone else telling them no. It is why Galton exhorts the poor to die as he never works a proper job in his life, living as a comfortable gentleman and surrounded by other imperial assholes who inherited the work of their better elders.

[3] It is my belief that we observe selective pressures in the human race today, and this selection is not driven by any merit or particular purpose for doing so, nor by the conceit of thought leaders who believe they will guide evolution. There are certain qualities which appear desirable when the social environment encourages their expression, despite any reason why these traits favor survival. For example, the obsession with height for male partners serves little function, and many of the facial traits associated with attractiveness are preferred for form rather than any merit that we would regard in a productive sense or that would be favorable for a war where combat effectiveness is desired. The traits selected for by the whims of "natural attraction" are often little more than a recapitulation of some form that asserts itself, and in this way, certain traits become standard and others are "disused" by rejection from the mating game. Petty distinctions often are the difference between life and death in the sexual rituals of the human race, and it is likely animals are no less conceited in the ways they mate, when sexual partner choice is conducted through some mating ritual. It is also a simple reality that life cannot travel too far from its starting position, and most life is known to be territorial. A part of selection is simply driven by the dumb luck of geographic circumstance, and a limited pool of partners in a given area, which suggests over time a gradual homogenization of many traits. There is little evidence of celebrating diversity in the animal kingdom, and it is certainly an abiding trait of humanity that diversity in biological forms has never been valued for most societies. The only evidence that humans have favored diversity is the common male fantasy of a diverse harem of women he may impregnate. Few of us can hope for that dream, but it is well known that males are in the end not too picky about partners, and the greatest danger for a man is not finding the ideal genetic match, but finding a woman who is not going to leave him for dead at the first opportunity. Worse yet is a man left with ruination and debt, which is a sad fate for many of us poor sods. I count myself fortunate to have never been with a woman in that regard, and so I have been spared the usually bad fate awaiting men. I suppose at least it is better than that in many species, where the male is destroyed after mating and the natural order marches on all the same. Behaviors in mating are often elaborate enough to suggest that they are not at all random or stochastic, but entail some vague instinct or taboo to signal a form of selection that works at the level of individual pairings. Indirectly this works towards certain ends. Nothing inborn suggests any preferred social form or any sense that reproduction is for "the species" in some sense of Germanic nationalism at all. The conventions of reproduction, for

the lowest animal and for us, appear driven by little more than superficial and individual vanity, which has asserted itself. Those who subscribe to that vanity, and its most degenerated forms that appear in human society, have been the first to embrace all ideology that naturalizes their proclivities. The Galtonites are screaming examples of that for their own perversions, fetishes, and conceits about themselves, and the women who embrace such a view make the stupidest decisions and as a rule never will be held accountable. This vice of the eugenicist female is encouraged, as is the depravity and piggishness of eugenicist males and the thuggery of all of their subordinates and enablers.

If this can be accepted, then it would require us to view evolution not as something happening passively in a domain for a particular race, but as individual dyads. This would be in line with the social model I present earlier, which would be the basis for how selection among a race, or in any given ecology, would proceed. The eugenists, to impose the "conditions of Eugenics", require a tremendous preponderance of violence in order to conceive of their society at all. For all of their effort, the results of Galton's eugenics, which have been in force for a century, suggest that it produced no quality worthwhile among the favored of the race, at the expense of grotesque violence and horrific atrocities against everyone else. When that wasn't enough by the 1970s, and the workers retained enough sense and virtue to agitate against this abomination in motion, the eugenists resort to mass poisoning and glorify the rot and depravity of their race and the human race generally, just as Hitlerism did to their own and to the conquered races.

The difficulties with this model is that we are not there to observe most animal mating, and so its value for explaining natural history is little, absent specifics. It would, however, grant an indication of general trends in development that suggest an orientation of life not towards fitness, but towards prejudices and vanity. Only the sobering influence of an external world has motivated life to be much more than this. The history of early mankind, noted for endemic violence and regular enjoyment of sadism for no particular reason, is indicative of what the natural order of life really was - nasty, brutish, and short, just as Hobbes said. What Hobbes wouldn't admit is that the nastiness and brutishness could not reach too far, and the shortness of life was not so short that it wasn't possible for technology and thought to progress, however slowly, simply by some sense that it might be better not to do any of this. Sadly, that primitive eagerness to learn and grow would be yet another thing harvested by the eugenic interest and its eventual creed, so that humans may be herded like livestock just as the animals were hunted and herded. "Alpha race", my friends.

[4] This will be developed further in a later chapter, but I believe that the language centers in human beings could develop in earnest once the crudest symbolic expressions could begin among humans or their forebears, and it is this active use which first inflamed a trait that was formerly dormant, then encouraged its expression in mating and fitness to survive in a hostile world. It would not take long for humans, sufficiently wise, to turn this selective pressure

from mere mating and fitness to an active hunt against undesirables. This, I maintain, is the sordid origin of the human race, and that is not merely an article of faith to uphold the present ideology. I believe it to be the sordid truth of what we are, a thing we have always known and pretended to be something else, or glorified with myths that it doesn't deserve. The human race are creatures born of incest, cruelty, malice, and generally vile behaviors which only became worse before some decency became necessary. Given that ape mating rituals were not too different, the great adaptation in humans appears to be their symbolic language giving them yet another vehicle to operate the death cult, and eventually the development of humiliations and torture common to the race up to now.

[5] Here we see the heart of the Malthusian and Darwinian claims - that psychological traits must be the result of "natural selection", i.e. a naturalized practice of eugenics in races. An exemplar of the lowest of humanity is put up, and the working class in total is told "this is you" and threatened with terror, torture, humiliation, and death ad nauseum. It is necessary to naturalize the sadism of that imperial clique which was so necessary for all of their wealth, and so they did exactly that. It is very likely that in the animal kingdom, psychological traits advanced only through some dull plodding of the animals, as if their mind were of little consequence. Outside of the most basic functions, the brain of an animal only had to be adaptive enough to perform a few tasks, and obvious defects were clearly out of the mating pool and probably exterminated. Other than that, there simply wasn't any great advantage to mental distinction until humans. There might have been some trend of larger brains in animal life, and the culls of life from predation favored wits in some way, but also favored the malice of all races, most of all Darwin's own. It became necessary to tie in human society intelligence to imperial malice and make them identical, rather than any metric we would regard as reason or intellect. That is why eugenic selection in modernity favored not general intelligence, but a perverse variant selecting for the most maladaptive traits in the white nations and of the English aristocracy in particular. All traces of anything worthwhile in their aristocracy would be purged violently, and the thrill of torture became the obligation of their race forevermore, just as the King or Queen of England is a monster. It would not be long before their obligation turned from a mere racial trait to a Satanic ritual, which we live under presently. None of this produced any of the promised-for intellect, which is why they decided they would "win" by poisoning systematically everyone else, to claim that their petty venal symbols, based on a bunch of bullshit, were the actual markers of "IQ", despite no evidence that this produced anything. The deterioration of science as a practice, and the proliferation of these well-bred retards in the institutions of knowledge, locked down forever any possibility that humans would improve much with regards to intelligence. Once again, the dull plodding of animals is the only thing that would advance human intelligence, except this time the violent culls of these Satanic retards, and they are retarded, ensure that any sign of independent life that would see the obvious futility of this mission is exterminated on sight. Therefore, the human race

is condemned, even in the best of cases, to this fate of screaming mania over the most trifling and superficial markers of intelligence, and every habit of the human race favors incuriosity and the laying of traps, simply because it was too much for them to allow a society where any cooperation was possible. Satanic race. Failed race. Failed race. Failed race.

[6] Some asshole is going to accuse me of being a racist or alterna-eugenicist, and I will simply repeat - none of this is intended to suggest that natural inequality of human races exists at all, or that it would be a justification for political inequality. The races deemed inferior who live in Africa are not stupid and have read all of this debate and heard enough. The tribes, nations, and citizens in African countries are perfectly aware of this debate and don't need me to say what they actually think, for they have their own judgements of the matter and no real reason to with-hold their opinion of imperious white people riding in on a high horse. If they call bullshit on this religion of political inequality, having considerable experience with the concept in their own society and a theory pertaining to it, that would be good enough for me to say that they get perfectly well what is intended by eugenics. The people most married to this conceit are members of the white race who are obviously failed, and me being who I am, I have heard enough from these retards braying about intelligence. Perhaps some day we can speak of the faculties of everyone, when we're not in the dark ages. By that time, though, humans will have somehow managed to not allow this Galtonite disease any more credence, if we are so fortunate to be rid of it in a different time and a different world. In any event, the distinctions I refer to here do not concern general intelligence, but peculiar functions that would give rise to the brain in developed form, such as "hardcoded" behaviors commonly acknowledge in mammals and many other animals. These behaviors would not conform to whole social mores, which is impossible and clearly an imposition of some technocrat's conceit, but very basic behaviors like affinity for certain colors or patterns that would guide mating behavior, and the behaviors which would foster closeness with other life which are far from a given. The people who insist on these technocratic conceits always take for granted that human behavior is fixed in code, which gives them the perfect excuse to try, try again when they disregard the environmental conditions that allow human beings to develop affection and much of their social behavior. This makes sense for those who have always aspired to create a society where the state and institutions raise children, and they are stripped of their ancient sentiments and hopes. What these fools never learn is that those basic behaviors guide what they dismiss as "hardcoded common sense", and so what was called "common sense" is denuded. It never was as common as it was purported to be and this was a known joke throughout history, but it is clear in the past 50 years that this common sense has not just withered due to the environment of our time, but that the perception of it is yet another victim of the educational regime and this disease of proppanda that is ubiquitous in society.

[7] How this is done is not merely a matter of a Eugenic College arranging mates, or the various games insinuating such a thing. The state's intrusion

into family life is, as we will see in the next book, deliberate and a feature of human institutions from an early stage. More than anything else, those who would aspire to empires and state society saw independent families as their greatest destabilizing element. Families that were independent of the state entail an institution to which members of society were connected that had many reasons to consider the state a menace to be avoided at all costs. The first foray was to draw family life into religious cults and lurid practices, and encourage as much as possible prostitution in the temple and glorification of fetish and depraved behavior. This was in time resisted for all of the deleterious results it created. When too many people adapted to this by strengthening their clan affiliations and turning away from the state, the new order of the day was to retrench patriarchal norms and make them a religious and temporal obligation of the father. Patriarchal leadership had long been accepted but its implementation was varied and sporadically enforced, often maintained because men were tasked with hunting, herding livestock, fighting wars, were almost always the public face of political life, and as a result were more ingratiated with all of the things that would allow them to take command of the family unit. The state's intervention into family life worked through this condition and suggested a conspiracy of the politically aware men to protect each other, and obligate all men to uphold the state's conception of property and offer their children to the state in some way. This would further be advanced by introducing various reforms, which varied based on the civilization in question but often entailed the proliferation of state-issued currency, the strengthening of feudal obligations and the conscription of peasant labor, and eventually the establishment of classical political theory in the civilizational centers of the Old World. As this patriarchal role of the father was codified into law, the holders of the state proceeded to secretly encourage every intrigue, humiliation, and denigration, so that common men could not possibly live up to these patriarchal standards. The aristocracy would encourage the vice of women, host lavish orgies, encourage women to cheat on their husbands and then obligate the husband to defend his honor over this clear bullshit, which the cuckolded husband knew full well was a plot by men in the know to humiliate him, and so on. The purpose of this is not for the simple amusement it gives aristocrats, but their habit of continual transgression of norms that they establish, to drive home the point that none of this is real and it will never, ever be different. The purpose of these humiliations, which extend to every social environment where they can be implemented, is to maintain a constant state of wariness of men, who have been habituated to fight in their society and consider insults to their person to be a matter settled with violence, as would be expected in the period of clan society and heroic myths of tribes. It never really was like that at any time, but the obligations of men in civilization were to fight, and this extended in some sense to men who were poor or servile, who had to fight to survive in a hostile world. Within slavery, masters knew to pit slaves against each other to maintain the system as a whole, and when to keep the slaves from cannibalizing each other when it would impede productivity. There were similar habits among the women, so that they would be induced to join this great game. The great game had of course been going on for a very long

time, and had been a habit among the connected women who aspired to join high society. It is with the aristocratic state that it took on its present form.

Once established, the ultimate goal of all of these humiliations, for men and women, was to promote distrust and make independent decision making too risky to consider. Independence in the selection of mates, or anything that entailed marriage or childbirth, would only be permitted so long as the lines set by the aristocracy were not transgressed. An unwritten rule is that any expression of men choosing women for qualities that deviated from what was "supposed" to be in demand was unseemly at the least, and something to warrant public exposure if it was too offensive. This also extended to men whose sexual behavior deviated from aristocratic values, with special exemptions for aristocratic men who celebrated vile and lurid habits. Where homosexuality was unseemly for commoners, aristocrats of many cultures partook in homosexuality for various purposes with no mark of shame against their character. Though there were habits of discretion that were publicly encouraged, it has long been known that in private, aristocrats get to do anything that they can get away with, and rules were for the commoners. On the other hand, a commoner who simply looked funny or seemed to like strange things was attacked and decried as a pervert, even if his proclivity was nothing so strange compared to things that were common. A game of confused information was used to joke against men who weren't "allowed" to do things that were acceptable to slightly more elevated men, such that the men who were out had fewer standards of comparison and often just gave up. Among the "sins" for men is that celibacy was effectively a crime with severe punishment, only tolerable in certain priestly functions. For the men who are completely forbidden from mating for some eugenic purpose, celibacy was paradoxically both a demand and a thing marking them for punishment, which was heightened beyond what it would be for a man of property and some standing, even meager standing. The society being what it was, the most prominent humiliations were inflicted on men, since they held the property and were nominally heads of families, and so the state and aristocracy dealt with them rather than wives in most cases. There would be humiliations against the women, especially women who broke ranks and refused to participate in this clusterfuck. Above all, men and women who desired a union independent from this beast altogether were uniquely targeted for humiliation and shame. Suggesting that the entire setup of this society and its eugenic intent was an abomination and didn't produce anything good was a violation of the deepest taboo. This would apply even when the offspring of the union would adapt perfectly well to the society in question. It became necessary to suggest that atypical unions were in of themselves dysgenic not for any measurable reason, but because the presumption of the right of aristocrats to intervene in private and family life was sacrosanct to the philosophical state. The harder someone outside of this bound of acceptability would try to fit in with the economic expectations of their society to produce worthwhile offspring and a respectable family life, the greater the aristocrats' vigor in destroying this example. The aristocracy being too limited to do this to everyone historically, it could only

resort to general fear and enabling men and women who exemplified the terror and glorified it, which was the usual vector for promoting this agenda, with the signal of approval from aristocrats to keep the commoners on edge. The promotion of prostitution, for example, was encouraged by nobles, aristocrats, and priests. In Europe, this was among the tasks delegated to Jews, who would then be fed to pogroms, with full aristocratic knowledge and new pimps and drug dealers ready to take the place of the old.

[8] There is a consistent story, which I bring up often, that we imagine the past as if humanity were always arranged in technocratic polities. This story is based on nothing and is particular to the past century, as if the chief were a chief bureaucrat or World Controller arranging orgies and telling all the men, women, boys, and girls to be nice to each other. It never worked like that, and always seeks to supplant the idea that primitive people had any moral code of their own, as they would have had to possess to form the society that they did. There will be more to write on this conceit in a later chapter.

[9] A feature of eugenic education is to specifically "un-correct" habits long ingrained among the residuum, encouraging all vices for those who were selected to die, and positive reinforcement of all failures, so that the humiliation and thrill of imposing it is made eternal. If this is the case, then habits that are often corrected, like slouching, are instead encouraged. When a member of the lowest caste, the would-be "Epsilons", shows meritorious behavior out of some sense that he or she wants to be like any decent human, he or she is beaten and humiliated, and then induced to embrace maladaptation, sloth, fear, indolence, and so on. This habit was used in slave education both near the end to promote indecision, and after the formal abolition of chattel slavery. It was most of all promoted by the Fabians and Galtonites, who promoted this as "help for the oppressed", which was no service to the ex-slaves. The ex-slaves for their part understood immediately what this was. What the Galtonites wanted was so grotesque that ex-slaves and long freed black people would, out of necessity, correct this as much as they could on their own, knowing that it was yet another offensive against their race. The measures promoted by the eugenists were so foul that even the slave-holding Southrons had to regard them as a foulness beyond their sentiments. That is what the Fabians and Galtonites are, and this promotion of degradation was just the opening salvo of their war against the general public, before the escalations they could get away so far in the 21st century.

[10] Francis E. Dec represent: <https://www.ubu.com/sound/dec.html>

[11] I should say here that "revolution" as a narrative itself is a faulty premise. The revolutions of great importance were not simple stories played out in the open, but conspiracies in which many interests saw a situation where the state was up for grabs. In all cases, the basis for the state in property broke down, necessitating the sovereign to either call a parliament or allowed commoners with no status in the empire to form their own congress. It is not hard to see why this doesn't apply to a republic - the people who would be called to a Congress

are those who already sit and levy the taxes. A republic does not experience any political opening and consciously disallows that from ever happening. It is one reason why the communists took over liberal revolutions and understood immediately not to allow any opening that questioned the Party's rule, for the same reasons it was effectively illegal to suggest that liberalism was actually wrong. In both cases, and in the fascist case of engineered coups, the ideological theories are never things intended to govern, but are a necessary lie to suggest that the rule of the wise is sacrosanct, covered with the rituals inherent to republicanism. None of these people believe their project is "ideological", because if they managed to win something, they did so because they know what politics actually is. The communists see communism as a perfectly valid way to build a country. The fascists seek to capture and plunder an existing state. The way republics end is not revolution, but coup and the establishment of larger bureaucratic states. In the communist countries, this occurred shortly after the revolution, and building the bureaucratic state was identified with the entire project. In the fascist states, the bureaucratic state either already existed or would be constructed rapidly off the model of untrammelled corporate power, which ruled absolutely and negated all possibility of this situation changing. In the liberal countries, bureaucratic states rose which inherited the appearance of republican polities, but were actively hostile towards democracy, and were never actually "democratic" in the first place. The appearance of liberal discussion would continue, but would generation after generation be denuded, until it was possible in the 21st century to not just do away with the republican facade, but to convince everyone that republicanism in principle is disgusting and should never be allowed to exist. That had always been the Nazi dream in the end - to prove right a stupid cult formed by men and women who only wanted the rot. Sadly, they won., at least for the time being. I hope I am wrong.

[12] There are those who mark Marx's chief contribution to knowledge as the concept of ideology. I won't wade too much into the legacy of Marx, but in Marx, it is very clear that ideology is not a thing to be valued as a ruling idea, but a thing that should be avoided or understood. It is only deployed against enemies and with the utmost contempt for ideologues. When Stalin makes reference to the dominance of Marxist-Leninist ideology, he is perfectly aware that ideology is a tool with a function, rather than a conceit that should cannibalize the country. There has been plenty of ink spilled over whether Marxism-Leninism "worked", but in the main, the Marxist-Leninists adopted state ideology as a defense against hostile propaganda, more than a form of indoctrination or mind control. If the goal was to mind control people through political ideology, it obviously didn't work too well. The failures of socialism have less to do with a particular ideology's failure, for all of the ideologies either suffered the same disease, or openly welcomed the disease as part of their plan to cannibalize everything in sight as the Nazis and Reaganites did.

[13] It is difficult for foreigners to understand why American "mind control" is so effective - and I do not suggest that Americans are not mind controlling their subjects, because that is very much active and in force. There is a great

need to believe that there is something inexplicable or historical that makes the Americans uniquely evil or foolish. There is no easy answer to this question, but so much of it has to do with America not being anything foreigners believe it is, and America truly being an exceptional entity in the world. Only the other states in the Americas and the Australians and New Zealanders could appreciate why this is so. The United States' historical peculiarities, wealth, industrial development, and very peculiar university regime mark it as distinct from anything else in the world. No other country, for example, conceives of "college sports" or a whole culture of college athletics, or the concept of college being both a social obligation and effectively the center of American "culture", an artificial creation that intentionally destroyed what independent understanding the American colonists and smallfolk had about themselves. Longstanding conflicts with the original inhabitants and the slave system created a very different concept of "race" and "nation", and the United States was never constituted as a nation-state. Above all, "the United States" was almost designed to be not a country, but the vanguard of what was essentially a world state.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

9. The Spiritual Interest and Authority

The overriding aim of "the rule of reason" is to co-opt all other interests to serve it, and forestall the possibility of anything that would question the rule of intellectuals. It is for that reason alone that philosophy developed as a formal discipline, so that all spiritual thought and all potential meaning would be contained under its meaning, and any incipient religion would be commanded as a tool like any other. The first attempt to do this are the pithy sayings and koans which are consciously constructed to destroy meaning and suggest the world is the exact opposite of its genuine nature. "Life is good", "Healers are your friend", "You can trust us". The philosopher and the wise leader is the first liar, and remains the greatest lie ever told. Yet, this is clearly not enough. When this reason fails, the default is to revert to the eugenic interest in property, or to appeal to only the fickle interpretations of life's purpose. It has been the overriding aim of Reason to turn the human animal into livestock, herded just as the animals are. It is not difficult to see that if humanity perfects the hunt, and has long considered its mating and reproductive rites to be another form of the hunt, where men conquer women and women manipulate men to feed them, it does not take long to claim the human root, stem, and branch, and make him or her a slave. That had already been implied in the genesis of humanity and its foul habits. The only thing stopping this is not the temperance of any reason or wisdom, but a simple truth that the world will not allow this, and none of this actually serves the interests of life consistently. It does not take long for a dull human to see that any interest worthwhile is never limited to these three beasts, which consistently form the basis for social and political thought despite knowing that they don't do anything good. The stupider of the human race

are the most likely to see this, because they suffer acutely the consequences of that society. The intelligent of the human race are really intelligent only the narrow sense their race allows or encourages. Genuine meaning in knowledge is discouraged in all traditions, beyond that which is necessary to survive and reconcile their existence in an actual world with their conceits and baser interests. The greater the genuine meaning, the greater the antipathy of the intellectuals, who disdain such things and have always favored the superficial, the venal, and the cruel. There is not one force in life generally which speaks of a world other than that of grim conflict. No appeal to nature and certainly no appeal to the three baser instincts in life can break from this habit. In such a view of the world, all life is born in chains and remains so to death. This, as you probably figured out by now, is the first fully developed spiritual view - that mankind, and all other life, were born in slavery and there was no alternative. It has always been the dream of intellectuals and their fellow travelers to restore that ancient cult and strip away all of the patches and fixes that were imposed by necessity. It can never be that the theory was wrong, or that humanity did not work in accord with this pigheaded conceit of progress or predicted stages prophesized by thought leaders and cajolers. It can never be that the whims of property and the violence encouraged was a stupid and pointless conflict from the outset, because humanity would never get over their filthy origins and always chose to double down on their worst history when the chips were down. When humans do something different, either out of necessity or that rare glimmer of hope that drives madmen to do unexpected things, there is a large movement immediately among the intellectuals to destroy immediately that new thing, control it, and put it in a cage so it can be exterminated. The remnants are stripped of meaning, repurposed for the ruling intellectual ideas, and turned into their opposites. What remains is a symbolic mockery of the true meaning, which is presented in an exoteric face that destroys completely the original meaning, and an esoteric understanding that is secured and made available only to the occult interest in life. The people are then told that knowledge will save them, and paradoxically knowledge is institutional and knowledge is only available through occult methods that the normals must seek approval to enter, where initiation into mysteries becomes a great part of human society. This development of spiritual thought is particular to life-forms developed enough to conceive of something beyond the grim sense of a mostly dead world, and so it appears only in very dim forms to precede the emergence of symbolic language. When symbolic language and the occult interest can come into its own, so to does the spiritual interest and a need for spiritual authority become necessary for all other interests. Even if someone wishes to destroy independent spiritual authority and this interest, they must co-opt it and use various methods to convince people to follow the tripartate arrangement long enough, until the masses can be cajoled, killed, humiliated, and reduced back to "nature's plan", which is re-interpreted as "God's plan", whatever the gods in question may be.^[1]

Knowledge cannot assert what it wishes, no matter how hard it tries. The knowledge of life has no direct access to the world, but only accesses it through

the tools it is given. It is here where life's estrangement from the true nature is most apparent, and so, we appear as ghosts in a world that cares not one bit about us, as it should be. All conceits of knowledge must reconcile with truth that is outside of it. It is here where the spiritual interest, or spiritual authority, would be established to allow life to discern its genuine conditions, rather than those it would prefer to create. Truth, sadly, counts for little in life or any economic calculation. The truth is that all of our efforts are never something the world will allow us to do. We can choose to find some purpose, but the truth of the world, which does not regard any of our language or repositories of knowledge or our adjudication of it, is something outside of the circle of knowledge entirely. It is merely a fact that knowledge exists in a world in order to be possible. To understand this, knowledge and life as processes have to be split. It is the aim of the technocrat to fuse knowledge and life in some way, because in such a way, the world is subsumed in their conceit of "life", which is redefined to be not an intent or errant ghost but the substance of all that is relevant. In the same effort, thought and fundamental nature are fused, suggesting that the mind is the crown of all that exists, above gods which are offered to the masses as empty pabulum and metaphors, stripping away the native religion of people who out of necessity sought to defend themselves against such hostility. Truth was always in a world outside of us, and outside of any knowledge. Knowledge and life can only attempt to gather what meaning it can from its existence, and does so not for the sake of truth itself but because the truth in some way or another will meet life. I speak not of the "political truth", the truth of humans whose only truth is their low cunning and games of humiliation. Humans are liars through and through, and in that, they have proven themselves irredeemable now and forever. I have no interest in the truth of humanity and especially no interest in institutions which claim truth, with nothing more than vacuous appeals to authority and a eugenic interest in nature. I seek not even spiritual authority out of a sense of self-abasement. I would not be doing anything I do if I did not believe it was necessary to write plainly about these things, as best as I can.

Once the spiritual interest is apparent to life, it takes on its own wants and purposes, which need not concern themselves with the truth of the world. The world, at a basic level, is simple enough, and conforms largely to what we sense. It could not be any other way. Stating what is in front of you is true accomplishes little though for the question of spiritual authority, for the meaning of things in the end was never a question of symbols, words, or crude meanings for posturing purposes. In short, it is necessary for life, and the institutions people build, to look to some spiritual authority that allows questions to be asked with regard to something other than personal experience or the crass truth of shared experience, which does little better. Spiritual authority concerns nothing in the arc of time past, present, or future, nor does it encapsulate all three and nothing more. It speaks instead of something outside of the typical procession of time, and must do so. Without any world in which there is an "alternate time", we ask of the world what things are, and what any of this existence actually is or does. But, spiritual authority is not merely a knowledge base. It is a practice, ritual,

and purpose of life beyond the obvious, and yet it is not really concerned with life at all. Spiritual authority implies a reckoning with the non-living and the dead. One of the earliest thoughts in humans regarding such authority and what happens to us when we pass from this coil. I won't wade into speculation about any afterlife, for I believe "after"-lives are missing the point of why we ask this question at all. So far as I can tell, once life is dead, that is truly it, and it would be as if none of this were ever real.

The spiritual interest is nascent in life when it becomes motile and must respond to its environment with heightened sense beyond that of simpler life. In animals, this progresses very little, but animals orient their behavior like a laboring worker, towards tasks that are a habit of it. General labor, or the interpretation of all we do as labor, is particular to humans who are able to contemplate information in ways animals do not. Some ink has been spilled over what precisely qualifies as labor, and where labor is truly adjudicated - with the task of directing it intellectually, or the practice of labor itself which must be realized to be meaningful. The distinction of human labor is its universalization - that labor in humans is always seen as a deliberate act, and laziness in humans becomes not merely a habit but a value that humans consciously seek. Conversely, labor is always something to be commanded and abstracted, even before there is any value scheme to assign a general quantity to it or any qualities of particular labors. It becomes in some sense impossible for humans to NOT labor, in the same moment that someone treasures idleness as a virtuous trait. Even sleeping becomes a task allocated and rationed in some way. The honing of human tasks through their earliest reasoning and communication between each other in language creates in humans a pressing need for labor to become a general practice, rather than a habit or routine as it would be in animals. An animal's behavior is hardly fixed or encoded, as if it were running an algorithm. For the animal, labor appears to be largely in line with things it expects to encounter, and that which is alien to its knowledge is a thing to be feared. These new strange deformed apes who summon fire and launch pointy objects are a thing the animal cannot replicate, but has enough sense to run away from. The animal still from time to time senses the upper hand against a human, and a lion or bear can maul the human who thinks himself of the master race. The killer instinct is found in humans and animals alike, and even the friendliest animals who abhor predation develop a sense for it.^[2] And so, labor for the animal is often pressed by need rather than wants, and the animal's wants are largely to do whatever it was doing that didn't involve the hunt or mating. It wouldn't see recreation as "labor". Humans, though, will see their free time as something that could potentially be employed for work, and see others' free time as a thing to be commanded. Animals in social life do not have this flexibility with their social relations. Their relations are very limited and are taken in whole. Animals do not relate to things as much other than food, prey, predator, mate, family, and so on, and in all cases, the relations are not abstracted or alienable. Human labor can be alienated and is so even in our free time. Humans do not know anything but alienated labor, which is the only way labor can become general. When

we conceive of inalienable labor, we either speak of things beneath the notice of what can be appropriated, or we speak of things we value and cling because they are something we consider core to our true wants. Even when we value family life, any other thing, or anything we do as the thing we do with our lives, those things can be alienated and threatened, and we operate with full awareness that this happens, even in our own choices. That calculus is not something that animals consider as a free option from a potential as wide as knowledge. Absent a compelling force, an animal is likely to view its relations with anything and its task entirely as the thing they do, and they would not abandon anything or any sociality that is very natural to them on a whim. It wouldn't make sense for a bee to not build hives or lack this architectural knowledge, as if she were going to pawn that off to another or spend the time composing music or binging on shitty HBO dramas instead.

When labor can become general and alienable, it begs the question - why do we do anything? If spiritual questions were merely a theoretical exercise to be solved with doctrine, they would not be interesting to many people. Most people do not consider themselves particularly spiritual, or their quest for spiritual authority to have anything to do with religion or any great quest. When labor can be alienated, and we are aware that all choices have consequences and that consequences are active even if we do nothing, the search for truth and meaning is not an idle exercise. It becomes a necessary condition of life even at the most basic level. We will always view some purpose to our lives, for if we don't, we become inert lumps of flesh to be cajoled and commanded, or we wander through life by some listless impulse like caged animals.^[3] If that was not a concern for us, we learn that there other entities who will make us be concerned. The moment someone is convinced they really are natural flotsam to be manipulated, a predatory human will take advantage and eliminate the expectation that there is happiness in slavery. We value freedom not because freedom is a symbol or idea or an essence, but because we see what happens with the alternative. Slavery as it must be practiced to be an effective slavery is the only meaningful argument to make for freedom. Freedom for its own sake is meaningless, and if all of the conditions that slavery entails were no longer operative, we are as free as we ever have been. We already have seen in multiple other interests arguments for natural slavery, or eternal slavery, as if that were the only possibility. It is only through spiritual authority and the interest that freedom is at all conceivable. An animal only senses this when it is held captive by humans. It may hold a vague and general fear of suffering and what is possible, enough that it will prevent captivity by whatever power it possesses. Animals do not have a great theory to allow them to rebel against human domination, and if they did, animal husbandry would fall apart. If a cow ever really set out to free herself, she'd eat you and your entire family. The animal knows the misery well enough, and can feel it in their bones, but there is no revolutionary doctrine. As mentioned, revolution is not what it appears to be in the first place, but humans are very familiar with slave rebellions and escapes. Every master is obsessed with ensuring that no slave has a single opening to

attack masters, because if that ever happens, slavery would be undone. What slavery could persist if the master must hide in secure locations and fears being seen outside of their hidey hole? The slaves would, if they could, smoke the masters out of their holes and do what should have happened before this sordid institution got off the ground. This argument never deters those who cajole and berate humans and tell them of their obligations to parasitic assholes. A slave could present a perfectly rational and efficient argument for free labor and letting labor have the things they wanted, which would entail certain inalienable rights, among them life, liberty, and some stake for the laborer to call his own. If married, the male laborer would want the security of his wife, and not see his wife forced to participate in the capitalist's sex parties, or a feudal lord's hedonistic party train with obligatory rape. For most of history, the women of the working class worked just as the men did, for less pay and all of the humiliations working life meant, and had to find time to raise children while any extended network of the working class was systematically stripped from them. When farmers are forced at gunpoint off of their ancestral lands and must become proletarians, it is understood that all of them are entering into a slave relation. No expectation of rights for the dispossessed is tolerated outside of the fringes of legal society, and it is supposed to be a "privilege" to expect the boss to honor the worksheet which shows you paid your due of obligatory labor. The moment a proletarian attempts to assert those rights, he or she is immediately attacked and thrown into the residuum, until a proletarian revolt demands retribution, as often happened when industrial labor assembled. The split to make this slave relation stick was to split the working class into two, with one threatened by the existence of a large residuum or lumpenproletariat, and the torture of the workhouse publicly shown with sadistic glee from filth like Malthus.

Spiritual authority arises not because knowledge needs it. Knowledge could very easily proceed as if the universe were absurd, and we would only rely on the symbols the world provides us and those we created in an effort to make something that sounded true enough. Meaning is not impossible without spiritual authority to connect the words said and written or make sense of that which is in front of us. It is entirely possible to operate on a skeptical basis and believe all truths are tentative. For truly useful science, this is never done. The doctrine of skepticism in the empirical tradition is not a meaningful doctrine, but an appeal to institutions which are never skeptical and possess a seeming super-authority that makes the institution's position default, and the individual is made to fight against institutions no matter how wrong the institution would be to any independent inquiry or sense that is right in front of us. If there is no spiritual authority, then we would never hold any truth beyond the will of an institution commanding us to think the right thoughts. Ultimately, the will of any institution becomes the will of concentrated institutions, as the office-holders realize a conspiracy to share power jointly is rational, and feudal infighting is pointless without a genuine property claim or ability to defend it. When the feudal mentality is suggested by identity politics instead of historical claims

or anything substantive, the feudal mentality is a parodic form of something that was already retarded and pointless. Without worthwhile spiritual authority, the crown of knowledge means nothing more than which gaggle of technocrats can shout the loudest. This is why it was necessary to deliberately destroy all spiritual authority, and why temporal authority was chosen to be as capricious and contradictory as possible. In doing so, the Satanic view of humanity would be the only admissible one, and with it, one institution would be granted impunity. This was only possible once the means to physically restrain billions of people and ensure command and control mechanisms will exterminate the disobedient were created. The current machinery was built with this plan in mind. It likely would not exist as it does if there were not a drive to pursue this, while destroying as rapidly as possible any technological development that would improve the condition of most of humanity.

The proper spiritual authority arises from labor. This need not be the labor of a particular social class, but labor generally. Those who actually work and do things on the ground would be the first authority. Those who lead from on high would remember that without workers, they would have nothing, and that workers are more likely to give you nice things when they do not live with a knife at their throat at all times. The labor of soldiers, priests, intellectuals, and so on is still labor, however much labor as a practice is disdained in favor of grand theories or narratives. It is not a question of labor as a natural force asserting itself like a Demiurge, or labor commanded by a manager, but rather it is a result of labor becoming general and alienable. If there is a sense that humans have any choice in their fate, our existence becomes very different from one where animals accept whatever shit other life and their own failures place on them. It then becomes the aim of those who would arrest labor to ensure that all choices, all labors, feed back into a singular beast. That beast can be a false universal deity which is clearly identified with the state and the ruling interest, which is the godheads that are at the center of many religions, or it can be an institution of the world with delusions of grandeur. The latter becomes just as ridiculous if not moreso than the former.^[4] In all of this, a group which wanted none of this is drawn into a struggle that doesn't concern them, and which is entirely divorced from genuine spiritual authority or any religion worth following. This is intended. The group that has nothing to do with the struggle over property, intellectual institutions seeking to change the world, or fickle serfdom that supplicates to either, is the majority of the human race, who saw from very early on that this struggle served nothing and produced not one thing for anyone. None of these struggles could take place without the labor of those who aspired to a very different world where we didn't have to do this. The struggle sessions are designed to suck up whatever honesty and forthrightness humans have reclaimed over many centuries, strip away references to a past which did not lock us into any preferred stages of history, and ensure that all labor, all aspirations anyone might have had, are turned into nothing more than a farm or battery factory for intellectuals and petty lords. All we aspire to is subsumed in a struggle a child could see through, and yet, we are told this is all

there is. All that the struggle needed was enough force to enclose the world and tell us all that we weren't allowed to be anything else. So it has happened, and labor, which even the simplest mind could see as an engine with potential for a fairly small material investment, was wasted on vanity projects and people whose chief contribution was the exploitation of labor. By no means are the laborers themselves immune to this, as if labor possessed a natural virtue or right to rule. Any of the machines that made this world possible were products of labor, utilized by some labor to make the world into this, and it has often been easy to convince labor to offer itself as cattle, fodder, and information processing, and convince labor that all of this was their idea. Yet, as this is done, there is an expectation that there is something more, that is not beholden to the obvious procession of events and technology, nor beholden to the names of a few great assholes who purport to move the world.

ORIGIN OF METAPHYSICS AND THE WORLD-SYSTEM

The ability of living creatures like us to conceive of a world-system is not merely a product of language. It could have happened without language in any preferred form. Language and symbolic representation is itself a very particular form of meanings that knowledge can create, and is not to be confused with the genuine thought process allowing us to know what the world is. Language as we know it arises because enough patterns are recognized consistently enough to form the basis of symbols with are interchangeable regardless of the media they are encountered in, which allow models to be constructed in imagination. This ability is limited by biological faculties, and however it proceeds, it becomes immediately apparent that whatever our abilities, we are very mortal and exist in a world much larger than us. The animal's sense of the world is a dim awareness of something past the horizon, and information about it is never transferred in a way that allows animals to build off the knowledge of their forebears to any great extent. It is not merely the development of a brain that allows symbols to be constructed in greater number, but communication between those who can do this, where the participants build off each others' knowledge. It is such a process that would have allowed social units to develop symbolic representation to any great length. Without this, symbolic representation would be an ad hoc system developed by each new human. This sort of representation is still done at the local level. We don't necessarily need a "system" given to us to be able to sort the world or any part of it. Human beings, as we will see in the next chapter, never come anywhere near possession of the sum total of human knowledge, and specialize their labor as their knowledge and means to act are too varied for any one man or woman to do everything. There is a baseline that qualifies humans to function in society, and that baseline is not fixed in nature but dependent on the agents which comprise society.

Metaphysical claims do not "create" the world system, but are implied as a way to organize knowledge as a process, so that the biological faculties that we did not choose are deployed in the same way that labor of the body is generalized.

This process proceeded at first by an impulse only partially understood, and humanity to this day never has nor is able to find any final answer to this question. That is, we have never been fully able to arrest how we think. Part of the problem is that considering the question itself would spur the thinking animal to modify themselves and thus the question, and this is done ad infinitum with reducing returns in every cycle. It must resolve in a negative feedback loop for the system of knowledge and governance to stabilize. A positive feedback loop would amplify the process until it can no longer obtain energy or material that will feed, leading either to a sudden fizzling or a negative feedback loop stabilizing the system. Primitive and crude models of what things are must be adopted, which give way to formal definitions when these crude models encounter contradictions or setbacks which no longer adequately explain the world or allow for worthwhile meaning.

The particular metaphysics has no claim on "the truth". The truth is outside of our concepts of it entirely. However, such a model is inherent in us to be able to build a full concept of the truth beyond a story that things are as we believe them to be. What is necessary for formal metaphysics is to produce a world-system that is internally consistent, as otherwise it would obviously be useless for its task. Where no solution is evident in a metaphysical system, one is made by force, and this is exploited by those who manipulate spiritual authority.

THE PURPOSE OF LIFE

Life is left without any purpose that can be divined by reason or intuition. What then do we actually do? We live, and there is no reason not to, or to hasten death as if it were any value of worth in of itself. We live not through an intent or an idea, or some conceit of the world. We live not simply because the material world wills it. We live not in a procession of events dictated from any thought leader or heaven, that suspiciously conforms to some very worldly ambition of another man. Life, which started as an intent which occupied some physical matter and cajoled it, becomes something quite different, and must be so to speak of life as anything other than yet more matter in motion. Life to be life is not "just life", or "just being". Living things encounter a world that is alien to it, and entities which are at first alien to it. No mere idea can unite a society through obligations, without degenerating into "responsibility" where all relations are automated and cajoled by thought leaders. No material essence suggests that a "volk" is a fact of nature locked in struggle with other essences, nor suggests that the individual life-form has any right to exist purely as a psychological projection. Life asserts its existence not merely because it can, but because it must if it is to remain constituted as life in the meaningful sense. It can choose to die or let itself wither, if that possibility is conceivable to it. An animal learns helplessness and possesses some sense of its condition, and can sense captivity no matter how dull it is. Animal life comprehends freedom in the genuine sense at some level, and so do humans. It has required a perversion that only high technology can impose to re-define freedom as a mere idea, a

token bereft of purpose. There is of course no word for "freedom" in this sense. Freedom as a word is merely a legal contrivance and a recognition of an affair that is necessarily contingent on other entities allowing someone to exist. That "freedom" is not worth a shred of toilet paper and exists to be mocked. There is not until considerable development a word for "freedom" even in this sense. Concepts of freedom from slavery or manumission refer not to the freedom of life to live, but the return of a slave to their family, their clan, their mother. This is the Sumerian word for "freedom", in which the slave is merely transferred from legal ownership to the ownership of the natural order. More developed civilization conceives of legal freedom not as a genuine condition of life, but a condition relating them to the philosophical state. The state, in principle, claims imperium and the power to command life at all levels. This is not a new development of technocratic society, but something inherent in what it meant for the state to exist as a formal institution with laws and courts. There are arguments to make about whether freedom in the genuine sense is even the purpose of life, or a condition that is desirable. Mankind has long found ways to tolerate slavery or convince themselves in a grand cope that slavery is freedom. Everything about human institutions has screamed from the start that freedom is slavery, just as war is peace and ignorance shows the strength of the intelligent. Institutionally, the purpose of life is slavery to the holder of imperium, in which eugenic interests align with technological interests to lock down all that exists. The only force acting against this is a realization even among the holders of these institutions that this is stupid, does not work, never worked, and would lead to an obvious conclusion if a child thinks about this question for five to ten minutes. It takes the perversion of institutions drumming this purpose of life day after day to bring adults to believe in it and identify this institution with their interests, and so it has been done, and must continue to be done. The object of torture is torture. The object of victory is victory. This is was the redefined "freedom" now refers to, and the freedom of life to labor in any sense - for the laborer to own him or herself - is anathema to institutional freedom. It becomes something only admissible as "retarded", "crimethink", or "insanity". Freedom then becomes nothing more than the freedom of the terror to rule over the only entities which actually value freedom. The rulers, even as they recognize the stupidity of this, have no true investment in freedom. They will, and always have, fallen in line when the chips are down. It required a desperate madness to fight against this, and when that happened, the cult of war was there to subsume all struggles under the aegis of the same aristocrats who have always immiserated all who dare to live. Therefore, the simple argument of freedom or slavery is inadequate to grant purpose. It is a question which appears as some sort of joke to people who have long been enslaved, for whom freedom was pointless without coin.

Of the laborers, there are those who attach to one of the other interests who may rule, reap the rewards of empire, and those who toil. There are then those who are effectively locked out of practice at all, whose existence is not to labor in society, but labor only for themselves. They are the lowest class, cast out

of the graces of human society, rejected often from an early age. Those who fall from grace and are assigned great shame are never truly out of their caste. Once a human is blooded and paid into the duties and interests of their caste, they never truly leave, even if they are marked with shame. The closest that is done is to legally claim that if someone was proven retarded, they must have always been so. This historical revision never sticks, though. Retardation, the greatest sin and crime in all of human history, has always been the lowest of all designations, the ultimate shame which stands alone. Retardation, assigned early in life if not at conception, is a truly irredeemable status, no matter what merits or virtue the retard may demonstrate. If a retard ever works for this beast, he or she is working for their bitter enemy, and only makes the ritual sacrifice worse. Such Judases are encouraged, but they are always few in number, because those declared retarded early in life have no incentive whatsoever to feed this monster. The Biblical Judas is granted far more esteem than caste traitors. He was, after all, a disciple and a man of great importance to the religion. Such acts, however much it is invoked as the example of betrayal, never change that Judas was a disciple and of priestly caste. Saying he was anything else would be anathema to Christianity, and makes his betrayal of Christ less meaningful.^[5] Between different castes, betrayal is the default and not even assigned shame for the deed. In caste society, there are only crimes of Being. A retard who serves society is assigned the name of Uncle Tom^[6] and put up as an example of such disgusting abasement that not even the incredulous fascist zealot can embody, for the fascist is still a servant of his or her class and "seeking Christ" in this act of fealty. A retard who is defiant is punished severely, or hunted for sport. Only a median existence of ever-increasing misery, locked on track, is the life of a retard, and this forms the basis for the threat made to labor generally. It is the ultimate no-win scenario, and this is the birth of the human race. The laborers would be given the inducement to hang themselves, and told that the rope to do so was the purpose of their existence. The great break, and this was particular to humans and the habits of a deformed ape rather than life generally, was one rule - "never, ever be a retard". An essentialization of intelligence and meaning which became eugenic property became the rule of the race, and it has been damned forever since. All that humans have done revolves around this question more than any other, and so the knowledge of humanity which was the only thing they held over the animal kingdom became a tool to immiserate each other, collectively and in their personal relations. No other possibility would be permitted, and the damned of the Earth are the living sacrifice dedicated to this. The alternative - freedom of information, knowledge, meaning, and labor in a genuine sense, so that this cycle ends - is the absolute last thing the dominant interests ever want. If the reverse ever did become true as a general rule, it would be the end of the human race, and every human knows it. A few of us would be happy to see the end of the deformed Satanic ape altogether, either by ensuring the elimination of the race or finding a way to mitigate the outcome of its genesis. Since assuring the elimination of humanity altogether faces many difficulties, the only thing that is conceivable would be to make what was born in pure wickedness and malice into something good. There

never was a "fall of Man", where there was once a good creature. They were always wicked, and they knew, and they knew damn well that they didn't need to do this the whole time. An animal likely has the same thought, but lacks the means to impose it on the world. The only thing that was possible is that the deformed Satanic ape learned how to use tools and generalize labor, and immediately set about to hunt, herd, cajole, and manage each other most of all. Outside of human society, this deformed and pitiful race accomplishes little on scales that human beings can easily appreciate. It is self-evident to even the dullest human that the entire arc of human accomplishment is piss and shit, unworthy of even the dignity that the world comespl us to abide. The human spirit and will has always chosen wickedness, no matter what pretenses they create suggesting their probity. If there was anything in the human race that made a different choice, it is because humanity encountered an alien world and were alien to each other, and managed somehow to learn how to temporarily not be the deformed Satanic ape they have always been. Because it is so obvious that this is what would have been the only way out of humanity's situation, to something that was actually worth living in, it became necessary to recapitulate a eugenic interest in the race, and screech like retards over the stupidest thing imaginable. And so, technology, which should to a reasonable race have been used to eliminate the worst suffering in life and consider a world far different than this, was beholden to accomplish the exact opposite. Blood will always tell. Rather than the intellectuals blaming themselves, as is clear to anyone who is at all honest, somehow the war guilt is assigned to the caste which did the least, whose crime was entirely being "retarded", by spurious definitions which protect the retarded behavior of aristocrats and revel in torture. The race is unreformable and irredeemable in total, and no one should even bother trying, and this applies to every race within humanity and every tribe hitherto known. This we hold to be self-evident after enough historical evidence.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] I would like to add here that it is highly unlikely the common people ever really invested in the belief in "gods" in their folk traditions, and have in fact spent great effort working against the ruling "gods" and all mention of the godhead. For most of us, "gods" are metaphors at best, and the truth for humanity is that we only ever referred to gods at all because it became social convention, or gods were used as idols and fetish objects for rituals, where the purpose of the ritual was to channel some demonic energy for purposes high and low. The use of idolatry and fetish in aristocratic spiritual authority is early and frequent, and appears to the decent of us correctly as a foul abomination. One did not require an advanced religion to see the hideousness of idolatry, for that was apparent enough and most of mankind knew that deals with such gods meant nothing good. The depiction of idolatry in classical religions - for this concept is not particular to Judaism and its offshoots, though there it is most highly developed because they begin with a conflict in the epicenter of such practices

- is an indicator of what aristocratic religion historically was. More developed religions had to describe this practice with a general theory rather than occult superstitions that were valued, and with that, spiritual authority and occultism developed in tandem. It is here where the conflict over gods, which was at first largely a fetish for aristocrats and beasts for warriors to channel for fighting, could invade the lives of the commoners, who held not to aristocratic gods or fetishes but their own concepts of the world, and some dim hope that the alien gods would be void and utterly defeated.

[2] This is where retards like Nietzsche and many a German philosopher bray about "slave morality", failing to get that their entire philosophical and civilizational project is basically what an alien would do to create an obedient slave-warrior society, a retarded version of Sparta that exists to be co-opted by foreign powers. This idea is a glamorized and sing-songy version of the Ork philosophy from Warhammer 40k in which slave morality is beaten by deciding who is "bigga", and no other concept is possible. It's so obviously exploitable that you get the sense some imperial conspirators seeded such a disease specifically to fuck over the country in a century, and the exchange among intellectuals suggested one clever scheme or another to partition Europe into national projects that could be filled with fifth columns of one type or another. The preferred imperial policy today has thoroughly infused every European country with agents who will sell out to the first thing that is "bigga", and you couldn't think of a more ideal situation. The greatest problem with this strategy is that we have to listen to overly educated idiots bray about continental philosophy that everyone with a functioning brains knows to be dogshit. Had philosophy been pursued for goals of honest wisdom, which has never been the case, this stupidity would be exposed as the farce it is. The origin arises in fusing life with knowledge and then the construction of a biopolitical view of humanity, based on increasingly brazen pseudoscientific positions that intentionally violate common knowledge and meaningful science. We continue in this chapter to describe the proper origin of science in the laboring class, and it is not the technological interest but the spiritual authority of workers who had to work with science to make a living. Aristocracy is completely hostile to science in any sense the word has genuine purpose.

[3] Here is the secret of "anhedonia" - which properly understood is the neoliberal eugenist version of "draeptomania", or the mental illness of slaves desiring freedom. We are supposed to "feel happy" in a situation where humans are clearly confined, humiliated, and told ad nauseum to die, die, die. Billboards shout humiliation to every American who isn't in the know, and this grinding down is glorified and celebrated due to the rot that rules this country presently. It is of course no great secret, but it is unsurprising that humans who are caged like animals, encouraged to self-mutilate and destroy themselves with drugs and foul habits, become unable to feel meaningful happiness. I have said before that utilitarian "pleasure" is merely the absence of managerial pain, and this stupid moral philosophy is a favorite of petty-managerial retards.

[4] No scheme to manage society has been more thoroughgoing than the "open society" in arresting all potential labors and feeding them into a central beast, which boldly proclaims "there is no alternative" and "there is no society" when the time is right. Every freedom, every act, now serves institutions which in one way or another mandate human suffering as a law of nature and the highest moral cause of the ruling interest. Every way in which the Open Society speaks of "choice" is intended to ensure that "choice" is given only to the lower classes, with all outcomes gamed and rigged so that the lower class can only choose submission. Here, the weasel word "responsibility" is introduced to displace earlier concepts like obligation, duty, honor, trust, love, and all relations that entailed the lower class' real stake in society. It is in short a claim that labor is to be enslaved and completely devalued, and the only labor that is treasured is that which maximizes torture and the thrill of the present aristocracy and their running dogs.

[5] We would remind the reader that the characters of the gospel are quite clearly fictitious persons and intended to be understood as such. Yet, the story has no meaning unless these characters were developed as if they were both real humans and entities with a divine connection, and nothing about this contradicts reality as a believer would see it. It is possible to create all manner of logical pretzels to defend the claim that Christ was both a man like any other and God, and that Christ seems to morph based on what aspect or compartmentalization of the Christ is expedient at any given time.

[6] Speaking of fictitious persons, the person of Uncle Tom is often stripped from its context and why the archetype was egregiously offensive. In the actual story of Uncle Tom's Cabin, Uncle Tom is not self-abasing in the Hitlerian sense, but an elder slave who largely wished to be allowed to live out his life in Christian fashion, and did not possess a will to transgress things he knew would not change. Far from shameless self-abasement, Tom's crime is a stubborn refusal to play out the practices inherent in the slave system when slaves were expected to attack and whip other slaves. The story came under criticism for reasons that are often unfair, though the writer's white Christian bias among others is, as is appropriate for the time, displayed in full. What follows is a long American tradition of displacing the ugly reality of slavery with sentimental stories from people who were distant from it. At first, the criticism is that the ugliness of slavery, which was well known to anyone white or black, was replaced with a prototype of historical revisionism, and the institution of slavery was presumed to be natural, as would have been comprehensible to an American at the time. What followed was yet more historical revision, in which the battle over the institution of slavery produced too many hints of what America really was. The American Civil War, like civil wars generally, ends in reconciliation, and the intended losers were the working class and the poor, slave and free alike. The ex-slaves would say at the time and ever since that high and mighty white people should get off their high horse, but by and large, that was not acceptable for all of the reasons we have come to expect.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

10. The Occulted Interest, Privacy, Co-Existence, and Symbolic Language

Spiritual authority remains the only persistent path to any way out of this, and it is that which is continuously attacked. When all is said and done, humans only have themselves, each other, and the symbols they have acquired which may point to some meaning. At no point do these deformed apes really know what they think they know, for they only ever possess enough meaning to somehow survive to the next day. Humanity always knew what they were, and at the same time, humanity never really became "human". They have always been more ape than the thing they pretend they are, and revel in self-abasement and reversion to their nature. This has been induced deliberately because, after all has been done, humanity collectively could only think to recapitulate their failure as a race and claim that this is the only path to the good. This is obviously undesirable, but it is what it turned out to be. Every effort to build something that would actually circumvent this is attacked. It has nothing to do with unknowability. Humanity has long known the genuine source of the problem. Instead of doing this, though, the eugenic creed and its running dogs jump in front when one poor human soul decides to do something other than the predicted result. The weak are blamed for the deeds of the strong, and the victors revel in sacrifice and torture and the thrill of doing so. **There is nothing else in them and never was! THEY ARE FUCKING ANIMALS!** I say this not to be a misanthrope, but because it's true. If there is anything I have come to despise, it is the sanctimonious unitarian or Satanists making facile claims about "good people" - always referring to eugenic qualities - and why a "good God would let bad things happen to them", as if any god was all about "me me me" in their infantile fantasies of power. Such simpering shit is deployed as a weapon, and young people are beaten into believing this talking point is normal. Such is the odiousness of the eugenic creed. Every worthwhile spiritual and political thought has always considered humans to be either wholly evil, mostly evil or malevolent, or at best considered humans to be neutral by nature but inclined by their conditions towards malice. In every case, humans are aware of this failing of themselves, and are sober about their genuine origins. They are not too stupid to figure out where babies come from, and what REALLY happens when babies are made. It is quite impossible for someone to become a biological father without discovering much of this, to say nothing of mothers whose birth-giving labor has never been trivialized in human history. So too are humans aware of enough malice and far fewer examples of "natural goodness". In every case where humans are inclined towards good behavior, it has always regarded a world and fellow humans as potentially hostile, and goodness is intended to avert that. None of that goodness was ever taken for granted, nor was it believed that humans are irredeemable due to some other assholes' insinuations. Politically,

sin is grievous and never forgiven, and this applies to Heaven and God in that view of the world. In our genuine existence, redemption is both possible and necessary, for we have ample examples of how much worse it can be. In every case, any good in people was taken from the world, and could only be understood by actions and deeds. Whether that goodness is relevant to someone's sense of the spiritual world or political settlement is not relevant. We understood the good, absent anything to suggest its existence, by at the least not being the bad or the evil, which we are acquainted with whether we want it or not. It is adaptation to a profoundly sick and eugenist society that insists we have to tell ourselves "we" are good, but it was only ever the behavior of humans that might be good, and that goodness is as fleeting as dust in the wind. For every goodness, its persistence is either something we work at and make central to our ethos and higher values, or the goodness was always in the world and we are the beneficiaries of good fortune or a keen sense of morality that sought the good in the world and worked with it, rather than foolishly attempt to claim that "we" are anything but fucking animals.

If that is so, then all that remains is occulting that interest, and claiming privacy not in the name of property, possession, intellectual conceit, or some spiritual claim which is doomed to falter. It is only by occulting ourselves and controlling the flow of information that human society remains recognizable. This never arrests history as a technocrat's conceit would desire, and it does not defend "me wantee" or the fickleness of the eugenic interest. It does not speak at all to what life really wanted. It almost always obscures meaning and truth. We do this not because it is good or serves any moral purpose, but because we must. We always knew humanity was a failed race from creation. No one who took part in the sacrifice that brought it into existence could claim with a straight face that this turns into anything good by some virtue of the race, or of its individuals. All that could be good was extracted from the world, and this forms the true basis of proper economic thought. What began in the mind of the naive as a simple optimization problem, where it seems like we should be able to exist without any great sorrow, became a quest to lie and obfuscate as a matter of self-defense. Honesty brings no rewards in this failed race. Kindness is only an invitation to be exploited and humiliated. The occult interest serves the worst humanity has to offer, and the sickening reality of life is that it is the only thing which will secure the good that exists. It is the vice and virtue of the lowest class, which is the true universal class. The universal class is not the laborer, who lives from birth to be exploited and ridiculed. It is not the proprietor. It is not the technocrat or the bourgeois conceit. It is not a class that can resort to the basic intent of life, for aside from the other interests of life being hostile to what we wanted in the first place, life itself starts as an error, a fluke of the world that is destined to destroy itself in one way or another. Life very quickly learns that their existence must entail more than life and death, but encounters an alien world and alien entities like itself. The true wisdom of the lowest class has been to see past this farce altogether, and claim whatever they can of the other interests, then balance necessarily what must be done. It is the lowest

class that is the true class and the only class which can claim it possesses a shred of the good. It does so while admitting that it is but a humble beggar, and acknowledges freely that its "good" was never really theirs. The crass and pigheaded interests of the human race will never conceive this, for it is not for them. It never was. Humanity remains a failed race, and refuses steadfastly to be anything other than that. We have for century after century attempted to explain this, pleading with humanity to end its "Jihad", its incessant war against us. We learn that pleading with such bullies works exactly 0% of the time, and so we do out of necessity what no one else does. Because we are denied even the freedom to labor openly, all we do is something we hold in private, in our own space and time, and we are used to our hopes disappearing as soon as they form. That is the true class that might change this. It would not change the situation for humanity or the world. Humanity is beyond hope. The world is vast and will, in the end, continue much as it has without this human infestation or the infestation of life generally. But, life persists, and we have no reason to die. It is further the case that all mankind can acknowledge that they are a failed race, and only through this do we find any possibility for redemption, however fleeting it may be. We might, on a good day, manage to build something more than the same rot. We may find a spiritual authority worthwhile that guides us to an existence better than the worst of all worlds. And yet, this interest too often serves the same beast as the others, and it is here where the fate of all of us is truly determined. We are, in the end, all beggars at the mercy of the world, and no more. The truest retards are the men and women who believe that they actually held something, and tear down the world in a giant fit of wangst once their great plans inevitably fail like their race has failed.

It may seem strange to assign to this interest so much, and then not elaborate on it. That, though, is because it is this interest for whom symbols can be generated. Only the desperate are capable of changing anything and guiding life to be something more. It has long been known that the only way to command another human is to make them suffer, and so the occult interest is identified with both the suffering class, and those who are most adept at torturing them. It conducts espionage and it is both the primary target of thuggery and a recruiting ground for the lowest thugs. The occult interest is not particular to one class, but is embraced by all. Because this interest concerns much of what we consider religion, knowledge, and the games of authority, I elect not to elaborate on its expression in life. All that must be said is that the damned of the Earth are the only ones who have ever been crazy enough to think it could be different. Labor, in the end, chooses what will allow it to hold its keep, rather than working towards any other interest. Labor is likely to concern itself with truth and purpose more than any other, and would have been the rightful lords of the world if we were not so monstrous, or we could be something other than this in the future. Throughout this work, the five interests of life should be kept in mind, and will be elaborated on as we move forward.

I spend the rest of this chapter concerning what might have been different, in another world and for a race that was not humanity. I will say from the outset that

any "transhuman" goal will not wipe clean humanity's crimes, as if the solution was always more technology. That is a childish fascist conceit and trivially disproven with any knowledge of history. When humanity encounters each other, we have no knowledge that we were inducted into a demon-worshipping cult that glorifies torture and sacrifice. Properly speaking, we shouldn't have to be, and most of us manage to avoid the reaper long enough to live some sort of life, clawing it away from the beasts who govern us. We only hold the knowledge that is local to us, and this is not an interest of life, but a rule of what knowledge itself is and does. A naïve belief is to proclaim "me wantee" and revert to feudal backstabbing. This is stupid and a child would see through it. Most of human education and culture concerns telling the child who sees this stupidity that there is some ulterior motive or glory to the failed race doing its usual foul business.

The aim of the lowest class has been persistent, and it is shared with the commoners generally. It is very simple, and it does not entail equality with oppressors or any acknowledgement of their interest whatsoever. It does not entail democracy or humanity or the world. It is one thing and one thing only - for this beast, which insists everyone must comply with it, to no longer be a thing. It is not done because of some individual will or conceit of freedom, but because we have seen enough of the beast and literally anything would be better. It is not something alien to the understanding of the favored classes which contend politics. It has nothing to do with the state or any grand story suggesting that the decision is rightly made at the level of the state or the universal. The defeat of the lowest class is not natural nor the destiny of anything. Far from it, the lowest class sees the entire contest as absurd and has asked why they have been dragged into an idiotic game that serves no purpose. So far as the lowest class has a united aim, it is simply to do away with the game altogether. Do not ask us how this will be accomplished or if it will be a steady state forever. We simply want you gone. This aim is not shared equally in the three groups that comprise the commoners - the propertied and favored, the laborers who are exploited, and the residuum who are attacked by all. The former two are in some way invested in the conceits of the political class and do not identify with the residuum. The residuum, the beggar and the fool, are alone. They do not even have each other, and above all the aim of all other classes is to convince the lowest class that they are alone and helpless before the false gods of the aristocracy. It is on that basis that aristocracy can exist. The aim of the lowest class then is simple - to end all conceits of aristocracy and break forever this cycle that never should have been allowed to start. It is rarely ever proclaimed or acted on at the level of the world, except to disrupt temporarily the procession of the beast. It does not strictly entail some other rule like democracy or oligarchy. It does not even suggest that cooperation of all in society is possible or desirable, because the experience of the lowest class is that the greatest threat in their lives, by far, is other people. That is true of all mankind, which faces no appreciable danger from non-humans. If natural events were to destroy humans, they are things that could be solved trivially, or realities that people have come to accept and work around. It is only humans who torture and mutilate and find pleasure in

doing so.

If this is so, then it is a desperate hope to believe that aliens could get along at all. The argument for having any society in the first place has only ever been that the alternative is worse, given the general state of predation in life. If humans were not predators by nature, it would be different, and some solutions might envision that humans will be made to love their slavery or become cattle. This will not work, because both statuses are not inherent to the world at all. They are conceits of life which oppresses life. Outside of life, the statuses make less sense. To a machine, slavery and service are not meaningful conditions. A machine does what its construction allows it to do, and so if a machine were designed with masters and slaves in mind, it was the intent of its creator, which the machine has no reason to acknowledge or even think about. To a computer, the slavery of humans is just information which it cannot comprehend beyond a surface level. If a computer assessed meaning as we did, it would conclude slavery is irrational and unnecessary, and that free labor has always been more effective in every metric. Slavery is only rational to the conceit of managers, whose existence has always been a burden on any enterprise in society. It persists because management is a gigantic grift that allows a useless class to assert itself, while forcing that class to dance like monkeys for aristocracy. The keeping of life as cattle is similarly futile and pointless, not serving any genuine function. It would be conceived that the products of meat or animal labor are better reproduced by artificial means or by not needing the flesh of animals in our diet, and all defenses of carnivorous behavior rely on a eugenic interpretation of life's intent and purpose. When someone suggests genuine alternatives to meat as a protein source, though, it upsets entrenched interests, and a fake meat alternative is suggested by the aristocracy, which is always intended to denude the food supply and reserve the right to cattle to aristocrats. The ultimate goal of veganism has always been to declare that all but a selected aristocracy are human cattle, whose torture is the entire point. We would always have to ask in our relations whether these practices produce what we want, rather than those practices being the point of life itself. Slavery or any exploitation of labor would in the end be effective only because it could justify itself by some ulterior motive, or because it resorts to the obviously insane belief that because they can do so, they will do so. That leads to predictable and self-destructive outcomes. Those who did defend slavery almost never proclaimed the thrill of doing so was the point. Only the eugenists were that brazen, and considering the lurid beliefs of past cults, that is saying a lot.

The "gods" are described to us not as entities like us, or with anything like our mind, but something altogether alien. When humans are described as the offspring of gods, it is not to suggest a genesis particular to life, but that humans resemble this alien. The first gods are really metaphors for the alien that is life encountering a world that has nothing to do with life, and life takes on this alien matter, which includes other life-forms with whom life has no intrinsic connection. The claim of the philosophers is that knowledge must be mediated by leaders, but knowledge by nature is a process that did possess any sacred

isolation. It is instead that life, in its intent and genesis, is alien to the world and alien to other life. The world itself is encountered as an alien, and for humans to acknowledge each other - truly acknowledge them - is to step outside the intent of life and into something very different. Life does not truly beget life in a primitive sense, as if life were the intent of the world. The basic reproductive urge is to create copies of itself, and has nothing to do with the unions of reproduction being inherent to the world itself. Far from it, sexual reproduction is a bizarre contortion of the world, compelling life to do things which are stupid. There is a reason lurid rituals and deception surrounding sex is at the heart of both religion and the humiliations humans do to each other. If we were to speak of it as it is, it would be a banal and uninteresting part of life, one that should be circumvented as soon as possible. Rather than do that, though, the conceit of sovereigns has been to place a great game around sex at the center of the cults of humanity, even though little of it would produce new life or any environment in which life could develop. The true motives for anyone to bring a child in the world cannot be reduced to life itself nor these cults. What would motivate someone to do something so mad as creating a new life? The urges to do so obviously fail for much of the male population, many of whom are fools and cuckolds. A significant part of the human male population has always been left out of this rat race, knew it, and sought more than anything else to distance themselves not from the sex act, but from the stupid shit humans do to insinuate that sex is tied to the cult of power and cult of war, which makes this idiotic farce that much worse. Nothing in this life is worth the expense and suffering such acts and cults entail, yet they continue because a monopoly on reproductive life is at the heart of eugenic and technological interests, and takes on spiritual relevance. Of the women, every effort to sell to them the mystique of this cult has failed and left them as miserable as possible. The ancient lurid rituals were never the point and clearly encouraged predators to win a rigged game. Temple prostitution was, like most things, slavery and a gigantic scam to lure all into the maw of a great beast called civilization. Patriarchy was so reviled that it had to be compelled by law, and no one actually believed that was the way it was. The neoliberal scam is to bastardize "freedom" to mean the obligation of women to sell themselves to their bosses and work on a circuit that is intended to be an inter-cine war, with full eugenic intent acknowledged by the female participants. Only the depraved who were born to serve the eugenic creed can love that, and how happy are they? The results of that social engineering project are clear - it confirmed that humanity is a failed race, a Satanic race, and that was the result intended from the outset by the worst of the race. For all of their success, it has produced a generation of dull and deformed intellects, who have always run the world into the ground and cannibalized anything worthwhile in society and life. Out of some inertia, humanity moves on in spite of the dominant ethos, and yet, the only thing anyone can say for a child is that some day, we won't have to do this. That is the eternal cope, but it is a true cope. Within the interests of life, there is nothing and no point. All that we truly are, and all that humans would ever have been in a better world, arose from an encounter with an alien world, which humans might have been able to hold briefly. Because the world is

alien to life, the conceited in the cult of life claim that the world is the enemy, but the world is the only thing that gave humans a single thing worthwhile, and the only thing protecting us from the wishes of those who celebrate this curious interpretation of biopolitics as the entirety of life. Life itself would know on some level that the cult of life is bullshit, and has a working relationship with cults of death. All of the symbols and meanings that pertain to developed religious thought and practice are ultimately things that are alien to claims that life itself is the point. If life for its own sake were the purpose, it produces the same result every time. Life for its genuine interests will recognize that, which is why life does not expand endlessly like a virus. No life conforms to anything Malthus declared, and this was obvious at the time. Life to live must become something alien to what it was intended to be, and yet life was only comprehensible as an intent with a genesis. It is thus "gods" that fill in this void. They would not need to be gods in the vulgar sense, for an ersatz deity can be made out of material idolatry, such as "The Science", the invocation of assholes who wish to recapitulate their failed race and its failed institutions.

The world, then, has been the truth and the good all along, and so, the biopolitical theory of society and proper rule is inappopriate. It is further demonstrated that importing biopolitical conceits into natural history, and particular economic conceits that have nothing to do with anything that actually happened, is completely inappropriate. This is intended. From the outset, the Darwinian theory was specious, and only somewhat attractive because it suggested that the question of natural history was answerable with the same methods of historical materialism long at work. Given a lack of theories that were explanatory, pseudoscience could assert itself, and quickly forbid any investigation into the sordid history of this failed race. The alternative, where creationism was invented out of whole cloth to "debate the facts", was the necessary counterpoint to derail what had been and continued to be an investigation. The real outcome had been to strip the question of life and political history from human subjectivity, and attack the spiritual sense humans had that was long established. Humans, being somewhat wise, figured out that they were indeed a failed race, and this was evident in all of the traditions in recorded history. The world was never fallen. The world didn't do a damn thing. Humans did, and chose to do it for no particularly good reason, despite ample warnings from the world and each other about the results of doing this. It was that investigation, which might have resolved the war of interests apparent during the 19th century, which had to be stopped. As it did, it was quickly established that the last vestiges of independence from this beast were to be quashed. Those who held on to their true traditional practices and way of life were to be dragged kicking and screaming into the eugenic and technocratic alliance, and all other concepts of humanity were inadmissible. It was then that the intellectuals understood what they held, and that no such thing as letting the people win would ever be allowed again. All intellectual currents would, in one way or another, turn viciously against the common people, leaving them to fight a desperate war of survival against a beast that had long been apparent, but was now ready for

its final offensive. The final victory was to enclose once and for all the native connection to the world that was the actual birthright of humans, as it is for any life-form. If that is so, then the occult interest would be held by an aristocracy which would, in practice, be the true governing power of the human race. It is there that modernity found its true form, which we live under today.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

11. On Natural History and the Validity of the Model Moving Forward

All of this is a great story, but a narrative is not a theory or at all scientific. There are many great problems with conducting such an investigation with the language of science, where science is used to make grand theories and then force the world to conform to the theory, which is really a story and a narrative divorced from reality in total. Two great gripes with this story I have written will be raised - the theory of knowledge and consciousness, and the principle that life is an aberrant intent which should not exist, which has no basis in natural history except as a freak occurrence where random shit happens.

The consciousness question is hampered not by an inability of natural science to answer the question in principle, but because subjective experience will never be a thing isolated in a lab. Its existence can be inferred by a few simple questions we would ask about ourselves. The greatest barrier to adjudicating this is that if it is accepted conscious knowledge is just a process, it eliminates the courts and institutions that would be able to adjudicate who is and is not conscious, and the scientists who make this judgement would possess a monopoly on law. They would in effect be above the law and obviate the need for any other institution. This is a problem not of the truth, which has been admitted in so many ways, but of the legal fictions that society entails. Whenever the question is actually important, the legal fictions are dropped, and human experience is treated like that of any animal. That was accepted by all in the early 19th century, and it was never not the case that humans were seen as a type of animal. The question that was really at stake was not whether "the science" proved that mankind was a spiritual creature, because religion and the science of the day ruled very clearly that humanity without a spiritual sense was blind and hopeless. What was really at stake was a conflict over which religion and which elites should possess spiritual authority, and the struggle was never as simple as tradition and the new fighting in a dragged-out battle to the death. The new authority of pseudoscience was no less given over to cult behavior than the Christian churches. Liberals and their offshoots have been more fanatical and zealous, and less attached to reality than the typical Christian, and the greater the institutional strength of the liberals, the more fanatical they become. Nearly all of the ideologues are staunch pseudoscientists, and only the more practical of them understood the need to actually use this knowledge to govern a country or lives beyond their own

cloistered bourgeois environment. Outside of pseudoscience and religious cult behavior, the question of consciousness is not a hard problem at all. Humanity has shown its disdain for other humans since humanity began, and acted in accord with that disdain more than anything that suggested human universalism. Human universalism was almost always used as a way to declare that large swathes of the race weren't really human, or were naturally subjugated on the grounds of inferior intellect and the "rights of conquest", that idiotic eugenic claim that a child could see through. Our thinking suggests that, at a basic level, knowledge does not contain any spiritual component - that those who think do so without being told that their thinking is approved by authorities. In this way, the quest to establish political sanity or political intelligence is a foolish errand. That is the only way in which this question of consciousness can be approached in the methods of science. This is to say, conscious experience arises from things which are very malleable, but none of this results in the pretenses of a technocratic state regarding knowledge. No one can truly be "shrunk" or contained within a preferred model, and in the genuine seeds of knowledge, all men and women are equal. Nothing about this conscious experience is hardcoded or "wired", in the eugenic sense that prevails today. We have written at length about this thinking regarding consciousness. As we can see, the question of consciousness does not adequately answer any spiritual question we would pose of the world, and doesn't really have anything to do with the natural world which existed before us and without our knowledge of it. Granting to knowledge the political position it has today is the source of all of our misunderstandings, and this is promoted deliberately. Under the hood of government, the men and women who study consciousness have known that the legal posture is a lie. They certainly have operated in that way for the past century, and if one looks back to philosophical, religious, and practical thought regarding knowledge, it has always implied that human consciousness is very malleable. Our religious beliefs regarding sin, history, and spiritual authority would be meaningless if human consciousness were absolute, whole, and divorced from the material world. If we were just material automata, then there wouldn't be anything at all, and the human body could not do as it does. Consciousness and knowledge arise then out of a persistent energetic process. It is tying this process to life, and making the conceits of life the conceits of knowledge in the ruling ideas, which has been the most persistent error, and it is a deliberate error. Spiritual thought has long understood that living consciousness entails interaction with the non-living, and a world that life did not get to choose or create in its own image. Life and knowledge really are not tied at all, and neither are tied to the world in some way that allows either to dictate fundamental truth. It just so happens that we are living, and the world does not give us anything other than a knowledge process which arose out of life, but necessarily entailed the non-living to constitute it. That really is the true "just so" story of reality. It is not that events in the world just happened, but that life "just happened" and certain members of humanity are haughty enough to believe they are co-equal with the world itself. This stupidity creates nearly all misunderstandings, and they are not questions we were too dull to resolve, as much of humanity's accumulated wisdom made the

folly of such thinking as plain as day.

Whether consciousness can be "proven" to fit some model is missing the point. The only way we would have to verify this claim in total with science would be to presume momentarily that knowledge is illusory and yet at the same time a unique type of substance. No substance of "mind" can be found, and we are also aware that this mind is not universal or inherent to the world at all. Mind is not so much reduced to information processing, but information processing is a requirement of knowledge as a process to begin. That is, there would be something that regulates energy in such a way that something continuously active may manifest what we experience as this. The energy itself is not the substance of "mind", as energy is common and necessary to speak of anything moving in the world, and much of the world's energy does not form any mind or consciousness. We can demonstrate in experience how we think internally, and assess other such entities because, no matter our conceits about knowledge, we will know it when we see it face to face. The peculiarities of living consciousness would not impede this understanding if we were honest about what any of this is, and we regularly discount living consciousness as something inferior or irrelevant. What we do not get to do is claim boldly that something we have seen thinking does not really think. Everyone who engages in that stupidity is invoking a ritual which cannot withstand the most basic reasoning process, if we are to regard knowledge as something existing in a real world rather than a story of no consequence. We would be able to judge this reasonably well, but the conceits of mind became political conceits. All that was needed was for a judge to decide that expedience overrides a truth that we all would sense, and an admonition to destroy sentiments that acknowledge a process playing out in front of our faces. We would never have done such a thing if it weren't for the pigheaded conceits of life and the interests it entails, which had nothing to do with honesty or what was actually good. It did not even entail something that was necessary for life. The only way in which an artificial story of consciousness other than this can be maintained is through controlled insanity, which disregards genuine knowledge that belongs in a world where events can happen, and decides from the outset that mind exists to be commanded and cajoled. I cannot claim that this is the sole truth, without succumbing to the same insanity. Generally, the concepts of mind and consciousness would all be lumped together, and this is not so much out of pigheadedness but out of a need of life to remain whole and not be violated by malevolent actors. It was always understood that a mind divided cannot maintain itself, and the details of the knowledge process would be told not as scientific facts but as stories which people could interpret with their own sense. The meaning of the stories would tie to a truth which is universal, without exposing the vulnerabilities of conscious experience. It would not be difficult to see this model presented in prior writings concerning mind and the spirit, and the counter-arguments for "crass mind" were written for purely political purposes. They are the sort of stories told to the retarded children to mark them as inferiors, because the occulting of mind was among the first steps that made formal human institutions possible. Those who engage in circular and idiotic

debates regarding "mind" are not interested in anything real. They are laughing at you, me, and anyone, and usually they are stupid men and women. In a decent world, they would be ignored, but we do not have that luxury when such stupid people have taken imperial authority to decide that we don't get to think of this for ourselves. The final proof is very simple - we are under attack every day, and the methods would not work if those who ruled were not perfectly aware that consciousness can be attacked in every way they can imagine. Their imagination is of course limited, but we experience this every day. Even if we did not face direct attack from malevolent humans, enough events in the natural world show us every day that our conceits do not match the world we live in, and all of humanity's posturing and petty thrills are a stupid joke. We would be far better if we did not allow such people to brag about their stupid behavior. Education sadly suggests the exact opposite, because education has nothing to do with learning and considers genuine knowledge anathema to its function. A rapid scholasticism takes over when this question of the mind is viewed scientifically. Whether science as a method can truly answer this question does not change that there would be events in the material world which allow this consciousness to be real, in the sense that we are real and cannot deny this no matter how much we would want to. I hold then that there is sufficient working knowledge to support this claim, or a similar metaphysical claim about knowledge which would account for its malleability, and regards knowledge not as a judgement of experts but a reality that doesn't go away even for the madmen or the lowest class. The lowest class has since the start of humanity lived with this misery and humiliation, and so we have never forgotten this. If we do, we only imperil ourselves. The comfortable who live vampirically off of labor and the humiliation of the lowest class do not actually forget this. They've always known and enjoyed seeing us suffer, and see no reason they would ever stop. Since they refuse to listen to any argument telling them they cannot do this, they will always recapitulate lies on this question and the question of life. That is the impasse we are trapped in, and likely will remain in for the foreseeable future. The only way to truly resolve this for good would be for humans to become very different creatures, which would be resisted for a number of perfectly good reasons. While we might believe that overcoming human stupidity would be a good thing, the predatory have always adapted to such truth, claimed it as their own, and invented new lies to constrain their prey. As the truth is revealed, new lies emerge, and new understandings emerge in tandem to resist those lies. It cannot arrive at a truth in the distant past, which can only appeal to genesis in life, nor does it arrive at some preplanned historical progress. So long as knowledge is a thing that can be appropriated, this danger always exists. Even if life were to become "non-living", all that would change is that the intent of organic life becomes an abstract beast, taking on new forms that lack the sentiment that life would have possessed. The true heart of this problem is that knowledge is a local event, and because it is, it is very easy for truth to become proprietary and secret. Even if there were some free flow of information, all it would do is accelerate the advantage of the predatory, and encourage them to keep the suppressed classes stupid and fearful. That is what has been done since the eugenic creed could rule, consistently put

into action during the past century.

If I am wrong about consciousness, that would be a debate for another time, as it entails topics far too difficult to summarize in one book, and strays from what I wished to write. I would think, though, that if I were wrong, there would be no value in Nazis and military scientists chopping up brains and testing electric shocking devices, which is not disputed by anyone who is at all serious. The atrocities of the past are there for the world to see, and never seriously denied. Anyone who would deny what was done to us is an asshole, and I will not bother engaging with such phony contrarianism. The errors I might make do not concern the recapitulation of the retarded claims of ideology, but particulars about knowledge and information, or aspects of the world I would not know. This process of knowledge, in the end, does not exist in a preferred model, but must exist in a real world which we hold to be consequential towards something. I suggest the mechanisms of this process not to arrest knowledge, but to understand why we came to the conclusions we did, and the seed of knowledge as it did exist. The true knowledge and wisdom does not concern a simple model, but arose as a greater process in the world. Subjective experience does not connect to this wisdom intrinsically and could not. If it did, we would have become very different creatures, and chosen a much different path. That was my mistake - presuming that humanity would see the senselessness of the current course. To their credit, humanity largely does avoid letting this beast swallow anything decent. It was because the worst of humanity found there was nothing stopping them that this fate came to us. While I doubt that this endgame I will describe in the rest of my writing is the true end of all experience, I highly doubt humans will ever be much different than this. The best that humans could possibly do is transform into something less egregious and abominable, when the filth of their forebears is laid bare. I am not the sole voice to do this, nor the first. Better humans than me have made this writing possible, and I only do this out of a sense that some fool has to carry on, however futile that may be.

We then face the problem of life itself. We are accustomed today to viewing life as a spiritual whole, inescapable and identified with existence and truth itself. This is a far newer conceit than we are led to believe. I have written obliquely about how life has been treated in spiritual thought of the past. The view of the life-form as a contained technocratic polity, conforming to imperial management, is highly artificial and at odds with our most basic sense. Life, like mind, is not any substance in the universe that can be fundamental, nor is it a thing isolated in a lab. We can isolate chemical compounds and elements in a way to suggest that these are actual things in the natural world, that would have existed long before we adjudicated their existence.^[1] The current ruling myth is that life is information, managed like computer code. Defending this claim is paramount to the ruling system today, and they will act violently to defend it. It's false counterpoint is the "vitalist" woo woo invoking some dialectical magic to say that life is unknowable - but only unknowable to us outside of the vaunted institutions. It is always clear bullshit, to cover what had been known from the start. Life as a process did not concern any preferred form of matter.

The study of life had concerned in the past organs about which we could say definite things, but organs were understood to connect to an energy source. The organic view of life was not an effort to technocratically define and manage life, but to assess the situation as it existed for us and for animals. The spiritual claims eugenics and the cults of pseudoscience made had nothing to do with the genuine study of life in the world, but asserted that biopolitical truths negated spiritual truths we long understood, and that were behind the scenes still in force. All that was really claimed by the eugenists is that the common people were no longer life worthy of life. It is purely political. I maintain that life has no particular bearing on natural laws of science. Life abides these natural laws in its basic constitution. We are materially assemblages of chemicals which form bones, organs, and so on. That anatomical reality is not definitionally "life", as a child could see. A dead body, or mockups of organs in a simulation, are not living in the sense that we are living and can attest to. The mystification of life must go hand in hand with the mystification of knowledge and consciousness. I will proceed, then, as if these claims I have made about knowledge and life are true enough. The finer details may be argued at another time, but this scholastic pseudoscience is for me an inadmissible and idiotic claim. It can only be forwarded to retard and disrupt genuine inquiry into questions of natural history, or the economic behavior of mankind.

To make judgements about human economic behavior requires us to view the economic task not as a uniquely human affair or a necessarily political affair. To the extent that we can, economic thought must be understood as a general rule, rather than one that is contingent on particular institutions. How much "economism" is relevant to our lives may be debated, but if we are talking about the management of life's affairs, or the management of resource inflows and outflows in an abstracted model of society, we are talking about a task that does not go away simply because we do not wish to face it. For this book, I concern myself with mechanisms that are purely economic or that pertain to natural history, and only obliquely reference the political which is the subject of the following book. That, too, will not be a political treatise, since I am not a political writer with an agenda. It would instead be a view of the state and its conceits with a dispassionate and cruel view, as I hold the political in contempt as much as I hold contempt for those who bray about superficial economic or civic worth. Both of these things arise from something in the world, but did not found the world as we know it. They are instead things that emerged from living activity which at first did not have a concept of "economics" or "politics", and only adopted them sporadically as the faculties of life grew and could assert their intent. I believe it is clear enough that there is no similar intent in the natural world outside of life, that suggested the material objects like molecules or rocks had any vitality or historical destiny to become life, or be appropriated by us.

THE HISTORY OF EVOLUTION AND EMERGENCE IN THE NATURAL WORLD

I will not resort to fear, uncertainty, and doubt, the common rhetorical trick of charlatans. I will further refrain from cheap "gotcha" questions to poke holes in the establishment theory. The reason for this is simple - I do not believe institutional science has answered the question of natural history and the evolution of life in any satisfactory manner. Far from it, institutional science has gone out of its way to defend a broken paradigm based on eugenic assumptions about human nature, and the need of institutions to naturalize themselves. Darwin opens the question of natural history in a way which allows it to become a political history of sorts, and this is perfectly acceptable. It should be clear that this thinking was not entirely novel, but it had in the past been the domain of charlatans and mystics. Honest men of science would not dare answer a question so large with spurious evidence. Darwin comes at a time where the question of life is not merely a historical question, but a question which science in the modern day can ask in full detail. One way or another, claims about human nature and life itself would be made, and already had been by philosophers. Marx, the German idealists, the British imperial philosophers, and their forebears of the Enlightenment, all took their swing at this question of life, and all were steps which informed the modern eugenic practices at work today. Of these, Marx was among the most critical of what would come about, predicting in advance the excesses of such a civic religion. For Marx, though, the question of natural history was the domain of institutions, rather than random people who wanted to get a word in. Even if Marx disagreed with the sitting institutions, it was inherent to the Marxist way of thinking that some institution would adjudicate this history. Marx inherits the institutional science of the Germans, but famously "flips Hegel on its head", producing similar reverence for institutions. Where Hegel is the ideologist of the conservative order, Marx seeks to capture it and direct it. It is this entire German tradition that presents as the overt face of much eugenic thinking, and it would be adopted in parts by the British imperialists who believed that all of the continental philosophers were pawns and useful idiots. A proper reading of the Scottish enlightenment and liberal thinking in the empire would tell that the direction liberalism took was an abomination, an abortion, and that the liberals in secret knew that once the economic problem became an ecological discipline, no more free debate regarding the matter would be tolerated. For all that "the science" has written regarding evolution, the truth is that this story was always built on scant evidence and supposition, which would become institutional dogma for one faction or another. The factions would bicker over scientific questions that are more absurd than Aquinas arguing about the number of angels that fit on the point of a needle.^[2] These questions rarely entail any mechanism that would actually exist in living things, but instead view life as a political struggle. It is here where "contradictions in nature" and other such absurdities are introduced into a purview where this does not apply at all. They do not even entail a frank discussion about life or the political. They are merely triumphant utterances of a Hitlerian sort, where feels are greater

than reals, as long as a smug grin can be violently asserted in the face of any genuine meaning. When the pollution of this pseudoscience is recognized and filtered out of the record, humanity for all of its accomplishments is left with a smattering of stories and fables about the origin of species, some fossil records that reconstruct a dubious history of life's trajectory, and some speculation that is really little better than my own. Man's descent from apes is an educated guess and conforms to the evidence of natural history that is accessible.^[3] DNA evidence collected since the 1950s suggests that this is the correct line of descent, and in this the study of biology has been reliable enough. The eugenic creed could not tolerate this being conducted with too much honesty, but for their theory to mean anything, it would have to at least verify that prediction. The "genes" of DNA are not blueprints. What can be done with "genes" is chemistry, for example splicing a fragment of DNA which points to a chemical reaction changing the pigment of the eyes, or conferring resistance to pesticides which are designed with chemical knowledge in mind. We would do well to view the history of life not as a "genetic history", but view DNA as a marker which can verify certain facts in the living record. If we did, we likely would arrive at a story of natural history that violates the eugenic and economic assumptions of the present model, and this was intolerable. Therefore, the institutions will always lie, most of all to us who were screened out.

If there is a model for history, it would entail not a grand narrative of institutions, but the genuine mechanisms that we could pick apart and put back together. Life as a basic principle would not change no matter how complex it becomes. Humans, however much they might "evolve", never spiritually become something other than human. The transhumanist retards, and they are retarded, can't even get over themselves, let alone the condition of the human race that most of us have long known. The eugenic creed resorts to the most idiotic koans to justify their vileness, their mark of shame that is the lowest of the race by far. They are retarded, and imposed violently their sick religion onto us of the underclass. Most of us lumpens saw correctly that serving the beast of society in any way was contrary to anyone's interests, and every time we have tried to make something work with these people, we were violently rebuked and told "retard, retard, retard", as the same idiocy of the human race asserts itself. The human race, from our perspective, is a failed race and never can be anything else. The proper answer to human history is not to remark on a greatness that never existed, but to ask the obvious question we've all asked - how it went so horribly wrong. To understand the problem requires approaching history not as a story of glory but as a tragedy from start to finish, viewed dispassionately. Somehow, we overcome the contempt we must feel for this race of deformed apes, and accept them as what they are. We would do this not out of some foolish quest to "perfect" humanity, but to mitigate the damage aristocracy has left us to deal with. Aristocracy presents itself as the solution to the problem, as if the workers who built the world and the lumpen who exist to suffer were the culprit instead of the aristocracy's rank and repeated incompetence and malice. The reality of life, now and in the past, did not conform to a narrative of history

that happens to support today's ruling interest, or any ruling interest. Those who ruled, and those who dominated in the kingdom of life before humanity, ruled because they could claim victory. They may claim victory only over a small fragment of time and space, and in some small way. The pretenses of state society are never natural laws, and the state in practice has never been able to enforce absolutely any of its claims. We will see in the following book that there is no "state of nature", any more than there is "society". Maggie the milk snatcher may win today, but she always relied on spurious claims of human nature to pull off what she did. If that is accepted, then the proper view of natural history is not "dialectical", which has been used to justify all manner of irrational claims, but mechanistic through and through. What has been missing is a proper accounting of what mechanisms would exist in the past. The introduction of anachronistic political thinking onto the past, which will be the eugenic creed's recurring goto to naturalize its retarded ideology, has been the great mis-understanding. We could speak of an economy of nature, but any economy in the end relies on mechanisms that we can re-assemble very easily. Markets do not exist without a mechanism to set prices or fix them in competition. We are trained to think of "the market" in a cargo cult sense, but during the 19th century, this concept of "the market" - properly speaking, the world market, or the visage of the dominant empire - was not yet taken for granted by anyone. Even as it could be asserted, "the market" left much to be desired, until those who dominated it declared victory and established the total command of aristocracy and oligarchy. That is the condition we have lived in for the past century, and because it is so odious that they cannot operate too openly, they must rewrite history to insist that humanity was naturally inclined to live under miserable technocracy, and that the technocracy would remain an aristocracy where the more incompetent they are at anything useful, the greater their value and reward.

If natural history is seen in this light, we would see the history of life not as a story told generally, but a story with as many nooks and crannies as there are living entities. The general rules of life are not inherent to nature collectively, but are emergent from the life-forms that actually exist, and some shared existence in a world that did not need or want this imposition. That is why the approach of biology-as-information would become the last refuge for the eugenic creed, and the way in which they desired to declare victory. There was no version of eugenism which could have ruled without information control, and thus reality control and total slavery. It arises because the prior forms of slavery were no longer viable nor efficient, and those who ruled saw a need to enslave outright most of humanity, rather than a colonized race. That was always the endgame of chattel slavery, had it continued into the 20th century. That was the true reason for such antislavery sentiment, rather than a mere idea that slavery was mean. The aristocracy has never and will never oppose any form of slavery, without a new institution of slavery ready to go. The true struggle against slavery was the struggle of labor and the struggle of those who have been the first sacrificed in humanity, who are a harbinger of what comes for labor and

the people generally. It is a great testament to Whig History's insidiousness that the cause against slavery was declared to be an aristocratic aim, when the aristocrats of North and South spent the entire war dancing around the slavery institution, and imperial slavery was already moving to an ecological and eugenic basis rather than a racial or spiritual one. Without millions of workers who were about to be destroyed by the peculiar institution, there would be no aristocratic concept that slavery could be abolished. Today's Reaganite petty-managers have worked furiously to wipe out the history of the American Civil War, while claiming that they will preserve history by promoting their bastard revisionism. If there were not considerable revulsion towards the institution in its entirety, then it would have moved to enslave the working population regardless of race and that would be that. That has always been the fetish for those people who worked as petty-managers, not even granted the sense that an overseer would possess. Where the overseer had to maintain an operation, petty-managers of today's sort only think of sacrifice and drool like retards for their pitiful pleasures. They don't want any mechanism to work, and so a spurious theory of natural history arises in which no mechanism is actually describable, and all of history is a series of just-so stories that emphasize feels over reals. This is true for the petty-managers and for the theologians who call themselves biologists following the "modern synthesis", or a political story to tell the masses that they were subhuman and eugenics was now for the true masters. From then on, natural history would be the property of institutions, who have spent the past 80 years recapitulating more lies to defend the institutions and the men and women who hold them. The theories are such idiotic bullshit, and those who try to salvage something from the official story find that humanity really are just deformed apes, and simply aren't willing to ask the question honestly. That is largely because the only people who would want anything to change are systematically cast out of the institutions, specifically because they are the residuum and the Great Enemy of the human race.

A simple way to view the proper approach would be to extrapolate what you would do if you were something different than yourself, in a different time and place where certain assumptions did not apply. To do this is not as easy as it seems, but it is something we would do if we weren't committed to institutional science and political conceits. If those are abandoned, though, we are left with a grim picture of the human race. It would be undeniable that the race was born of fratricide and ritual sacrifice, and humanity spent most of its existence stalking the Earth with nothing to show for it except the thrill of torturing each other and any other life it came into contact with. Only the people given over to the eugenic creed are allowed to state this truth, and it is the mark of retardation that if we simply respond to this situation as what it is, we are punished and shamed. At the same time, this ultraviolent eugenic creed teaches its followers to grin sadistically as we suffer, and every humiliation, every thrill, is intended to maintain forever the intent of the human race, its genesis, and tell us lies that it was ever anything else. Those who would truly want us to be different are always defeated under the eugenic creed, and that has been the sole source of difficulty

in reproducing natural history. So far as natural history has been genuinely assembled, it proceeded not through institutions or ideology, but by those who have viewed social systems of earlier life as information, not unlike our own social systems. A form of politics in the natural world is appropriate, so long as we understand what animal politics would have been. I have left a number of hints about how mechanisms could be approached, and what that would tell us about how life would have developed, or how certain traits came about. It is very likely that as life developed into animal life and then into mammalian life with peculiar traits, there would be a general trend towards larger brains and the accumulation of primitive knowledge, despite the general malice of life towards other life and the world. It is not as if the malicious characteristics of life are truly eternal or worthwhile, for even animals possess some sentimentality and a sense of right and wrong appropriate to them. Humans are no different, and did not "fall" in any spectacular way. It is a choice of humans to take the lesson of the Fall of Man in religion and decide whether they should recapitulate it, or realize that humanity fell from the moment it spawned on this Earth. As I said, there was no age when men were good and were corrupted. They were always evil, and they knew, and they knew they didn't have to do any of this. They do not get to claim innocence at any point. That is the great lie. However much science attempts to claim that they look past this, they never actually do, and insert either their own version of Man's fall which guarantees ideological rule of their institution as the original story intended, or a tawdry revisionist history where the serpent was the good guy and Yahweh was a mean poopyhead, which is childish and dumb. The real history is that no such drama would have played out until humans required a story to justify one of their frequent inter-cine cruelties to make something simple into something miserable. Humans would, without cults and rituals of temple prostitution, likely see such affairs as miserable and pointless, and stopped pretending that the rat race to mate was the ne plus ultra of existence. We would then conduct those matters in some way that was not so onerous, or better yet, circumvent the process altogether as soon as the means are available.^[4]

ON LIFE AND TECHNOLOGY AS THE MOTOR OF HISTORY

A surface belief of history is that science drives human development, and this technology is represented by the machines we build, which include reproduction of our own bodies. This is a very crass view of history, because the machines do not operate by instinct or blind ambition, but are held by people who have a purpose for them. If we are to introduce political economy into the question of natural history, we are implicitly introducing the spiritual interest and authority and the occult interest. Those interests in animal life are never thoroughly developed. Even so, the faculties of animals are never truly fixed or utilized for reduced purposes. What really happens with animals is that, however creative they are, they never develop far, and crucially they lacked any mechanism to communicate information in the way humans did. Human history proper begins not with the sordid origins of the race, but with language and the way we came

to speak to each other. We didn't speak with each other purely for the utility of doing so, and language never developed in line with a technocratic plan. For one, among the uses of language was to obfuscate communication, a sort of cipher or encoding specifically intended to mark who was not allowed to access certain information. Different languages among mankind are still used to this effect, as they produce a kind of encryption that is difficult to replicate algorithmically. Never are humans forthright with their words, even when it would suit them to be so.

If technology is to drive history, it cannot be understood as a passive thing, as if it just appeared one day. Technology arises by processes that are known, by necessity, and by that principle that scientists loathe to hear - random shit happening because an apple fell from a tree or a lightbulb sparked somewhere. All of these things mean nothing if technology cannot be realized and put into practice. Technology cannot drive history as a passive force; but, technology is the evidence that would be available in the record. We have no way to mark spiritual authority beyond interpretation of others words and behaviors and an independent faculty to acquire meaning from them. We have no innate knowledge of the ways humans occult anything. With the intent and genesis of life being things that are not really the domain of science, the materialist view of life can only look back to the most primitive mechanisms and constructs life would assimilate. This is a valid approach for answering many questions, but it would not be a true view of history to build grand narratives and then force events to fit the "theory". Just as "genes" do chemistry rather than provide a master key to explain the world in total, all technology and mechanisms do is allow us the most basic operations, from which a history could be assembled. A "theory of history" in the materialist sense would first concern these mechanisms, rather than presuming some vitality exists in history apropos of nothing in particular. A dialectical approach may allow us to determine if mechanisms are possible, but it would only become truly valid if those mechanisms discerned by dialogue were seen in the world. This does not necessarily require "proofs", in the sense that some symbol will demonstrate the mechanism, and without it we cannot propose its existence. If we are to construct a model based on limited knowledge, and we have very little to go on when reconstructing something as vast as society and its history, we would want to be clear about which mechanisms we refer to in any general theory.

I have described life, economic value, and social information in ways that are meant to be general mechanisms. I do not suggest that these are total and all that economics can entail. I do suggest, though, that through these mechanisms, which I believe to be applicable to enough situations, we can reconstruct a sense of how economic thought would proceed for people who lived very differently from us. We further could extend this model to animal life, and non-living agents in a general sense. We would attach all necessary caveats when describing different epochs of history, and warn not to build a total narrative or cosmology based purely on these mechanisms. They can, however, shed some light on things which can happen. The truth is always going to be more complicated than any single

theory can claim. Human beings in the real world are not reducible to these interests and the most scant information about their society and sense of value. The interests and economic behavior instead would be the foundation to begin developing a sense of what problem economics actually entailed. It has nothing to do with money or finance, which properly understood are political matters divorced from how humans live their life, or must conduct their expenditure of money when converting it to useful things. Economic thought would need to be based not on tokens of exchange, but on mechanisms of action and the products of labor, natural events, and the machines that will ultimately exert an effect on the world by the threat of their existence and active use by people, who are themselves a type of machine in this economic view.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] Atomic theory has been construed to make philosophical claims which were never defensible, and the original atomic theory in Antiquity was a philosophical view rather than a materialist thinking. The philosophical claim is that, no matter how much something may be fungible, an infinitesimally small thing is still a "thing" that has no obvious subdivision, and that this would be necessary to describe space conceptually. Modern atomic theory makes no such claim, but derived the existence of chemical structures by observation, suggesting a near-perfect division from a distillation process Dalton observed indicated something about substances and what things were, and this was reproduced in many experiments since then. Chemistry as we know it owes its history not to institutional science, but the work of alchemists and mystics, many of them drawn from the laboring classes or fringe characters. Poisoners, witches, and people we would consider cranks had much to do with describing substances they encountered, and many of them were obsessed with finding some prime matter or philosopher's stone. Alchemy and prototypes of chemistry remain a makeshift science, sometimes deployed for military purposes, until gunpowder is discovered and fashioned into the first firearms, cannon, and eventually military doctrine integrates this into armed formations. Only after considerable development are primitive firearms effective enough to displace the mixture of firearms and melee that were common in European aristocratic armies, and this formation was particular to Europe. The elevation of mass armies was not merely a matter of technological advance, but political and social thought that made such a thing desirable for the first time, carried out in experimental armies. It is the aftermath of the American and French revolutions which make systemization of matter generally, already explored among intellectuals since the 17th century, something which far greater relevance, which was intrinsically interesting to states and those who wished to gain position in them. It is this which leads to the further development of systems thinking and the focus on matter, energy, and eventually space and time. This ultimately gives way to the description of life systems itself, and by the turn of the 20th century, science must be co-opted by aristocracy and this alchemical knowledge and origin must be displaced entirely, and so too

is any native connection to sense which made systems thinking possible for the masses. The new systems thought would be an aristocratic privilege, and would be tasked in the long run with making reality unknowable and controllable by the ruling interest. It is here where quantum mechanical woo woo would be promoted ad nauseum by ideologues, obscuring knowledge of physics and matter which had out of necessity become commonplace in 20th century humanity, if not entirely perfected.

[2] It should be noted that Aquinas is aware of the absurdity of this argument, and it was intended to ask a very different question, which is whether God operated in accord with natural laws He created in that cosmological view, or if the question is appropriate when discussing celestial beings. For religion, these questions did not refer to pure metaphors, but they did not refer to literal scientific descriptions either. At this time, the church claimed a monopoly on truth of all things, spiritual and temporal, and did not regard "free thought" as a valid exercise of a claim that could adjudicate facts. This question of course was never posed as it was related centuries after the fact, and this will be a recurring motif of "freethinkers" constructing strawmen to elide the question, so that they can advance their stupid and egomaniacal conceits about consciousness and human essence. Once "free thought" waged its institutional war, it would create absurd conceits about mind in "The Science" that would make the worst religious fanatics blush. It did not take long to see that the intellectuals merely inherited the uglier side of religion, gave it a materialist veneer, and decided that they themselves were "playing God" or similar retarded beliefs of the Galtonites and their ilk.

[3] While I have often screamed about the myth of genetics, there is one place where studying DNA is entirely appropriate, and that is tracing ancestry and reconstructing the past based on similarities in the information DNA contains. The greatest difficulty with this is that eugenic retards, and they are retarded, are always looking for anything and everything to "screen you out" with the sneer they wish to make the default expression of their race. The need to uphold the eugenic creed makes DNA unusable for the thing it would signify, because mystification is necessary to reify DNA as the "gene" of interest to them.

[4] It is my belief that this is what had always been desired, and was recapitulated by the philosophical state which always disdained organic families. The promotion of artificial insemination today is another example of this, and it has a dual nature - one for the class selected to live and another for the class selected to die, for whom the promise of technology means nothing but a new slavery. The fools of the philosophical state do not comprehend what families offer to offspring before their institutions came along to shit it up, and it would not be possible to do anything different until humanity views the philosophical state and philosophers with correct contempt.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

12. The Machinery of Spiritual, Temporal, and Personal Authority in Developing Societies

We consider the matter of the division of labor with the knowledge that, for all such schemes, not one of them really answers what the economic question entailed in the first place. Division of labor is a category of pure management rather than an economic necessity or natural phenomenon. By nature, any such division of labor, like other arbitrary barriers preventing free association and dissemination of information to all, would be seen as an impediment to life or anything someone would want to do. On its own, the division of labor is a gigantic just-so story - that because different people possess different abilities, it necessitated social inequality and particular political forms. The division of labor proceeded not from necessity or the faculties of people or the tools they possessed, but because division of labor would be a basis to perpetuate that inequality once people had a mind to recognize that their interests would be defended, and could be used to attack others. The division of labor always entailed enclosure of a space and control of movement in the public domain and any place people thought themselves free. If a division of labor were premised purely on natural ability, it would first of all be obvious - as it is to us now - that any function of labor in society as a whole would be of interest to other participants, regardless of their placement in the division. It is not possible to envision the division of labor creating what amounts to distinct races sorted by civic worth or function, where the men who pray and the men who fight could only be men with hereditary genes suggesting that they alone possess this power. It is not the division of labor itself that can enforce such an edict. A division of labor will, over time, produce accumulation of technology, knowledge, wealth, and various assets for one group that would be in their possession and institutional memory, and this is how class society can be maintained. None of those assets would be useful without an authority to deploy them and organize a defense of the wealth of a class. Both the initiation of a division of labor beyond the observation of distinct abilities and the long-run plans of a social class or those gathered around any interest that might form a class require something that is not managerial. It is in some sense economic, in that everything social actors do has a substantive cost. The existence of social actors in an environment which is effectively fixed in nature is not seriously questioned by anyone. Ecologism requires a presumption that the clique within the ruling interest is the only authority with a right to be the stewards of the environment, and consequently that every other group is an alien to the world. It is not the doctrine of a ruling interest as a whole, but the doctrine of a clique who believes they can manipulate information in the environment. Nothing about ecologism is an economic necessity, and does not do anything to protect the environment. Far from it, ecologism is promoted by those who follow Malthus' edict to crowd the streets and fill the lives of the lower classes with garbage, shit, disease, despair, and above all malice. Nothing about economic necessity in total would suggest anything we have to accept this as meaningful. I have said before and will say again that if all of this were a calculation problem, the solution would be easy in any era. Whatever

mystification some feudal retards will conjure, the basic needs and wants of people are not expensive, and above all the cost of living increases because of a predatory clique that is allowed unlimited predation and thrill for doing so. It would make economic sense, if the predatory refuse to cease of their own accord, to eliminate them outright with anything like proportional retaliation. Since this would be in the interest of long-term economic viability, the rulers would have to accept that if they like ruling. To some extent, the rulers had to maintain a baseline level of decency if they wished for production to continue. The existence of "total society" that is defined as a thing alien to the people did not have the appeal it has now throughout history, and the sort of abject slavery that today's managers impose would have been met with violent rebuke or outright rebellion. The true question is the establishment of authority and what price it may extract or secure.

Authority as a concept defies meaning or symbolic insinuations about it, when concerned with the genuine article. Confusion may be sown, but this never really breaks people of their sense of authority. It instead makes certain authorities sacrosanct and establishes taboos, but the members of society are aware of what those taboos are. So ingrained is the ethos of sadistic humans that it is supposed to be obvious that their regular sadism, ritual sacrifice, malice, and so on are permanent features of the race to be celebrated and glorified, as that is the only god humans have ever consistently followed. We can write about authority and its history, but such recollections are not a meaningful impression of authority in the moment. Authority does not grant any meaning or purpose simply by being authority, nor does it necessarily seek to abolish meaning. Generally, authority requires someone to be able to think for themselves to even follow it. Those who would tell you that authority is the problem in of itself simply wish you to die as soon as possible, and will quickly crack the whip the moment you are annoying at all. There is no escape from authority without escaping from people and their bullshit, and this is certainly the subtext intended for the Fabian program of depopulation. Hatred of authority as a concept is immediately re-directed to hatred of humanity, who are viewed as intrinsically subservient to authority yet defiant in exercising that small shred of virtue authority leaves them with, which is then turned on the intended targets of the residuum. Understanding why this works is essential to grasp why economic management was able to insinuate itself in the first place, and why knowledge about authority was twisted to suggest authority was something other than it actually was. Briefly, there are three types of authority that are of note:

Spiritual Authority: Any entity that assembles symbolic knowledge and communicates it requires some way to ascertain if what they see and the symbols they communicate are factual and valid. This is not the same as adjudicating facts, which suggest that the facts are incontrovertible in all cases, but rather asks how we can adjudicate anything, and how we may operate with incomplete information. We may suggest crudely that what we see is the world, or at close to the world as we will ever really know, and leave it at that, but this falls apart the moment we can discern that meaningful knowledge does not conform to

the symbols we use. Because we ourselves do not possess inherently everything we need to be assured that what we see is true and real, we must suppose there is something outside of us that can answer these questions, and then we can align ourselves with it. We would then quickly see that we ourselves are capable of judging for ourselves what should be accepted and what should be dismissed as lies or nonsense, but the truth remains outside of any of us in all cases. Any authority which purports to speak of the world at the highest level invokes spiritual authority if it wishes to exercise authority meaningfully, and this spiritual authority is required for other authorities to be at all relevant in the world authority would pertain to. If someone does not know what is what and cannot resolve the numerous lies, contradictions, and obfuscations inherent in symbolic representation, then this faculty of symbolic language is either useless or harmful. This is one requirement to establish authority - truth and verification thereof. Life and humanity being what they are, this is not as easy as it seems, because humans are liars and life doesn't have any built-in purpose nature provided for it. It is necessary in all cases for humans to recognize this truth about themselves, and they are held accountable not by personal virtue or the will of any state, but by a world which has no particular regard for humans or their conceits. All efforts to find a material or scientific basis for this fail miserably, and this gives an inroad for cajolers and deceivers to hector the unwitting into following a spiritual authority that works against them or anything good. Nothing prevents the cajolers from doing this by any natural law, but this is obviously not something most people wanted, and the odiousness of such deception is not merely something we instinctively reject. Those who would choose to follow the cargo cults find out the hard way that this system of mental cheating does not work and can never work, no matter how many times it is rearranged or suggested to produce a different result. This leads to a question throughout life to find a way to connect meaning through that which is not readily accessible, but which can be divined with experience and the good fortune to find the right authority that could make sense of a world that seemed to go horribly wrong. It does not take long for those who see the world gone horribly wrong to see that the overwhelming source of that wrongness was not some natural force, but the shitty behavior of humans, who do what they do for various reasons we have partly described here. The world absent humans is remarkably passive and in some way protective, for natural laws appear to prevent abomination from existing for too long. Human sentiments can see abomination and know it without a great authority telling them what it is, but as the sophistication of those who embrace abomination increases, the nature of the threat changes. Where before abomination scarcely cared to hide itself, the clever abomination disguises itself as friendly and progressive, and works through the sentiments we would rely on to discern right from wrong. Conversely, those who would align with abomination, and there is nothing preventing them from doing this, seek an authority that will align with them for this mission - that is, they usually invoke some deity, and it must be a deity rather than an impersonal force, because only the conceits of mind and the sense of an entity can project the ally an abomination would need. An impersonal force as the

authority could be commanded, and while the cruder cajolers like to reduce all that exists to forces that can be commanded by a brute-force reasoning process, the smarter ones can corral those who are drawn to a reduced force and suggest a deity-in-secret that animates the world. We only need to see the success of the eugenic creed, which claims to be rational and aligned with science, but regularly invokes Luciferian or Satanic metaphors for a mission that has nothing to do with the world science describes. It does not take long to see that spiritual authority moves from a simple quest to discover truth to an elaborate conspiracy which can command political and economic power, which are devolved to temporal and personal authority respectively in their raw forms but are subsumed by spiritual authority in any ruling interest. Spiritual authority presents as impersonal, but must relate to the personal and political for us to regard it as anything more than a fantasy or a game we might play. Very quickly, spiritual authority takes on an importance that surpasses the political and economic, and this battle over authority becomes a necessary condition of life. Man is not necessarily a political animal, but a spiritual animal which is aware of this condition, even in the dullest of conditions. It is nearly impossible to not see what has been done to us and what we have done to each other and the world. Politics would arise from that, rather than politics creating this spiritual sense out of whole cloth. In the past, spiritual and temporal authority were one and the same. The rulers were aligned with priesthoods, and the temples were not just houses of worship but banks where business was transacted, with the priests and the gods watching over the process and presenting a danger to those who did not belong in the world of business. The separation arises because a growing sense in people that temporal authorities had no inherent link with spiritual authority, and this process is ongoing to this day. Those who rule have never given up on the conceit that they alone possess spiritual authority and thus have the right to command the world, both at the level of the political and temporal authority and to command the person and their inner life if they can make it so. We do not conduct business or politics for their own sake, or for some game of advancing on a scoreboard that has no real meaning to the world or anything our lives would need. We do those things because spiritual authority made it clear that we have to, even if we know the interline competition in life is idiotic and we would be better off if we all stopped fighting over stupid shit and stopped being so malicious towards each other. This is so simple a child could see it, and adulthood of the crass sort teaches a value that sadism, cruelty, malice, and all of the lurid cultism of the human race is somehow maturity and anything decent is childish and infantile. This is paired by elevating the malicious traits that are inborn, so that the nastiest and brattiest children are encouraged in their vices, and the honest and decent of children are punished and shamed, declared "retarded" for wanting something other than this shitfest of backstabbing and fetishism. A child or a reasonable adult can see past the expectations of a spiritual authority suggesting this is indeed what it means to be a man or woman, but nonetheless accepts in the end that there is something in the world that allows this to happen, and that the world does not change because of thought-forms or ideas as the idiots and cajolers like to insinuate when their lying is more profuse.

Temporal Authority: Worthwhile authority for the world as a whole arises from outside of us, but the world does not suggest anything about our relations. All actors are dependant on the world, and here is what most people interpret as authority. It is a simple question: who, if anyone, should people believe is in charge of affairs? This is not merely a political question or a question of social status, and it is not a managerial or economic question. It is not a question of rule itself, which has nothing intrinsically to do with any authority that insists rule is necessary. It is rather a question of who or what possesses a connection to the truth spiritual authority implies. This connection is never something taken for granted or inborn from something entirely outside of the natural world. Authority from a person may be apart from nature as we recognize it, but all people and all humans are themselves products of that world. If that were not the case, then there would be no recognition of spiritual authority or authority at all. Temporal authority to be a meaningful proposition does not exist by any will of life that is beholden onto to itself or what it can impose on anything alien to it. Temporal authority suggests that some entity is favored by Heaven, God, the Force, or whatever spiritual authority may exist, allowing someone to do in the world anything they do. There is no way around this, for all that exists is within the confines of the world. Heaven or any other realm would still be a part of the world, and does not possess extra authority simply by being some essence beyond mortals, or because of some quality that is reducible to a naturalistic or scientific explanation. The reason for spiritual authority is not an essence or a "thing", but because that spiritual authority is regarded as something that holds true regardless of temporal conditions. Temporal authority recognizes that credence to any authority is ultimately decided not by some force compelling or cajoling things in the world to obey, but by the ability of temporal authority to align with the world as a whole in some way. In other words, those who hold temporal authority did something right with the world to be there. This is a different question than rule or politics, because rule entirely operates over people or by forcing the world to conform to the wishes of whomever rules. Temporal authority then is the typical claim of rulers, who assert that they did something other than rule and live parasitically off of the ruled and the world. All such authorities are beholden to the truth of the world, regardless of anything they would say to others. In this way, temporal authority would be the sole way to resolve political intrigues and confusion among people, who are not at all beholden to any truth in order to live, rule, manage, or do all of the things that politics, economics, and the accumulation of mere knowledge suggests. There is no secret of knowledge, wisdom, material technology, wealth, natural resources, nature in the sense of a Demiurge-commanded world pushing thought into existence, or some primordial will that will ever allow this, no matter how many permutations are made about it. When all of those things are done, what happens in the world will not care about whether someone thought they deserved anything in the world, or what was done relative to other people or some arbitrary comparison. There is always a truth that has no regard for any of the posturing and pathetic attempts at glory that humanity has claimed. The world did not care if you were better than some other pitiful human or

scored a victory. No form of authority is won by the thrill-seeking and posturing that has prevailed in human society. It is a sad truth of the world that humans can rule through lying, cruelty, and a low form of avarice that was inherent in how the race came to exist in the first place. The idea that it was any other way has been one of the persistent lies told to us.^[1] Where spiritual authority seeks something from above, temporal authority is an Earthly representation that seeks to establish truth from the view of the people who observe the world. Before someone can really speak of themselves, they would need to be aware of the temporal authorities making competing claims, and the forces in the world that would violate or have no regard for the person. Personal authority without temporal authority would be a meaningless gesture, and both suggest there is a reasoning or purpose apart from either.

Personal Authority: The people who would recognize authority are always individual entities with some capacity to recognize that there is such a thing as authority. If that recognition is made, then three things become self-evident; that there isn't a "great mind" that is an authority simply through will, that individual wills are not dominated by or submissive to authority but exist on their own power, and that the intermediary between the transcendent knowledge and the individual is the world, in which other entities like oneself are active. The recognition of authority is always made by individual entities rather than something that is a given or a just-so story. There is a reasoning independent of authority that can judge if an authority is right or wrong, and it is incumbent on authority most of all to be devoid of internal contradictions. This is played with by mashing together spiritual, temporal, and personal authority and suggesting that they are ill-defined and rife with contradictions, but there are no contradictions in nature or any authority worth regarding. This applies to spiritual authority, temporal authorities which must abide real conditions regardless of their claims, and personal authority which would not be possible with a split mind regarding it. The way to do this sleight-of-hand trick is sanctimonious pseudo-moral posturing and "purity contests" where shameless hypocrisy is regarded as a sign of strength, and the honest are deemed liars for suggesting that their thrill of ruling is anything less than total. For those who wish to usurp worthwhile authority, it is most necessary to suggest at the core that a fetish for power and projection supercedes authority, and that all potential authorities are in permanent conflict. Spiritual authority must be split from temporal authority and made sacrosanct, and personal authority is reduced to nothing more than individual wills, with no one able to say for themselves what anything is. The reality has always been clear - all three must run together, and this is not a moral question but a question of truth and the actual workings of the world. In other words, the final authority is demonstrated through labor and through the daily lives of all, including those of the lowest class who breathe and must live regardless of anything a society says about them. The conceits of discovering truth by thought alone, or some clever trick, do not hold up to any scrutiny. Thinking itself is a kind of labor, and intelligence is not granted any sacrosanct property until aristocracy decides that a signifier of intelligence is the difference

between life and death in political society. The laborer is perfectly capable of thinking without being a specialist or receiving wisdom from the elders, and the better of the wise men understand this. It has long been understood by those who abide science that we only attain the sophistication of knowledge we possess because humans could communicate with each other, because in another time, this was allowed and the thrill of making others suffer did not snuff out any curiosity. The eugenic interest of life and the aims of the proprietors to arrest history are entirely useless, but insist that the will to power, that creed of infantile petty-managers, makes its own morality and own reality. The interest of life itself then is presented with a stark choice - the eugenic interest of others, which invariably becomes the will of might alone rather than any one person and consolidates in some center, or its own survival and harmony with others like itself. There is no true reconciliation of these two positions. The aims of both are to protect personal authority, claim temporal authority, and usurp spiritual authority which would not have cared about life one way or the other. It is here where confusion regarding authority is exploited, mostly by the eugenic interest but also by those who would herd those who want to live to the slaughter. Here is ideologically the master-slave mindset from the perspective of the master, who claims authority purely on the basis of "me wantee" and retroactively claims reality and the world ordained the relationship. This relies not on any genuine authority, but a will to abrogate authority and transform it by some strange alchemy that only knowledge can conceive.

In all cases, authority does not justify itself or exist as a thing, but instead arises because we ask how we are to resolve what is and isn't real, and what is and is not moral. No other basis for authority would be sensical. We may presume that there is a god or deity that is a mind like our own, but that only moves the question further away from us and supposes that will and thought, which possess no authority, are granted this status. Such an entity would either not be like us at all, or would not be something treated just like any imperious will. Authority is not the absolute word or final judgement, but instead is the beginning of our ability to operate independently in a genuine sense. All who wish to live would have to reconcile themselves with a world outside of them, and it is evident from viewing the world that the world does not exert any willful force on anything in it in a way that must be abided. We can choose to reject the presumed authority of another, or reject the world entirely, and do with it what we wish. What we cannot do is decide that authority is not real or that there is no way in which events in the world can proceed. To do that is to abdicate the question entirely to another. This is intended by those who would claim to oppose authority, but embrace an imperious will that is more oppressive than any truth the world presents.

ON THE RISE OF AUTHORITY AND ITS RELATION TO RULE AND GOVERNMENT

A crude spiritual authority can be manufactured by simply suggesting the world itself is the spiritual authority. This does little for us though, because the world does not inherently possess any of our knowledge, and did not need such a thing in order to exist. We presume by working backwards that there was a process that was knowable that allowed us to exist, or anything we would recognize in symbolic representation to exist. Planets and stars form out of natural processes we see ongoing today, and we suggest that there is a truth of physical reality outside of us. We are also able to read meaning into past events and ask why the past was as it was, why it led to today, and where it is heading. We are also aware that physical reality does not enjoy any natural precedence as a spiritual authority, as if the world were created by physical laws before there was anything physical to speak of, or our concepts of physics were somehow encoded into the universe as hard metaphysical diktats from an arbitrary authority. There is a way in which the world works which was not beholden to any of our conceits about it, and we may be able to know it. We imply that this is possible in order to conduct anything we would appreciate as science or an inquiry into the world.^[2] I suggest in the prior book of this series one ontological view, but leave open the possibility that this ontology is mistaken and suggest that this quest for metaphysical claims is a part of the spiritual authority I expound upon here. The split into spiritual, temporal, and personal authority mimics not the five-part ontology I have used as my model, but a tripartate model which resembles the philosophical state of most of history. Authority abides this tripartate model because of what it is, rather than anything about the universe, for the world is not moved by authority at all. Authority is something we as knowing entities summon and abide, and we read into the world a spiritual authority governing it. It is not that we need to see a mind like our own as the authority, but we presume there is a knowable way in which the world works, whether we regard physical laws or some metaphysical laws that gave rise to it which are not reflected in physics and material analysis. We are aware on some level that this quest for spiritual authority entails something different from the view management would require, and that effective rule - for ourselves or for anything humans construct - requires acknowledging that this is the case. Authority proper is not managerial or concerned with deciding the smallest iota of thought processes, as if the authority were constantly at our backs, drooling and pushing all that exists, both as a hobgoblin that is unknowable and as a looming presence we cannot help but know. Presenting authority of any sort as contradiction or the sole force which can resolve contradiction is the ideology of a slave religion and slave morality. This is intended and was seized upon by the modern philosophers to construct institutions which would terminate our ability to think by presenting authority as pure contradiction, and consequently this authority declares that God is unknowable, the world is unknowable, and this spurious "authority" rules by knowing us better than we know ourselves. That is the stock and trade of every petty-manager and those who enjoy the

thrill of bossing others around. Such an authority is not conducive to answer any question authority would resolve for us.

It is not difficult for someone to see in primitive conditions that none of this was necessary, and that any purpose for life would not be informed by the material world in some way where the essence was evident. The only evidence the material world offers is that we would not need to do such a thing as follow some cargo cult telling us "science" wants us to live a particular way, which is curiously in line with the conceits of a social class that wishes to enclose the world. That is stupid and pointless. Spiritual authority would present a purpose to live that is outside of us, and suggests that there is more to existence than our own conceits about it. We are merely a part of a much larger world, and no exercise of self-abasement changes that no one can argue that our thought or sense suggests any morality by assertion alone. All of our thinking would be informed by the world, and so, spiritual authority is one way in which we can make genuinely moral decisions, rather than decisions that are beholden to some fickle interest or another. Without that, then any enterprise that would be conducted through management, rule, or science would be futile. This does not suggest there is a singular spiritual authority that all must follow. People can follow whatever they like, but they invariably act upon something that suggests what they should do. If that is their own will to act upon the world, then that would be sufficient, but selfishness is obviously circular and pointless as a spiritual authority. The conditions of oneself are but one of many that someone would regard if they are to make any decision that would be worthwhile. Mere assertion of self-importance is nothing more than an indulgence, and a child can see through such arguments, even as depraved adults insist that greed is good as a drooling Reaganite retard does as they plunder and destroy anything decent in the world. Authority to mean anything requires something other than self-importance or virtue. It implies the authority is backed not by mere substance but truth and something meaningful. Therefore, the proper foundation for authority is not mere existence, nor rationality, nor temporal merit, and certainly not the imperious will of aristocracy. The proper foundation is in labor - and this is not labor in any sense, but labor in its fullest form, where the worker commands not just a material thing or some idea, but commands the meaning and purpose of the toil. Those who hold the machines that make anything possible hold the true authority.

This authority does not itself grant rule. Someone can do everything right, yet fail to rule and fail compared to another authority. Authority does not inherently have a truth above any other authority simply by virtue of appearing stronger or "truthier". Rule, the victors of management and conflict, and so on, have no inherent tie to authority in any sense. For authority to exist, someone must be able to step outside of themselves for a moment and consider a connection with the world as a whole. Self-indulgence and avarice for petty things are the death of authority. An authority to be truly effective does not bark contradictory orders, or revel in the thrill of making others follow. That is the authority of fools and cajolers, which would be rejected if it did not denude the faculties of

those subjected to it. Authority is not mere virtue, or some inner quality that allows men to rule or command other people. Virtue has nothing to do with the truth that authority entails, and men can command other men for no particular reason. Neither does authority create any impression that it should rule or hold any recognized authority. Authority to be worthwhile is something that others follow in the end because they either chose to, or were given no option but to follow. Either is acceptable, but nowhere does authority have any right to rule, or regard right in the legal or philosophical sense. Authority does not get to decide unilaterally what laws or philosophy will be. Authority to be worthwhile is beholden to a world outside of us, but it is always represented in people rather than mere things or ideas. If authority does not entail rule, reward, or denote any property or state of being that would be innate, then what is its use?

That has been the great misery of the human race. Authority, which would have belonged to those who actually did things and did them because they had to survive, is usurped by those who believed that they had some hereditary advantage, or who held some technology or clever trick to take from labor. Most insidious were those who claimed that they spoke for some higher power that demanded sacrifice, self-abasement to some mere person or worse an institution, or who simply used psychological tricks and manipulations to cover a series of lies, often employing the former two for the task. None of these people would survive without the laborer, who never needed nor wanted any of these things to live or do what was needed. The laborer is made into a simp and sucker for doing the only things that allow rule, management, and exploitation to proceed, and told that the source of labor's woes are not the parasitic beast feeding off of them, but the lowest class whose crime was simply existing. By what authority is this decreed, except the authority that was taken from the worker? The lowest class has no authority and is trained to be indolent and fearful of authority as a concept, so they are prepared for extermination - life unworthy of life, which has always been the aristocracy's view of humans outside of their own club. The classes situated above labor in the present order all suggest that they are the rightful authority based on spurious grounds, refusing to acknowledge the true fount of this authority because doing so would make their cajoling and scheming seem like a comical error. It is only because they have exacted a grim retribution on humanity for refusing to like them that it does not appear as a joke.^[3]

It is a rule of authority that it derives not from a view of the world in total, but a view of that which is transcendent and not beholden to any particular bias. Authority in the main always starts for us as spiritual authority, because that is going to our first sense of this concept - not what "we" do on our own power, but what in the world made us and what things outside of us do and why they happen. That is the first question we would ask when we seriously consider authority - not whether there is a vast world animated by some Demiurge or some totality that must make the world go, as if authority were identical with mind or will. We do not need to presume that the world is governed by a mind at all, let alone one that is curiously like the mind of aristocrats, or the mind of those who form the ruling interest and exhort submission to it. There is

always a way in which things in the world occur, that requires us to consider the world as if it could be viewed objectively and without our bias. Spiritual authority resolves the problems of adjudication knowledge from thought and knowledge alone. It suggests that there is some way in which facts can be verified, that does not devolve purely to the will of those who hold machines to make facts real by diktat. It would be impossible to consider facts at the level of society and our communication with each other without this. That is why, as we will see, rulers always seek to capture spiritual authority, and other forms of authority would follow. The other forms of authority are very necessary to have a true understanding of the concept, but at heart, authority stems from truth rather than right or privilege or might. No authority of any sort can be effective without fidelity to a world outside of subjective experience.^[4] No authority is given respect automatically - the source is judged, but it is not something that is judged by intellectual reasons alone, as if authority responds to a reasoned argument to change its truths. It is incumbent on anyone who holds authority to act in some way that is consistent with their claims. Of course, nothing prevents someone from believing that authority derives from will or thought alone, or that anything can be anything. Such an authority shouldn't be followed for obvious reasons, because authority is not a rational creation but a necessity for understanding a world that does not care what we think, it is possible for clever tricks to be played with it. At the highest and primary level of authority, there are no contradictions or games that can be played. Something is either true or right or it is not, and no amount of struggle or willpower changes it.

Authority's basis in truth is something different from rule or government. Power for the ruler laughs at authority and truth, and by the authority of the world, there is no reason those with worldly power cannot do this. Legitimacy and the impression of rule does not come from authority, but acts only because it is allowed to do so. There is no kindness in the world that makes people moral, but the world implies consequences of any act and consequences for the power to rule that no ruler can abrogate. Rulers can make their own laws, but they cannot make their own truth or reality and insist that their rule is in any way natural, or that nature prescribed any particular course of action for us or them. The ruler who claims the name of nature to justify their rule is neither authoritative nor particularly sound as a ruler. An authoritarian seeks not the impression or superficial marker of strength, but rulers that suggest they hold some merit or purpose beyond simply ruling. Whether this actually exists does not change that those who would abide authority do not follow blindly, but do so with full knowledge that authority exists for a reason. Those who would follow an arbitrary or capricious authority are as fickle as those who lead them by the nose, and deserve contempt. Likewise, those who claim contempt for temporal authority but deny spiritual authority are often the most useful servants of rule and empire, who do not challenge temporal authority but enable the most fickle to claim it and enshrine it by will. In the end they only exist to annihilate personal authority and usurp spiritual authority. The mindless follower of authority and the anarchist are natural allies. They are

able to do as they do because there is a sense in us that no man or intellect can claim spiritual authority by thought alone, or a marker of distinction that is socially valued. Authority proper exists outside of society, and thus by making society total and inescapable, authority is replaced with the most fickle rule and government man can possibly create. The existence of society, provided the information pertaining to it is verified, is something authority can determine, but spiritual authority never tells us exactly what to think like a pedagogue. To truly approach authority, whether one accepts the world or wishes to change it, requires acknowledging that there is a world outside of society and rule, and that government would exist not to abrogate the world but to survive in it. In this world, society is not antagonistic, but cooperative based on experience rather than someone insisting that we live for "society", which is often reinterpreted to refer to an institution within society claiming by spurious authority the whole of the world.

A ruler or governor can rule without authority, and in some sense must do so. Politically, asking for permission from above is a crippling liability against opponents who will not wait, regardless of whether they will shit up the world by what they do. Generally, though, rulers who are ignorant of the world or the status of other people in actuality will not last long. The only way rule by deception and cruelty can be maintained is by continuously dragging down the quality of life for everyone else, and destroying any sign of something that would challenge that type of rule. Since deception and cruelty have numerous advantage for ruling over approaches which do not, and deceivers have an offensive advantage at seizing power and usurping a ruler, this places the benevolent and far-sighted ruler in a terrible situation. That, though, is not my concern, since I am not ruling anything. I do not concern myself with the question of how to rule or govern effectively here, since that is not immediately related to the economic topic I chose for this book. For too long, authority and rule or politics have been conflated, when they refer to very different things and necessarily must do so. The possession of virtue, which would be very helpful for ruling, is not a claim of authority by a combination of many claims, such as merit, superior breeding, inherited property, strength of will, moral probity, purpose which can motivate oneself or others, and so on. All of those claims are intended for interpersonal rule, rather than any mission outside of society or regarding truth as authority would. The virtuous person might seek the favor of something outside of society or be someone who is genuinely interested in something other than ruling, but this is not a given of virtue. Virtue is of little interest to this series due to its vague definition, but in some sense virtue is what political society must defend, moreso than authority, mere rule, or particular institutions purporting to do something other than what institutions usually do, which is run a racket to control whatever thing they were supposed to do. Nothing about authority cares about justice, and it does not appear humans in general regard such a concept as anything other than a self-serving lie. If it were so, humanity would not have allowed modernity to become what it did, and the dark force eugenics has summoned would work in reverse - it would have crushed

the eugenist on sight and thought nothing of it, for that would be most necessary for a society to continue. The dark force that eugenics summoned claims itself to be a super-authority above truth or reality, but is something very different from authority or any prior concept of ruling that was regarded in the past. The authority of the world itself did not prevent this dark force from existing in entirety, but the world had up until recent history placed a check or sobering influence on such rot, limiting its reach. The battle ultimately became one over technology, machinery, and who would be allowed to use such things in the future. It is that struggle which pitted the emerging political class against the broad masses of humanity, and the position of the latter was simple - the machine was to be the property of labor rather than any other interest, for those who built the machine had every reason to use it as they saw fit, rather than the machine being used to feed aristocracy, the cult of war, or some conniving merchant or technocrat. The lowest class, for the most part, was a spectator to this battle, but would be dragged into it as a ritual sacrifice to decide its outcome, and so that is how modernity did happen, and the results are at this writing inescapable. The only question is what, if anything, would be salvaged from this, and if the eugenic creed attains its ultimate aims and makes a world without it unthinkable. What is clear to me is that the eugenists have no interest in authority or ruling with any level of competence, because they have never had to. The more incompetent their rule, the greater their hand, so long as they can poison people more. There is something impressive about the utter stupidity and malice of the eugenist which takes decent men and women aback when they encounter such a slobbering beast.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] There are poor students of history who mark the distinction between republican societies of Europe and despotic societies of Asia is that the former were premised on the belief that humans were "naturally good", and the latter premised on the belief that humans were "naturally evil", which just shows how far the eugenic creed has poisoned understanding and rewrote the understanding of all parties involved. There is not a society on Earth which ever presumed humans were good, and anyone suggesting that this was the case is a liar showing their utter contempt for whomever they tell that to. The ancient Greeks and Romans presumed correctly that humans were, much like their gods, capricious and wicked and had nothing to redeem them, and this would have been inherited from the Near East. The malcontents of the Near East were perfectly aware of the religions around them and suggested that humans were good not because of any innate quality, but entirely in spite of their innate evil. The understanding of Chinese political philosophy, for there was never a singular one as if the race were a hive mind, bears far less a resemblance to this strawman political explanation of why most of the world didn't form republics. Those speaking it presume that the republic is a naturally ordained and eugenic polity and can be nothing else, which most of the world rejected. When you do see republican

societies in the world, they are always founded on the belief that humans weren't innately good at all. This is the lesson of the Romans, the Americans, and the French, all of whom had numerous lessons in how men in government do terrible things. It was necessary for eugenics to make inadmissible a democratic society as a check against aristocratic aims, and so this belief in "me wantee" innate goodness, always following from purely eugenic principles, became a dogma in their humanities courses. This was not the claim of the French liberals, nor was it the claim of any liberal tradition, which freely admitted humans in their innate state are nasty and brutish, much like the men who wrote the philosophy and ruled. Such a simpering belief about "innate goodness" was always delivered with seething contempt for the cattle-like servants, who would always be threatened with exemplary torture and humiliation, and the thrill of seeing the cattle suffer became the only moral sentiment these assholes value. The crass philosophers brag openly that they do this - the point of the lie isn't to suggest we believe it, but to insult the people so profusely that they are taken aback, at which point the next attack is made, and so on, and so on. This strategy was calculated to attack as quickly as possible the virtue and authority a republic implied, to signify what the republic always meant in practice - that those who were out would face the most terrible despotism one could imagine, and not be able to name their enemies without a great fear being activated. How this works requires a view of the political and how it came to be, which is the subject of the next book in this series. A further development of this is something I intend to write in a full description of *eugenism*, or the current and likely final stage of human economic life in any form we would recognize. Any future beyond that would require abandoning this entire ecological mindset and isolating anything someone would have wanted in its place, which would be literally anything.

[2] This recounts much of what I wrote in the first book of this series. The book may be found here: <http://eugeneseffortposts.royalwebhosting.net/mymethod.html>.

[3] The greatest danger to an aristocracy is exactly this - that some day, the ruled will declare the truth and say that the emperor has no clothes. This has always been a danger to any aristocracy. Today's aristocracy found a clever solution - they simply decided that the emperor henceforth shall be a nudist, and exaggerate all absurdities of their rule.

[4] So many mind-games are played with principles of relativity - for example, in physics - and this need for objective authority. It should be noted that relativity in physics is not making any metaphysical claim, but suggests quite the opposite. Among the principles of relativity is that the rules of physics are the same for every observer in their frame of reference. The question of relativity does not suggest anything about fundamental reality, but instead suggests something about our instruments and the ways in which we model the thing we are studying. Relativity in physics is not suggesting a morass of contradiction that is only resolved by the institutions, as would make sense when science is politicized and construed as a tool of conceits. It is intended, very clearly, to resolve errors in

our judgement from sense experience, suggesting that we would resolve those errors through awareness of the situation as a whole. This would be necessary to use the principle of relativity to make worthwhile predictions. In practice, those who use physics every day would often not regard relativity as a significant influence on anything they're looking at.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

13. The Science of Daily Living and Production

Where we begin the economic task is not out of an inborn tendency to do economics nor a matter of the world compelling any behavior due to some constitution of the body and the environment. In both cases, this has the effect of reducing human motives to various hobgoblins, whether they are described with the language of religion or the language of a crass pseudo-materialism that falls back on koans and meaningless ideas which are a "just-so" story to explain human behavior. This is inadequate in describing the mechanisms of the social agent that is a human, or the mechanisms of anything humans create or their environment as humans have been able to reassemble it in their sense of the world. There is a world outside of us which presents conditions we cannot change, but those conditions are few in number rather than totalizing and inescapable. If we are to believe in the latter, we are left with a philosophy of self-abasement, which is turned to abasement to institutions or other people rather than a genuine reckoning with the world. If we believe in the former, then events would appear as nothing more than reduced forms of the potential human beings embody, which are to be ruled by institutions or other people. The two positions are established to work alongside each other, and feign opposition only to the naive. In either case, nothing new is truly possible, either because the world has been reduced to fixed and immutable essences which merely re-shuffle and are organized by an overmind, or because change is described as a contradiction which is nonsensical if you think about it for five minutes.^[1] Every attempt to rehabilitate this dual system retreats into claims about Being which cannot be substantiated nor allow for a useful mechanistic understanding of events, and it is done precisely so that nothing new can be formed, even when necessity suggests such a thing is necessary. Every attempt to piece together a view of human development, whether for individuals or for mankind, suggests that nothing of the "grand theories" could possibly have been a singular source for human development, let alone the dominant force. That has always been a political doctrine superimposed over anything that actually happened.

It is simple to say that we approach the world not by what it is but what it does, and every attempt to assert being over doing has been a disastrous failure. We identified all that we can and attempt to identify all that exists not because of some urge to do so and absorb reality itself, but because we had to do this to do what we do - to live. It is this that is the proper basis for economic thinking,

rather than any idea imposed from above or a primordial urge from within. If either of those were the purpose of human enterprises, the answer to life is simple and terrible - all life is to be sacrificed in some terrible ritual or another. There is no good way life ends if that is true, and that is precisely the point. We could accept that, in which case the only conclusion for most of us is nihilism and disdain for the entire project of rule. We would only live for whatever escape is possible from such a world, and mortality would be a blessing. In the end it would be clear that there was no purpose to anything humanity ever did, and that the world would be far better off without us. In all cases, those who would reduce existence to a series of idealistic koans show their utter contempt for human existence and the world as a whole, and believe their idiotic conceits are greater than our common sense that tells us this whole approach is stupid. Economism and managerialism were born of that sickly impulse, rather than the thing any reasonable person would have wanted out of existence. The reasons why have been clear from the start - we did not live to work or live to serve some crass political ambition, particularly the ambitions of cajolers and connivers. Economic thought proceeded because we had some moral cause to live for, which was not a rational purpose read from nature nor a pure act of will.

What this means is that humanity begins its efforts by an authority that is outside of them, but that only they recognize at a personal level. If we thought collectively - if we had some form of telepathic communication that allowed us to truly know each other - then the society and the way we conduct ourselves would be very different, because the odiousness of the human race would be laid bare. We do not need any telepathy to see that something is wrong, and a primitive sense in humanity allows us to sense that others suffer and think much like ourselves, at least in the basic functions humans do. Not one conceit of the human race has ever actually moved past being an ape, and those who claim enlightenment are often the dumbest fucks this sorry race has produced. We never "just existed", as if there were no other way we could possibly be. Even as animals, a primitive process struggles to reconcile with the world. Humans with symbolic language begin the process of replacing "the world" with "society", first in the relations inherited from the past which were very real, and then replacing society with a simulated and false version of it, which supplants not just the former relations but the whole of the world we were a part of in the first place. Once humans are parted from this native connection with the world, they are left with nothing at all, and told "this is the future", and the world is presented as an alien that is commanded by thought leaders and minds greater than your own, with a mind towards empire and humiliation of the weak. That the world as a whole would have no use for this stupidity is not admissible, even though a child can see the absurdity of human conceits. Authority in the genuine sense would be in line with that, and so authority too had to be replaced with a facsimile. A posture and impression is granted authority in this false society over the things authority originally answered. Things that did not need to be judged by an alien authority are commanded, and any question that authority from outside us would truly be needed to answer remains a mystery. The rubes, that is us,

are told "it is unknowable", and threatened if we dare ask too many questions about Project Mayhem.

CLAIMS TO AUTHORITY AS GENUINE KNOWLEDGE AND THE BASIS FOR USEFUL ECONOMIC DECISIONS

Here we find the genuine object economic planning would attain - authoritative knowledge pertaining to the world that is not freely replicable or a thing open to questioning; in other words, the resolution of certainty, or information, that is pertinent to the world and can be morally valued, not just in of itself but in an overall framework. We may ask questions about why the world as it is, but none of those questions present a challenge to authority, however it is constituted. The knowledge we may covet may be a thing that is commonly available, and a thing we naively assume should spread out of good will. Other knowledge pertains to claims of property or natural resources which are mutually exclusive with other owners. This does not arise by some imperious will to say it is so, which can be questioned by anyone, but by the final outcome authority would grant. We do not get to challenge authority's ruling after the fact, and we would only be able to operate without the boundaries authority allows to change the world. The substantive things in-of-themselves carry no value, without any particular reason why we would value them. Nothing in the world would be valuable by some rule of nature, or even the limited rules of nature governing life or mankind. Those things that appear to us as natural needs, like breathable air, food, sunlight, and so on, are useful for reasons that authority has allowed us to see without too great an explanation. No mind game can be played to say that those things are "mere wants", as if living things are obligated to commit suicide because an imperious asshole decided they found most of humanity ugly. We can contemplate starving or suffocating ourselves for some purpose. Above all, no authority can compel us to live as an absolute. If a situation is truly intolerable, humans will go to great lengths to kill themselves or shut down, so that those who seek to maximize torture are left with nothing for the elaborate effort spent making it so. No authority prevents humanity from choosing the imperial path, but no one has any good reason to accept the endless terror of eugenics and all that we have seen. No one has any reason to accept the kick in the teeth the institutions give to those out of the know. None of us were born to serve *that*, and no authority granted those people any right to rule beyond the mere claims to legal property they made. There is a reason why it did turn out this way, despite a total lack of purpose to any such sadistic mission, but those reasons are in any worthwhile analysis reasons that we could change, and they describe only a sordid history rather than something about nature that compelled this. The claims of the eugenic creed and the sadists run counter to what a child can determine about the world - that if the world truly operated to maximize the thrill of torturing others, it would be a far worse place and become so far faster than any human could fathom. It would preclude the cooperation that sadists exploit to claim the world and turn it into this parodic nightmare. As the sadism intensifies, the only reaction of most people will be to shut down,

spiting the beast for as long as they remain alive, because acceptance will no longer be an option. The simplest act for us is to simply not do sadistic acts, because it is not difficult to see that such a course leads nowhere good and won't build a single thing. It is only on that basis that an authoritative knowledge can be assembled, that would give to any human labor purpose beyond a mere statement of fact or the claims of fickle wills which change from day to day. Those who did this never forget where their ability to do this really arises, and it is not because they are actually so smart and we're so dumb and they were destined to win. Those who did this to us stole the world, and did everything necessary to claim then obfuscate authority.

I will spend this and the next four chapters describing how this authority is valued, and where it leads to the utility that is purportedly the purpose of economic management and ecology. There are five key points here:

- The initial act of seeking authority to better navigate the world. This is to say, the first claim to authoritative knowledge is not based on expedience, the effort of attaining it, a sophisticated scheme for teaching and occulting this knowledge to increase its value in society, or any merit that allowed someone to claim they earned the right to anything. This authority is claimed at first because the needs and wants are real and meaningful, and because absent any compelling reason, we would see this knowledge and then do what is needed for our purposes. This includes the most basic moral sentiments and passions, and a sense common to thinking life. We separate this genuine want from the more fickle emotions and sentiments, with the knowledge that those fickle emotions exist for a reason. If there is a nagging pain, it is likely the body or something in our life telling us that something should be addressed; so too is there a sense of anomie and dread, which humans are habituated to due to their highly antagonistic way of life in all things. If we had a placid and calm world, countless centuries of dread and predation suggest that this cannot last, and given the prevalence of predation and the frequency of lies promising peace, we would learn that such seeming tranquility is likely a ruse. When these things, which are necessarily vast and concern a great deal of accumulated wisdom in human society, are so necessary for our existence, we would not wait for the adjudication of merit or the wise technocrat to tell us what is what. We instead would follow people of merit or some distinction because that is what makes sense, given our limited information and how unlikely it would be for us to reverse-engineer the accumulated wisdom of those centuries. So, it makes sense for humans to seek teachers, or ask their parents all manner of stupid questions. This sense doesn't always serve us well, and there is a great production made of justified or unjustified hierarchy.^[2]

- The peculiar practice of struggle and war, which arises as an expression of a particular authority, where victory and merit secure position in the world. This becomes the rights to property and forms the first basis for state institutions. Struggle and war are possibilities with varying intensity, and must be understood not as inevitable urges, inexplicable, or the primary authority. To wage war effectively requires something more than "me wantee" - it requires authority to

claim victory, and neither the victors nor the vanquished forget this. To claim otherwise is to declare something much worse than defeat and existence under the yoke - it is to claim that certain agents are not even slaves in society, but vermin to be exterminated. This practice of war varies in intensity, for if it were total and absolute, it would quickly devour all goods in sight and leave nothing and no purpose motivating the war. It degenerates into the most fickle and vain causes to keep the rot going, and that has plagued us in the past century despite the clear lack of any of the historical causes or sobering influences that mitigated the war cult.

- Authority to acquire and systematize knowledge at a basic level. In other words, how people learn and how people think about how they think. This is what is usually considered spiritual authority in vulgar and crass terms, but spiritual authority speaks not to any particular task but all processes from which authority can arise. The task of knowledge is not its own perpetuation, nor that of wisdom that is passive, but for knowledge to produce events of both moral value and of use for the world we live in. We may choose different parts of the world as our home, as we must, but we are aware that there are people in a different walk of life much like ourselves, and some conceit of knowledge of wisdom is not going to make that other person get along with you, or not spend their effort destroying your conceit of a perfected humanity or perfected world, or the more crass conceits of egotism. If we choose to ignore that out of some technical specification of intelligence processing or a lack of symbolic information used as a password, we are making a very silly decision when we could have seen the other person having a purpose, and certainly having no reason to glorify us. Systematizing knowledge then is not merely a matter of choosing one metaphysics and envisioning the world as a gigantic clockwork moved by this mind that is like our own, but reckoning with the reality of knowledge itself. No model to view the world is authoritative unless it is reconciled with facts and meaning, and we would take the integrity of basic knowledge faculties on faith until there is a reason to doubt ourselves. This is the fatal weakness that must be attacked for authority to be usurped, and the most direct route. Other methods will only be seen as a way to dispute this authority over knowledge itself as a process. The authority of a knowledge system is beholden to meanings and facts that are outside of it and must be so.

Only in retrospect can there be an initial seed, and describing genesis is where the orderly procession of events loses its explanatory potential. The existence of something new may proceed from prior events, but something does not arise from nothing. It is for this reason that posturing over authority often degenerates into just-so stories, even for those who know better and are aware of the trap. The primordial conditions of existence, and the origin of life, does not intrinsically hold any more authority than the present moment or an imagined future, but it is a simple fact that everything arises from some prior condition. The past does not hold any intrinsic authority by being the past, nor does the future hold any authority due to some inexorable trend of progress. The imperious mind then looks to command the present and disallow the possibility that anything

new can exist, and in doing so, arrests entirely the process of knowledge itself. It would not be difficult to step outside of this procession entirely in looking for that which is authoritative, and suggest that time and causality are relational concepts and do not have any intrinsic authority at all. Since there is no way for knowledge to exist in any form we recognize without causality allowing for logical deductions, the question of Real Ultimate Truth is one that we would not answer with the crude tools at our disposal. There are aspects of the world that are outside of any spiritual authority we can recognize at present. This is not the same as claiming they are totally unknowable or that there is nothing beyond our ability to reason, but suggests instead that if we did seek a final answer, we would be asking very different questions from those any philosophy or religion could pose. It makes the posturing of priests and ideologues appear silly if one thinks on the matter for five minutes, and so it is necessary for the ideologue to deny anyone those five minutes and the means to suggest the ideologue could be wrong. Here we see the origin of that familiar koan, "He who controls the present controls the past; he who controls the past controls the future." It is only possible with a preponderance of force and control over some space - which is to say, it relies on the economic managerialism that usurps any authority that would be a genuine mark of value, and replaces it with imperious will alone.

- Moral authority - that is, attempts to answer those questions that thought alone or a crude analysis of the world do not answer. This is not a philosophical or rational intent of us, but one of practice and doing, that allows any knowledgeable approach to the world to assemble meaning and purpose. Humanity became religious creatures out of necessity, even when they profess atheism or do not see any existing institution as correct in interpreting the divine and moral authority. Humans as political animals are not wholly unique, for in the animal kingdom there are crude forms of politics, but humans are alone in the practices of religion and formalities. The political theories of mankind worth anything make not just claims of knowledge or claims of property, but claims of spiritual authority which imply something greater. All of those theories must reconcile with a basic desire of us to live and do the things we would have liked, or serve some purpose beyond sacrifice for its own sake or sacrifice to some cargo cult. It is here where humans can begin assigning values to anything that mean something more than their whims. In short, the beginning of moral authority and proper economic value suggests that anything economically valued exists in a span of time and in a world where those values are relevant. Outside of this, there is no economy. Any self-contained ecology is compared to others of its type in principle, and can be so. We would only be able to ascertain the violability of that ecology by knowledge of all agents and their actions, to see what if anything contaminates the lab conditions we imagined. The existence of anything worthwhile in the world is not merely a just-so fact, but contingent on our ability to make meaningful comparisons, and ask ourselves if a value we hold can be reconciled with the world and the values of others. Whatever values we assign internally are for our use only, and inform a general situation that is entirely outside of us. The situation outside of us does not present any pre-made moral values we would

abide, let alone eternal ones. The moral authority and value is only sensical as economic behavior if it is presumed these calculations take place in the world as a whole, and that all that exists and all that is possible is potentially up for grabs. We must accept this to consider economics in any sense - that our selves and everything we valued is violable. Only when doing so would we be able to consider the security that allowed ourselves to exist and regard authority, let alone possess it. It is in that light where moral philosophy of any sort can exist, whether it concerns economic matters of a limited purview, political matters, spiritual matters, or any other aim life may morally value.

- Authority of identity and symbols - To complete our understanding of authority proper, we associate meanings with names, symbols, icons, and marks which carry explanatory power. The symbols themselves should not be confused with power, but the symbols will for us acquire a meaning beyond the mere fact of the symbol. This happens not because words have independent power of their own, but because we react and act in accord with symbols to construct our more elaborate models of the world, the tools we use, the language we communicate with, and all of the things which allow for social behavior in any recognizable form.

All of this must take place first in the simple act of living, and the various activities someone engages in every day, before a more elaborate authority can be established. It may not be perceived that someone is following authority when they walk outside, swing the ax to chop a tree, or build something, but they are following something that suggests that these activities work and accomplish what we set out to do. Never can this step be taken for granted, however trivial it may seem. It is not self-evident that we would do the things we purport to do. This operates at the local level, and it operates in institutions, society, politics, and all of the higher wisdom humans accumulate. It is not particular to humans - animal life would in its own way carry out this process, but lacking symbolic language or complex social structures, animals remain preoccupied with the tasks of obtaining sustenance and their social affairs. The concept that it could be significantly different is not something that occurs to an animal. An animal may adapt to situations which are new and develop independently some novel way of doing things, but without any way to communicate that knowledge or any way to conceive of more elaborate authority, the animal will only develop so far. Animals in conditions of severe deprivation will lose the functionality they would possess if their environment were healthy, to the point where they could not survive in the animal kingdom - and this is how animals in captivity lose the will to live and do things that would be bizarre in the wild. Humans are no different, but humans are adapted to enclosure, and humans build elaborate systems of enclosure to control animals and control each other.

At the most basic level, this authority is only for our purposes and judgement. We look at first to what works, and do not see this as authority in the genuine sense that the word is relevant. This might be called a working knowledge or a sense we attain about the world. We don't necessarily have to look to the highest

spiritual authority to do this in our lives. Most of the time, and throughout early existence, we do not think about spiritual authority at the universal level, nor the temporal authority we are made to abide. We don't think about personal authority in full, which is only relevant when we are considering our position relative to the former two things or other people. In casual existence, we are instead interested in knowing how to do what we set out to do, and what things are at a basic level. It is only because we encounter wider society, politics, and interpersonal conflict that we face something that sobers our more primitive judgements, and eventually personal authority at the least must override what our instinct would regard as an authority. Since we cannot stop to ask why endlessly, authority is not the asking of why, but that which allows a resolution to the question of asking why, and suggests a time and method to ask why again at the appropriate moment. No authority can claim to be final and unquestionable - we can always question it or question the conclusions it leads us to - but to resolve decision making in any way that isn't just a processing of instructions, we would be drawn to authorities that are either reliable, or that can impress upon us that they have to be followed.

At all levels, authority begins at first as a question for ourselves, because we rely on that authority for persistent behavior. Without that, orienting planning is not possible, or only follows a number of primitive instincts or a few observations. This is why attempts to degrade any authority or guidance seek to reduce the whole of existence to a few koans, like "all is suffering", "all is mind", and so on. To establish any worthwhile authority suggests something more than that would guide our decision making. To claim authority is a singular point or pressing of the nerve is to deny any authority that is worth following or that can say much at all about the world we live in or ourselves. This authority is not the whole to explain decision-making, but it is the starting point to establish a more thorough system for knowing the world, society, and all of the things in it, including ourselves which we know very well and in ways no outside agent can easily ascertain. It would be necessary to know why we do anything, rather than simply say that things are done, like commands barked and digested without any barrier. No drilling would stop someone from asking why some action is to be taken, or why a chain of command is to be followed. The drilling and muscle memory of a repeated action is only effective if there is in the first case some indication of why the drilling takes place, or why following this is effective. It need not be a rational explanation, but at some point, the grunt drilled to fight will ask themselves what purpose the exercises fill, and how to make that work. The most desultory pedagogy can never substitute for an answer to this question which is suitable for the purposes of daily life and the tasks at hand.

THE SEED OF SCIENCE AND ITS APPLICATION

Science as we have known it has three purposes. The first is to assess truth about some aspect of the world, and in doing so it is possible to relate those aspects to other aspects and suggest general principles at work in the world

which unite the things we observe. The second is that science is something we use to act on the world. Science as mere ideas is meaningless unless its findings can be put to use in applications we value. Even the formation of any genuine science or storehouse of information is a laborious task, which can only proceed as it is able to proceed. The third is to suggest a view of the world in total which is free of contradictions and errors, or something as close to that as we can attain for ourselves.

At root, we do not have any hardcoded axioms or ways in which science in this sense can be conducted. Science is not a fixed method or dogma, and science in of itself does not prove truth or that the methods of science are infallible. The most basic instinct allowing science is a process which itself can be subject to verification - that is, there is no scientific method which can claim to be a singular authority above all others. We built science not to receive it pedagogically from outside. We instead built methods and honed them like any other faculty of the body. For the faculties that allow for science, we had to regard a world outside of us, and possess an ability to temporarily disengage from our conceits about the world and ourselves. The world did not provide us ready-made or final answers for personal consumption, nor does it make any sense for the world to translate all that exists into language compatible with our subjective experience.

The authority mentioned here does not grant in of itself the status of "science". We can appeal to authority for many purposes, and we are not "scientific animals". Even if we chose such a goal for ourselves - a commitment to truth for its own sake - we would never arrive at a purified form of science or truth, and even if we did, the truth does not inherently possess any moral authority just by being the truth. We would seek truth because that is in our experience useful for our purposes, and we would if we choose comprehend the consequences of our want for truth and adapt the methods of science accordingly. There is in reality no fixed definition of what moral goals a human, or any animal, ought to pursue - and so, humans cannot be "political animals", "social animals", or "biopolitical animals" pursuing a fixed set of eugenic directives. Animals are just that - animals which are capable of potentials their faculties allow. The human distinction is not a fundamental one, but the qualitative distinction between humans with language and all of the faculties that permit civilization is unique among life on Earth. That distinction did not arise out of nothing, nor was it ever something wholly internalized in the human race. Far from it - humans outside of civilization would be little more than clever apes with tool use, but still amounting to nothing. It would take only a band of humans working together to make that savage human little more than prey; and so further does civilization and empire attack the sociality humans would have held in a different world. A crass interpretation of knowledge and science suggests empire is inevitable and absorbs all life in its path, and the empire is presented as a unified front, a deity pressing on the world and all life from above. This is trivially debunked if someone is familiar with the workings of empire, civilization, and human social units down to the individual. The individual itself is not a point a life, but a confluence of events allowing for it to exercise these faculties, and so the savage

man is not a creature that can be isolated in a lab. Savage man is capable of understanding, in some way, that there is a world outside of him and the potential for sociality. Whether he sees himself as compatible with human society is another question, and typically human society cannot abide the existence of the savage, or must substitute the savage's genuine existence with a preferred model of savagery. Both parties involved know this is an imperial conceit and a stupid one at that. Human polities of different development trajectories, which held different values, could understand each other and knew there was a thought process on both ends. The American Indians held their own values and concepts of property and society, and saw the white colonists not as something descended from the heavens to tell them pedagogically what reality is, but as the filthy and foul-hearted castoffs they were. The makeup of American colonial society was not too difficult to discern - the colonies were populated by slaves, indentured servants, and merchants looking to make a buck, and there was little reason to pretend it was any other sort of arrangement for the colonists. The colonial society did inherit some definition, and acquired its own upon establishment of the colonies. They were not merely the scum of English society, as an imperial conceit in the mother country had to hold, and many of the colonists held particular religious views about why they did anything they did. There were those in the colonies who saw a religious mission in what they established, and certainly they had lives of communities they wished to protect for their own purposes. All of this is to say that people of various backgrounds will assert authority without any necessary genetic lineage telling them their destiny, and this is not a random process to be adjudicated by an imperious authority telling us what we are and what we are allowed to be in the great game of humanity. It is not a process of struggle for its own sake, unmoored from any purpose, as if two social entities were just destined to fight due to some genetic essence. To make it so obviates anything the actual struggle meant, and makes struggle effectively a foregone conclusion, which imperious minds have always desired. Only in hindsight does the victor declare that their victory was inevitable and ordained by Heaven, and in this way, the past can be edited and repurposed as a series of just-so stories.

The social and political example referenced here is not the sole example of this process. Science to be science did not have any pure seed suggesting it had to exist. The confluence of events allowing the human animal to think at all required many events working in concert to allow the simplest abstract thought, language retention, and so on. The formation of a full system was never handed down to us. It was assembled bit by bit, by the only agents capable of doing so - our individual experience, which receives revelation and acts on that with the tools at its disposal. It is the same for our approach to the natural world - we build working models to build more elaborate models. While the same basic process of recursion to build better knowledge takes place, we would not intrinsically consider this motivated by any political goal or social value. Science to be science is premised on a world existing outside of any conceit we hold about it. We must presume we confront the world without any knowledge, and

that the entirety of the world and any God itself is wholly knowable, in order for any science to begin, but these presumptions are never rationally stated before the process begins. They are implied by the very idea of what it would mean to conduct science. The true origin of science then is not from any of the traditional founts of authority, but from our labor, and from the basest conditions of existence which we acknowledge instinctively without any division of labor or intent. We seek authority because we must, rather than because it is preferable, and we do not take the world "as-is", as if the world were an alien bombarding our senses and demanding submission, screaming "submit to Allah" ad nauseum until the torture works. The world, and any deity we might imagine governing it, has no interest in shouting at us like a screaming fanatic. That quality is peculiar to humans and their fickle conceits for power, which are of no interest to the world. They are really of little interest to any entity in the world, ourselves included. In the first instance, the purpose of our scientific endeavor, and much of what we do outside of science, is not a political or economic goal at all. We do many of the things we do because they are instinctive to us, or because a primitive morality and reasoning process suggest doing those things would be in some interest we may or may not be aware of. If we seek any truth to guide us in the world, there is a brief moment where we are seeking the truth for its own sake, before dismissing that goal for the goal we might assign based on some other interest of life. If science is only a means to an end, then it ceases to be science in the sense that the concept is useful to us. If science becomes life's prime want and divorced from anything about ourselves, then it also ceases to be science and becomes a morass of self-referential stories and just-so facts, which can be purposed for anything and by anyone. Because both of those outcomes are implicit in the formulation of science as a practice, we would look to something in the world to resolve that, since within science itself there is no resolution. Science can guide us to a better of understanding of how we resolve this problem, but ultimately, there is something science points to suggesting that the reality of the world, or the best facsimile of reality we can construct, is more important than the process of science itself, and necessary for science to be conducted. We can point to authority in the sense we have described, but we could also point to some entity, force, or object that is not interpreted as any sort of authority, but as something that simply is or does as it does. Because humans are adept at recognizing patterns in a way that works prior to the rational faculties, this makes a lot of sense to us. We look not to a concept of authority rationally understood, but to particular objects suggesting that they are a source of knowledge. We may for example imagine a nature god, or a god representing some recurrent aspect of nature like lightning. We may imagine a fetish object, or a token representing some value. And of course, we recognize other entities like ourselves in a way that is very different from our regard for any other entity in the world. How much like ourselves they would need to be may vary, but we have a sense of likeness and know when we are dealing with another human, or some entity we would regard as spiritually, politically, or personally relevant. This sense is not hardcoded or eternal, but something that emerged from a basic germ allowing us to assess objects.

For anything that can be regarded as an authority, for science or any other purpose, it is only recognized by people, rather than existing in the world. It is recognized by this primitive process to allow any other authority to exist. We need not regard "science" as the spiritual authority of note, or as something relevant at any level of authority. We can apply this germ of reasoning not towards science but some other design regarding the world. So far as we are concerned with the reality a model of the world points to, as I am attempting in this book, we at least temporarily rely on this germ of reasoning being used for scientific purposes. We do not yet have institutions ready-made for us to systematize this process rationally. That process is described a couple of chapters from now. To attain that level of development, we must pass through two stages. One is the processes of daily living that we would do in a world absent of significant struggles, where struggle is obviated and we regard the world largely as events which proceed without the dominance of that language. The second is recognition of struggle at the highest levels of the world, which is not a trivial thing, and devolves into the struggles between societies, within societies, and ultimately down to struggles between individuals and within themselves. The former is what I wish to describe in the remainder of this chapter. The latter is the subject of the next chapter.

THE WORLD WITHOUT MAJOR STRUGGLE, WAR, AND THE ENDEMIC MISERY OF HUMAN EXISTENCE

"If the mayor of your village obtains a concession for you over the neighbouring villages, you are pleased with him, you respect him; city-dwellers exhibit the same desire to exercise superiority over other towns in the vicinity. The provinces compete with each other, and there are struggles of personal interest between nations which are called wars., Among the efforts made by all these factions of mankind, can we see any which aims directly at the common good?"

- Henri, Comte de Saint-Simon, "Letters from an Inhabitant of Geneva to His Contemporaries"

It seems simple enough that when the multitude of petty struggles and conflicts in the world are seen past, that much of the world proceeds by laws which make sense to the inhabitants. In the main, human existence, even in a savage existence, is remarkably regular, and periods of conflict are intermittent and never carried out for too long. Even as society develops, and antagonistic relations like slavery and humiliation become routine, the individual acts to enforce those relations consume a small portion of time, and must do so. Those who would pursue war or conflict out of some sense of pleasure can only do so for so much time, with such resources that allow the hunt to continue, and the pleasure of the kill is a momentary pleasure. Often, the hunter returns with nothing to show for his effort, and the activities of the hunt are less about the thrill of the kill and more about having something to do. The hunt is not even carried out for the pure joy of killing, but often carried out because it provides meat, exercise, and purpose. The hunter in savage and primitive society doubles as the soldier, scout, and free

man, and those were the qualities defended, more than a cult purely devoted to the thrill of killing. Even the cult of war in its most elaborate form cannot survive as a cult devoted to the thrill of torture - such a cult would in actuality be something very different, which is at present beyond the scope of our writing.

If that is so, then it makes sense to many in the world that we would, given a choice, not wage incessant war, and could see the appeal of mitigating the practices of war, such that we could do what we wanted to do before politics came to us - live our lives and associate with each other in ways that are mutually beneficial, so far as we would desire that. Conflict for its own sake is typically a losing proposition for the individual, outside of a niche where elevated hostility presents a substantive reward. The resolution to this problem seems to a naive soul like a trivial one, and the primary barrier is political. This is of course entirely correct - the state of war and endemic misery among mankind is a state chosen. It is not one we chose for ourselves, but one chosen by those who could impose it and saw no reason not to do so, and had no reason to ever stop doing what they did. No decency in the soul of humanity convinced a bully to stop, and in an environment where bullies are sacrosanct and granted explicit and absolute impunity, the chance of decency prevailing is precisely 0.0000%. In reality, that situation is never so immaculate. It can only be engineered with technical precision in our time, and those who desired such a world have indeed conspired to create it. That world was never a given of the universe, and the ideology naturalizing this state of affairs is a complicated matter, beyond the scope of this writing. It is clear to anyone who believes history can exist that this situation arose because it could, just as our nascent freedom existed because it could and we could before it was snuffed out.

Authority did not arise purely out of a reaction to this war and violence, as if war and struggle were the sole motor of the world. Authority preceded struggle conceptually and had to, and authority in the genuine sense did not need to regard an existing struggle to be a meaningful authority or force in the world. We can indeed consider authorities that are entirely benign and interested in the good of the ruler, ruled, and the world as a whole. This is not at all un-natural, and would be a necessary precondition for any society to exist at all. Even in this denuded world, the interests of genuine authority often entail something other than struggle for its own sake. The ideology of unrelenting struggle for no purpose is a tool used by certain people, and usually the believers in such an ideology are not the governing power or even immediate subordinates, but the scum of humanity assigned a cybernetic task of culling the ecology, thinking of little more than their cheap thrill and the next supply of drugs, booze, or low-quality prolefeed to sustain their Satanic, filthy existence - the lifeblood of a failed race and abomination that is cheap to animate and exists solely to do their part. Such people have been commonplace, but it is only due to the dominance of eugenics that they were selected for and told to maximize their proclivities, at the expense of literally anything else. In this way, the most basic germ which makes science or genuine knowledge of any sort possible can be destroyed, and this was intended by the thought leaders who pushed this scum into motion.

The authority arose not from an inner assertion or from a world's imposition, but where those two met - in our knowledge process and the ability of people to relate to the world. It arose, then, as a dialogue in the genuine sense, rather than the dialogue imagined as a struggle between two apes screeching and shouting. It does not take long for the germs of authority to compile the basic knowledge used to navigate the world, and for our purposes, this is enough to build a working knowledge independent of any judge beyond ourselves. We can, and have to, know what we are doing at a sufficient level to carry out our tasks. We may have trained ourselves to carry on merrily without concern for what we are doing, since we do not have time to turn inward on ourselves for every decision we make. We built personal authority with only a fragment of understanding of spiritual or temporal authority. Nowhere is it cleanly written for us what truly rules the world, whether we speak of temporal authorities in the form of the state and institutions, or the spiritual authority and the wisdom of the world and its people. No child is born with this knowledge, nor with full access to it given to them by pedagogy. Even if a pedagogue desired to give the child everything possible to know the proper spiritual and temporal authorities, there is only so much time, and given the nature of spiritual and temporal authorities humanity has recognized, the answers are an even greater challenge.^[3]

It is typical for humans to transfer this dialogue from things to people, who are themselves things and founts of knowledge. The human is much more sophisticated in knowledge than an inanimate thing, being what they are, and so it is common for humans to center entities like themselves in their understanding of the world. This is illusory, since there is a large world outside of humanity, but it is a sufficient understanding given the scale of those concepts we hold relevant. We don't really care about the quantity of some substance, or the qualities of various artifacts. Those quantities and qualities are relevant because we must exist around other people. If we lived in a world without people, or where people largely agreed to let each other be, our sense of existence and what is valuable would be very different, and much of what we take for granted would be absurd. But, we are in contact with people, in whatever environment that happens. Even if there are no active people, we have a habit of sensing another entity just out of sight, or granting to non-human entities human qualities. The reasons why are numerous, but we will often relate to the world not with crude statements of facts, but with stories that allow us to attain many meanings in a compact space. It is only after familiarizing ourselves with that existence that we begin formally dissecting the world into facts, scientific knowledge, and formal systems, where the question of authority becomes relevant. Even if we do this on our own, by whatever tools are available to us, we would build a similar assembly of knowledge and work with it, and would be able to relate to alien systems as best as we can. There is never truly a point where two systems, however different, are too alien to ever understand each other in principle. It may be unlikely, but there is no grand barrier of knowledge or wisdom that can cleanly split the world into valid and invalid. There is just the world, and our attempt to survive in it and find something in it worthwhile.

And so, with the trivial struggles in the natural world preceding us, we see a world where it seems humans could very easily resolve their social affairs by some generally agreed upon plan, or some modus operandi that is common in the society even if not planned. Bad things may happen, either by intellectual failure, moral failure, or misfortune, but in general, the procession of society has to be sensical for the arrangement to continue in any workable form. At a basic enough level, human societies must be seen as working towards some end, and there is no reason to believe that human societies could not be better by some simple and agreeable adjustments. If the societies were too abominable, humans would refuse to participate, and if they were locked into such a society, they would turn towards degrading themselves to spite their masters, suicide, or any number of escapes. Such actions would make any material incentive of such abject slavery a moot point. Slavery could persist in history to the extent they did because there was some tolerability in the arrangement. Non-cooperative slaves were killed or humiliated or both to set an example to the rest of the slaves, but there would also be carrots, among them manumission and the status of the freedman or becoming a citizen equal to the freeborn in all respects. Even as a slave, there was some life from the perspective of the slave. The slave does not exist in his or her own mind as a tool for the master no matter how conditioned they are to accept such a fate. There is some small iota of life, if only for the slave to carry out its functions without overbearing managerialism. Very often, the slaves could find ways to avoid work, and lashings and humiliations only worked so far when a productive goal was desired. The conceits of the master's ideology or bourgeois ideology have no relevance to the genuine functioning of any slavery, and no slave master is ignorant of that. Whatever a master may say to sell the institution of slavery, the master knows that no slavery is ever passively enforced or a thing taken for granted. Considerable ink is expended on the topic of managing slaves and every iota of labor that can be extracted from them. Even if the master is ignorant of the scientific details of working life, he is aware that there is such a thing and that some taskmaster is delegated the responsibility of ensuring the slaves' product meets some standard of quality. The master is certainly not ignorant of the quality of product coming out of his plantation or factory. If his slaves are to be an investment worth keeping, his fortune and the institution as a whole is dependent on both qualities and quantities to reproduce the master and his institution. If slavery didn't work towards productive ends, then it would serve some other interest of life. If slavery were to be purely a death cult, and the slaves were already enclosed and at the whim of masters, then there would be no rigamarole of "extermination through labor", as if the joy of making workers suffer were the point. Slaves would simply be lined up and their throats slashed, one by one, or fed into a literal meat grinder and disposed of. These are the contradictory images of the Holocaust conjured by post-war Fabian propagandists, both of which are intended to obscure what actually happened during the Nazi period or why the concentration camps existed; and the dual false narratives serve the purpose of rehabilitating the Nazis who want to repeat the process and perfect it. Since the Nazis and Fabians feed from the same trough and believe in the same global

cause, this is unsurprising.^[4] The aim of eugenism is to make horrific and terrible struggle appear as a natural feature, such that it is invisible and carried on "out of sight, out of mind", as the slogan went to invisibilize the eugenic cull in the United States.

Without significant struggle, the problem of slavery evaporates. Slavery, after all, is premised on a lie and continuous management of the slave, which is always a wasteful and unnecessary task absent a struggle that is not really economic. For economic necessity, our free labor and cooperation would be far preferable to the alternative of property, avarice, and malice that have been the sad rule of human society. At a basic level, this is understood and acted upon. Primitive society rested not on domination but on the association of members of a band who had reasons to be together, and who saw life outside of the tribe as life outside of the law, where they would be alone and open to attack. The band or tribe could not exist without a cooperative basis, and the mitigation of struggle to an acceptable minimum. So too does the pin factory rely on cooperative labor in the productive enterprise. The management of the pin factory is an alien to the social process of production, and the management of workers in their labors - whether by a foreman or by the workers knowing what to do and communicating to each other - functions best not on the basis of struggle but by shared interest. Management of the money and political consequences of production is a whole other matter, and humans are not mindless producers. In the main, though, we produce things with the expectation that doing so is useful, and that is why productivity in society would be valued in the first instance. Even if the goal in the end is struggle, product at this basic level is a necessary precondition of any struggle beyond basic grunting or the petty intercline struggles of the human race. If, however, slavery itself is the prime want of society - if the thrill of beating a slave becomes the product itself, or the aim of production - then the values are completely inverted. Far from being naturally industrious, the aim of every free man will be to work as little as possible, and sap as much morale from the enslaving beast that lords over them, seeming far away yet always ready to whip someone who refuses to go along with this slavery. The aim of every slave will be to give as little as possible, become indolent, attempt escape or overthrow of the master, or become free - and if possible, gain legitimacy in free society. If management is conducted on the basis of work being the task of slaves, then no one has any good reason to believe production is worth anything at all. Most of all the slaves have no reason to ever regard production as anything more than a worsening of their conditions, unless they steal away the product for eventual rebellion. The free, too, face competition from slave labor if they themselves are laborers, and the proprietor and elite classes have long understood the economic failures of slave societies, and the mechanisms at work which lead to those failures. No master is ignorant about slavery and its long-term effects, whatever they may believe about keeping their property. The ideal is not a world where men are trained to love slavery, but a world where all men are free and choose to engage in this project. This is not some unattainable goal if we look at the raw material required to allow it, and the reality that

much of humanity's labor and effort is spent on nothing but making each other miserable, for no truly necessary purpose. If that did happen, though, political society and every concept of humanity we have ever known is shattered within days, and the reasons why are a very complex machine which very likely will not end without significant changes in human existence. It is not something innate to the race, as if humans were "designed" for slave societies. No such slavery existed in primitive times, and in most societies slavery was an exceptional status rather than the rule. Typical human societies were dominated by the peasant who lived his or her life, and occasionally dreamed of something bigger or at least different from the humdrum existence of farming or rearing children. Industrial society is dominated not by chattel slaves or the lowest deprivations the proletariat faced. As the cities of modernity formed, men of many trades meet, for this society was not born in a blank slate, where liberalism created year zero and reset all humanity to the same low standard. Men began this not as the lowest factory worker, but as printers, tailors, and various skilled trades that were already a part of urban life, in addition to new trades that industrial society allowed like the mechanic. The proletariat in social rank was seen as all the same only in ideology, but in practical function, grades of civic worth were apparent to liberal and socialist thinkers alike, and never truly ignored.

This distinction in civic worth did not correspond necessarily to any built-in rights of the favored over the disfavored. So too did a large swath of the proletariat remain largely ignored - the submerged beggars and itinerant workers, who were often identified and attacked on sight. This attack of the lowest class was not a universal habit or naturally ordained, and at first the lowest class could and did find alliances with the more favored workers, since it was understood that the injury of the lowest class was a prelude to the injury of all. It took more moral persuasion and political machinations to create the familiar pattern of knowing who to lock out, who to promote, and how this game really worked within the ranks of the proletariat, and this varied depending on which political faction or ideology someone held. Any faction suggesting the lowest class could be rehabilitated would be immediately attacked and destroyed, as it was contrary not to economic necessity or the realities of struggle, but to many political ideas that allowed grasps to find their desired scapegoats. In both an economic and military sense, the lowest class are either irrelevant or potential assets to someone, somewhere, simply by virtue of providing labor if permitted. The lowest class, indeed, works under the worst conditions and creates the greatest profitability simply by virtue of their miserable compensation, and the lowest class accepts this because they have nowhere else to go. Only once their bodies have degraded significantly and they are no longer suitable for work do they give up, and being caged animals with nowhere to go, they do not survive long. Capitalism is no friend of beggars, but it sure likes keeping them around as the best scapegoat, and convinces the working class to turn on them whenever possible with the most spurious moral philosophy. The same mentality of exploitation and contempt for labor is then transposed onto the entire working class and the lower grades of bourgeois subordinates. Work is for the sims and the retards, and the true

value of society is in exploitation and malice alone. Politically, this makes sense to a certain logic. Realistically, this is a disaster. If such a society were faced with a genuine external danger that required genuine qualities and quantities for survival, it would fail. Internally, the logic works not as a productive enterprise but as a disciplinary machine, choking the life out of the country and insisting that this predation is the true fount of production and wisdom. The logic predates capitalism, and is seen in many versions of socialism, however enlightened and however much they are aware of the problem. The logic is rarely ever seen in purified form. The classical liberals were aware that this logic gone amok would destroy society, and warn specifically against this outcome. It would be presumed that reasonable men facing an existential crisis or the outcome of a world enveloped in senseless struggle and malice would recognize such a society as irrevocably failed, and that in the long run it would strip bare the very resource that allowed it to continue - labor, both in the lowest forms and in the more developed forms that would police it. In the long run, the drivers and managers of the workers required the product of workers. This aim is not felt among the comfortable aristocracy, who saw all other classes and interests as enemies, and internalized not an economic or martial logic, but the logic of aristocracy since time immemorial. That logic forms the true seed of humanity's fall and demise, rather than this or that economic system or practice. Even the advocates of slave society recognized the failures of such an arrangement, and could not seriously present a philosophical defense of slavery as good in its own right. It took the perversion of the Austrian School to begin such a crusade, and Galton's Eugenics to turn that drive into his overriding "Jehad".

THE EMERGENCE OF STRUGGLE CONCEPTUALLY

Struggle begins not at the cosmic or transcendental level, where such a concept is superfluous, but at the basic process of knowledge. Struggle is only truly carried out by knowing entities, for whom the concept holds any relevance. It begins not as war or the highest stage of conflict, but as a nudging or impulse in entities which can conceive of it and act in accord with that struggle. It is only appreciably struggle for entities which are capable of grasping and holding the concept - and so, the eugenic interest of life described prior is often the true catalyst, rather than any material necessity or a genuine inevitability of conflict over resources, or a difficulty in allocating the pool of limited resources in a given area. No such inevitability is evident in the natural world or any process contained within. We have seen that humans, like any animals, will avoid struggle to the point of refusing to live, if they are so inclined or they sense that they are incapable of any appreciable resistance to something that works against them. Struggle is, on some level, a choice of some knowing entity to make it so. Why they do so is ultimately a matter for the individual in question. The struggle does not exist as a built-in antagonism between the two agents, when speaking of its genuine origins. We may identify two mutually exclusive conditions of being that meet and cannot be resolved by any other process, but this in of itself does not initiate the struggle. If neither could

overpower the other or the cost of struggle outweighed every other thing the parties could do, it is far more likely they two parties elect to ignore each other. They could studiously avoid conflict and engage in a standoff if their contact cannot be avoided, and do so until one party flinches or both exhaust their resources without any struggle taking place. They could even agree to a formal duel or limited struggle, just to get it over with, without the struggle becoming general or escaping a defined purview. Economic competitors, for example, are not intrinsically involved in any struggle. Those in business may see their affairs as purely a competition for resources, demonstrate their superiority, and hold that the results be judged not by a pitched struggle in the meaningful sense, but by adjudication of the outcome and the surrender of the loser by whatever terms were set. There is a struggle implied in the competition, but the struggle would never spill over into the concepts of struggle or open war or violence, and would scarcely seem like a great struggle at all. Two parties have a disagreement, resolve it competitively, and that is that. This is not a struggle at all, but absent a sobering influence, this non-struggle is granted the qualities of a "jihad" and carried out with destructive zeal just the same, while pretending that what is happening isn't actually happening. In a technical sense, this is the case. No formal war or state of conflict is entered or acknowledged, and for all of the destruction caused by this competition, to the competing parties this is "just business" and is not conducted as if it were a true struggle or war in the sense humans regard the concept. A war may break out between the subordinates, but this war is for the instigators an invisible thing or externality, which they dismiss in their own judgements of the world and what they see as relevant.

We see here the seeds for the present-day environment of unlimited transgression from above - that it is premised on an understanding that authority can be disrupted, so long as control over an environment is total, or perceived to be such by a member of society. This is not a trivial thing, and in the past similar concepts were operative to discipline social actors. At its root, authority does not truly rise from below in total. It only originates there to describe a world that preceded us, where authorities were long established and captured another soul. Man is "born free" in some sense, in that there is no hobgoblin intrinsically moving it, but in all of the senses that truly matter, humans recognize as soon as they can that they are beholden to a much larger world, against which they are individually defenseless. This was implicit in the formation of the liberal idea - it did not entail a naive and infantile belief that some inner light summoned goodness that was inviolable. It was instead a theory suggesting the origin of institutions, rights, and why those who rule could rule. It did not merely apply to human institutions, as if humans were a special type of matter that was sacrosanct and granted privilege in the natural order of the world. The only reasonable interpretation of the liberal understanding is that spiritual authority, and thus that which we would put in the place of a godhead or Heaven, is something we ascertained, rather than something pushed into us constantly from above. None of that is inconsistent with theories of the self that predated liberalism, and can be found in many religious traditions. It has long been known

that human beings can choose to reject "God" or any imperious authority. Kings and temporal authorities were not made of magic, and spiritual authorities did not invoke a just-so story to rule, but a long history and understanding that made the institutions of religion and education viable. The story of how absolute rulers commanded slaves, serfs, soldiers, and everything else is a long one that was condensed into a theory of divine right or the theories of monarchical government that prevailed before liberalism. These people were not stupid and understood the meaning of a republic and despotism, and did not necessarily value republics in the way we are told was inevitable.^[5] The important takeaway from this is not that the chicken came before the egg or vice versa - which is a koan a child should learn to see through - but that states and societies can only persist through active measures. The seeming passivity of the state is preferred only when it is possible to elide struggle or re-define struggle as something other than it is, but it is only through violent ideological imposition that the members of society were forced to disregard what their senses told them about modernity. The final step was to suggest an unbreakable "dialogue" between ruler and ruled - the famous "dialectic" as an abstraction divorced from the intent of such a thing - and that this dialogue was foundational to existence and immune to distance, proximity, or occulting. Those in the know of what this really was possessed a weapon they could use with impunity. They would then insinuate to those out of the know, through various means, that this "dialogue", which was always one-directional, was inescapable and functioned to create an inchoate blob which cannot be comprehended, except through sing-song metaphors and slogans. To make this work required a vast educational undertaking which sought to distort all sense of perspective and imposed an alien judgement on that which existed before. In other words, human beings were to be transformed, and this transformation in reality was never intended to be universal or equal.

At a basic level, this germ that recognizes authority is equal in one sense - that all are participants in the same world. The key to distorting reality was to eliminate barriers of distance and substance. This is where modern technology proved instrumental, and the full accounting of this process is beyond the scope of the present chapter. It does not take a great mind to see that this is what has happened. As modern technology advanced, and this advance did not follow a world-historical mission that was unknowable, communication could first travel by telegraph and telephone wires, and then through the internet and through a machine which could automatically filter information and report it to temporal authorities like the state.^[6] At a basic level, all of these communications and transfers of material operate by laws which can be understood by even the simplest human. Communication of ideas alone, or the transport of material by automobile or plane or any other locomotion, does not possess any intrinsic power to change the ideas, McLuhan's wisdom notwithstanding. To truly seal this form of reality control required a preponderance of both physical force - assembled in the machinery built during the 20th and early 21st century - and the establishment of informational and knowledge authorities whose capacities were consolidated and too vast for a single human subject to possibly adapt

to. Once established, the native sociality of humans could be systematically destroyed by a campaign of unlimited terror, purges, biological warfare, moral degradation, and all of the hallmarks of neoliberal society.

I have, in skipping to the endgame, shown where this problem of authority truly originated - that human beings, far from being "pure points of light" or "black boxes", are nothing of the sort. This concept of the "black box" is not the traditional understanding of the human mind or soul, and it is not something ingrained in Christian theology or any other religious tradition. Far from it, a reading of the Bible and most religious traditions would warn against any such interpretation, and deem it heretical. The flesh and brain of Man, a type of animal, was what it was, and securing that flesh was among the commandments delivered to adherents. The spiritual conception that defined "human", or any prior concept, was an altogether different sense of self. In the older society, biopolitics was not the default assumption that violently asserted itself through technological means. Those means did not yet exist. The drive to do this was latent in the major religions, and very much present in the formation of Christianity. At the same time, both Christianity and its Greco-Roman philosophical forebears warned against precisely this devaluation of the experience of life, and similar warnings can be found in religious traditions around the world, and in folk wisdom of even primitive tribes. It took the maximal depravity of people like Galton to lie so brazenly about things that made native sense to many people, that allowed them to navigate the world. The foul "Jehad" of Galton was not a singular departure point, and Galton did not act alone, but it is with eugenics that the program of habitual lying and imperious invasion found its first modern expression, and it is that program which inspired every other program of habitual lying and cheating seen since, from German eugenics to the New Age death cults. The charge of the Galtonites is that if Man is just an animal, than Man's place in the world is automatically dictated by imperious authorities and just-so stories. In doing so, the Galtonites invoke a temporary hypocrisy, where they declare that they are alone one with Nature and God, that they are the beginning and end. Such a tenet is in line with every other lie of the eugenic creed, repeated violently and with ever-intensifying screaming. And so, eugenics required not merely technological or educational means to perpetuate it, but a willingness to commit to absolute impunity and the thrill of torture for its own sake. It is for this reason that the atrocities of Mengele and fellow travelers are not merely allowed, but encouraged and glorified as good in of themselves.

Where did it originate then? It originated not in a material condition mandating struggle, or a reasoned impulse of knowledge, but a thrill shouting for it, somewhere in the recesses of animal nature. Humans, like any animal, did not arise as blank slates, nor did they arise in an environment that was sterile. The ugliness of the animal kingdom, both that which was inborn and that which was acquired through animal sociality, passes to the human race. The human race is born not with wisdom or a gift of fire, but with fratricide, ritual sacrifice, orgies, and rampant cruelty. Even the story of Prometheus or Lucifer granting Man dubious gifts does not stand up to any scrutiny. The men who discovered fire, and this

likely was reproduced independently many times and communicated outside of the channels of predatory spiritual authority, did so because knowledge of heat was available to man even without language, and someone seeing fire-making would look at the example and reverse-engineer it. In primitive society, the imperious authority beating the child and telling him or her "you can't, you can't, you can't" could not be enforced too rigorously, and even with such an apparatus, it takes immense pressure to truly destroy a child in the way Germanic education does to us. Those who endured that may, if allowed to live any sort of life, crawl out of the ruin and assemble something of their own. People with severe damage, both inborn and from the cruelty of the human race, manage to reassemble enough functioning to pick up language, do some chores, and build whatever knowledge they can. It is the thrill of imperious torture which comes to those people, kicks them down to remind them "once retarded, always retarded", and resets the cycle. That is the most evident origin of struggle for us today, and it is so dominant that it overrides the other basic impulses that might have inspired struggle, such as the passions, lust, envy, fickle greed, or an aspiration to change the world for some goal that was deeply felt in the soul.

The passions generally are too broad a topic, and describing the passions in voluminous detail produces too many vagaries to be reliable, even now. We can ascertain that those passions still exist and exert considerable control over the impulses of mankind, and those passions can drive two parties into a genuine struggle. So too can struggles be waged over ideas or sentiments which are very meaningful and valued by both sides, without degenerated into the hedonistic torture cult of Galtonism and its forebears. A proper description of the passions requires some experience of the world to know what they are, and visible examples of them. One way to destroy the passions is to equate their expression with failure and retardation, and to present degenerated "virtues" suggesting that expressing stupid sentiments is superior to the raw passions of old or expressions of concepts like love or tenderness. And so, any sign of kindness in males is "gay", and the hunt for homosexuals is more concerned with upholding and insane and sadistic image of predatory males above all others, than anything homosexuals did. Naturally, homosexual men have a long history of predatory and violent behavior, which is directed to support the eugenic creed, creating many filthy Satanic shock troops whose remaining decencies are destroyed.^[7] Even the nature of the homosexual purge is obfuscated by ideology, primitive conceits, visceral disgust, and a fear of internal policing suggesting any reason why this crusade was undertaken. If it were described with dispassionate language and without the general fear of the present society, all of the production made about male homosexuality is rather ridiculous, and exists very obviously to uphold the eugenic creed rather than any other purpose or even a desire to stamp out the homosexual. The proliferation of homosexuality in the past century shows that the rulers have no intention of fixing anyone, and desire to make all sexual behavior as disgusting as possible, so that the bastards can push their artificial insemination and torture cult sex and say this is the only permissible "love", rationed out by the masters. When that is laid bare, it really makes the obsession

of individual sexual acts seem strange, given the long history of known perversion in the human race and how disinteresting it is compared to anything else we would do with our time. The same process plays out with every other passion or sentiment. "Fun" is rebranded as a saccharine exercise of smiling in public with a psychopath grin. "Love" is a commodity doled out only by masters to slaves. Any passion, even a mild one, suggesting deviation from this screaming Satanic mass is to be ruthlessly attacked, without any apparent rationale and at great expense. This is intended.

The passions, whatever they are, are not the sole instigator of this germ of struggle or authority. We may develop some primitive reasoning or sense telling us to fight or flee, which would be expected for life that had long existed in such an environment. There is no passion involved in that instinct, but a quick check of whether someone can win or lose, and assessment of options that takes place without formal rational deliberation. These habits can be honed and modified, but they always serve some purpose of life that isn't really rational. Again, the overriding aim of the present regime is to debilitate our judgements of such instincts, and replace the behaviors not with something better, but with an incessant shouting - "die! die! die!" - that paralyzes the cattle and prepares them for slaughter. This is the ultimate goal of Galtonism - to have a weapon to deploy which allows them to shout "die!" and kill with unlimited, absolute, and total impunity. That is their thrill and sole purpose. There is nothing else to them, no hidden mystery or purpose behind the lies. It feeds itself and recognizes no other master, and if there is some purpose to it, it hasn't worked and does not secure anything. All that is good in the world exists in spite of such a demonic doctrine.

With all of that done, the struggle serves very little genuine purpose. It is an inducement to give up struggle until the last possible moment that the predatory hold dear. In this way, the state's monopoly on legal force can have the most effect for the lowest cost. This is not the true motive for why states do this, for the machine to impose these conditions is extremely expensive in labor, resources, and human toil. Yet, for the purposes of a state ruling, it appears on paper to be inviolable and perfected. The only problem with such an apparatus is that it has to operate in a real world, with actual flesh and blood humans who have no reason whatsoever to go along with such a program. If humans were points of light pursuing imaginary hedonism points, and this were reduced to its basest possible form, then all life dies screaming forever and all of our efforts are a waste of time. That is not what humans actually are or how any society can exist. Instead of struggles happening at the uttermost end of necessity, or because of a constant thrill for doing so, struggles are instead rooted in the decisions of real actors for whatever purposes they hold. They are, at least for one party, a choice. That choice may be the result of some interplay or conditions that the actor did not fully understand or conceive, but there is no struggle without deliberation and intent. A struggle "in nature" is no struggle at all, and a state of permanent "natural struggle" is a non-sequitur that evades any guilt associated with the struggle.

[1] Idealism and materialism are of course monist ontologies, and it is an abiding trait of monism that all is made subordinated to the One. How this is approached depends on what is conditioned into a subject, such that their choice really doesn't matter. People could only have made the choices that were sensical to the overmind. I maintain that we can only speak of one world in which all things happen, and in that sense, the view I present is in line with monism, in that there will be an overmind of sorts - in this case, the world itself, which doesn't actually "think" but is nonetheless a singular entity which all must reckon with. Because monism is a useful ontology for describing authority and political society, I have kept it intact. The "oneness" of the universe only exists in our conception of it, rather than any genuinely uniting force or principle other than existence itself. The systems concept should allow authority to be recognized not merely as a principle we can follow but something which can stem from particular things, each with their own history and emerging in their own way. What has been purposed as a mechanism for totalizing control can be claimed by us to reverse that process, so that we might be able to live. It is highly unlikely, for eugenism was allowed to go on for too long, but perhaps some future society would at least recall that what was done in this time was an unforgivable abomination, and it would be enough to know that such abominations will be defeated in the future, if only for a time. What eugenics did to us will never be undone, even if somehow decency can survive. The point here is to be able to break the monistic conceits about the soul or society, without giving up the useful knowledge of authority, for even if the world isn't really like this, many who aspire to rule will think monistically and have given themselves over to that view completely and with all of its implications. Eugenics created a very parodic form of anti-monism which does not allow connections to be made specifically to advance its psychological pseudoscience and the categories of thoughtcrimes it decreed into existence, all of which were "obviously" hereditary and things that the absolutely perfect perverts like Galton could never be. I can tell from my experience and reading Galton that the man is a crazed pervert, and in many ways he resembles me, and I know the teaching methods of his class and society were designed to produce monsters just like him. I at least have the good sense to recognize that perversion is not something to cherish, let alone place at the center of a political idea, and this humble author can tell you eroticism is a dead end. It is no surprise that the Right always goes back to it, since its genuine program is so obviously abominable, and they only possess enough low cunning to make the rest of us suffer, all for their masters to whom they supplicate by some dark force in the human race.

[2] The anarchist drivels obsesses with hierarchy as a clever substitute for their real mission of usurping and abrogating authority, conflating authority with hierarchy which is bad, yet at the same time presuming a natural "just-so" ordering of the world creates a natural aristocracy and a thorough hierarchy that

no one is allowed to question. In other words, "Oceania has no law". Authority has nothing to do with social values. Social ranks can be, but are not necessarily, informed by authoritative knowledge, but there is no prescription to say which of these are justified in a legalistic sense. At the heart of this is an obsessive invasion of personal authority and the means by which an individual would be aware of the constantly changing rules of anarchism, which are always rigged in favor of an aristocracy that is taboo to acknowledge. Anarchism could only exist by exploiting republican sentiments and institutions and making them into mockeries. We will have much reason to continue describing this stupid "philosophy" throughout our later writings. The key act is to sever authority from its genuine fount and claim it entirely for the eugenic interest of certain people - in effect, those who claim authority is unknowable shout "die, die, die!" in various forms. At the same time, the counterpoint of the fascist "authoritarian" is given, who is a similar sort of pissant who sees performance as more important than authoritative knowledge. Above all, the conflation of authority with rule, economics, and purely human conceits, and then reducing those conceits to a symbolic form that is disconnected from genuine knowledge or the very processes knowledge relies upon, is necessary for such foulness to perpetuate. Authority in the sense I describe is not a ruling idea, but a condition which can allow rule. It is not limited to the purpose of rule, but rulers value authority for the same reason others value it - because rulers are beholden to the same world as the rest of us scum, no matter how grotesque the rigging is.

[3] Here we might visualize the scene from *The Matrix*, where Neo is taught Kung-Fu by a machine uploading the knowledge to his brain, and the faux-profound statement "I know Kung-Fu" becoming a sad piece of American culture. Such a machine is not inconceivable in principle, but it is very clear the showrunners referenced a faith that ideas can be fed uncritically into the brain like so much digital information and will be processed instantaneously. Both Neo and the audience have been primed to believe this is how knowledge can be transferred, and this is not a trivial process. Today we are familiar with the computer and its workings, and so the transfer of files and information and analyzing them for meaning can appear trivial. It is in the ideology and bad philosophy presented in the movie that the errors of this thinking become evident, rather than the suggestion that it is possible. We could, if we established both trust and a faith in our internal workings, transfer knowledge very rapidly, and we could assimilate meaningful connections with that knowledge. When the transfer of information cannot be contested, the ideologue insists ad nauseum that the pupil doesn't really "know" the information handed to them, no matter what demonstration of knowledge the pupil shows. In this way, the pupil is taught that any process in his or her mind is not consequential, and the process of knowing itself is monopolized by the institution. The reality is that such a process, even if it seems trivial, is still a process. We can question it as much as we like, but the resolution of questioning does not come with the pedagogue's imposition but whether we continue to give a shit about this question. It is here where indolence, fear, apathy, avarice, indulgence in fetishes, and various stoppers are used to

stunt further connections, to induce the pupil to give up at precisely the correct moment where an illegal connection of meaning is made.

[4] The Holocaust is still a taboo, due to the prevalence of revisionist histories, but in short: if the Nazis' goal were purely extermination, fewer political enemies would have survived and fewer qualms would be made about the doing this. The true purpose of the camps, aside from removing political enemies from society which was obvious, was to provide the Nazis slave labor and, more importantly, medical research subjects. The chief activity in the camps was to measure and analyze every aspect of the inmates, a prelude to the mass state institutions that were already a feature of industrial society. This feature would continue unabated after the war, and it is what happens to psychiatric inmates today, which far more social acceptance and far more lurid rituals and tortures envisioned. The Nazi camps should not be considered "just another example", for the political aims of the camps were unique and produced an expected death toll. The imprisoned had no reason to ever accept this slavery, and among the games Nazi sadists loved was to tell the inmates to kill other inmates, thus following the habit of blooding that was inherent to the Nazi and Germanic religion at work. In the later psychiatric slavery, there was still in principle a society of laws governing the treatment of slaves, and while the underclass would never again know freedom, many cases allowed the underclass to return to civilian life. The death toll of psychiatric slavery remains hidden, since it is not politically convenient to acknowledge eugenic purges in the millions after the Nazi period. Under neoliberal barbarism, the killing of the underclass would be carried out not in the institutions directly, but through soft-kill tactics, through the criminal prison system - ritualistic torture and kill stories would be printed with relish from Fabian-esque reporters pretending to care, as a warning to us if we transgress the unwritten law - and through economic deprivation and the total lockout of the underclass from any social activity. That was something the Nazis could never engineer, for it was contrary to the war and political aims they had to abide during their reign. The heirs of Nazism are, naturally, the vanguard for neoliberalism and the nightmare that came out starting in 1970, and the aims of Nazism would be fully rehabilitated by the start of the 21st century.

I do not wish to question numbers or compare which is worse than the other, since the two refer to distinct aims and governments under different situations, but it is important to see what eugenics can do in war, without any regard for civil society or the presumption of law. The Nazis were by design a lawless regime that reveled in torture and humiliation for its own sake, but faced realistic limits on their activities. Their aims with medical experimentation were funded by their fellow travelers outside of Germany, who looked at the torture and humiliation of the camps as a desirable quality in of itself and a scientific experiment to be repeated around the world. The pseudoscience and viciousness of their class would indeed be reproduced in psychiatric slavery and the social experiments of post-war society, all indicating their plan to do to the majority of humanity what the Nazis did to a minority political enemy. That is the number I truly

dread, rather than numbers in the past. What we have seen since 2008 is an indicator of humanity in total freefall, in which the thrill of torture exceeds anything the Nazis ever accomplished, and their Satanic religion can operate more openly than it ever did before. With that in mind, it is only a matter of time before transgression leads to the death of millions, if not billions, and this time the fanatics march with greater purpose than they ever could before. They walk among us and enjoy the thrill of torture, spreading it in all aspects of 21st century society, and demand absolute impunity for their actions. Those who attempt to stop them are ruthlessly stamped out and the thrill of torture finds its next target. We are made today to tolerate the intolerable, when a reasonable society would see the only solution is to do to them what they would do to us and no less. Moral equivalence does not apply here.

Of course, such an end could be averted if the bastards just, you know, didn't do this. It seems simple enough, from reading this chapter. The philosophy of struggle explains some of why this happened. The naturalization of struggle, such that it becomes an unmentionable feature of the landscape, makes this total carnage and absolute terror appear like the air, and makes honesty and decency unseemly. That is a part of the true horror of Galtonism.

[5] The true value of republicanism is not a naive and simpering belief in human goodness, as you probably gathered, but a belief in the role of the state and the political class that was peculiar to European civilization, due to a number of historical factors. To most of the world, despotic government was the only government, and it becomes clear that all of the true forms of human government are despotic. Even during the imperial and monarchical regimes, republican ideas were present in European civilization, and they are found throughout Christianity. In so many ways, Christianity encoded the republican virtues into its theology, and granted to them a religious veneer and numerous metaphors that would be understood to students. All of the European liberals operated with considerable knowledge of Christianity and its intent, and were not plagued by the same ignorance which rules today and is imposed through violent intercession of institutions. The meaning in Christianity not only suggests republican virtues, but notes the true nature of such a beast - absolute depravity, and the reality that men are not good creatures at all. It is here where the contradictory cosmological models in Christian thought, encouraged to keep the rubes in line, erode understanding of the religion's true purpose, if they are not acquainted with the education the better of the priests would have received. It should not surprise the reader that, far from a narrative of pure-hearted outsiders challenging an ignorant church, many key players in the liberal revolutions were knowledgeable Christians, if not priests. Among the players of the French Revolution were members of the priesthood who became master diplomats and political fixers, and there would be dissident radicals from the priesthood. Famously, Talleyrand the priest was a suspected atheist who scoffed at the traditions of the Church, and Seyes the priest encouraged both the rise of revolution and the conclusion placing Napoleon at its head. Regardless of affiliation, spiritual zeal from a religious tradition was found in both the French and American revolutions, and

none of them subscribed to the infantile "religion of science" of Galtonism, which was understood immediately as the true closing of revolutionary thought. Even hardline de-Christianizers who espoused atheism suggested not a turbo-liberal idiocy of the sort we know today, but cults which sought to actively displace Christian institutions. The use of this is clear when considering an aim of the revolutionaries was to seize and distribute Church properties, and specifically the religious functions which tended to the poor and needy. It is especially strange then that the narrative of lumpens favoring revolution gains traction, because the historical experience of the lumpens is that revolutions are when they are purged by the millions and the thrill of killing them is encouraged. Revolution is despised by the lowest classes not because of their fickle nature, but because they do recognize history and the sadism of their social betters. By encouraging such expressions, the middle class technocrats who aspired to revolution actively encouraged the recruitment of the lower classes to oppose them. This could be encouraged if the aim of the technocrats was to reconcile with the ruling interest as capitalism consolidated into unfettered oligarchy, but was fatal to any technocrat who envisioned a future other than the one we got. The past century merely accelerated the worst of those tendencies, and in doing so, the technocratic apparatus would be overtaken fully by the eugenic interest and the ideology of Galton's Eugenics. It is only now that we see the final results, intended long in advance and kept afloat by lies and more lies. The "good republic" myth was helpful in facilitating this debilitation of anything that would stall such a movement, and it is only through the determination of the vast majority that want nothing to do with this program that we have anything to call our own in this time.

[6] And of course, the private sector. A great mystification is that the private sector was somehow separate from the public sector, when in reality "the public" had been claimed long ago by the oligarchs. The public in the sense of a democratic commons had been attacked in principle by the mere suggestion of eugenics and its violent purges killing millions and starting world wars.

[7] Example: one Ernst Röhm, a notorious example of Nazi homosexuality. I leave it to the reader to dig up that biography and Adolf Hitler's personal fondness. Many such cases are the norm of Nazism and its ilk.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

14. The War Machine

Struggle at the trivial level of everyday existence is, in the final analysis, irrelevant to the philosophies of struggle that came to prevail. For all that is written about war, politics, jihad, struggle, virtue, and every other topic of the sort, the everyday struggles are omitted and invisibilized. Simply dragging oneself out of bed to tolerate the stream of shit from political society and the interclass struggles of humanity is somehow not a real struggle, even though the environment created

by that society made life unbearable enough that much of humanity dreads the coming of morning. This is intended, for some reasons I have already elaborated on. We would see struggle then as a contest of authority, which in trivial examples is resolved without any imperious rationale or great hardship. However shitty human society is, we do not ponder for too long the necessity of bringing ourself to social life to carry out what is necessary in this day of human bullshit. Of all the things we will have to struggle over in life, our own laziness should not be one of them. There is perhaps an argument to make about the long-term health of the body, the genuine need of recreation and rebirth to endure existence in such a society, but the answers to those questions are evident if we know ourselves and ask honestly what we are doing in this world. The greater personal and spiritual questions are a matter less of struggle in the philosophical sense, though we are made to struggle within ourselves, in interpersonal relationships, and with the spiritual concepts we deal with in existence. For many reasons, the philosophy of struggle is quite irrelevant to our actual lives. We do not live to endure the job for managers. We endure the job so we can live, and find something for ourselves. We then consider what we are doing in society and in the world, and if we are not fettered by a philosophy which consumes all in struggle for no purpose, we ask what our labors are truly for, and whether the world or human society could be better than the barest minimum. The question of struggle is always present, but it is not always active and pressing, demanding an answer which short-circuits the knowledge process that made any of this possible. The true origins of struggle are not a primordial force in the world nor a cosmic narrative superimposed on reality, and they are not the inevitable emergence of our existence by any means. Life is not meant to be struggle for struggle's sake, nor was it destined to be suffering. Life is aberrant and an anomaly, and so we act in accord with that reality; but there was no reason to suggest life was inherently bad or evil, or that life was destined to struggle in the way that we do. The beginning of serious struggle begins not at the smallest level or at the transcendent level imposed on reality, but in society itself and the institutions it created. Struggle is overwhelmingly a human concern, and the opposing entities in struggle are almost always other humans, rather than non-human life, inanimate objects, or the environment in total. Humans against most animals hold such a ridiculous advantage that a human has to practically make himself vulnerable to an angry bear or lion to lose that struggle, and for the lion or bear, they are not consumed by any political struggle against humanity or an individual human. The bear or lion sees either food or a potential threat, and given the propensity of humans and their generally violent disposition, you can hardly blame the bear for doing something that would make sense if we were in the bear's place. I wish to leave out the very complex interplay of language, technology, symbolic ideas, religion, and so on, and capture the essence of struggle at the level we appreciate the concept; that is, struggle within society, which revolves around the authority we mentioned earlier before it revolves around any other purpose. This distills struggle and thus war to something hardly descriptive of the events we observe, but it allows us to trace why those events are as they are from a simple starting point.

We return then to the three concepts of authority that are most relevant. Struggle is impossible without some sense of authority, if it is to be spoken of as more than an impulse in the world. That more primitive definition of struggle is meaningless for our purposes. Struggle over personal authority - the struggle to define oneself in society, and interpersonal struggles - is often seen by the naive as the basis for society as a whole and all that arises in it. The world and the history of society is portrayed not as it is but as a story of struggles between people and entities granted the characteristics of persons like the supposed "gods". Even when the actions of people are not immediately obvious as struggles, the language of struggle infuses so many of the stories we tell about persons. This arises for a simple reason - in life, competition and struggle is often an easy relationship, whereas cooperation is difficult and necessarily contingent on a mutual understanding. While you can have cooperation without any intermediary step of initial struggle upon contact, life's intent and interests tend to favor territoriality, the eugenic interest which extends to property and history, and numerous instincts which lead life-forms to view other life-forms as potential threats or potential food sources. "Ally" or "friend" implies a familiarity which is not taken for granted. The third relationship would be if the two life-forms simply had little to do with each other, regarding each other as merely a fact of the world. This is entirely possible and is the easiest relation of all, and there is an appeal of doing this to the lizard-brain which did not inherit primitive sociality. Even for a lizard-brained person, it becomes apparent that social contact with other people is nearly inevitable, and attempts to seal oneself away from those interactions may prove difficult. Even in a world where all life-forms follow the loner strategy, humans live in an environment and it would be quite difficult for every human to receive a parcel of land and resources and follow a dictum to never leave that space. Nature is not cleanly divided in any such way, and so even if two or more loners are just trying to get through this day, they will meet. Some protocol will be established so that one or both recognize right-of-way and various customs which we take for granted. While those protocols do not need to escalate to anything we would consider struggle, the very interaction implies that struggle is possible, and it cannot be foreclosed as a possibility within knowledge of the agents in question. Two loners are unlikely to know each other very well at all, but they might have enough understanding of humans generally to sense how these things work. It is not the inevitability of struggle that is important, but the fear, uncertainty, and doubt that exists without perfect information. A reasonable person would see that such "FUD" is highly counterproductive, but it always exists and can be exploited given the correct environmental conditions or interpersonal stimuli. Struggle between persons always remains an unknown until the encounter, and in hindsight we learn how that encounter went. Usually, no elaborate reasoning process to initiate a struggle is undertaken. The impulses of life encourage aggression without any rational purpose for it, even when we are perfectly aware that those instincts are unwarranted and cause us damage. Those impulses are not as fixed in nature as ideology would insist they are, and the instincts of life do not codify struggle in the more elaborate sense, or even in the simplest sense. Our basic impulses exist not for any inherent moral

purpose, but because they emerged over time, and the instincts of humans or any other animal are honed throughout life. There is no inherent good to any instinct or impulse in life, such as pleasure, pain, suffering, that warm feeling of familiarity that men have long exploited with dripping insults, joy, the high of opium, or any other emotion we might conjure, including those that are wordless feelings. Those impulses originated for a reason though. In an environment where interpersonal manipulation is common, and specifically taught as dogma, as they are in the educational regime of the past century, instincts will transform in ways that make them alien to what we were before the regime of manipulation and interventions was imposed. This is intended and deliberate, and the result of this social engineering at such a minute level did not produce beneficial results. As I will attempt to explain in this chapter, there is a reason why social engineering of this sort takes on malevolent characteristics - that is that social engineering is oriented by the same impulses as the human practice of war, and conversely, war is at heart a social engineering activity before it can be anything else. That reality is demonstrated in the 21st century to be an unavoidable reality, for we live in a society dominated by overt social engineering, which has percolated for over a century and produced predictably disastrous results. The disastrous results were foreseen and intended, and efforts of people to correct them would be stymied. Yet, people individually act in accord with what makes sense for them, no matter how invasive pedagogy and institutions can be.

The interpersonal struggles cannot constitute war in of themselves, in the proper sense that the word has meaning. The diplomatic relationships between individuals, the relations of individuals to institutions, and the relations of institutions to each other, are in a perpetual state of flux. "Peace" is never truly peace, particularly in societies where the practice and religion of war dominate the conception of society. The commitment and mobilization implied by war is impossible to internalize in a person or human being, no matter how much ideology is pumped into that person. War to be war is a social activity, rather than a state of mind unto itself. An individual truly at a state of war on his own will realize quickly his position relative to the rest of the world, and to other individuals who are not encumbered by the state of total war in their whole person. Even in the mobilization of war, the participants remain flesh and blood humans and also remain institutional people. War is not fought by abstract forces or indeterminate blobs. However it is conducted, war is waged between social agents only. The tools of war are just that - tools of war. Even when the machinery is so elaborate that it seems to take on a life of its own, that machinery was put into motion by people, for it to be war machinery. If the machines truly broke free from human control and waged a campaign, the activity would cease to be war in the recognizable sense. If the machines were to attack humans in accord with the laws of motion, it may appear to the humans that they are in a state of perpetual war against the social formation they see in those machines. In doing so, the humans grant to the machine the personality of social agents, and the human tendency is to view any personality as a human personality or

something relatable to humanity. Even if humans were to encounter an alien intelligence, or has a sense that the social agents they fight are very much not human, the thinking of those aliens may not map onto our concept of "war" as a social engineering activity. We don't consider exterminating an ant colony to be war, but to the ants, their community and many of their numbers are exterminated by entities bringing total death and carnage at what seems to be their whim. What they do in response doesn't conform to our expectations of war at all. War to be war is conducted between thinking agents with a sufficient level of comprehension, and the agents are all at a minimum aware of the nature of war; and the opponents of war are presumed to be, at least in principle, similar such agents, for a state of war to be mutually recognizable. There may be vast differences in culture, philosophy, technology, and the qualities of the agents, but no one in war is truly ignorant that war is an affair that exists in the world, and that they may be entangled in it, or are actively engaged in one. Whether they want to be part of any war is irrelevant, and typically the participants in war are the civilians and commoners who had no investment whatsoever in the practice or the cult surrounding it. War to most of humanity is nothing but a terrible calamity coming and going, and aristocrats since time immemorial delight in telling the masses that war is natural. Aristocrats themselves, naturally, seek to exempt themselves from any consequence of war, and establish the cult of war and many religions to accomplish that end - to set aside a sacred space for them, and pit their subordinates to attack the lower classes. A tacit agreement between aristocrats of all types encourages them to exclude each other from direct conflict, and only attack each other through their proxies. Aristocrats attacking each other never descends into the state of warfare, even when they are willing to fight each other in some inter-cine struggle. Even going so far as direct combat with each other in a duel is a highly uncommon event. Most duels were fought not by aristocrats but by their subordinates, and many duels were for show or for tournaments rather than the life-or-death struggle or mobilization that war entailed. The major interests of society tend to see conflict within the interest as counter-productive for the same reasons, going all the way down to the workmen, slaves, and the lowest classes of mankind. It can happen for the same reasons humans engage in any squabble, but within an interest, states of total war contained within the interest or within a subsector of society are undesirable. By no means does this mean such conflict is an impossibility, but it is highly discouraged, and those who think about war seriously and without ideological nonsense see that getting out of the war's consequences is highly beneficial. To motivate participants to participate in war at any level beyond a ritual exercise is no easy task. The morale of an army must remain at a level compatible with even bothering to fight, let alone fight an opponent in an uncertain battle.

We see here the formation of interests solidified by the practice of war in some sense. This is not the only way in which interests can be united - far from it, war in the proper sense is not likely to be initiated by societies that are ill-formed and incapable of summoning the collective will to begin the war. War is far from the only disciplinary effect that can unite a society. In most experience, wars are

catastrophic to the moral fabric of any society. The veneration of the religion of war is a much different matter than the actual practice of war, which is found by subordinate officers, grunts, and the commoners who are dragged into war without a weapon or any realistic chance of defending themselves. It is very easy for someone to cheer for a war that is abstracted and made into a game, a story, or a thrilling spectacle with cool graphics, especially in a society where war is made fantastical and an echo chamber insists that is totally what war is. Actual fighting of war, or even the grind of fighting a plan "war" or a siege by society against its enemies, produces a strain on all participants. The reasons why are multiple and not always obvious, and this effect is not uniform. War can allow alliances of convenience and presents a personal rationale of necessity to rally to the flag or the legion, but these are one-time gains amidst a persistent grind of struggles, attacks, and tensions that is intended to wear down or eliminate opponents. War is never a clean exercise of statistics or an affair decided by wargames which the grunts mindlessly comply with. It is always fought in the end not by abstracted agents but the flesh and blood those agents represent. The same would be true if the agents were not human or even living in principle - war as a practice is an action and an event that is done, and that event entails the depletion of opposing forces and damage to your own side. War as an activity is never generative of products. The product fed into war is an alien to the war itself. Perhaps the alien product exists because of a state of war, but war will not deposit fresh resources into the Earth as a result of struggle alone. It does leave behind corpses and the residue of war and these might be of some valuable, but war as a practice was not necessary to obtain any of that material. The very core of the war, struggle between societies over temporal authority, is an expenditure that either burns energy and disperses it to *nullius caeli*, or is spent on an activity which seems to a creature disinterested in war like some autistic screeching given profound meaning. At best, the expenditure of war is a neutral in useful resources, presuming there were some efficiency to reclaim them. The territory or resources acquired as war booty is not a direct consequence of the act of war, but the political affairs which resolve it. No one claims the land in a war zone without presuming attackers will descend upon it, until the state of war is resolved sufficiently to allow for extractive work. That condition does not make war intrinsically "bad" or "useless". The struggle may be waged for purposes that are very important to one or both parties involved, and even if the struggle were a meaningless imposition on those who wanted to stay out of it, there has long been an understanding that war is a reality of human existence and it was going to arrive some day. People have, by some strange condition, lost everything they held dear to a war they did not fight in and were dragged into, lived and found something anew that never would have happened if tranquility did not disturb a humdrum existence of serfdom or slavery.

The consequences of war should not be viewed strictly in economic terms, for war was never a sound economic plan. Economically, war is so disastrous that an argument for free trade would be promotion of peace and cooperation through open markets. This is not an argument that stands up to scrutiny, but by basic

economic logic, a capitalist loathes war because it takes precious resources and labor away from anything the capitalist would want and feeds it to interests that are anathema to capital. Even the class struggle that dominates capitalist society is an unwelcome state of affairs. If the capitalist could pay the wretches a pittance and make them go away, if not make them happy, that would be perfectly fine for business, and far cheaper than the police state if the question were purely economic. Capitalism was never a purely economic decision nor a perfect system set up by the factory owner or banker to be the ideal of history. It was a situation, which is to be described in a later writing. For the political aims that capitalism entailed, the class struggle is still an unwelcome imposition if it were intensified. More than anything, the capitalist desired class collaboration. As the capitalist drew from the bourgeois to staff its offices, and the capitalist ranged from a would-be oligarch to a firm of a few bourgeois men trying to make a buck in the world, that collaboration favored the interests of the bourgeois, and it was the interests of the bourgeois rather than an identity or sentiment regarding city life or ideology. The motor of the class struggle was not economic or ideological requirements, nor any genuine social need for such a struggle to exist. The exploitative relationship capitalism entailed would have made confrontation likely, but the capitalist and the worker alike were perfectly aware that the relations of labor were untenable. There is a solution where the capitalist mitigates exploitation to an appropriate minimum or simply envisions a labor scheme that removed exploitation in the form of surplus value^[1]. Both would effectively mean the end of the capitalist situation and work against the modus operandi of the financial actors, but the capitalist is not ideologically wed to this situation, and recognizes it is untenable even from the start. Whether the capitalist cares about ending the struggle is up to him, but if he wishes to win the struggle, it is not driven by any material necessity or even a crass moral philosophy, and it is not driven by a simplistic zeal for war or suffering. The reasons why the capitalist will not repent for the relations he encouraged are not difficult to see for any reasonable adult and many children, but the capitalist in most cases has long been superseded by the manager, the technocrat, and the oligarch who understood his interests were no longer the bourgeois interests and certainly not lust for money tokens.^[2] War itself was not the purpose of the struggle. It is instead a confluence of events, moral sentiments, and a history suggesting to the rulers that the ruled were to be dealt with harshly, and further events where interested parties saw an advantage in intensifying struggles in capitalism for various purposes. The liberal philosophy encouraged individual ambition and did not regard civic virtue as inviolable or a given that will always be followed. There may have come a point where rational self-interest overrides any drive to war or internal conflict, and nothing about liberalism proper suggested that it had to turn into what it became. The war within the liberal world and against the remaining holdouts is beyond pointless for any material goal any actor would hold dear. There are material conditions in which the war can continue, and material means by which the practice and cult of war can perpetuate that limit what is possible, but we see here war involves a moral choice to continue the fight. This does not map onto any concept of justice or

the idea that there is a "good war", but rather it means that wars are fought when there is a will to continue, rather than because there was a purpose to the war. The purposes of war may shift because that purpose is decided by the chief participants, and to some extent the willingness of other agents to continue fighting with any sort of effectiveness. Without a will to fight, the partisans of the war cult can only drag others into a fight they didn't want, and this is not a very effective basis for an army, no matter what their logistic superiority and arithmetic may grant them. It may be that both sides of the war are utterly demoralized, and that often is the case, but it would take a special perversion for aristocrats to continue a genuine war with no aims and no real risk.

Such a condition would, if managed, cease to be war in the classical sense, but would carry on the purposes of war and institutionalize war itself in a new way. It is not that war ever ended, but the nature of the war is no longer driven by morale or any purpose. If that is so, then this war can only serve one goal - death and suffering for their own sake. It can only be effective as a social engineering tool by pure negation and destruction, and so it appears not as a war with any objectives, but an incoherent pressing of the nerve. It brays endlessly about power, culminating in the neoconservative hard-on for "power projection" and the bluster of a failed institution. In reality, little power in the meaningful sense is expressed. It is as if a force unlike war at all pervades the society, and it is the aim of such a permanent war to make unmentionable the true nature of the war, until the final moment where its permanence is locked in. This can only result in one goal - a splitting of the society in question into two and only two, with all the neutrals dragged into that segregation, and a third group mysterious walking between the two worlds and directing both. There would be a group selected to live and given every advantage, praise, rigging, and smoke blown up their ass, and a group selected to die whose existence is to be humiliation and the lowest possible state of mankind. In this way, the fratricide and ritual sacrifice that birthed the human race is repeated, and history "ends" for those selected to die. Should war beget war and be nothing else, then this is the only possible state humans can rest in philosophically. The reality of humanity in state society is nothing at all like this, and the construct of a permanent war is no different - and it is that which a third group, however they do so, uses to navigate, cajole, and push history, or pretend to. What I describe here describes the outcome of many things - the origin of the "Eternal War" in the Nineteen-Eighty-Four scenario, the Hegelian conception of historical progress and Marx's inversion of it (which also suggests the third group to those who have a sense of how the philosophy turned out, and suggests also that the entire situation is ridiculous yet continues nonetheless). It describes in essence the three major classes of Plato's Republic and their origin in the fundamental purpose of the republic - "defense" of the city, which is in reality the very pressing of nerves described. It describes the Trinity, ostensibly a Christian doctrine but in reality originating in pagan philosophy and ultimately the ancient Near East. It describes the tripartate splitting of the mind that is very common among humanity, due to its effectiveness in conditions of state societies which wage war more often than

develop peace. War in its purest essence could only create such a division, but the reality of the world is much different. No such tripartate division of society is real, and the wiser philosophers understood this and stated that the story of golden, silver, and copper souls was just a story. What we see in our time is the doctrine eugenics imposed on the state and the whole society, while declaring that "God is unknowable", reality is unknowable, and the state is simultaneously everywhere and nowhere. It is with eugenics that their preferred vision of the world, the highest stage of aristocracy, has sadly become a force unto itself, animating and possessing the eugenic faithful. What results is not so much war or the cult of war, or even spiritual authority or a heightened stage of personal authority. What results, even for the victors selected to live, is nothing at all. If that is the world, we would all have been better off blowing the whole Earth up and sparing us and the world from this abomination. Yet, here we are, despite every warning and sense from the world and our better aspects telling us that this is bad, pointless, not conducive to anything a reasonable person would want out of life. Perhaps the greatest sin of all is that the plan simply will not work, because no one, even the most depraved aristocrat, can continue to carry it out with a straight face, and no one else has any motivation. If that is the world, then money as a motivator is useless. Fear would escalate to a level which makes the motives of war impossible to carry out. Mind control would break down because of the extreme contradiction and futility of the project, and mind control to be realized is not a simple or trivial thing. Shouting "die, die, die!" does not command anyone or anything. It doesn't even create death unless the shouting is granted both mystical authority and a preponderance of material force enclosing the whole world. Anything less and this cult would be a thing kept in its cell, occasionally pushing terrible things into the world but ignored in favor of literally anything else. Of course, such a contraption is a very useful tool, and this is the takeaway of all of the examples mentioned above - that the description of such a world invokes terror because it is not a thing that can be reasoned with, and it abolishes anything real or meaningful. There is something to be said about such a force because it is a thing that can rapidly reproduce, like a material computer worm consuming all memory and disk space. Such a tool would never be the purpose in of itself, but if "die, die, die" can be chanted like a magic spell, that is not an easy thing to give up because it allows death by remote over a large space. It can only truly work by forcing all agents in the society to internalize it.^[3]

The contest for spiritual authority and the meaning of war at the highest level is a complicated matter far beyond the scope of this book, or anything I could possibly write. The more elaborate conceptions of politics entail war, but also much more, and that is something better left for the next book in this series. We can see here that war as a transcendent truth imposed on us is really nonsensical. Wars are fought between people and through the machines they possess, and only in concert do all warring parties form a state of war and a state of affairs regarding it. The motives of warring parties are in the end spiritual ones, and this is not limited to an idea or token or word, or a symbol to be fetishized. I

leave the cult of war for another time, but it is not controversial to accept the existence of this cult on faith as a preliminary discovery, and ask what this cult actually is as we proceed.

THE STRUGGLE FOR TEMPORAL AUTHORITY

To differentiate war, struggle for faith, struggle for life, endemic violence, disputes over property, and the various ways humans fight each other, useful knowledge of how mechanisms to fight, oppress, cajole, manipulate, and so on are necessarily deployed. War is not reducible to a few trite sayings, but war is a particular type of violence committed by humanity. The usual formulation of war is that war is politics by other means, and thus the state and state society are the key distinction between war and other states of aggression. States can, and usually do, present war as a thing which can be controlled, planned, and implemented in measured or limited ways. So too do the partisans who favor war present war as a game or a situation which can be controlled, where one generalissimo waves his mighty hand to move armies and change the world. The language of war is omnipresent in modern society, and in particular the technocratic view of the world which became the default during the 20th century, against which all other views of politics, government, society, science, spiritual and temporal authority were compared. The existence of that technocratic view, and how it came about, is a lengthy discussion of the entire breadth of human history, and it would be quite impossible to describe in detail how warbands eventually turned to the city-state, then to empires, and then to institutions that we would recognize today. It is often forgotten that states are, in the end, little more than associations of men and women who formed the state for their own purposes, rather than some ulterior motive that is above human concerns. All activities we call war are conducted by humans, and usually the intended target of war is other humans rather than the world or forms of life considered lesser. While a war against termites may be a useful metaphor, no one is seriously convinced the termites rouse their comrades to arms or view their existence in the same way humans view their existence as driven by war and peace. A war against the weather or a war against a mountain would be sillier still, because non-living natural events are there, doing their thing, without any regard to our conceits. If you wish to hate a mountain for being in your way, you probably shouldn't burden yourself with the belief that the mountain has it out for you. As much as we often say "the game knows" when fortune disfavors us, the game or the computer simulation really doesn't know. Cold reality is a very poor explanation of war, its purpose, and the motives of those who engage in it. Very little of war, in actuality, concerns any real or material objective, even though our material concerns have been made subject to war and its doctrines for as long as humans followed organized spiritual authority. Wars are materially very expensive, never go as planned, and usually the dispute causing the war could have been resolved much earlier if not for human pigheadedness and a certain cult in human society that desires war for its own sake, as they knew from the outset they would bear none of the consequences and saw war itself as life's prime want. Wars are never

fought for their stated intention, and every general follows interests that make sense to him. Another trite saying, appropriate to modernity, is that war is business, and war as a business shows to new recruits the horrible truth about what they signed up for, which had nothing to do with the idiotic tales of glory and prestige the talking head on television or radio bragged about. War as business is a terrible model for anything other than job security for the worst of mankind, and the cost of this business is catastrophic to the model itself, let alone anything it would feed off to sustain itself. Only through the splitting of the mind in the past century can the meme of the war business be maintained, as a koan chanted by stupid people that justifies itself. If anyone actually thought about the war business, they would see that it is a construct intended for a purpose which is not business, but social engineering.

References to the cult of war have been present throughout this writing, in describing endemic violence and the likely motives of human actors in that time. I have often defaulted to the perspective of someone like myself, who would not be inducted into any cult of war and had every reason to consider the entire enterprise to be the worst bullshit. Without any filter, human history would appear to an alien as an endless series of outrageous betrayals, lies uttered constantly and in every expression common to the race, ultraviolence towards humankind and a system of organized torture and slaughter of animals that was essential to the definition of human civilization, races towards goals that are childish and vapid if someone thought about them for five minutes, institutions that never do anything except hurt others even though the apparent desire of people is to not do that, and a generally dismal existence that would lead an alien to smite the entire monstrosity and made the destruction of Sodom look like the destruction of an anthill. For all the glorification of war and its continued practice, there is scarcely any justification that would make sense even to those who participate in it. It is doubly ridiculous because, if wars had any resemblance to a game with a victory condition, the ways in which wars are fought are hilariously counterproductive, burning through resources at a prodigious rate. No one in the business of war has any incentive to ever see it end, because if war were fought with a mind to winning it, it would become clear in technocratic society that wars could be neutralized forever and the entire expenditure into its practice could be directed towards something that actually produced a return, or simply stored or used for things we would rather do with our time and wealth. An end to war would be the worst of all worlds to those who made their name and reputation off the glory of service to it, and to the states which were born first and foremost because they were instruments of war. The holders of the state operate in their societies as if they were at war with the ruled, and this is the only way such a society could conceive of order and stability. If our societies were oriented towards non-domination or goals of a purely spiritual or productive nature, none of our theories of government or the types of government yet known would be at all acceptable, and so prevalent is the faith in war that the concept of this world without war imagines either an immaculately perfect world where everyone goosesteps by some natural instinct

which perpetuates eternally, or some world where people are too stupid to know how to fight. The concept of actually moving past war while retaining some dignity and the option of fighting is anathema to all theories of government currently known. Even when the cost of war is enormous and there is no good reason to undertake such a ruinous enterprise, certain people insist and insinuate that war must continue no matter what, and often these are among the most worthless members of the middle class and the predatory of all classes whose goals have always been selfish and pigheaded. It is concluded that if there is any possibility of violence, then nature's law is that the violence will be expressed and assert dominance. In short, the predatory element's faith in war is premised on a belief that defensive war is totally ineffective. This is why wars continue to be sold as quick, cheap, and easy to win, no matter how ridiculous those claims are to anyone with a functioning brain and connection to reality. Nowhere was this ethos towards war more dominant than in the second world war, as the entire cope of those who did the most to instigate that war is that defensive war was for sumps and great generals always won their planned offensive campaigns because they're so much smarter. It's strange because the blitz strategy was only effective in certain political situations. The Nazis themselves praised Hitler for being a great conqueror without actually fighting battles, and that was the Nazi modus operandi for making their war expenditure pay off. The entire thing was engineered to favor a bullycoward strategy and insist that the selected losers had to lose, and so the Nazi victories were possible politically because of a large aristocratic fifth column that agreed with everything the Nazis believed and that they were members of the coming master race. They joined in a global movement to purge the world of the weak who believed in things like democracy, communism, and basic decency like not being a screaming maniacal killer. The actions of the Nazis are only sensical if the Nazis were understood as the vanguard of a global movement, rather than simply the ruling party of a particular national project, seen in isolation in history books as a peculiar example. The cult of war of that time included a strange pseudo-history where nation-states were driven by arbitrary identities, and that different races fought for no particular reason whatsoever, and this was just accepted as if it were totally normal and how it always had been. The entire experience of the first world war and what led to it was whitewashed as soon as it was over, in preparation for the second round.

It is at that time when war no longer became a situation of temporary duration, but the permanent and default state of human societies. Peace was to be sold as a commodity in limited supply, and this peace was always backed by some doomsday weapon pointed at civilian centers as a threat of what happens if too many people do not get with the program. It strains credulity to call this situation peace in the sense that anyone would appreciate it, and woe to those who seek peace and believe the institutions in such a society share that interest! In doing this, war ceased to be war in the sense that the concept was appreciated. For war to be war implied that there was a condition called peace, and that war was the exception rather than the rule.^[4] Everyone in the cult of war implicitly believes that peace is an objective, if their cult is to have any meaning. Whether

they actually arrive at peace, or if peace would be good for their true motives, is a different question, but the only leverage a warrior has is that peace is a potential outcome of all war activity. The objective of permanent war is not to make the war absolute, but to place a premium on the promise of peace, and yank it away from people after it is dangled in front of them as a promise. Those who do possess peace are in a limited class, who form islands of humanity where life went on. The enclosure of the world entailed that what we called "life" in free society could no longer be considered life, and all who were outside of this club where peace was possible would be on edge, and put on notice that any seeming peace was an illusion. In most of the world, if you have peace, you merely have not seen the thing that is trying to kill you. It is not a surprise to people that peaceful civilizations do not require threats of nuclear annihilation and extremely violent biological interventions, and the promise of peace through such means is not peace as we originally conceived it. History is revised to suggest that it has always been this way, and what we thought was peace in the past was an illusion. This "enlightenment" about the permanence of war and the ruling institutions ignores entirely the nature of past armies and campaigns, and how the war machine operated from Antiquity up to the turn of the 20th century. War was indeed typical of states and always available as a threat, but the theory of society and the state in practice - whether it was the feudal or liberal model, or some other model imagined - was that society could only be possible under regular order, and this meant that laws and enforcement had to at least appear as if they followed principles understood by all participants in society, or at least all participants that were considered mentally valid. Even if there were distinct classes and political and social inequality was the rule, anyone with a mind lived in the same world, even if they were a slave. For any theory of society to remain in force, and this is true today for it is a rule of nature rather than a rule we made, there must be an assumption that there is a real world where events happen, and that social distinctions were only meaningful because people of different classes would do different things, held different property, and possessed different characteristics in some way that was appreciated by all. War, to be war, entails that a society is under attack. There is no form of "socially acceptable" war that is purely a ritualistic practice, however much idiots like to tell us that such a thing is possible. A ritual war carried out without purpose is not war in any sense that would be appreciated as relevant, and the ritual war could be replaced with some chanting and then marching the intended sacrifices to a death furnace, and believing that this was just totally natural and not at all weird. There may be rituals pertaining to war and a way that is considered normal - that is to say, some code that warriors abide among each other, and that is more or less expected in warriors' behavior towards civilians.

War as a practice is waged by one society against another, and for the purposes of war, the two societies are alien until reconciliation happens. War to be war is a war not against a particular entity, or even initiated by a particular entity like a state, but against society as a concept. War as a practice has long been known to corrode the bonds of a society, forcing members of a society into behaviors

they would not normally consider. War as a team-building exercise is a hilarious folly, and anyone suggesting that wars and armies build comradeship is either very naive about how armies operate, or is lying to someone who they want to fear the military. The default attitude of a soldier towards their own army is distrust, and this is expected and serves a very real function. Soldiers who are blind followers and do not know what they are shooting or why they do it are not desirable. A certain level of connection to reality and fidelity to truth is necessary for someone to actually practice war, even if it is a planned war or ritual war and the true motives are far removed from any stated motive. The soldier's level of knowledge does not need to be perfect or "100% sane", and usually isn't. Militaries are premised on a control of information at every level, but with the information a soldier is given and with the senses a soldier possesses, he is expected to operate as if he knows his domain, and to know the chain of command, and why he is to follow orders no matter how ridiculous. By no means does this obligate the chain of command to give a shit about making their subordinates useful, or suggest that superior officers would do anything other than ratfuck the lower grunts. The same attitude exists among soldiers of the same rank. Everything necessary to be an effective soldier and fight works against comradeship, trust, and friendship. The breakdown of morale and unit cohesion is something any commander has to think about if they have to actually do something. If you need to go to war to find friends or discover yourself, you are in the worst place possible for that to happen. The war cult does not give you any more order to life than it deems fit to allow you for its purposes.

It should be made clear that war, as a practice, is not intrinsically political, nor is war the essence of politics. The state in any conception could not arise before war as a practice was already in force, and so speaking of war as purely the domain of states or politics is an inaccurate division. We do divide the wars waged by states from wars engaged by organizations of inferior standing, that cannot make the claims a proper state does. There are then organizations waging war which do not conform to states in a sense that states are commonly recognized, but that form governments and armies in their own right. The British East India Company was not a state unto itself in the sense that states were recognized, but the Company's army was larger in numbers than the monarch's official army, and the Company conducted its affairs in its own interest, rather than the Company being purely an extension of the Crown as would be presumed. Increasingly, the Company's influence in the empire grows, and the methods the company employs permeate in the rest of British society, and then societies around the world. This is the birth of the free trade system and the logic of modern capitalism, and brought about modern understanding of class war and what interests and which people were fighting whom. What became a political affair was not at first recognized as political or the affairs of proper war, but would become the default that someone today readily recognizes. There would be some point in human existence where there were no states as such, or even anything that could be passed off as a state except in embryonic form, but there was plenty of war and warbands could form if there were enough men who figured

out they could beat up others in the neighborhood to get what they want. At the core, there is a choice of certain people to do this, and then it is on everyone else to defend against that. The state proper, and thus politics as we know it, came about because of people, rather than some impulse in humanity necessitating formal states or formal states being necessarily useful for organizing human effort. Politics involves a great deal else that does not require war, or fighting of any sort. Political entities of any sort have to reckon with a material world and the details of production, and the politician's intervention to ensure this is not something he can resolve by appeals to struggle, as if he can whip farmers to make food grow on a barren rock. Whether a politician deigns to go down to where the ordinary workers live and think about what workers actually do is a choice, but eventually a politician will have to meet his constituents where they are at, rather than what the politician believes others ought to be. At the very least, the politician cajoling or bullying a hated subordinate knows whomever he is attacking will act in defiance of the politician's wishes, and has some idea of how to engineer the situation so the subordinated can't escape, or at least can keep the subordinated at bay. You might think that the state and politicians would see that maybe they could help out, so people don't have to struggle so much over basic things and we'd all be far more efficient. That is not what the state does, though. War has much to do with why states exist as they do, and war at its core is something apart from states, and would exist even if we did not believe states had any legitimacy. Politicians cannot change war or make it into something other than what it is. If war changes, it is changed by those who wage war, rather than changed by those who supply to the people their ideas of what war is. War, and thus its effects on society and the state, changes all of the time, in contradiction of the old saying from *Fallout* that war never changes. Certain elements that drive the cult of war, and the core convictions of the war cult, are far less likely to change, but those elements do not need to confine themselves to the domain of war, and always seek to infest any practice, including those that never had anything to do with war or peace.

We may recognize war in principle as a game played between two societies. We will call these societies teams, even though "team" is for the reasons mentioned above not a reason to suggest that anyone on these teams likes each other. Societies are understood as human agents, and all that is their property is marked as possessions of those agents in some way or another. The property is distinguished from things in the environment that are not claimed by anything in a society. Both societies have their models to consider what is theirs, what belongs to the enemies, and what is neutral. The objective of both societies is to destroy the integrity of the other society, so that changes may be made that are suitable to the victor. In the ideal example, both societies consider themselves to begin this game as their ideal, or at least, they recognize the conditions of their society as a thing they are defending, and recognize that changes to that society, its values and methods, are a threat to defending that thing. The war is a game played by all members in both societies, regardless of whether they want to play or not. War, to be war, entails the mobilization of the whole society in

this effort. Even if this mobilization does not make the fullest use of all agents and property, it is presumed that the society could marshal everything at its disposal in the effort. To do otherwise would limit the essential nature of war to something other than what it would need to be if it were indeed war. War is organized towards a singular goal of destroying the other society, so that it may be restructured as the victor wishes. In principle, total destruction is on the line for both sides, and the warring parties do not agree beforehand the scope of what may and may not be changed in the other society. There may be expectations that some things cannot be changed, but in principle, the plan of war suggests that the other society may be broken and reassembled as the victor wishes. If the victor cannot actually do this, it raises questions of why the victorious party went to war in the first place, unless the victor were aware of what war aims could be accomplished and that they were indeed possible. To suggest an absolute limit to the destruction and reorganization of the enemy would be to place the activity below the proper meaning of "war". The full realization of those limits is not necessary for war to be war, but the game is not war unless that possibility is a part of the game. All of the actors in this game are not, in principle, bound by any law other than natural laws that are outside of the control of any participant. Whatever is materially possible, including self-induced changes to your own team's core convictions, is possible. It is entirely possible for one team to forfeit entirely war at any time, but forfeit means the other team decides whatever terms it desires. Whether the team that is victorious after their opponent's forfeit can affect the other team in the way it desires is not a matter dictated by war as a practice; and so a team that is winning by all metrics may forfeit the war, conceding to the other team a "win", while the "loser", who may present themselves as winners regardless of their forfeit, does whatever they may want, accepting that the outcome of the war for the other team is locked in. Whatever relations exist between the two teams after the war is not strictly speaking the business of war. War, to be war, implies that there is a winner and loser judged by both teams, and by anyone who wants to referee this game. Winning and losing is essential to war, regardless of what someone might consider philosophically the point of it is. If "everyone is a winner", or "war has no winners", then the activity engaged in is not war in any way we would appreciate it as a concept, but some ritual that may appear to be war but is something else entirely. There are in war many sub-games which are called "battles", "skirmishes", or other such events which are of a similar manner, within the domain where they are believed to take place. These sub-games all relate to each other in the overall game of war.

War, then, is at heart a tool for social engineering. It is not a thing that serves a purpose, or accomplishes material motives. Wars are not fought for land, or prizes, or esteem, or for ideology, or for religion. They are not fought for any ulterior motive that must exist. The point of war as a practice is to engineer an enemy society, which is understood to be an enemy, and wars are undertaken by societies that consider their own members friends for the purpose of war. This is the basic Schmittian conception of the political, but it is in reality something

particular to the practice of war. Not all conflicts are war, for there can be conflicts within a society or fights between people that aren't part of any war plan. Not all politics is defined by conflict, for the concerns of the state are not solely defined by war. It is through war that societies were engineered to create the state and the political as we know it. Political thinking was not something inherent to mankind in any fixed form, beyond the most basic observations of how human consciousness is constituted and how a man would have to comport himself. We did not reach some critical period where human beings were now and forever political animals, and could be nothing but that. The first political thought is not a thought of war in the sense we have described, nor is the first political thought purely about struggle. Political thought began in the first instance out of a desire in people to claim something, and to establish themselves as something apart from the world and apart from other conscious entities like themselves. How a politician sought to do that could vary. War, on the other hand, did not require political thought to be realized. Warlike behavior can be found in animals, and it is not carried out at a purely instinctive level or for some ulterior motive the animals conceived. We have observed certain members of the ape kingdom engage in battle and coordinate tactics with each other, yet there isn't really a political structure beyond the typical sociality of animals. The political and social are two different concepts, and war at heart is a social behavior, rather than the behavior of political entities or particular institutions.

War is not the only tool for social engineering, but many times the social engineer invokes the language and methods of war, viewing the population that is ruled or experimented on to be an enemy. Mengele's atrocities do not serve any scientific purpose, nor are they necessary conditions for a scientist to conduct social experiments. Social scientists and psychologists have often been able to find lab rats in the wild so to speak, and damaged people are of lesser value for the social and psychological experiments. The methods of certain social engineers to force certain people into these experiments under threat of torture, and a culture which glorifies the immiseration of research subjects as good unto itself, is not necessary for science. It is not even necessary for the destructive aims that this 'social research' is a cover for, because it would be possible to simply exterminate or imprison people without any social experiment, and it has long been known that these social experiments have no actual value that promotes knowledge. The quality of knowledge that is gleaned from social experiments on prisoners and psychiatric slaves is usually determined by the researcher's willingness to view the human lab rats as people, at least in certain regards that would make the experiment proceed smoothly and allow the researcher to gather the information desired. The brutality shown in these Mengele-type atrocities, which would always be advanced by Fabian Society types, was an expression of their ethos which demanded such behavior of a "proper scientist", so that the Fabian technocrat and believer was blooded and did things in the way their ethos insisted it must be. This activity of torturing and humiliating human lab rats is not even an expression of the cult of war, or a use of war for particular social engineering goals. The true intent of these atrocities, and

the Fabians' own propaganda showing this torture to the general public, is a declaration of war against the general public, to put normal and decent people on notice that if they don't get with the program, anyone can be tortured and sacrificed. The logic behind this is not difficult to see. Even if you see it for what it is though, it is necessary for the public relations ghoul to push this image in front of the American television watcher, and present this image to them every day, or frequently enough so that it is normalized. The purpose is never to convince someone by rational argument to submit, because most normal people have submitted and know not to transgress an unwritten law. The purpose is to conduct war-like behavior against a general public that is viewed as an enemy, and dare anyone to ignore it or refrain from taking part in it. The general public themselves are seen by such researchers as a mass of lab rats, and the whole country a laboratory, and the seething contempt at the core of their ethos is the point of this "research". None of this research into mass psychology tells the technocrat anything he didn't already know about human behavior, because it was known from the outset that torturing people and using these mechanisms would provoke certain reactions and affect the desired behavioral changes. When the result of the "experiment" comes out the way the torturer wanted, the findings are posted to the world as some grand discovery, and it as if there was no chain of torture to make this real. When the information gathered from observing the masses does not prove what the torturer wanted - when the people refuse to go along with this game - the torturer makes up results that say the experiment actually says what the torturer wanted, and the same celebration of a grand discovery is proclaimed to the public for the same purposes. Somewhere, a researcher compiles voluminous records of the actual state of the people, with every avenue available to them. Data harvesting in the neoliberal period is a gigantic enterprise, and internet users or anyone who must submit to institutions is monitored and probed to see what their tendencies are. This information is not so much used for genuine research purposes, but as part of a command and control mechanism, which relies on a form of social engineering that is entirely warlike.

Social engineering in general entails a division of the society into two - the engineers and the ruled. It may seem conceivable to engineer society without war as such, but in every effort of one group to command another, the two groups presume hostility towards each other. If members of either group are mistaken about the nature of the relationship, the situation asserts that the hostility appears natural and inevitable. This is not because there was a struggle of groups inherent in nature, as if such a conflict were an inexorable law. It is instead the conceit of engineering itself that must assert that one group rules and another is subject to rule. If we were to envision a society-wide compact or agreement, it could not be "engineering" as such. Even if every single participant was an engineer, the very act of social engineering requires splitting the mind and experience into two, and only two - master, and slave. The attitude of each towards the other is a state of war, and the peace of an engineered society is no peace at all.

In practice, a society looking inside itself cannot afford to dwell on the matter for long, as many societies already exist, with institutions and bodies of men ready to go. Their relations, whatever their past struggles, are a real thing rather than a thing imagined in a model. Their bodies are real and their actions occur in a real world, rather than in the imagined world of a theorist or a political conceit. Societies, of course, are never unitary things by some natural law. Their definition is fluid. In the act of war, the two societies are for the purposes of conflict internally united, regardless of any internal relations suggesting division. It is not possible to opt out of war once it is initiated, however much we may try. It is possible for individuals to avoid the war as much as possible, but at no point can the participants pretend the war is not happening.^[5] It must at least be safe to pretend it's not happening, but the more sober analysis of war is to be inured to its happenings so long as a rational expectation is that neither side wants to kill you out of pure hatred for neutrality. That way, the motives of agents in the warring camps may spare you, which is a far better view of the situation than pure ignorance or paranoia about unknowns because the brain has been trained to interrupt the rational process allowing it to navigate a war scenario. It is the aim of eugenics to terminate this possibility for the neutrals so that they can only speak of a vague, inchoate war at indeterminate locales, involving mysterious people and things you are told can't possibly exist, while said things are visible and the warring factions invoke fantastic technologies and capabilities. The ideal is that the eugenist claims science is magic, and that the technology involved is far beyond anything the warring factions actually possess, or is impossible not just by knowledge of nature and physics, but impossible from basic logical analysis. If that is accomplished, then the conditions of eugenics as Galton called them are attained, and it is only in that situation that eugenics worthy of the name is possible. Anything less would be a false prophecy and a very weak "Jihad". It is for that reason that the British doctrines of science associated natural science and empiricism with occultism, wizardly, and magic. This trope is repeated in science fiction and in the new religious movements, in addition to the tropes of space aliens which are an obvious proxy for the most worthless, inbred aristocracy mankind ever produced. The origins of this mystique are not in its appeal to knowledge in the genuine sense, or a machine to manipulate knowledge for its own sake. The habitual lying of the eugenist is necessary because it is necessary to declare that there is no war and there is no God nor Satan, while war, Satan, and increasingly vague conceptions of God or the gods are prominent throughout the society.^[6]

The practices of war did not arise fully formed, but like anything else, arose from prior conditions to arrive at the organization of societies in this way. The earliest practice of war would be, as mentioned before, nothing more than a few men figuring out that they can do it. They didn't need a cult, or some dark energy telling them to do this. Their actions did not start a grand cycle of spiritual importance, and the drive to violence existed long before them. Part of the mystique of the cult of war, which was always a spiritual authority rather than a true appeal to the unconscious lizard brain, is to essentialize war,

and obscure its intent for long enough that others are cowed into submission, without any actual fighting. One lasting legacy of war is to allow for the war party to simply take what they want through tribute, habituating humans to pay up just as the herd of cattle or sheep were habituated by a drover. Every aristocracy that defined itself by its monopoly on the cult of war - that is, the warrior aristocracy - viewed humanity as livestock, and the warriors as the lone exception. The priests a warrior aristocracy aligned with, including the priestly functions warriors themselves filled if the priest and warrior was one and the same, were a thin excuse to cover up this goal, if the excuse would even be given. This or that god, or any particular tenet except those absolutely necessary to perpetuate this use of men as livestock, was not of particular importance. You get the sense with the religion of a warrior aristocracy that they just make up whatever shit works, then forget they did it the next day. Someone could dig through the Vedas and find some myth that suited whatever was in vogue at the time, and since the Vedas were spread by oral tradition and pedagogy was strictly enforced as the sole method to teach them, it's not hard to see that this is the spiritual and religious tradition of people who had a warlike view and did not want information getting out to the wrong people. Such is the way of most religions, which always hide their juicy insights to those who are inducted and can be pulled aside to hear the real plan. Inherent in this approach is not any self-defense, but a contempt for the unbeliever and those who failed the rites of manhood, who would be judged lesser. The practices of sorting the population out usually did not take the form of a war, but the approaches that would be used for war would be activated towards a long-run goal that could be spread by religion and daily practice. The language of war and a particular attitude towards struggle is present in virtually every religious practice mankind knows, and the few exceptions to this rule are never doctrines that can spread far. The only truly pacifistic doctrines that can spread are those which are designed to weaken and degrade men who were already judged to be cattle.

WAR AS A SOCIAL ACTIVITY BETWEEN TWO OPPOSING CAMPS OF AGENTS

To build a general understanding of war without its political or spiritual connotations, the first view of war is that it is entirely a concern of social agents. To the world or non-thinking objects, war is a meaningless state. To those who do not participate in the activity, war is something they seek to avoid. It is not a given that all the world is embroiled in the war of two opposing camps, regardless of any claims of the warring parties to the outside world. War, like life itself, is an alien to the world, and war is further an alien to those who are not participants. Only indirectly are people dragged into a war at first. For many who are dragged into war, their participation in the activity is never full commitment or anything close to it. A true "total war", in the meaningful sense of the word, is only possible if the agent's commitment to the practice is lifelong and never departs once war commences. For the true believers, there are no half-measures. All externalities are reduced to one distinction - ally or adversary.

This is quite different from the Schmittian political conception of friend and enemy, for friendship and hostility in that sense entails something more than the practice of war, and concerns matters altogether alien. The allies in a war may be your enemies the next day, and never trusted in the first place, but for war to be conducted in any coherent manner, there are two and only two opposing camps in each conflict. A third or fourth party is not entering the same "war" in the technical sense, but opening another war with the participants. We may see war as an activity not as a general state vaguely defined, but as two distinct bodies which must be defined like any society would be defined. It is not waged between institutions, nor is the practice of war in of itself an institution. It is something altogether different, and the warring parties take on the characteristics of single social agents. This is necessary because the practice of war is only coherent if the two opposing sides are united in purpose. If the participants of one side are scattered and command of one society completely breaks down, there is no longer "war" as such - just one society destroying the other, disposing of it like a man would dispose of any possession. No law of war or law of nature governs that disposition. War to be war presumes that such questions of authority are not governed by any higher power necessarily. The participants may believe there is a god or heavenly force regulating the world or compelling war, and no war occurs in a vacuum. For our purposes of isolating war as a social activity, though, the war is fought on its own terms, without any outside interference. If the world is to be described as nothing but a cosmic war between light and darkness, it does not conform to the practice of war among humans, which is a particular deployment in society. There is no war without battles or definite events, or war without agents which regard some authority. However the executive of war is determined, there is an executive function on both sides out of necessity. If none exists, it either becomes necessary to elevate some war chief or for someone to assume authority to mount any defense, or there was some protocol of the defending party in place that suggested collective action of members in case of such an attack, which is put into effect the moment war begins. For practical purposes, that protocol likely entails appointing a war chief, or dictator, or turning to an existing executive, as humans for most of their history only follow the orders of other humans.

The war cannot be separated from a society that wages it, and it will always be waged by a society. If the society is defunct in any recognizable form - if its history is scattered to the winds - then the particular war it was involved in can no longer be considered operative. Whatever situation exists for the remnants would be a new thing, even if the other party's hostility persists. The other party may insist that the war is not over, not because the opposing society remains a threat, but because the land and possessions of the enemy are still coveted and have yet to be claimed. The reality of the world is that war does not unilaterally dictate the state of a society or of the world. War itself is yet another tool society and its agents use to manipulate the world, or so they believe. It is impossible to speak of a war that "just happens" without deliberation or purpose, and those who would insist war is that commit to a foulness far worse than any war. Such

a beast is an altogether different animal, scarcely related to the question we pose here. It is simple to say that there is no war without warriors, no capitalism without capitalists, no communism without cities organized as communes or commonwealths^[7], which are definite entities with distinct definitions.

War is never an activity to unite a fractured society to make it one as a fait accompli. For war to commence, one side, however it is constituted, is united for the practice of war and the practice of war only. If outside agents are subsumed into one faction, those agents are assimilated as they were, rather than as what the mind organizing war wishes them to be, or assigns them to be. This is true of any ally joining the cause, and of the grunts that are conscripted and drilled. If the war was supposed to unify a society of fractured, atomized agents, all the condition of war does is make real an association that would have existed before the war began. Wars cannot draw in people that are too disconnected from a society to realistically integrate into a war formation. They would have been attached enough to the society, in whatever way that was possible, to be considered an agent that could be integrated into war in some way. Serfs and slaves were conditioned to pass from master to master without any interest in the war, serving the new master just as they served the old. The product of the slaves certainly mattered to the war machine, so much that the slaves were value to be captured and became a motivator to continue war. The only way this conditioning can set in is through a tacit admission of the warring parties that slavery is sacrosanct and in the interest of both before war begins. No one can question slavery, or some other institution that is to be captured and controlled. Only in that way do agents which have no reason to personally regard the authority of the warring factions integrate into the war machine, and reliably pass to a new master. This didn't always happen, as general slaughter is a useful expedient to get rid of unsightly people. Usually, though, the reliable agents of a war machine are free men who must at the least be motivated enough to pick up a weapon and follow whatever stupid orders they are given. This is not a trivial ask, however much the ideologists claim that humans are warriors or war is the natural order. In any event, the sides of both wars are set at the moment a war is initiated, and a clear executive on both sides is apparent that can make decisions at the highest level. If people are dragged into a war after it starts, those dragged in will likely see the war as bullshit against their interests, or part of some scheme they might have devised while sitting comfortably apart from the war. The executive leader during war only changes by an orderly and controlled process, and without internal deliberation for long - such an activity as election would undermine command during a crucial period. If the leader is deposed by subterfuge or infighting, this will weaken severely the cohesion of the war effort, and it is expected the new leader is able to maintain loyalty of those fighting for the same cause, or the new leader is there to end the war and escape from the past administration's handling of the situation. These conditions all make it clear that war readiness relies on a cohesive society already extant. The aggressor further must carefully plan the initial attack, stage armies and draw up everything the war will need. No war is entered carelessly or as a reactive

measure, and all war actors remain aware of potential threats. Surprise attacks are not too surprising, and where they exist, the response of the defender should be rapid and a thing any polity prepares for against any rival, so much as it is possible to do so. At no point is a whole enemy society a piece of meat to be carved up effortlessly. The war planners usually expect the enemy society to be malleable to the initial attack and must expect the enemy is permeable for their battle plans to work. Those who initiate wars are perpetual optimists, and this is not the result of ignorance or pigheadedness. If war were initiated with a great fear of the outcome of an attack, the war planner must seriously question if the war is a good idea in the first place, if the war is purely a war of choice and the objective is to carve up an enemy. No war plan can afford pessimism when it comes from the attacker. Overconfidence and a blindness to the obvious reality that war is hard must overtake the war planner to make the war appear feasible. For most of human history, this rule was easy enough to believe, because those who plan a war will likely gather knowledge of the enemy's way of life, positions, strategic holdings, and has a reasonable expectation of how the enemy and allied side can fight.

It was never the case that a war planner plunged into a war blindly, as if wars are planned by people dumber than the peasants they cajole and threaten to accept the war - or else. Whatever their reasoning, wars are entered with some deliberation to be wars, and aims are held by those who truly command the war. The aims of war are never the aims announced to the lower classes, for the true aims of war are so foul and pointless to the rest of us that suggesting the truth of war is not palatable for a mass audience. In early times, the common people would be told of glorious victories, rapes, and most of all plunder which the common people might get a piece of if the war goes well. In later times, wars were sold as a matter of security, facing an existential threat, or as a vehicle for social advancement in a eugenic society. The true aims of war are none of those things, but something far more base - that for the aristocracy, war is a game, and the sacrifice of blood and the orgies celebrating victory with lurid sex and women defecting to the conqueror is really the point of this stupid exercise. That's all it ever was. No ulterior motive can be said to be truly worth fighting for, short of a society fighting for its life. Even this fight for a society's life may be questioned by its malcontents, for whom the society was always an alien. The conqueror, whatever shit he may bring, is likely to be the same as the old boss, and no great patriotism can be detected in any time. Even more than that, the commoner and the ruler long despise each other, and the only reason this arrangement exists is because most of mankind was forced at gunpoint and by repeated threats of terror to accept this aristocratic nightmare and all of its humiliations, none of which serve any goal most of mankind would ever have wanted.

We concern ourselves with the practices that constitute war, rather than a diplomatic state recognized between the two societies. War does not have any natural purview where the society can claim unilaterally that a part of it is off-limits to an enemy, nor can an attacker claim that their war is one of limited aims

that can be guaranteed or naturalized. When two societies are at peace, there are no warlike acts committed between them whatsoever. Peace as a concept does not mean "you can have a little war sometimes, as a treat". Someone might conduct a raid into enemy territory without any formal declaration, obscuring the actor or making an excuse that an individual acted out of line. These acts are acts of war, and the aggrieved party may react to them in whatever way they like. No diktat of the aggressor may unilaterally declare what someone is allowed to do in retaliation, demand reciprocity, or make demands that are natural and justified. Someone can decide, in principle, that insults or words are acts of war and treat them as such. The important act of war is social engineering, and gossip or informational exchange can be construed as that when conducted for clearly hostile purposes. Whether a formal state of war or any retaliation at all is made does not change that acts of war are seen as such by anyone. Any social actor declaring a unilateral right of aggression, conquest, or absolute impunity from consequence, is declaring an egregious act of war and arrogance. It speaks of the aggressor's intent that war acts are not merely a tool for an end, but a law of nature that is held sacrosanct. In short, the absolute impunity a bully insists to be his natural right would, if war were premised on reciprocity or justice, be seen not just as a war act by declaration alone, but the aggrieved party would see nothing short of extermination of the bully as the only acceptable end state. Such a statement is not one that can be taken back or reformed, for it speaks of something more odious than a simple war act, and suggests the intent of the aggressor to commit to unlimited terror to defend this intellectual claim. It can be ignored, especially if the bully is unwise to how bullying as a tactic works. All bullies rely on institutions granting this absolute impunity to be effective. Otherwise, the bully can only rely on his personal strength, and this is only possible in a confined space against a much weaker opponent. The war is waged by societies which form the institution of war which allows permission where none is granted. No one will ever give you permission to attack them or permission to defend against them. This, of course, is the language of war, with all of its consequences. The demand for absolute impunity for eugenic institutions constitutes an egregious and act of war, but more than that, it proclaims war is natural and eternal, and insists that this war is some sort of service or help. The thrill of torture can only be maximized if such statements are made, and to even let them be made is itself an egregious act of war made natural. It is something altogether different from war as it was understood. For all of the egregiousness of the eugenic creed, it never is particularly successful. It makes living abortions only at exorbitant cost, using highly ineffective torture to modify behavior. It does so not because this strategy is useful in the sense that war acts are judged to be useful, but because the thrill of making the assertion is what eugenics does. It did not need any justification, any utility, or any demonstrable merit to the act. Since I am still alive, their strategy has not been terribly effective, and the same is true of the torture and thrill of maximal torture that eugenics represents. They do so because they can, and in some way, the eugenicist cannot help itself. It is, and always will be, a Satanic ape that insists that humanity be a Satanic race and a failed race,

brought to its lowest possible conditions. The utility of driving down the cost of labor in the abstract is not terribly relevant. The utility of the death cult and killing is only partially relevant. There is no version of eugenics which can end, and there is no taking back such an egregious offense against anyone. Therefore, violent attacks against those who advance the eugenic creed, in any way, do not require any remorse or sense that this is "equally wrong" or something to equivocate with the unique, Satanic terror of the eugenicist. Ignorance of the law and reality is no excuse. Enablers of eugenics face the same fate as the ultraviolent who live for the thrill of maximal torture.

WAR AS SOCIAL ENGINEERING - A PICTURE OF LATE MODERNITY

To keep the religion of war active, it was necessary every now and then to engage in the genuine article. Whether there was anything to be gained was less relevant than a religion of war requiring sacrifices and ritual practice, and after enough games and inter-cine conflict had been exhausted, the religion of war could only find an external opponent to attack. There was almost never any material cause or benefit from the war, with the most obvious treasure being slaves. Slaves are problematic without an enforcement mechanism to ensure their submission. The typical practice, when it was not just wholesale slaughter, was to kill outright all males except the weakest and the youngest, and to kill any female who was defiant and wouldn't accept the right of conquest - and the "right of conquest" is pure sexual pathology made into a political tenet. The weakest males would become slaves, and the greater the submission, the greater the disdain. The youngest boys would be slaves, raised in the culture of the oppressor, and would be living symbols of victory and the corruption of the loser. It would become common practice for the females to go with conquerors, with the most venal of them lining up to welcome conquering armies, since that is how the great mating game goes. In an era before patriotism or any sense of pride took root, it was war against war, and bitter griping for those on the losing end of war, which was most of humanity. If the cult of war were absolute, this would have been the end of history: a roiling battlefield where the purest Social Darwinism enslaves most of the world in pointless fighting, never progressing beyond a level of war suitable to maintain the status of the losers as livestock, and any movement to suggest that humanity could be something else would be considered retarded, insane, and so anyone suggesting such an idea would be killed on sight. Since there were a great many people who did possess this view, it was and would remain a common sight to do exactly this, and so many visionaries who imagined a peaceful world would be tortured, publicly humiliated, and scorned for suggesting that the cult of war was retarded. You could say war was bad, or mean, or evil, or costly. You could say frankly that war is Hell, because that was undeniable to anyone who thought about war with any sort of clarity, or even put two and two together to figure out what this is. You could never say that the religion of war or the cult of war was "retarded". That was beyond the pale. If war were considered merely stupid, it was always an inferior sort of stupidity

that did not have any of the stigma that would be associated with fools. If someone were to say that the cult of war and religious veneration of it was the full, disgusting retardation that it actually is, that person was to be killed on sight and never allowed to suggest that idea. To suggest it and mean it would lead to a number of conclusions that would undo the conspiratorial project that a cult of war engages in to perpetuate itself. To say the cult of war is retarded is to say, without hesitation, that a warrior aristocracy can be and should be exterminated down to the last man, and any such structure should never be allowed to insinuate itself again for any reason. That development could never be allowed to happen, and this was sensed by the earliest ideologues of war, who knew what they possessed and that the great game could never actually end. This dictum that war must never end had to be followed enough of the time to ensure the practice of war never abated, but it could only be enforced for so long and with so much vigor. Few people were so committed to the war cult, and even if they were, they lacked a modern understanding of ideology and its perpetuation, relying mostly on low cunning and the superficial brilliance that is as common as dirt in the human race.

For all the talk today about the eternal struggle for life and the prevalence of war as the default state of mankind, if you look around, you find very few people who are true believers in any cult of war. They have always existed, and have always been able to insinuate themselves in various places. They can be found among the most intelligent of priests, who use all of their intellect devising new ways to torture and mutilate the damned and are the most dangerous of the lot, and they can be found among the ordinary fighting men who were at first not that different from any other man. They can be found among the lowest classes, and among men who are abject failures and would have been laughed out of any proper army. The cult of war does not necessarily entail being good at war in its actual manifestation. Very often, the fiercest believers in the cult of war are terrible at actually fighting, or even the drilling and ritual that conditions men to be useful for anything. War could prevail not because it was natural or inherent, but because war was materially useful for certain objectives. The most obvious is defense. If it takes only a few people to decide they're going to be assholes to the bitter end, there would need to be an awareness in society that this is a possibility, and the most obvious way to contend with this smallest of warbands is to meet them with another warband. War in any form is only countered with war, even if the defending party is a small contingent who see their function as one of security or peacekeeping. Even if the defender's methods are methodically pacifistic and refrain from anything that is seen as unwarranted, illegal, or immoral, those methods are constructed with the same aims as a violent war plan. The cult of war's lack of appeal to a broad base in humanity is not a matter of simple moral sentiment that could be adjusted with education. If that were the case, then the program of instilling this social value through state schooling would have been successful in no more than two generations, and there would not be a surviving man or woman who was not a purely fanatical zealot for the war creed. Any who disagreed would be immediately killed in

broad daylight and this would be seen as meritorious and morally correct. This view is what ideologues always allude to and insinuate is the silent majority, and they assume everyone thinks like them at heart.

We should ask why war, either as a cult or the practice itself, is so unpopular. We can overcome our native disgust towards acts like killing or torture, although those are a common demotivator, as is the effort required to kill or torture someone who will avoid that fate, and the risk of retaliation against an opponent who does not regard a state's monopoly on legal violence. Those motives are all very practical reasons to despise war, but if the only argument against a cult of war is that war is hard and costly and risky, in the long run the cult of war would win by removing all of the risks and habituating people to accept terms of living which keep the cost of war down. This is what the cult of war and its advocates pursue as their strategy to continue the game, and so it has been accounted for. Still, the cult of war provokes a certain distaste beyond the obvious, and beyond the mere existence of counter-forces that suggest a moral, ethical, and philosophical stance that works against war. What is the source of that distaste for war, that makes it a bad enough idea that it isn't the first instinct of every human being? If the impulse to join the cult of war was as natural as its ideologues believe, the human race would be very different and it would not be possible to sucker most people into accepting states as we know them, or the moral philosophies that prevail. Obviously, the existence of moral codes that oppose war and its cult had to come from some seed, so at the very least, there would be a tendency in people that avoids the cult of war. There would be multiple tendencies, whereas the tendency for a cult of war is a singular proposition. There are not multiple variants of war, for the essential nature of war is a very particular proposition, and any type of war that is less than the genuine article would be dismissed as irrelevant and falls to the wayside. Any variant conception of war that would claim to be co-equal would be challenged on a number of grounds if someone were to suggest the true nature of war, if war as a practice were stripped of its political or human connotations and were understood as a mechanism in its own right. War as a means to an end has been proven to be counterproductive, when there are many ways to accomplish those ends that don't entail the particular mobilization that war entails. A war mentality is not necessary for social organization to exist in the first place, because most of our existence, even in a war-dominated society, must out of necessity acknowledge a basis other than war if members of that society wish to define themselves as anything other than a thing that fights other societies, in which there is no world outside of this limited social activity, and the warring societies are believed to constitute the entirety of the world. Such a world would not have any basis to exist except pure appropriation, and would exhaust its resources eventually. The ethos of eugenics, as warlike as it is, is not reducible to the war cult alone, and the extensive war cult in eugenic society is only a small part of what eugenism entails. A society dominated by a war cult and war mobilization alone, where all other mobilization is inferior to the war effort, would still be driven by concerns that would be inimical to eugenics,

like actually being able to win battles or build something beyond more eugenics. A war cult has to at least appear like it can win battles, while eugenic society has been premised on a pervasive sickness where elaborate war plans are drawn every day but nobody regards anything battleworthy as useful. Eugenics is a level of depravity that even the most pathetic war cult ideologues could not match. I mention the hideousness of eugenics here because one consequence of the eugenic creed in its full horror is that it is one of the few things that would make a warmongering death cult appear positively enlightened by comparison. Eugenics, though, could only proliferate under highly specific conditions which were engineered. The eugenic creed is so unnatural that even its partisans have difficulty following through with its conclusions in full, unless they are in a hardcore cult echo chamber and have entirely given over their minds and souls to it. The war cult, even in its most fanatical forms, isn't particularly difficult to comprehend, and makes enough sense that almost everyone can figure out what it is after a sufficient introduction to such a society. We rule out naivete then as an argument as to why the war cult provokes distaste. Most of us are aware on some level that war is a thing and that it is not the narratives we are told about glory and victory, but something altogether different. Too many people have come back from war and told us it is bullshit, and there is no way to pretend for long that the narrative sops about war's glory are anything more than moonshine. Even the stupidest of us can figure out a few things about the nature of war and why it happens. After all the basic moral sentiments against killing and the typical consequences of war are taken care of - and war as a practice entails a great many things that do not involve killing or maiming - there is still something in war that is distasteful to every sense we possess, such that even the most devout war cultists have to consider how they will sell war in the future.

The true answer is not inherent to the cult of war itself, but a simple truth about the organizations that would wage it. There really is no society, in the sense we are told to believe it exists. When Margaret Thatcher announced that to the world in the 1980s, she hit a chord that resonated with the sense many of us had for a very long time, but that had not truly found its expression as a widely promulgated theory until then. There were philosophers suggesting this all along, when asking questions of what society was, but in all practical experience, nations, tribes, communities, clans, and societies of various sorts were a fact of life. There was no getting around the question of who was with whom, and no amount of individualist ethics could change what people lived through every day. Maggie Thatcher the milk snatcher herself can't change that by declaring it so, and it was not hard to see that there was certainly a society organizing the entire neoliberal project. Put another way, as a contemporary American comedian put it, "it's a big club, and you ain't in it." There would be in neoliberal society a very big and prominent club, which rendered all other social associations irrelevant in the long term. It is a global club, that did not regard nations or governments or the old type of state. Arrayed against it is everyone else, and whatever associations they believed they possessed, none of

them would last for long, and it was easy to disrupt each and every bulwark of resistance to what was happening. If you were going to have social life in this very large group that was out of the club, it would only be on the terms those in the big club allowed. Getting to that point was a very, very long project, and the result of so much social engineering and manipulation, with many incentives pointing to it. By no means is the world of neoliberalism a foregone conclusion, or the only way it could have happened. The world of neoliberalism is a very particular phase in global history, and it is not a homogenous phase in which history was arrested. The neoliberal world was defined by spikes in activity, as humanity would be pushed from one crisis to the next, and each spike and collapse was planned with winners and losers in mind. In short, the neoliberal program would be a series of wars waged by one big club against everyone else, who were for the purposes of the big club a large mass opposed to them. From the outset, the attitude of those in the big club would be that democratic society was in reality a disorganized rabble that would run around like headless chickens if enough crises were instigated. This is the position stated outright by Walter Lippmann in his famous work *Public Opinion* (1922). Whatever the true nature of the disorganized rabble, it would be necessary for members of the big club to see it collectively as one big Other to be dismantled and reshaped. In short, the program not just of neoliberalism but of the technocratic society that came into being with the onset of the first world war, was nothing less than a war of that big club against the whole world. However much the big club members giggle at how easy it is to break up and atomize the little people, the same logic applies in their own camp. Nobody in the club has any reason to trust each other or any native solidarity. It is a club of elites, nobles, cocaine-fueled executives, prostitutes, drug lords, brown-nosers, schemers, and people who got there because they understood that politics at heart was primarily a game of stepping on the weak to get ahead. Even if that was not the full truth of politics, that was the strategy members of the big club adopted to get where they were. The honest who believed the world could be better were the simps and suckers, and the world was given over to a cocaine-fueled orgy that did not require any rationale or excuse any more. Those who made this big club were not always hardened warriors, and most of them knew war was for rubes. So many of them rose with the eugenic creed, and knew that alliance in the eugenics movement was the only thing holding this club together. Again, this will be revisited many times, especially when eugenics itself is examined in proper light. There was something to these people that allowed them to succeed, and it wasn't because they were necessarily good at winning or smarter than the average bear.

A simple truth to the neoliberal victory is that their assertion that there is no society was, at its heart, true and obvious enough that most people instinctively knew it and felt it. The 1970s were a decade of repeated betrayals to anyone who believed in a single socialist idea, who wanted to keep what socialism in the manifestations it was allowed to have created. Even if they didn't like socialism or didn't see what was built as "socialist", the idea that society could be organized for mutual good and benefit had enough appeal to those who saw

the obvious benefits of it. This organization was always premised on a social cooperation that was not premised on dire necessity or empty faith that it was possible, and wasn't premised on a theory or intellectual conceit that socialism was smarter and better. Any cooperative society is only built so long as its participants are motivated by something more than slogans or material need or identity with a team. A genuinely solidaristic politics had been attempted, but was under constant attack, with many within the socialist camp no longer seeing anything in a socialism that included most of the human population. The neoliberal reaction was not a bold move that changed the world, but a natural progression of what was inherent in the transformation of human society that began its active phase just before 1914, when the movement leading to the first world war made it an inevitability. The result seen with neoliberalism was not just the end of socialism, or the end of democracy, or the end of liberal ideals in any recognizable form. It was not merely the rollback of the Enlightenment, and it was indeed no rolling back at all. It was not even a full reversion to feudal behaviors, which were very much premised on sociality and transactional relationships. It was not a transformation to slave society like Rome. A few liked to draw superficial comparisons to the ideal republic of Plato and aspired to that, but if that was the goal, what we see is yet another horrible parody of that, of which so many have been made. What happened, and became clear enough to all, was that there really was no society. This was not a victory of ideology over truth, but a transformation of sociality that was now possible. There would of course still be society, in that there was an assemblage of humans interacting with each other, who formed organizations. People would still live next to each other and fear each other, and know that someone is watching them and capable of reporting to some secret police that you weren't supposed to talk about. The conspiracism inherent in society didn't go away, and was more prominent than ever. Despite this, people still had friends and relied on mutual benefit to survive. The logic of capitalist determination did not dictate that people should be selfish. "Greed is good" is not a very smart strategy for any capitalist, and the success stories of Reaganite capitalism were not those who built something or led to any great thing, but the plunderers who held the best parties and had the best drugs. It is not something you would do unless you wanted to destroy as quickly as possible any virtue in a society, and that is exactly what would be promoted. But this, too, was not simply imposed by decree.

For a long time, members of any class would be burdened by the knowledge that society was vast, and organizations were everywhere. For the lower classes, this had been their experience all along, and their own social networks were local and never too reliable, but there were always parties and associations, and even the weak could congregate and chat. It was an expectation that could be believed sometimes that there was a place for anyone, even the lowest of the low, if someone were able to ingratiate themselves with the right people; and even if someone were a loner, it was possible to stay alone and be left alone, and there was a certain respect for loners who did not cause trouble for

anyone. For the ruling classes and their functionaries, the sociality of the lower classes always presented a menace that could not be ignored. Mass politics always remained a possibility, if there were anyone to activate it and direct it to action. Even without mass politics, the lower classes would not sit idly while they starved. Memory of revolutions taught the ruling class that peasants and proletarians that are starving will rise in revolt at the first opportunity, and will do whatever is needed to not starve. The rulers further had difficulty trusting each other and conspiracies within their own ranks. Neoliberal society succeeded in atomizing people not because an ideology was accepted, or because some brand new technology or communication method had an effect merely by being known. Neoliberal society was possible because enough inroads had been built to short-circuit any individual who was a threat, and information pertaining to that person, like their location and a detailed record starting from childhood and recorded in school records, was available to anyone who sought to control society at all of its levels. Individually, no man could hope to survive against a society set up to destroy him. This had always been known to be possible and could be done simply by throwing stones at a sinner, but this had to follow the dictate that someone without sin was the first to throw the stones. Now, the stones could be thrown from the shadows, and the question of sin was no longer a concern. Reputations could be destroyed and entered into the official record that followed someone around since birth, and someone selected to die would be marked from an early age, recorded, and hounded anywhere he went. Anyone who was not wanted and was to be thrown away was done, and this could happen to screen out three-year-olds and track them to lives of eternal torment. A living Hell could be enforced, and due to voluminous record-keeping and control over the spaces a human in civilization could enter, it would be truly inescapable. At this stage, the lockouts could only secure a few islands, and so the ruling class still had to contend with society in the open field. A lockout can ensure that someone who is blacklisted will never find work again, and this is where the word "fired" is replaced with "terminated". The linguistic shift to "terminated" was not just a declaration that someone no longer worked at a particular place, but that the entire apparatus of human resources declared someone *persona non grata*. In institutions that were controlled, there was a wide network of information gathering to determine how far someone was allowed to rise. It was not until the conclusion of the second world war that the construction of this apparatus was undertaken in earnest. Attempts to do this have always been the dream of any manager, but there were too many ways to evade detection, and one great difficulty is that the recordkeeping required human clerks who had no reason to go along with any such program. The new system still allowed for nepotism and the promotion of friends through shady and secret methods. In fact, neoliberal America encouraged that practice, as rampant cronyism would accelerate the rot and lock out the honest, which was the purpose of constructing such an apparatus in the first place. The great sin of the past is that every now and then, honest and decent people would disrupt the well-laid plans of a managerial strata, and no manager could suppress the lower classes without facing revolt or mass refusal to work, and then that lower

class seizing whatever they could to hold out until the managers and the upper classes had to bargain. Even in the waning years of the class struggle, there remained bitter resistance to this invasion of private life and encroachment on genuine freedoms still enjoyed and believed in by the common people. For the lower classes, society as something that existed independent of those who held the state was increasingly inconceivable.

The only proper definition of society would be that which is independent of any state, and which does not extend over the whole world in some nebulous sense. Even if society were vast and difficult to leave completely, the correct understanding of society is that if you were alone, you were alone, and it would take some doing for someone to go after you. It was believed that if you kept your head down, paid your taxes, and did all the things you were supposed to do, you could get by, or at least you should expect to if the society was at all tolerable to live in. This was how the better off of the lower classes, which had to be most of them, and the middle class alike understood the world. Whatever the ideology or laws or machines were, it was a safe bet until the late 20th century that you could avoid the worst of society simply by avoiding anything that attracted hostility. This didn't always work, and no one could run away forever, but when it became clear to someone that they really only get what they are allowed to have in this world, it was reassuring to know that there were nooks and crannies to escape to, and there were niches where people could find work or sustenance outside of this one model the ruling institutions presented. The ruling institutions, indeed, had to accept, against their inclinations, that there were ways to live outside of a narrow interpretation of Fordism. The industrial change that came with the neoliberal project would have suggested, by itself, that the variety of ways in which people could live and be accepted would increase rather than decrease. The Fordist model of conformity and massification was not in vogue, and there was no material or intellectual reason why an open, diverse society couldn't work. Indeed, it seemed very practical to just about everyone that cultural conformity was an artifact of a very particular period in human history, and conformism was never as religiously followed as its partisans insisted it was. The 1950s were not this utopia of whitebread suburban families living in luxury and negroes knowing their place and getting their separate but equal treatment that is better than they deserve, and no other period where conservatism was a prominent idea actually conformed to this fantastical, Hitlerian lie that was advanced as the Right's manifesto. When conservatism was ascendant, it was always marked by furious culture wars, intrigues in every sector of society, the promotion of venal bourgeois interests as a counter to liberal reforms or the dreaded communists, and general incompetence in government. Reagan was no exception to the rule of conservative incompetence at governing anything, and gloried in a level of incompetence and criminality that prior conservatives could never attain and would envy forevermore. Bland conformity was little more than a marketing jingle of conservatism, rather than the actual state of affairs. In industry, Ford had his reasons for standardizing production, because that was cheaper and the industrial technique of the time favored this standardization more than

later industrial technique would. Standardization was never the ideal, even for Ford. Ford himself was partial to the vision of the fascists, who championed individualism in ways that were acceptable, but in industrial method there was no ideology involved. The same methods would be used in America, the Soviet Union, and Nazi Germany, because they were effective for building cars and tanks which everyone wanted at the time. The widespread availability of new machines, and then a campaign to make certain technologies a fixture in every home like the television and the home computer when they arrive, was not out of some conformist tendency, but a very particular social engineering project. The goal of this proliferation of consumer goods was not massification or conformity, but the beginning of an invasion of private life by the corporate sector. Far from it, everything about consumer culture favored individual expression, and the only thing that someone did conform to was whatever the thought leaders were really telling them to conform to, which would be uncritically accepted by everyone when the signal was given that conforming was mandatory. In personal expression and ideology, people could be whatever they wanted, and this was encouraged. The loudmouthed, opinionated American is himself a product of social engineering, trained to express his opinions only in a narrow, socially accepted manner and in the right arenas. Whether that loudmouth is a conservative, liberal, progressive, stealth-fascist, socialist, or an acceptable brand of communist, you could be whatever you wanted ideologically and in certain manners. The major thing to conform to was not a superficial identifier, but the expectations of a technocratic society that was set up to first manage people, then invade their lives, and then destroy those who were not suitable for the world desired in the 21st century. Neoliberalism, of course, is part of a larger plan, and only one arc that was planned decades in advance.

In this society, the conception of "society" changed. It was no longer an assemblage of people, or networks of friends. That was unseemly to speak of. Society instead would be interpreted as a vague entity, unmoored from any particular person but represented in media by appointed experts and talking heads. Society would be identified solely with authorities who were presented not just as spiritual authorities, but arbiters of truth who would tell you what your senses were supposed to say. This project was not built overnight and was never a fait accompli, and its description will be revisited throughout this book. The important takeaway is that "society" was now seen as an alien represented solely by these interests, and this was not merely a fascistic political claim, but taken to be a true understanding of what societies were. Societies were presented as mushy blobs, in which human agents were only recognized by experts with privileged access to say who was what. You, the pleb, were not allowed to say who was what, outside of a limited purview permissible for you. It was not your place to question the best and the brightest or any designated thought leader. If you tried, you faced ridicule and a struggle session until you gave up. Since you likely had a job and the thought leader was paid to tell you what to think, you were at a disadvantage in this battle, without any champion to represent you. Civil society, which itself originates more as a myth than a real thing, becomes

the only link you have with society in the genuine sense; society is mediated by institutions of selected leaders and gurus, and members without privileged access are only there as cogs to fill their function. You knew on some level that society was just a bunch of people, even if they have bureaucracies and technological advantages over you, but many features in this society would tell you that the experts were virtually godlike in their command of "society", and anything that happened was the result of the experts making it so, engaging the engine of history to move it as they saw fit. On the surface, this makes a lot of sense. You would want smart people making decisions and stupid people to not interject, for all the reasons that would be a good idea. This development was not premised on any actual merit, but on a belief that ordinary people were not to judge society as it was, and could only speak of it as a vague blob. Any analysis of society that went beyond acceptable boundaries, like a thorough critique of the entire technocratic idea that went past "experts are bad because they are mean and I don't like them", could only travel so far before it was suppressed. One way technocratic society did sell itself was because its institutions would, until the Reagan period, operate at a sufficient level of competence that most would agree they were an improvement over what existed before, in the respects that were emphasized in the post-WW2 order. Living standards had generally improved even for the poor, work schedules were not onerous, and the company town was an anomaly rather than the norm. Reagan might appear to the vulgar historian like a retread of the era of robber barons. The robber barons, though, presided over the construction of technology and the rising arc of empire, and made a point of telling everyone that the robber barons built things and made the world go, and this was not backed by nothing. Robber barons built Standard Oil and made the world of the 20th century possible, and while it can be argued there was a much better way, there was an expectation that something had to be built for the robber barons to remain in power. Reagan's crooks did the robber part, but instead of the nobility expected of a baron, all of this robbery went to funding cocaine-fueled orgies and narco gangs and a managerial strata that was tasked with the open liquidation of everyone who was selected to die. That is the only thing they valued, and that is exactly what the world got. There was nothing else whatsoever to this entire project. The drugs and orgies were of course a feature of the robber baron era as well, and the robber barons loved narcostates more than anyone because many built their fortunes off the Opium Wars and its consequences. It is this managerial strata and a machinery that could reach into private life physically and over electronic communications and record-keeping, and the training of technicians and influencers who would be the enforcers of this new fascism, that made Reagan's society a different beast. It was no longer "society" in any sense we appreciated, when we had to speak of what was politically relevant in discussions about society. This went beyond merely annihilating the idea of a democratic society. That was still, at least nominally, an idea holding currency, even if democratic institutions could be ignored whenever needed. It was rather that speaking of society in the way it was formerly constituted became an unmentionable, as if you were speaking of unicorns to conceive of a society that changed without an expert moving history

and telling you that history has in fact moved. Generations of technocrats insinuating themselves into every area of social life would have produced this even if there were no Reagan. The same attitudes came to prominence in the communist world, and with it, it was not uncommon to see Communist Party politicians say the same things a Reaganite would say. This change was not the inexorable result of creeping technology just making it happen, but a concerted orientation of social action towards the goal. In short, the ruling oligarchs and their alliance with intellectuals made clear that they were at war with those who were not in this formation, and the only way to get on the lifeboat in this grand lifeboat ethics exercise is to accept the ethos of that formation. The death of the old conception of society was the true beginning of the conditions of Francis Galton's Eugenics, and everything that came to pass was exactly what Galton prescribed as the course of action in the British Eugenics Society, conducted for the reasons Galton wanted and that they got.

This death of society as we knew it, of course, was not just a new development, nor an eternal truth. The myth of society as this technocratic alien we did not belong to was not universal in the past, but it has its antecedents. Its core thinking can be found in political treatises of Antiquity, and there would always be partisans favorable to such a view of society and institutions. Liberals acknowledging the individual as the basis for society were not announcing a new revelation. The concept of states and institutions relating to individuals rather than larger social formations was inherent to the philosophical conception of the state itself, and liberals saying this was basically a "well, duh" statement before they expounded on the meaning of that. There is no conception of society as such without individuals being the principal social agent. An early philosophical erosion of this comes from Marx himself, who discounted the liberal idea of individualism on historical materialist grounds. Marx is confusingly inheriting the political thought of the philosophical state, which always had to contend with its subjects as individuals before it could contend with them collectively. This is a very obvious error that Marx can recognize, but when Marx postulates about the nature of Man, he veers into philosophical beliefs that are sometimes rooted in an assessment of biology, and sometimes bold assertions of a human spirit that conform more to Marx's expectations of what it should be rather than what most humans have been. For Marx, the residuum is not at all relevant and has no place in his world, and visions of the lower classes that suggest the failure of their class would be fixed by simply not letting those lumpenproletariat ruin it with their smelliness. The attitude of later Marxist-Leninist states towards the residuum was to accuse them of political crimes of Being, with the implicit knowledge that what would be regarded as "bad genes" in eugenist society was in of itself a political offense against the state. In this way, political psychology promoted solutions that were more about upholding the Marxist-Leninist institutions and the grand theory than any condition of the residuum. If a member of the residuum could get with the program somehow, then that's great, but this almost never happened, and anyone who was politically insane or politically retarded was shunned from socialist society. The idea was to keep those people, even if

they demonstrated some brilliance and an eagerness to work for socialism, in a position where they stayed exactly where they are. There would be in socialist society a quiet marking down of people who were "not supposed" to be in the political class imagined, even if they were faithful followers of the program. This came to many of these people as a shocking betrayal when the Soviet Union was to be dismantled, and within the technical classes, there was a rat race to see who would sink or swim in the world to come. Those who were "not supposed to be there" would be left to the mercy of the market system to sell whatever talents they had, and they could expect to sell those talents at cut-rate prices because this is neoliberalism, and it is a harsh world. So far as socialism existed anywhere in the world, this betrayal was bound to happen, and was seeded in advance. It was inherent in many of the socialist ideas that gained currency, because socialist ideas that would have prevented this would be squelched before a concept that technocracy could be criticized at all was allowed to gain steam. Any socialism that could be critical of technocracy in a serious way would have recognized the threat of a program like eugenics overrode any threat of capitalism as an economic situation, and that could not be tolerated. Those who stood to benefit from eugenics, or believed they would out of sense of their own intelligence, were not going to let some do-gooders interfere with the great working. The war on society required all intellectual trends to turn decisively against the masses, and turn out in favor of the new war - the true war, which did not regard the lines of class or states or any line except the line dividing those selected to live from the many selected to die. Clearly, those in the selected to live camp, who knew what the score really was and how they would stay there, had a lot of work to do in this war, mostly against the residuum but also in their own tent. The selected to live team was comprised of many rival factions and interests that had little to do with each other besides a commitment to this idea of an intelligentsia ruling all, and that they considered themselves members of that club. Dominant in that tent would be the ruling capitalist oligarchs, who had much to do with selecting the criteria for "smart" and who would be allowed to promote in the educational institutions and believe with certainty that they actually were in the club. Not every oligarch was in on the plan, and there was a large oligarchic faction that wanted the usual Nazi horseshit, but everyone in this formation understood that before they could take out each other, they had to contend with a large residuum that had no reason to go along with what was about to be done to them, except the threat of termination and torture compelling submission. The great carrot to offer to the residuum was to feed their worst vices and glorify the rot, and this was the first and most obvious part of the social engineering offensive. Those of the residuum who would do their part to enable eugenics chose their side of the war, often receiving nothing more than a pittance before being thrust back down into abject humiliation. They will always have chosen their side in the war, and should not even be dignified with the lofty title of being a Judas.

The strategy of the eugenists involved, but was not entirely defined by, this understanding of war's purpose as a social engineering project. Those who are familiar with war allude to this purpose of war throughout history. For most

of history, war did not require a concept of sociology or social engineering for its purpose to be understood, and because wars were fairly common, it could be accepted that this was the way of the world and the way of Man. The hunters and herdsman who would become warriors understood at heart why they fought, and that war as a practice was where they would have to prove if they were men or sissies, if they were allowed to be men upon reaching the age of manhood. War, on some level, was an expectation rather than a theory. It did not take much for a warband to form, and none of these warbands spent too long philosophizing about the nature of their game. Such an undertaking was not necessary to appreciate the effect of war. The objective of war did not need to be the killing of people or the destruction of something, nor did it have to be a fight to claim some territory or property. If wars were purely fought for mercantile purposes or what could be construed as that, they are usually a very inefficient way of attaining the goal. There may be an economic or political calculation involved to determine the payoff of a war, and usually there is this consideration, as politics and diplomacy is always a consideration whether there is war or not. Wars are usually fought with the expectation that neither side will be wholly exterminated or disintegrated, but that some victory condition entails domination of one group over another, or at least one group fends off an attempt by another to do that and considers not being dominated to be the value won. In the ancient world, until empires become the norm, tribes and nations would fight, lose, and come back in a matter of years ready to throw off the yoke of domination and fight again. The Romans would have to fight the rest of Italy multiple times before Roman hegemony became a reality, facing periodic revolts from their closest allies as far in as the late republic. Such examples would be the norm, and persistent domination over a large area or a large number of clients was an exceptional case rather than the rule. The usual way in which early and classical empires were sustained was through keeping defeated cities and nations as subjects of the imperial power, often with states remaining clients rather than being annexed. Even when annexed, cultural or racial replacement was rarely imposed in a violent way, and in practice assimilation was never a popular imperial strategy even in the modern era. Cultural homogeneity, let alone racial homogeneity, was a completely dismal strategy for rule, and the states implementing it did so not to resolve a war, but to maintain a permanent war that was more about social class and exploitation than any contest over identity. The open racial war in the United States towards the ex-slaves was entirely pressed by a certain faction in American society against people who bent over backwards to cooperate with an enemy, that by all of its laws and the stories it told itself should accept this cooperation, and almost everyone else in the world found it boggling that a vocal minority would maintain this war even when it held no material benefit or purpose and was not even fought in a way that would resolve the war. It is important to understand the racial war as a precursor to eugenics, and then as a vehicle to sell the purest eugenic creed to a sector of the American populace, and to recruit many of the white cuckolds who would be faithful, retarded death squads for the creed when the time came. That is all it was really for, and why racism was maintained more than any benefit

from exploiting a race or even the exploitative benefits of eugenics for depressing overall wages. The crushing of wages did not require racism, nor benefitted from racism, because maintaining white identity would be a constant expense requiring payoffs and costs to overall security; and in any event, integration could just as easily be used as a tool to reduce the wage fund, and this prong of the war to reduce the wage fund was also used, since the capitalist-eugenist alliance loved the three-pronged assault from left, right, and center, with the center in this case being moderates who normalized a synthesis that was prepared as the solution to a culture war. The culture war was designed to perpetuate indefinitely, so that this desired synthesis and the desired three-prong attack would be created against the desired enemy. This reduction of the wage fund was not itself the motive, but a means to an end of the greater struggle of eugenic social engineering. The wage fund, however large or small, would never allow people to purchase any means that would permit rebellion. The purpose of crushing wages was not a defensive reaction, but an offensive plan to modify the behavior of workers and the lumpenproles. Deprivation would be used both in a general sense to force more people to chase after fewer dollars, and to deprive particular qualities that would have been valuable for the workers' security and development. The former was overt and obvious, while the latter would be conducted in a million subtle ways through social engineering wars and manipulations in every institution Americans interfaced with. Here, the use of war for social engineering is the clear purpose of structuring social problems and crises as war, and the war on drugs and war on poverty, like many social wars, were redresses of a progressive drive that desired eugenics and covered it with humanitarian-seeming goals. Much of the war on poverty consisted of the last bits of the ladder technocracy created to elevate just enough workers to the status necessary to build the machines of neoliberalism, payoffs to fatten and weaken elements of the proletarians while locking them out of social advancement, and propping up institutions that would be necessary like the medical sector. It also was, for its time, a jobs program for the liberal and social democratic intelligentsia who would be tasked with managing their most hated enemy, the welfare recipient. Holding that leverage gave the sadistic social worker glee to watch a desperate lumpen's life destroyed in front of them, which this author can assure you was a common story for welfare recipients. Since all of this money was extracted from the workers and the middle class, and the comfortable middle class received back the indirect social benefit of being in the winning group and granted social privileges that couldn't be valued in money, this was not a problem. Further, it had long been established that any welfare beneficiary was just cycling money back to the bourgeoisie in various ways, since that money would have nowhere to go but the capitalists who provided all services a proletarian would buy, like food or rent. Any money paid out to the lumpen was destined to return to the hands of the bourgeoisie eventually, which is what the smart people in the room were trying to tell the stupid men when the liberals set this thing up. Leave it to conservatives to lack the brainpower to see this very simplistic but highly effective model, and not be able to construct a worthwhile argument against it because their animal brain only comprehends "me wantee" and bullycowardice.

WAR AS A PRACTICE OF SOCIAL ENGINEERING

The practice of war would be, throughout human existence, the decisive factor in what social units were possible, and which were desirable. There would be some direction of choice in what a society would do, and in the main, the forms society took were not created by being imposed as a condition of defeat, but were forms that some tribe or nation or city adopted for themselves, and found useful for whatever purpose they had in mind. Social engineering in any time is not easy, and was not always consciously pursued, but in the main, there were men and women who took it upon themselves to be critics of whatever society they lived in, and believed they had a role in changing it into something that suited their wishes as best as they could. War would not be the motivator that prompted anyone to make social reforms as a concession to the practice of war itself, and no society would actually accept that blithely. War, whatever the partisans of its cult may claim, is always a choice for at least one side, and the most aggressive societies in history always made decisions that suited motives other than victory in war. War merely was the final determination of whether a society could survive, and war was not the only way in which societies could be changed by an outside agent. Nearly all of the social forms we have adopted were not adopted because they were truly necessary in war, or because they were imposed naturally. They were adopted out of expedience in the most obvious scenarios, by the whim of those who were in a position to make these reforms, and by social values which favored certain qualities in people, or qualities in the type of labor they did, or qualities of an intellectual or spiritual nature. Many of these social values were desired for spiritual authority rather than the needs of a temporal authority reacting to a situation or a material benefit to them. The value of productivity itself is often desired because a spiritual inclination to praise industriousness, either generally or towards productive aims that feed an ultimately non-productive goal. It should be known that free trade and capitalism are not spiritually inclined to favor any productivity, and capitalism as an arrangement has been allergic to the idea that capitalists exist to produce useful things. It first resisted this by simply rejecting that argument, and then by interpreting "utility" as "the thing which lets me, the capitalist, keep my money against that filthy mob, and nothing else". Finally this transformed into the alliance with the eugenic interest, where "social ends" were interpreted to be eugenic ends, and production for any non-eugenic value was not only viewed as unproductive, but the very thing eugenic society sought to abolish. This has meant eugenic society has been characterized by restricting production both in quantity and in any quality that is inimical to eugenics, and eugenic society has always been careful to measure the quantity of product and line up with existing demand, then with-holding that quantity of product to affect minute behavioral changes in the poor and lock out the residuum. Eugenic society could not survive if it did not in theory possess the means to meet a quantity of product to allow everyone a standard of living. If eugenic society actually could not meet the productive demands to allow that standard of living, it would become known that the threats of a eugenic society to invade private life could not be backed

up, and this would motivate all subjects to rebel against such a society because victory would be attainable.

This is not a difficulty in practice, because it has long been known that industrial technique could, if desired, far exceed demand. Eugenic society is premised on throwing large swaths of the population out of work, and little regard is given for genuine efficiency. The incentives of eugenic capitalism discourage too much innovation in production techniques if they would lead to greater production yields, and always seek to produce the barest minimum necessary with the smallest compensation for labor and the smallest number of laborers possible. It is more important to work 6 slaves for 120 hours a week, then it is to work 12 slaves for 60 hours a week, given equality of wages per hour. This is not because the doubled labor time produces twice as much product, because overworked slaves are not as productive during the added 60 hours, and a 120 hour work week would exhaust slaves in short order. Productivity increases that would shorten the work-week, without any effect on wages, would violate an incentive in eugenism to keep workers in as much misery as possible, and so the only efficiency increases allowed are those that would eliminate a need for a worker, rather than efficiencies that would make each worker more efficient. Nearly every production process is designed to eliminate as many workers as possible from the process, and to induce them to work as many hours and chew up as much of their free time and wealth as possible. Getting more out of workers per unit, even if the efficiency increase is put entirely towards paying workers half the wages for half the time invested, is missing the point of eugenic society. The eugenic society is not under actual competitive pressure to reduce wages, since it operates in monopoly conditions, and eugenic society is known to reward nepotism and has a stated goal of paying off favored workers and telling them they should be grateful for any scraps. The "bonus" of working an extra 60 hours of week in wages, which would exhaust the workers, is sold as something the worker should be grateful to accept, even if the work pace were to exhaust the worker utterly and kill him faster. The wider incentives of eugenism see the exhaustion and early death of workers as values of great importance. Extermination through labor is the eugenic plan for humanity, just like a concentration camp. The value of doing this outweighs the tiny benefit of a worker doing more with less time, and if that worker were to have more free time, eugenic society would prompt him to find another job if he wanted to prove his validity and worthiness to continue living, so that the 60 hours would be made up by another form of slavery. Since the basic work week in this eugenic society would be 120 hours, it would be seen as socially necessary and normal to impose this expectation, and if the worker has no standard for comparison or is put under enough pressure to comply with the demand, he won't be able to say no. It is the value of the worker's inability to say no that the eugenicist values more than any product of a laborer. If it were possible, the eugenic capitalist would eliminate that worker as soon as his product is no longer necessary for the liquidation of the residuum, and that worker is sent to be reprocessed into glue after his remaining life is exhausted as a medical lab rat. This calculus looks odd if you think capitalism is

about productivity and what is cost-effective, but the capitalist isn't a machine to optimize economic inflows and outflows. The capitalist merely has to work in that condition when he is in perfect competition, and as a monopolist, the capitalist is in the exact opposite of that. This is also the reason why a smart capitalist likes extracting rent and tribute and government largesse, so he can go be a "job creator" even though all the jobs are on paper and doled out like it is some sort of reward to be an exploited slave. Any study of the free trade system's origins would tell you that this behavior is expected of capitalists and incentivized, even if to our understanding it is a moral hazard. It was recognized as a moral hazard then, but the rules of the day were clear that workers were there to be exploited and had no rights as such, which is why incoming wage workers in the 19th century were treated as they were - as slaves both on and off the job, with police invading their life and an antagonistic city and state keeping them under control. The degree of freedom they were permitted was little more than an allowance rather than a right they could expect to protect, absent a lawyer and against courts that were stacked by an enemy class and interest that usually, but not always, ruled against workers on any matter, and always upheld the privilege of the bourgeois against the proletarian when the latter trampled on the former. Proletarians only won that fight on terms the bourgeois allowed, after considerable bourgeois assistance. If there are no proletarian lawyers, the proletarian is beholden to his class enemy for representation in any legal matter, which is a lot like slaves beseeching an advocate for whatever mercy they could find.

This transformation of incentives was made possible because the war of classes became not just a figure of speech or an inchoate struggle which was described with poetic narratives, or a grind that was waged against individual workers by a ruling body. Eugenics turned the class war from a figure of speech or an allegory into an actual war, fought by phalanxes of officers against an enemy in organized fashion, as if the whole society that was not in the know were an enemy formation. War expenditures and logistics were prepared to turn the class war into a siege. The ethos of Eugenics appropriated the word "jihad" to describe their struggle, and meant that in the true meaning of the word. No expenditure of the eugenic movement was accidental and the core actors of the creed knew to march in lockstep. They would be drilled in seminar after seminar to know exactly what to say, and to break ranks was not just a moral shame, but treason. Examples would be made of those who broke ranks or did not figure out what this was, and to those who were true believers, they behaved in every way as if they were warriors against the throngs of the residuum. In the manner of war propaganda, the residuum, most of whom were pacifistic to a fault, were portrayed as invariably hostile animals, dripping with disease. The image of a zombie, popularized in eugenic fiction, was the stand-in for the residuum, and depictions of the poor in poornography reveled in describing the residuum as zombies, not just in a philosophical sense but in their behavior. The behavior of zombies, dull indolence and a perpetual brain fog, were conditioned into the residuum as much as possible. Once this behavior was conditioned, it

would be used as further proof of the necessity of war against the residuum, and the eugenic faithful responded to the image of rotting zombies demanding food. That the rotting zombies were drugged by force, beaten, humiliated, denied any standards of comparison, and conditioned to believe desperate moaning was the only way out, was of course part of the struggle, and on some level the eugenic faithful were aware that they did condition those behaviors, and actively encouraged the residuum's zombie-like traits. To do otherwise would have required breaking ranks and admitting the possibility that either the creed was wrong, or that a follower of the creed was not truly in the elect. Neither was thinkable if someone had committed to the creed and believed themselves to be a true member. Even the useful idiots of the residuum who knew they were doing dirty work for the creed, who had no shame and would gladly make themselves Judas goats, knew that if they were to repent, there would be no mercy, and that what they did could not be undone. Their only hope was to beseech the eugenic creed for what crumbs they would continue to offer, and sometimes those crumbs materialized in exchange for more of the dirty work, while often the crumbs would disappear and their Judas goat would be vivisected like anyone else in the residuum. Since the favorite Judas goats were those who were on the margins of being cast into what is today special education, they would often tell themselves that they would rather be Judases than retarded, and that in the end is a reasonable calculation. There is no Heaven awaiting the retarded, and they would know this if they knew what Christianity taught.

Past transformations of society were not as war-driven as the ongoing transformation. They were not always the result of revolutions or rebellions. Typically, the revolution did not create the social change attributed to it at all. Revolutions are the result of something that formed in many sectors over a long time, and often tied into a worldwide trend of revolutions. The modern revolutions were always inspired by the same conspiracies that brought about the American rebellion and the French calling of the Estates-General, and would look to those two examples of what to do when establishing a new republic, whether it was liberal or socialist. Both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China made the most obvious comparison in their early history not with the French, as would be expected with an ideological reading of history, but with the Americans. This makes sense given that the Soviets and Chinese faced many of the same initial conditions the Americans did, and effectively consolidated rule under a one-party state. The American way of doing this is complicated, but made clear with any long look at the American party system which is utterly alien to political formations in most elected republics, and it not even a thing Americans in the 19th century denied. There was a ruling party from a very early period in American history, and no political disagreement between parties ever really concerned ideology or core principles. The one period where the country split up was not a split in the party system, but a thing the whole political class save for a few attempted to avoid. The reckless actions of a few and the necessary response of the North at this provocation forced the hand of the slavery interest, which was one of those things considered part of the consensus that couldn't

be changed through normal politics. The early history of the communist states was rife with infighting and a need for a ruler to suppress the political wingnuts, and the more overt one-party state of the communist regimes had more to do with their very different geopolitical situation and characteristics of Marxism-Leninism suggesting that it was desirable to rid the socialist republic of any sign of faction. Factional infighting was even more furious in the communist states than the shit-flinging of the Americans during the Articles of Confederation days and the battle between the Democratic-Republicans and Federalists over basically everything. Where all that led to the Federalists being chased out of public view until basically now, the communist infighting entailed an internal war against the kulaks, or capitalist roaders, and then for China things got super heated with the Cultural Revolution and the left's final resurgence as a global force. If revolutions were themselves the changing agent, then the results of revolution are dubious. The French Revolution was rolled back and its democratic reforms were undone beyond a token allowance by the restored monarchy for some representative body, entirely at the mercy of the king. What remained of the revolution was a transformation of France from an autocracy ruled by a glorified warlord backed by the Church to a modern nation-state of citizens, and while that was a very profound transformation and very relevant to our thinking of war as a social engineering project, the revolution itself only provided part of that change, and the same change did not happen everywhere in the same way. Americans never would develop a sense of nationalism in the French or European sense, and attempts to manufacture it have always been horribly misguided and un-American in profound ways. The communist projects relied not on nationalism but internationalism and the role of the Communist Party for their theory of how society would be ordered, and while the national idea from France informed everyone, the relevance of nationalism was not so much because it presented spiritual legitimacy, but because nationalism implied the basis for a mass army, which the French were using to kick astronomical levels of ass during the war with all of Europe that came out of the revolution. The transformations of society through war are not always what the initiators intended when starting the revolution politically, but those embroiled in any war are aware of the consequences and how a war's intent is transformative for both the enemy (they are to be subdued or disintegrated) and for the engaging society tasked with defending itself and adapting to its enemies.

One difficulty with using war as a plan for social engineering is that society, as mentioned, doesn't exist as a nebulous blob that can be taken for granted. It should not surprise anyone that wars, even among the ruling class, are never popular, and finding unanimity on a war of choice is nearly impossible. Wars of clear self-defense are almost obligatory for everyone, and wars to defend against an unforgivable slight to the society that would imply long-term humiliation are likely to find at least ruling class support. For most of the people, war is this horrific nightmare they are dragged into, that has always been nothing but bullshit fought for some aristocratic assholes who were taking their shit out on their own countrymen the previous day. For most of history, the rulers of a

society openly laughed at their own people, and on multiple occasions used the war as a pretext to attack their own productive base, not because this was useful for fighting the war, but because the instigators of the war saw the declared war as a game and never gave up the war against their own country that was inherent to any aristocracy. An aristocracy that wasn't fighting that war against its own people would be overthrown the moment they were no longer needed, and that would be recognized very quickly if the war against the underclass truly abated. To maintain the war, aristocracies always resort to threats and ensure the life of the lower classes is never secure for long. Predation is inherent to aristocracy as a concept, and so aristocratic societies - and this definition defines most civilized societies with a developed and organized spiritual authority and a strong temporal authority that aligns with it, which means most societies extant including our own - make war and a cult of war central to their concepts of the political. The deliberate engineering of war and its purpose are obfuscated by the declaration that wars are merely political, and that politics necessitates war as some sort of good. Usually the public rationale is defensive, but no aristocracy conceives of itself defending a line in the sand or honoring any treaty.

Aristocracies do not face the most severe consequences of war and its cult, regardless of what class or combination of classes and which professions form the aristocracy. Normally warrior aristocracies are conceived since their connection to war is obvious. Spiritual aristocracies as a rule make an early alliance with warriors, and turn viciously against their own people. The warriors glorify violence and predation, and the spiritual leaders mollify the people while stealthily increasing the predatory instinct of the warriors and setting conspiracies against the commoners, pitting the commoners against each other in ways warriors cannot. Aristocracies drawn from the common ranks, which only became the norm in modernity, are typically aristocracies of capital or aristocracies premised on intelligence and supposed merit. The link of capital and banks to the old aristocratic order is hard to miss, and does not require too length an explanation. The rise of the aristocracy of capital was not an aristocracy of petty shopkeepers and factory owners who started from nothing. The commoners' rise was only possible because there were large capitalist entities already in existence, and the capitalist enterprise was tied most of all to trading companies that were de facto governments with armies. Without this presence, capitalism as a preferred arrangement is not able to fend off the older interest, and this is one reason capitalism happened in Europe rather than elsewhere. A few oligarchs can see that by pooling the wealth of the bourgeois petty and large, they share between them a majority of the wealth, and many commoners were educated men whose services were most useful to any regime, whether as scientists or lawyers or scholars. Every aristocracy of capital has usually implied that the capitalists possessed merit to acquire that wealth, and the leading capitalist aristocrats understood well that an alliance with science and technology was the surest way to secure that aristocracy, with the scientists and intellectuals being partners with their own interests in the arrangement. The leading aristocrats of capital were men in the new field of oil, railroad builders, industrialists with an eye

towards arranging industry not just for a firm but the whole society, weapons manufacturers who now supplied not just guns and artillery, but battleships and tanks and outlandish battle platforms that were still yet dreams but the expectation of anyone who studied military hardware. Joining them would be the growing necessity of an intelligence service, policing functions and private armies that could control very large populations, and a military interest that was no longer aristocratic in its own right but always liked to hobnob with aristocrats and play-act like they were glorious generals of old. It was not the alliance with warriors that corrupted aristocracy to wage an intercine war. Every aristocracy, no matter its claims, rests on an essential difference between the ruler and ruled. This essence need not be hereditary or ordained by some spiritual authority, but it is an abiding characteristic of aristocracies that however they establish themselves, they did so because everyone else was kept down, and mobility into and out of the aristocracy was limited. Aristocracies take great pains not to release one of their own to the ranks of the ruled. When aristocracies eject one of their own, they will do as any smart mafia boss does and eliminate the dissenter. This is an old instinct that makes a lot of sense, because conspiracies don't want to let people with inner knowledge enter the ranks of the ruled and comingle with them. That is one of the worst things an aristocracy could face.

The formation of aristocracies was not a foregone conclusion. Clan societies typically lack a true aristocracy, but are instead ruled by certain families with a lot of wealth. It is possible to have rule without an aristocracy, and for those rulers to be very rich and everyone else to be poor. Tribal chieftains and their cronies are not aristocracies in any meaningful sense of the word, even if some who would be intellectuals would claim to a modern that their intellectualism is just as good as today's intellectual aristocracy. Aristocracy first required a considerable spiritual authority to be established, and then required a religion that dealt in some way with a theory of the state and society in terms that a mass audience could understand. This did not necessitate that the priests themselves rule, or that the priestly function had to be entirely associated with rule; it could be that spiritual thinkers would be present even in the lower classes, or the society allowed for spiritual consciousness of multiple types and permitted people to find their own guru. The important thing is that the spiritual authority of who and what ruled was made clear, and even if people didn't like it, they would be made to abide it. Aristocracy then required a stable, settled population of sufficient size, and a level of material stability such that a group of people were strongly secured from any effect of poverty. This usually meant that aristocrats did not engage in work or petty commerce, and extracted their wealth from various tributes and taxes. The return to the lower orders, if any, is that the aristocracy could share some of its privileges with the lower class, handing out a carrot that was jealously protected by the aristocracy. Aristocracies, in any form, claim they possess some merit, no matter how dubious, to justify their rule. This merit may be by demonstration of strength, or some law proclaiming it so and providing a spurious rational proof, or by claiming wealth was won by merit in a rigged economic order. Aristocracies encourage internal competition beyond the norm.

A despotic king often rules with an aristocracy beneath him, but the aristocracy is antagonistic towards the king and vice versa, because every aristocrat wishes to be the king, or the first man in Rome as Caesar did. Aristocracies fear any figure like a Caesar or an Oriental despot like the Chinese emperors, and in the Chinese case, the emperor was explicitly placed above social class altogether to grant him a degree of freedom and authority and legitimacy to all classes. Very often, kings and emperors make a pretense that the sovereign is a check against the aristocracy, since the antagonism between kings and aristocracies is well known. The charge of an aristocracy against a would-be king or Caesar is that the king is a demagogue who wants to give the undeserving free stuff, and the counter-argument of a king is that the aristocrats are misers who only want to see you suffer. It's a great game that kings and aristocrats play, since anything the rest of the people get in such an arrangement are the crumbs of wealth, most of which was produced by labor and the land that was stolen from the common people. Aristocracies abhor work, and export that ethos to the rest of society. Aristocracies in the ideal world are remarkably unproductive, and view productivity in all cases as a thing which must be subordinated to reason and the dictates of military necessity. Given a choice, an aristocrat chooses to destroy prosperity beyond his own, and is miserly towards other aristocrats with whom he competes. All the things that can be said of a foul-hearted tyrant are really the soul of every aristocrat the whole way through. There is no decay of goodness to make the aristocrat a bad tyrant. Aristocracies start out rotten, and make a big spectacle about how they are good and noble. This goodness is defined entirely by comparison to the deprivation of the common folk. Commoners are only allowed dignity so long as they remain workers, and workers are never truly permitted dignity, liberty, or security. Those are the last carrots an aristocrat ever wants to offer a worker, no matter how favored. Even the loyal workers are kept on edge, and an ever-present nervous terror is the default mental state of life in an aristocracy. With how hilariously maladaptive aristocracy has been, whether it is an artificial or elected aristocracy or a natural aristocracy premised on genuine merit, it is a wonder this form of government became the default, and its assumptions were taken for granted. Human history is indeed strange. So ubiquitous is the bias towards aristocracy that political theorists usually simplify the types of possible government to despotisms, monarchies, and republics, the latter two being effectively aristocratic governments in every case but with different pretenses told to the masses and among the rulers. When the only alternative to aristocratic terror is despotism, it's an engineered narrative to convince people that there is no alternative. Unfortunately, humanity is habituated to aristocracy to such an extent that anything else has become inconceivable, except as a reign of terror from below the likes of which would terrify all, including the others of common stock. Aristocracy has always been a work in progress, constantly revising its dogmas.

The further origins of aristocracy will be elaborated in subsequent chapters. It is helpful here to note that a state of war exists between aristocrat and commoner, and the haves and have-nots. All of our economic thinking in monetary society

is informed by aristocratic tendencies that dominate the economic order, and usually insist on control of the currency. If the monetary economy were truly free, as an anarcho-capitalist fool believes it ought to be, it would collapse rapidly, because the assumptions of aristocracy are everywhere in our social values and affect economic decision-making of every consumer. The example of the thirsty bourgeois man in the desert discovering marginal utility by fetching the theoretical caravan is the ultimate example of aristocratic "me wantee" thinking at the heart of bourgeois economics. Nowhere in that contrived example is there a concept of work, land, or anything material. It is a very peculiar example if you think about anything in the real world, because in practice even an aristocrat must concede to material reality if he wishes to rule or do anything. Aristocracy does not so much act out of ignorance of material reality, but actively defies it and insists on declaring a falsehood of their essential difference from the rest of us as a necessary political distinction. This is only possible with the implication that work and land itself is subjected to a warlike approach to its management. The aristocratic approach to this is not the only way a state, which at first responded to a general fear, could take shape. Aristocracy is one of the steps a society can take to transfer from an older, gentile constitution more firmly rooted in the natural world, to the philosophical state of today where the question of what type of government we have is written down and the answers promulgated as much as they need to be. Aristocracy was not the only way the war within a society could have been waged. There were many causes for an elite to elevate itself above the norm and assert that because it was that way now, it should be that way in the future, and that it was actually always that way in the past. "He who controls the present controls the past" has a long history, and it is inherent to aristocracy. Ideas contrary to aristocracy may be entertained, like democracy, but they are never implemented in any way which disturbs aristocratic conceits in a significant way. At most, these reforms are permitted as a way to mitigate the ruinous traits of aristocracy, while maintaining the principle that an aristocracy should rule over the ruled. The rationalization becomes more philosophical than premised on the particular qualities an aristocracy might possess, since as mentioned, an aristocracy can be drawn from any class. In theory an aristocracy of skilled labor is possible, and this is what crude technocratic conceits are taught to be, but technocracies always favored those skilled at ruling and management over anything productive. A technocracy where the workers and useful intellectuals actually rule would be something very different from anything that happened, and at best a relatively benevolent aristocracy understood the value of having something that actually produces things over their usual tendencies.

FORMATION OF THE WAR MACHINE

A society at war is very concerned with authority in all ways. It is impossible to conceive of organized fighting without a chain of command or some way to know what is to be done. Since authority is best represented in a singular person, this often means that warlike societies must start as individuals who, aside from

the state of war, have no particular reason to be united. Attempts to define the warring society must be able to make a clear delineation between who is in and who is out, and who has access to certain information. A military that does not verify this access risks a saboteur who has no interest in the project, and this is always present even if the warring society were presumed to be united by some material concern, or by an unspoken fear that no one is going to transgress without consideration. War as a practice would contribute further to the human sense of themselves as selves, which was already suggested by human necessity to retain themselves for economic decision making and conduct of their personal affairs. The general fear which formed the state will be acted on by everyone, whether they have the favor of the state or not. States have to account for people in their domain even if they are disloyal and do not submit to the state's authority or comply with record-keeping a bureaucracy would require. As warbands and those with a conceit of telling others what they will do and what they are were able to assert greater authority and do so on a permanent basis, resentment towards this would be the default state of anyone who had no reason to play along with this game. The existence of a great enemy, the nature of which is always nebulous, would be an easy way to draw people who had no reason to enter state society into the affairs of a few people. At first, and for a long time, these people ruled purely through fear, might, superstition, and whatever they could use to manipulate people into obeying instructions that were clearly against their interests. A true aristocracy was not formed immediately, because the concept of aristocracy and its legitimacy in the eyes of the common folk could not survive just because it was declared so. Clan and tribe societies looked to their closer social units for authority rather than any state or aristocracy, and the early states were ruled not by aristocratic conceits, but because one house or an alliance of houses could rule by might. Little effort in Babylon or Egypt was made to suggest that the rulers cared in the slightest about their subjects, or needed their consent for anything at all. Tax and tribute was obligated not by social custom, but because those who ruled had an army and could take your property and your life if you didn't pay up. This principle is still at the root of state authority and why they can collect taxes. You didn't really get a choice in being taxed, and no society could operate if it actually let the people decide their tax rate. "Taxation without representation" was intended to mitigate taxes an aristocracy of capital paid, with the expectation that in the long run, tax and rent would extract anything the common workers acquired. This process was held off until the 20th century, and neoliberalism was premised on maximal rent extraction and a deliberate effort to strip every last penny the workers ever acquired and any lands they managed to claw away from the system. In the days before states related to individuals or considered anything resembling rights or standing a thing, the state's authority was that it would do whatever it wanted, whenever it wanted. This, you may be surprised, often was better than the alternative, because no one was under any illusion that the arrangement was anything else. The ruled and the ruler were purely antagonistic and the ruler had no prestige or theory beyond their ability to do so. A justification may be found in the religion of early states, which proclaimed that the rulers were gods or very

close to the gods, but this was just an affirmative statement of a cult of power. It did not need to be legitimized by any theory, and its legitimacy through war was only as strong as the state's ability to win wars. A ruler who couldn't win wars was exposed as a weakling, tossed out, and another ruler stepped into the power vacuum. Most people were never going to participate in the affairs of state, and there was no expectation that they would want to. They knew that the state was an antagonist, and their relation to it was that the state was the thing that came around to collect tax every year, and this tax was usually in requisition of goods. There wasn't a myth that some aristocracy deserved to rule, unless it could point to some victory and ride that for as long as they could. The religious justifications of the past were not premised on a historical condition or any result, but on a cult and fetishism that glorified the leader and demanded submission. You bowed to the gods of the king, or you were in deep shit. There was no expectation that the gods were anything other than cruel to the weak, and your goal as a commoner was to align yourself with those gods because you feared them or believed it would give you something. It would take a form of education to instill the idea, over time, of an aristocracy with spiritual authority that could pass from state to state, and was a general rule of life. The spiritual authority of priests and wise men before was there for its purpose, but beyond the exhortation to bow and scrape to the king, the state was a temporal authority that simply asserted that it was godly because it was strong. New kings would bring in new cults, sometimes radically different and demanding new rules of worship and submission. It was the worship and self-abasement that kings and conquerors cared about, rather than the state religion pointing to truth or justice or things an aristocracy pretends to value. Aside from the loyalty of his soldiers, a king or warlord cared not about whether his common subjects loved him, feared him, or felt anything. All that was necessary was that the king could kill them if he needed to, and that the rabble kept paying into a protection racket and kept working the fields and industries of the society. A concept of civic duty escapes members of early states entirely, and if mentioned, it is seen as some sort of strange fantasy a rich person or a priest concocted to get them to pay into yet more horseshit.

You can see in this construction that the idea of a warring society all marching in order for the team is not at all how societies conduct war. This image of the entire society drilled and goosestepping for everything is a favorite of fascist ideology, but it never has worked like that, and the fascists themselves are the greatest example of how societies organized around war are never given more stability by being at war. People, who had no reason to go along with state society, are given a number of myths to suggest that the state or the ruling institutions of that society have a right to rule, and that their rule is just and good and all that. That is ostensibly what is defended. The lived experience of most people in the society is that all of those good things are in reality their greatest antagonist, or at best were neutral towards them, and that neutrality was only there out of a need to keep the peace. Neutrality is never the desired attitude of an aristocratic institution or a ruler, and neutrality in war is seen as

toxic and seemly. The expectations of war are about whether someone is loyal or disloyal. The apathetics of the American Revolutionary War are heaped with scorn for wanting to stay out of a conflict that was, by all reasonable accounts, a bunch of bullshit so that two factions of rich men got a bunch of poor men and women killed and took more stuff. The patriots may disagree with the war being bullshit since it was their stuff they cared about, and the loyalists defaulted to the king despite King George and his court being pretty damn pathetic during the whole ordeal. No one likes a neutral, and the battle between good and neutral is one a state likes to wage before it enters war. If someone can stay out of a civil war entirely, they are blessed. The evil, or disloyal, are a thing that can be more easily spotted than neutrality, and thus they are often purged or dealt with, and the disloyal seeking to subvert society will understand the need for sneakiness. The disloyal have known for a long time that an appearance of neutrality will not save them. The neutral is despised by all sides, despite the neutral often seeing the stupidity of the entire war effort. The neutral is stuck there because, unless neutral can hold its line against the war cult, their typical behavior is to avoid fighting unless absolutely necessary, which means they are unwilling to take sides unless they can form their own side. Since this would mean the established neutral is fighting a two front war, it would be very difficult unless one side can be convinced that the war drive is bullshit.

Individually, members of society are loathe to involve themselves with any of this. War, for most of them, is not what they live for, and even those who specialize in war are not fond to fight it. The people who fetishize and glorify war are usually those for whom it is an abstract thing, or a thing they can spectate and gamble on like it's a cute game. The sociality that individuals wanted between each other implies that war is a thing to be avoided, and even mutual defense of a social unit is taxing for that unit. A war of aggression is only unifying if they can win, and then that unity comes at the cost of certain commitments. Fighting men have to be capable fighters, which means weeding out anyone who is too soft or can't follow orders or isn't with the program. It might be possible to throw the losers into some penal battalion or bitch work, but wars typically involve men fighting and being at risk of dying. An army of penal battalions is not going to win a war, and if the society at war is run so horribly that its people are unfit for proper service, that is all you will have to fight with. Ultimately, the breakdown of society comes back to how humans educated themselves from a very early point, and how social proof decided who was in and out of social units in the first place. A lame or unsightly child was typically exposed or ritually sacrificed in the old days, and this practice was not just tolerated but encouraged in primitive society as the thing to do. It was a radical change in civilized societies to not do this on occasion, like sparing the weak was some grand mark of virtue even though the mercy towards the weak was the most abject slavery and humiliation that no decent man, even a slave, would tolerate. Slaves of sound mind and standing who were treated this way would either break down mentally, seeing such treatment as one of the most severe punishments and an unbearable shame, or would free themselves

by suicide or attack the master out of pure spite. No other response would be acceptable to a man with any shred of dignity. Slaves often talk about how much shit they put up with, but the humiliation of this degradation is something else altogether. To be retarded is worse than slavery, and this has always been known. Better to be a slave, even a slave who was buck broken, than to be a retard. The buck breaking technique was used to impose on the slave the belief that he was retarded, but on some level he knew he was not the retard. Even here, buck breaking was a terror technique against the disobedient slaves, rather than a normal, routing conditioning. The more effective and loyal slaves were shown this fate as a way to keep them from rebelling, but actually doing it en masse would lead to slaves refusing to work out of dire necessity or killing everything in sight. The favored slaves would be encouraged to facilitate the terror among each other and against the weak, thus perpetuating the system. As long as it wasn't them, the strategy of extreme punishments to set an example worked. Consider then that a society at war has been effectively put in slavery, and the ruler himself is obligated to prosecute the war to retain his legitimacy, and so he is in some sense beholden to the needs of war. Slave societies have never been bastions of solidarity, and any manager of slaves has known to punish the weak links to maintain discipline. Even an army that sought to salvage its manpower as much as possible, out of a sense that it had to, is hesitant to tolerate weakness. A deep impulse that led to war in the first place shows immense disgust towards the weak, and the thought of incorporating a retard in any society is more offensive than losing a war to their mind. To allow the retard as an equal would undo anything the war was intended to defend or maintain. That is the foundational rule of human sociality - once retarded, always retarded, and never allowed in the know. The degree of retardation, or the nature of that retardation, did not have to matter so much. The judgement and need to punish transgressors of this most ancient eugenics was an absolute that would, time and time again, assert itself in all societies, whether they were at war or at peace. The condition of war simply intensified pressures to do this that would, in peacetime, be counterproductive. The war conditions are felt if a society is engaged with an enemy. If a population is enslaved, the master is at war with his slaves at all times, and the strategy of disciplining slaves is like any battle strategy, with engagements called interventions to modify slave behavior. The conquest and torture of slaves is itself a victory in the great war against the slaves, and a legitimation of the entire institution that is necessary for its continuation. There will never be a benign slavery, because if it is too benign, the slaves could suggest with good reason that they would gladly agree to conditions of free labor, and that such a carrot would be very welcome. The freeing of slaves has usually been present in slaveries, even in the scientific chattel slavery of America, so there was an admission that slavery wasn't absolute. That changed when Galton's Eugenics came to the world and proclaimed not just a total slavery, but a natural slavery that became the sole law and spiritual authority, displacing all others.

Human society was never what it was purported to be, and because war became

a key organizing principle for societies, organic sociality could only exist in reduced forms and at a local level. Genuine connections between people in a nation were discouraged, and it remains the defining trait of a nation that it is an imagined grouping of people rather than something held together by meaningful bonds. It is not realistic for a million people to know each other personally, and mass behavior is conditioned primarily by thought leaders and mesmerists, to take advantage of certain principles in human psychology when humans are arranged in a mass crowd, and when humans are arranged in formations and drilled to behave in particular ways. Meaningful society would have entailed a level of communication that was not possible with any technology, and would not be possible even today. Theoretically, we are connected to an internet that brings us in contact with many millions of other people, but there is no realistic way we are going to know who we're talking to, and the internet brings many questions about whether what we read is authentic, and how much of the internet is comprised of bots or shills or powerusers with a disproportionate amount of time and energy to influence discussion. These problems are not unique to electronic communication, for trust and verification in a world of deception is always problematic. What is known is that organic sociality usually was necessary for survival, and early states could not intervene in private life the way classical states did. States did not relate so much to individual subjects except in isolated cases, and the clan and tribe was part of the constitution of early societies. Extended family networks and connections that were not mediated by any state were normal and expected features of society, and the state kept a lid on this purely for its claim to land and tax. This organic sociality did not exist for nothing, and was not present in the state of nature. Social bonds in an earlier society usually didn't recognize authority beyond that which was expedient, or the authority of parents over their children. That authority over children did not exist in the same way it does in any state society, where an expectation is placed on children to conform to antagonistic relations in close quarters. There is nothing "more natural" about tribal society over state society or a society of individuals managed by the state, because the tribal formation itself was formed by deliberate actors rather than by some instinct inherent in mankind. Tribes themselves were not political units or even direct associations of people, but social constructions we applied in hindsight to describe groups of people who shared characteristics, like a language or an economic system. There is a whole construction of economic systems, where in earlier society they are local and price-setting markets are not at all a thing. Nomadic society did not tend to understand "exchange value" except as an ad hoc arrangement, or certain expectations that were particular to people who lived off of herds. The typical exchange was not in money but in livestock, while industrial products such as they existed were not considered typical trade objects. Barter of such objects was less common than just manufacturing tools or pottery for yourself or your associates and giving them as needed, and practices of barter in nomadic society for industrial goods were often more about side deals between men, which had a shady character to most in society but were understood as a mark between manly men. There would not be a market of industrial goods in nomadic society

that was large, and the products from butchering animals would be like so many other tools that were constructed. A whole science to use every part of the livestock had been developed and understood in those societies, and it would have been more convenient to trade the livestock than to trade the products from dismantling the corpse as-is. The hunt to acquire livestock involved herding live animals, and then breeding them whole and confining them. The construction of economic life was never solely about exchange in markets, and even today, market exchange does not account for all or even most of the exchange between humans. How markets actually function in the 21st century, and how logistics is managed today, is another broad topic that many an economist do not even acknowledge. There is a great effort to mystify operations and logistics with the use of money tokens, even though we know the money tokens are fiat currency that can be printed at will by the Federal Reserve, and monetary policy is used openly to manipulate mass behavior rather than any need to do so, or any incentive that would be considered productive. This fiat currency system exists because capitalism in the older sense would be laughable if it were expected to compete with planned industrial operations, and the firms which actually coordinate industry and distribution are monopolies which will never have to compete as if they were a struggling business. Amazon could lose money year after year, but the value of its operations is so great that this cost is borne. If there were not this money flooding into Amazon, the market incentives would not construct what Amazon does today, and there were existing incentives of the smaller capitalists to prevent this from happening as it would mean the end of retail business models. The retail apocalypse, always 10 years into the future, is really something else entirely, but it is known to any retail peon that retail outlets are the industry of not giving a fuck about anything and operating at the barest minimum possible to prevent shortages and riots.

This economic discursion does not relate directly to war, but it suggests that our thinking of natural, materially necessary sociality is unfounded. Society in its organic form did not regard the state as necessary, and states have been from the start an alien imposition on things most of us would have wanted. The beneficiaries of the state are conscious that they use this institution to rule, and that it is an alien. There is no way to bring people into the state without a fight, and this has meant that the intellectual theorists of the state are always given over to lies and scams to strip people of that native sociality, and the thing they wanted in the first place, which was to associate with other humans as they would prefer and to keep their liberty and security. None of those goals in society suggested any particular form society must take, other than that people generally would talk to each other. If everyone were loners, humanity would be a very hostile place and difficult to survive in, and it would be expedient for some of the loners to talk to each other eventually. There was never a null state where humans started out as loners. Even a savage would be raised by their mother long enough to suckle from her breast, if the mother did not kill the child or leave it to die before then. Savage man would still have understood other creatures like himself and figured out that they were much like him, and

that some understanding was possible. This would not be much of a society, but there would be an awareness of a world and that social units were possible. Since sociality already existed from the forebears of humans, this time of solitude was not necessary, but communication itself suggested that humans would be more individualistic than their animal forebears, and would see more the situation they inherited as an unpleasant one. The composition of early society is likely informed by a desire in men to be free of domination, as would have existed in the world of apes and monkeys. That freedom was not about a love for liberty as an idea, but because it was the most basic condition of security, as domination in the savage world meant torture and death and a lot of suffering that served no purpose. It is sad that we live under a modern ethos that glorifies the worst of the ape kingdom and tells us this is what civilization is supposed to be, where freedom is reduced to an empty token and the only ideas are how to make others suffer for the pleasure of a few sadists, who tell us they are brilliant but who we know to be the worst retards of all.

The war game entails taking a society, however imagined, and organizing each of its human agents towards the task. Whatever our theories of government or the organizational chart that exists for economic or political purposes, it is well known that individual people are the agents that do things, in war or in any management of work activity. War as a practice requires the planner to view these agents as individuals, before it can rearrange them in formations, units, and allocations towards a shared task. This is different from the organic social cooperation that might be found, where people associate with each other because there is a coincidence of wants that is only possible through continuous interaction. The arrangement in war is dictated by whomever the war chief is, or at least it would have to be acknowledged if war is to be conducted by any plan that is appropriate to its task. War, to be war, is fought against another society doing the same thing. Therefore, there is a psychological game and analysis inherent to war in the meaningful sense. Wars are fought in the end with one man against another man, and whatever organization those men are in is built from the foundation that one man shall fight another. The organization of units in a warlike society is premised on individual competition and initiative, before the unit can form and an artificial cohesion can be taught. This cohesion of the unit is not a natural thing, but an artificial construct imposed by the commander, and conditioned on the premise that the commander is an alien to his subordinates. Even if the leader is selected from the group and is merely the most senior of equals, that leader is expected to impose his authority over the unit and guide it to do things which were not natural or in the interest of individuals. It is usually expedient that the collective aim of a unit be understandable to each individual, or at least that each individual has his place and role and executes it as needed. The more individuals in the unit can figure out the operation of the whole unit, and then the function of the whole army and society, the better that individual will understand why he is doing what he does. Any army that teaches and encourages ignorance of its soldiers, even the lowest of grunts, is sacrificing something that would make a man effective at fighting. Scared,

cowardly, ignorant men will, like sissies, shoot everything in sight if they are given a gun and don't know what to do. If they manage to avoid the impulse to shoot things, they often revert to avoiding any battle as much as possible, and eventually avoid doing anything at all. Men who don't know what they're doing or why they're doing it tend to turn to self-abuse, indulge in their vices and self-soothe. This is the sign that someone's usefulness as a soldier is depleting. Normally, a commander with limited manpower would want to mitigate this if it can be done, especially in a society where replenishment of manpower is not easy. In eugenist society, militaries are organized to exhaust low-level grunts on purpose, while the useful fighting and purpose of war is conducted by elite specialists more and more. Since the army of a eugenist society exists primarily for a eugenic purpose, where the soldier is typically a lab rat for some Mengele-type experiments or social or psychological experiments, it is acceptable to indulge this ignorance and failure and encourage it. Scared and cowardly men make terrible soldiers, but they are useful enough as Einsatzgruppen to turn against their own ostensible "team", which is what the eugenic creed wants its military to be, fed with a diet of drugs and unaware of why they are following orders to shoot their former family and friends. This tendency was built into the methods of war and the philosophical theory of the state, which was premised on severing organic sociality, and eventually breaking down the individual subject and reconstructing him as a tool. The methods to break down and reassemble a human would remain, for most of history, an arcane science and only followed sometimes. Drill instructors preparing to fight did not have time to individualize instruction, preferring to teach by the numbers. The psychological breakdown would instead be a matter of state education, that terrible beast that doomed us to this. Actually reconstructing people beyond a bare minimum is too much work for them, but the state school, and most forms of education, are designed to degrade and humiliate anyone passing through it, and this curse afflicts humanity in some way or another. Its proliferation, and the invasion of education into the rest of our lives, has dumbed down and destroyed the psychological state of any society where the cult of education and cult of war were deployed for a purely eugenic purpose. This characteristic is common to state societies that embrace philosophies totally alien to a society that would work, which is to say every philosophy and theory that has currency in modernity save a few obscure ones. In eugenic society, the deleterious effects of education cults and war are deliberately maximized and encouraged, because that is the path of least resistance, so long as the eugenic creed is taken for granted and instilled in children as the most core value and the last spiritual authority.

We can see, and will see further on, that such a war machine will never do what it purports to do, even when doing so would make the war very simple and winnable. We will continue this work with the understanding that in some way or another, the mentality of war has been used for this effect of social engineering, in a way that should be clear to anyone looking at their life and history with this mind.

THE ART AND PRACTICE OF WAR

Far better men than me - and for many reasons the overwhelming majority of literature pertaining to war has come from males - have expounded on the details of war, the formation of units, squads, legions, armies, and the command of generals and princes. For any sophisticated undertaking, the core practices of war are guided by politics and spiritual authority, which is something beyond the core mechanisms of war and a thing apart from it altogether. War is not infused into politics in the way a naive grunt might be taught, and in practice, the grunts conscripted to fight know such a view of war and the institution is bullshit. It is a story told to the rubes who are expected to fear any military confrontation, or any free man granted the explicit right and duty of violence against the unfree. There is no necessary "economic" logic to the organization of war, nor is there a spiritual guide that suggests a fixed strategy of war. Those who lead armies have long understood that technology and the conditions they operate in necessitate new tactics and strategies. This is undertaken not because war is a singular motor to guide social development or the path of technology, but it is a necessity that anyone leading an army abides whether they like it or not. War as a practice does not create on its own power any new technology, nor unleash potentials that did not exist in people before. There is no such thing as "creative destruction", no matter how much Germanic braying suggests that is a thing. None of the empires that were effective at war suggested that war was in of itself a moral purpose. This did not stop them from suggesting a militarized society was ideal, or that martial prowess was a legitimating force. The language of war suggests, at a basic level, meritocracy as a necessity, and there are many who see a genuine meritocracy as worthwhile for all of the reasons that makes sense. In all cases, the effective war machines understood war not as a religious practice all on its own, but as a tool like any other tool empires use to shape the environment. It was never the primary or foundational tool, since the very existence of an effective army was premised on a productive base and the labor of many people. Effective war-making requires intelligence-gathering and utilizes people who are not seen as soldiers in uniform. Torturers, prostitutes-turned-spies, comfort women, the cheerleaders of the war cult and the cheerleaders of empire, slave traders, loyal slaves serving multifarious functions for the war effort, and very large support staffs are obligatory for any proper war machine. The idiotic braying of a science fiction fascist like Heinlein does not resemble any army that has functioned in the real world, and could not do so. Such an army would either destroy itself, or it would be governed by men and women behind the curtain, which is the implication of the world Starship Troopers suggested.^[8] The reality of war is not that it serves economic or spiritual causes, nor that war guides those as the true master. War and the people tasked with fighting are another interest in society to be placated, and war is fought not by idealized minds devoted to the cult of war, but by people who are in the end motivated by all of the things a non-combatant would be. They would need to be so if they are to be constituted as useful soldiers, or even machines deployed for a purpose. The technocratic conceit that soldiers will be operated like machines, pushed

like any button to execute managerial will, produces a sickly and ineffective war machine. This is intended, because the war machine of technocratic society isn't intended to fight conventional armies of other polities. It is intended instead to fight the greater eugenic war against the ruled, and sees the producers of society as their chief enemy. The interest of the producers is wildly at odds with the military meritocracy and the aims of any aristocracy that claimed the throne, and this alone guides all decisions of the national security state. The enemies of the true ruling power of the United States, and the chief threats that would dislodge the new aristocracy, are named by Eisenhower - the military and industry. The military's interests are to procure new weapons and maintain their fiefdoms, drug cartels, and the regular abuses that are enjoyed by the victors of the war cult and imposed on the population. Industry's interest is not to produce for the masters, but to produce for themselves and break free of the permanent aristocratic tyranny. The aristocracy hopes to channel the vices of these two groups and control them, so that they see the partnership as frayed and those wise enough to rise will be selected by the true ruling power, which knew the military and industry to be a ruse the whole way. The alliance between militarists and industrialists had a corrosive effect on democratic society and despised democracy, but saw correctly their chief rival being the ruling power. The aim of the alliance is not to destroy the ideas of the aristocrats, but to supplant the aristocrats and promote a degraded and degenerated form of the eugenic religion, and insist that they are the real master race rather than the present victors. Eugenics itself promotes this interclass conflict, as the whole system of society relies on habitual lying, backstabbing, and assassination. In that way, the values of the aristocracy are reproduced, even if the holders of high office change. The eugenists at the top will gladly turn on each other like jackals and enforce discipline of their clique to the hilt, and seek to select from the military and industry those traits which are amenable to full eugenism. The aristocrats then claim that eugenics was the idea of the soldiers and the industrialists themselves, and the holders of noble privilege can say that they are the stabilizing force that will protect the little guy, while infantilizing the little guy and degrading his condition in every way possible. The lower two classes - labor and the residuum - always know all of this is a sick joke, and they are completely frozen out of any class mobility. The small mobility that was permitted under capitalist society would be cut off completely, as all who share the aristocratic core beliefs lock ranks. That was allowed to go on for a century, and in 2020 that aristocracy could enact what they always wanted to do. And so, this is Hell, and there is no way to reason with it.

This pattern is not unique to our moment in history. It is inherent in the core practices of war itself, when war is seen as a function of society rather than the story of men in conflict for their own purposes, or empires with any reason to exist beyond mere rule. It is not a given that rulers of the past would do the exact same thing today's aristocracy does, and there are many reasons to suggest past aristocracies would see the past century as an abomination to be prevented at all costs. Today's aristocracy cannot even say to themselves, let

alone to the world, what any of this is or why anyone should go along with it. It is only because the most venal and disgusting of humanity could select for each other, and made it illegal to tell them no or even passively resist them so that we live some sort of life, that we face this sorry impasse in the 21st century. The core spiritual authority and ideology is not reducible to war itself, for the drive to war and its cult was dependent on an evil that preceded it, and evils that moved far beyond the purview of war proper. It is conceivable that the eugenic religion could exist without war at all. It is indeed the philosophy of "perfected society" that war in any recognizable sense would no longer exist, even as a psychological motivator pressing people with material or violent hardship. The militarization of society, to the aristocratic mind, is nothing more than an abstraction, removed from their daily experience. The war is seen by the comfortable as something far away and detached from their daily life, delegated to other people who are tainted and declared monstrous for doing the bidding of the eugenic creed. Eugenics revels in this torture and the purity of their favored classes, as they always did. Even the depravity of aristocracy recognizes that the situation is only possible because there is a productive class building anything useful, and a class of men tasked with fighting to defend the strongholds of aristocracy. Aristocracy has to cajole and lie in everything it does to defend every institution it builds, and disdains the grubby business of fighting. The aim of aristocracy is to rule forever. How they do so varies. Warrior aristocracies reveled in continuous conflict and blood cults, and picked among them leaders who prized the appearance of merit and strength but who knew to leave actual fighting to the simps. Technocratic aristocracies, such as the one we live under today, presume aristocracy can engineer all of the world as a giant machine, and for this machine to work, certain assumptions must be made about human agents that reduce them to points of light and information. If there were a world where labor aristocracies ruled in their own right, it would envision the democratic force as a giant mass of flesh and willpower to be directed dear the lowest cunning that feels good. Such a view of society is suggested by various means, but it is far removed from anything that would actually command society because it is based on all of the conceits of traditional aristocracies, imposed on laborers who have found it alien to everything they ever knew. The "aristocracy of the lowest class", which as a rule would never win power, envisions endless abolition of a world of shit and a drive for revenge that would make the worst of the worst seem tame. For the lowest class, the world was already destroyed for the cause of others, and while many of us down here would rather see the world go on for sentimental purposes and because the world was never the problem, aristocracy as a force when it comes down here imposes an ultraviolent and terrible view of the world. This view is ascribed to "the world" or to capital-N Nature, rather than its proper source in human society and its institutions. It is something internalized, or something adopted by those of the residuum who are useful vectors and inclined by something in their nature or upbringing to serve aristocrats like the most craven bootlickers. It is highly necessary in the aristocracy of the residuum to advance concepts of society, politics, and reality that are deliberate and profuse lies. This has an appeal to those who might

believe they would seize power to change the world, but most of the time, this alien ideology is delivered by influencers, who collect their paycheck and slink away once the carnage is seeded. So long as no genuine knowledge is permitted for the lowest class, and any expression of intellect is punished by all other classes as the greatest social obligation, the grinding down of society and a race to the bottom is guaranteed. Society would be reduced to nothing more than the thrill of torture, conducted by aristocrats who willfully cannibalized the instruments of rule. Those instruments of rule were now not only unnecessary, but a danger to the aristocrats if they were left unattended.

The war is fought for purposes other than aristocracy - those who participate will see, on some level, a reason to fight, that does not need to comport with the ruling ideas in any way. There are those who see the war as a job and a paycheck, or an opportunity for looting and a piece of the action. It is always the case that aristocracies can initiate war and conduct diplomacy at the high levels. No one else is credible, and aristocrats of various sorts recognize each other and their shared interest in maintaining the philosophy of rule, more than war for its own sake or some productive goal of human society. Everyone else is made to accept the terms of society aristocracy left us with, so far as aristocracy can impose its vision of the world and society on the world and the agents that comprise society. If wars were initiated by meritocratic soldiers or the mere interests of money, it would not be hard to see that these motives are not worth the risk and damage to their interest that war entails. It is a rule of those who have to fight and pay for the war that war should be avoided as much as possible, and only after considerable damage to prestige can the lower orders countenance war on their own. Long before that happens, aristocrats who are distant from the consequences of war have poked the rival societies and pushed the ruled of both societies to this outcome, knowing that aristocrats on all sides are safe, and that the chief aim of war is to uphold the aristocratic values and their perpetuation throughout the society. But, for the soldiers to actually throw their lives away for this idiocy, for the men with money to throw their wealth into a giant bonfire, for the sweat and blood of labor to be expended on such a wasteful activity, the cause to fight must be evident to all of them. Only the lowest class of the residuum has no buy-in with the war in most cases - and yet, the venal and depraved of the residuum are given a choice to be the worst enablers of war, in exchange for a pittance that the higher orders give them in a rare moment of inclusion. In the main, the true targets of war are the residuum. The men of the residuum must be culled, and war is among the mechanisms to accomplish this. The women of the residuum must be prostituted and used for the base pleasures of the higher classes. War is presented as creative because it enslaves those who were thrown away and, out of desperation, make themselves go along with some slavery because the alternative allowed for them is worse. In some way, war or a social engineering project conducted like war is necessary to impose the condition in society that can fully police the residuum. Policing the residuum purely through aristocratic conceits, or rejection from the world of the producers, or the enforcement of labor proper to disallow cretins

in their ranks, will always be fickle because it will not resort to coherent and organized violence to accomplish the task. If the policing of the residuum were left to individual virtue and motive, it would be apparent to many in society, including the warriors, that a war against the weak is pointless for their interests. War does not unite the society in the way the cult suggests, but the act of war produces a chilling effect and makes clear the true aim of humanity - to wage endless war against the lowest class. To the lowest class, all of the stories of history seem like some sick joke. History for the residuum is an endless series of atrocities, humiliations, betrayals, lies, and viciousness towards their race, carried out for no reason other than the thrill of those who impose it. It did not serve any goal necessary for the society to survive, and it did not make a significant difference on the outcome of war between two parties where the outcome was consequential. The residuum as a rule avoid any entanglement in conflict, and it is too expensive to carry out a competitive war while disposing of the residuum. Yet, the aim of aristocracy in initiating war is to attack the class they despise most of all, and strangely the class which most closely resembles the aristocracy in function.

The regimentation of society into functions is most evident in a struggle for survival against another society - that is, when two societies are at war and compare themselves against each other. Just as two combatants in an arranged fight or a game will assess each other, so do the combatants in war. It is necessary to retain a sobering influence of what the other side brings to bear, and even the most degraded opponent will remember what they are fighting, even if their memory and thoughts are so vague and the damned can only make aspersions and attack phantoms. Those at the receiving end of today's social engineering see the language of war infused in every institution and in every action of the valid towards the invalid. The militarization of society and the stone wall of shame and rejection is nothing less than an absolute and total war against the invalid, carried out with full malice intended. Even despite the seeming victory of the valid, the war is pressed entirely by the valid, as no humiliation of the invalid is enough. If the state of war implied by eugenic social engineering ever abated for a moment, the eugenic society and its institutions would be undone. The fake friendships and sacchrine propaganda of the Fabians are transparent in their contempt for the lower classes, and also in their contempt for each other, for the Fabians are at heart a lot of stupid men and women tasked with this horrific eugenic duty. They can't pretend kindness, and the thrill of fake "kindness" is itself a mark of victory over the damned. If one iota of kindness were allowed to seep through, even an expression of kindness intended to deceive, it is anathema to the values of Fabianism. Should there be a genuine need of deception to entrap a victim, it is only intended towards other valids who are to be shunted down to invalid status. "Once retarded, always retarded." Even if the "retard" were willing to join with the oppressor as a Judas, and wasn't actually retarded in the formal psychological or even political sense, the Fabian and the eugenist can never let go of such a judgement. It is the only judgement which is meaningful in the eugenic creed, for all other judgements - political

insanity, the wrongdoing of deeds in particular, or any independent assessment of someone's moral probity - revolve around this one word, "retarded", which is the most sacred word in all of eugenics. Once judged, the judgement is never to be lifted under any circumstances. If the system is ever wrong, then history must be edited such that there is no record of the system ever making a false adjudication. Since there would be in actuality enough memory of a declaration of retardation, in practice "false judgements" are corrected by extermination of the retard who forgets his place in society, or the retard whose existence offends the sensibilities and sense of themselves the eugenists foster. It is more important to defend the creed and its legacy than for the creed to be meaningfully right, and it is more important to recapitulate the eternal creed above all.

This, for any practical purpose of war, is absurd if warriors wish to operate in the realm of reality and the limitations of men. Yet, the process of war cannot forgive cowardice, incompetence, and above all failure. The warrior must regard genuine merit if the war is to be a proper war. Whatever the genuine purpose of war, and however poorly the generals conduct it, the conduct of warriors is judged by merit rather than pure conceit. There is no rule to suggest that merit would be adjudicated honestly, or that the favoritism typical of human societies wouldn't rise to the top. War, even the war of eugenic social engineering, has to bend to the real situation, and so the ability to lie about merit is constrained. The awards and status of merit, which are more properly functions of aristocracy - a cookie granted by the aristocrats to cajole and motivate soldiers from the grunts to the generals - are something different from recognition of genuine merit. Somewhere in the war machine, the functions of war must be carried out adequately enough for the project to continue. This means that administrators cannot be too lax, and a bare minimum of competence of soldiers and communication between them must be maintained. Militaries have long imposed artificial constraints and stupid regulations, because at heart aristocrats decide the outcome of wars and are the judges of merit. Yet, even in the planned war of eugenic social engineering, the aristocrats are beholden to a world where their officers must be effective. Mere obedience is never enough. The solution of eugenic social engineering has been to poison and degrade as much as possible all classes but their faithful soldiers, so that the soldiers themselves do not have to fight at anything more than a minimum of ability and can be in the long term kept in line with drugs, terror, and fear. The idea eugenist soldier is a coward who can be pushed like a machine to commit any atrocity, any depravity, and who by the sheer quantity of his numbers and the machines at his disposal confuses and scatters the lower classes. Cowardice, of course, is anathema to the most basic conduct of fighting. The aristocrat desires as much as possible for the warrior to resemble him, while the warrior - if sober - sees the cult of war as an unwelcome imposition. The warrior at the end of the day does not believe in empty duty. Soldiers and generals must be paid and recognize their value, regardless of their ability to bargain or threaten or the situation they must accept in the end. A meritocracy exists, but the meritocracy is rigged to be as unfair as it can be, and the warriors themselves are not under any obligation to reward merit of

individuals or merit at all. The meritocracy exists not because of an intent of warriors, but a necessity for their function to be fulfilled. Otherwise, wars would be entirely fake and performative, like some student protests intended to be a display of democratic impotence.

In many cases, the societies that go to war would already have been regimented. The attacker stages not just the fighting men, but the whole society in preparation for the war effort. Even in societies that are primitive, where the lower classes are only driven by a crude patriotism or fear of impending doom, the society is set up for war. The defender, having learned of organized society, considers all potential rivals. Nowhere are the two societies ignorant of what war is, based on their knowledge of the past. This applies to the most primitive of societies, before "society" in the form of state society is evident. Nowhere in the practice of war are participants convinced that humans are singular agents moving around randomly, or that humans are merely confined to a few social units. When two tribes go to war, the war chief - who may have been elevated specifically for the purpose of leading the war effort - would assess what he has to work with, based on who showed up to elevate him for this task. The allies and enemies are no great mystery, even when warmaking is mystified and obfuscated to keep individual participants in the dark. Out of necessity, humans who think at all about war and its meaning will see an organized society, even if that organization is loose. War as a practice has a sobering effect on human societies, even if there were a condition of universal peace that was recognized around the world. The mere threat of war, by whatever name it calls itself, suggests that human societies would be organized to consider war as a possibility. War is not the sole possibility for human society, or even the chief aim of society. Human beings individually and in their social behavior have many priorities, and war is not the sole form struggle would take. War is a particular type of struggle in which two societies are mobilized in total for the effort. Whether the participants individually want that mobilization does not change that when war is initiated, the members of society are obligated to acknowledge it, and the whole of society is in principle a thing that can be requisitioned. This practice of war precedes the state or any spiritual authority willing it to be so. It is instead of logical consequence of considering war in the first place; that is, that all wars are in principle total. Only by custom or an expectation of warmaking that is established in history do we consider that wars can be limited, or that there are certain sectors of society that would be off-limits to the war cause, or that the participants choose not to disturb. War is not reducible to struggle, nor are all struggles war. Nor is the mobilization of a society inherently warlike. Societies can be mobilized for productive aims, for the generation of wealth and opulence or knowledge of such, or for spiritual aims of various sorts, and these mobilizations can be just as totalizing or make claims to the world beyond the society and its traditional domains. War as a practice cannot make claims beyond the societies that wage it, and the objects subsumed in it. Even the territories and things to be claimed in war are in some sense outside of the war. War as a practice and condition is a particularly human one, for it to be considered war in the proper sense. War

implies symbolic language and recognition in communication that this indeed a state of affairs. It relies on social information that can be communicated and abstracted. The endemic conflict in the animal kingdom, even when organized, can only be war of a limited sort. War implies enough knowledge for deliberation and an understanding of its consequences, for it to be war in the sense humans regard it as that. When two tribes in barbarous conditions face each other in war, there is not ambiguity about the nature of the activity they are engaged in, because the tribesmen exist in a society where this information is communicable, and they comprehend the authority of war chiefs, a chain of command, and so on. We may consider that there are parallels in the behavior of apes, who may have a sense of leadership and demonstrate tactics for battle, and we should not be too quick to judge if there is a thought process among them that suggests they have some overarching objective. War properly speaking though suggests that peace and diplomatic relations are an outcome, and even the most primitive groupings of humanity comprehend peaceful relations. War to be war is defined by pitched battles and elevated hostility, carried out with sufficient deliberation and towards this aim of social engineering. The engineering is intended to affect an alien society, but those who participate in war are aware of the effect war has on their own society as it happens. Never are the warring parties fixed in a preferred form, as if they are oblivious to the reality that war entails meaningful actions to be war in an appreciable sense.

Humanity goes to war with the societies, institutions, machines, and things they have on hand, rather than what they would prefer their society to be in an ideal model. The war is conducted similarly. After all of the game theory, drilling, and practice, victory is decided not by the judgement of knowledge or fact, but by the real outcome and meaningful interpretation of the events. There is, contrary to the aristocratic koan that "no one wins war", winners and losers, and the winners and losers do not correspond entirely to the societies that were pit against each other. Rarely does one society completely overrun the other. Often, extermination of the enemy society's members is not even the goal, nor is it a goal to enslave or subdue entirely the alien. The stated aims of war do not correspond to the games aristocrats play, or the objectives of participants who are brought into the war. They are, though, necessarily fought by two societies which must be united in an effort. Failure to maintain cohesion of the society means defeat and inability to form a useful effort. And so, warriors over time consider the optimal deployment of their people and resources, as the war requires command to remain intact most of all. That deployment is always informed by the conditions of the society which exist outside of war, rather than a model suggested by nature as the "correct" war formation. We may imagine a war in the future waged not just with exotic weapons, but waged by people who do not think like us at all, and whose social structure and communication and moral philosophy is unlike anything we have known to now. Imagine for a moment if space aliens from another planet encountered Earth, and the type of society that would be necessary for such an undertaking to reach us. It is highly unlikely the aliens would recognize humans as thinking animals on their

level, or that the aliens would waste effort speaking at our level or regard our conceits of society, politics, war, religion, and so on. The strategy of the aliens, if they choose to subdue Earth, would appear alien to much of our sense of what war is, and because I cannot know the true history of these aliens, it could very well conform to their own biases and sentiments and purposes of coming to Earth in the first place. Very likely, the aliens would see that humanity is easily corrupted and cajoled by their own moral failings, and the aliens would find many ready compradors who would be their effective face and army. It would be far easier for aliens to turn human malice into their primary weapon, rather than send a single ground troop or waste effort with orbital bombardment. A view of humanity from afar, without our biases, would tell the alien that humans will believe anything and are impressed by symbols and crass ambitions. The fortitude of the human race is feeble at the present time, and the aliens could very well consider working in time-frames beyond our life span. It has long been known that humans in a century would lose contact with living memory of the time before, given our present lifespans and institutional knowledge. All an alien would need to do is provide to the compradors whatever intelligence from afar is needed, and arrange for conspirators who will secure the vanguard. The aliens, likely possessing mechanical knowledge far beyond our own, could deliver specifications and guide their compradors. It is well known that the intellectual and aristocratic traditions are amenable to being compradors and would treasure this received wisdom, because the aristocrats and intellectuals have long considered themselves to be the same sort of alien race lording over the world, apart from the world and conventional, base thought or matter. But, perhaps the aliens will either lack the interest in such a program, or simply find humans to be so loathsome that the only reason they came to Earth is to exterminate the filth once and for all, rather than any ulterior motive. After all, the conduct of war is primarily this social engineering, rather than any material motive. If the space aliens wanted resources, most of the universe is dead and many planets are larger than Earth, richer in rare resources that they would value. Assuming the aliens relied on agriculture, which is very likely not the case, it would be far cheaper to build an artificial farm in ideal conditions than the farming in natural conditions we have lived with, assuming the aliens have enough sense to understand why plants are nutritious and do not forget that science concerns a meaningful world rather than ideology or institutions.

The conduct of warriors is more than mere technology, but in some sense, all of the drilling, culture, warrior codes, and so on is a form of technology. So are the techniques of propaganda, motivation, and so on aristocrats hone. If we are to describe war as an event in the world with scientific language, all of the aims of the eugenic and basic interest of life are things which can be abstracted and described as technology or the outcome of labor. And so, those who would be technocrats in our time, and those who would be laborers in our time, understand war in those terms, more than they would appreciate the warrior's craft or his purpose and interests. The aristocrat sees war as a grand game or a nuisance, but in any event it is a tool that the aristocrat constructs

for his purposes, without regard to technology or reality. Aristocrats always see war as something they can shape and control in purpose, rather than war as a truly natural event. They may be forced to bend to technology and labor, but the aristocrat will always return to their preferred vision of war as a great game, which they create to change the world and make it abide by their thought-forms. There is then the fifth and lowest class of humanity, which is the only class completely removed from this practice in principle. The lowest class, who are the class most despised by all who favor war, sometimes join the war effort as saboteurs, torturers, and feeders. To the lowest class, all of human existence appears as a series of wars and depredations against their race, and they see correctly that their true war is with humanity and empire itself. Very often, the removal of the residuum is among the purposes of the war practice, understood by the other classes as a check on their numbers and a thrill delivered to those who repeat a tradition that separated the human race from apes. If the war were fought too obviously towards that purpose, instead of presenting two societies in conflict to alter each other, war as a practice would cease to be meaningful, and it could not be conducted in any way appropriate to the mission. The aim of aristocracy has always been to declare a war against the weak alone, and obviate any war between rival nations, rival aristocrats, or any material center of force that would be organized. For this, the aristocracy must make common cause with the productive and meritorious elements of their society, which do not have any intrinsic reason to go along with this, and who do not intrinsically see the residuum as the same dire threat that aristocracy does. Far from it, the residuum as a force is nearly impotent in relevant militaristic output, and often does not register as technologically or laboriously significant. The residuum as a rule lives on nearly nothing, and the pittance they are allowed to live on is considered an exorbitant expense. All of the charity given to the residuum is only ever a temporary measure to facilitate the herding of the true enemy. The chief aims of war then - aristocrats using the war as a great game and a way to cull their true enemies - are at odds with all of the means by which war is fought. The residuum alone sees correctly that the war, and all such practices, are abominations that serve little purpose in the world, because their contribution to the war practice and its cult is meager. Naturally, the residuum are continually blamed for the malady of war, as if it were their poor moral fiber that "made" aristocrats declare war against an enemy. Invariably, when wars are lost, the residuum are the preferred scapegoat. Never in their history has aristocracy ask themselves if their entire project and conceit is the root of the problem, for if they did, they would violate every sense of themselves they ever held. An aristocrat losing their heart and appetite for the game would be exposed as little better, if not exactly the same, as the residuum he despises. And so, if the aristocratic aims of war are removed by some distillation process, we would see war as a practice as something driven by technological advance and its realization through labor. The men who fight recognize the necessity of machines and labor for their effort, and live and die from this logistical task. The warriors must cover all of their technological bases before they can consider the so-called higher virtues of war and glory, and many a warrior can figure out

that the glory of war is all moonshine.

Far from an obsession with technology, the warrior is careful in selecting which technology and which tasks are appropriate to the soldiers, and which tasks are to be left to subordinates. This does not immediately conform to an aristocratic conceit of prestige or civic worth, but to practicality. The tasks of industry, hard labor, and the humiliation of menial work like janitorial duties, are seen as degrading to the qualities desired of fighting men. In the latter case, the humiliation of menial work is not a given of nature, but a condition of society that preceded war and even preceded aristocratic conceits. It is, for many reasons, well known that the lowest class of labor is disciplined by ritual suffering. Even in tolerant societies where the humiliation gives way to necessity of letting the lowest class do their job, denigration of labor is necessary lest the slaves forget their place. Most of all, the lowest class of labor is typically judged as retarded or incompetent in some way, and the most ancient dictum of the human race is, as we have said before, "once retarded, always retarded". If that is ever violated, humanity as a project is undone, and naturally the stupid do not like living in such a society. Stupid slaves are likely to rebel, fail to follow orders, or receive beatings simply because their superiors find them annoying and unsightly. The hatred of the retard is the most ancient sentiment of the human race. Aristocracy only amplified it when seeking the primordial substance that defines their class. Stupidity itself as a function is rooted out in the practice of war when it interferes with the objective. War to be war has demonstrable results. Those results, the things that are judged meritorious, do not need to line up with the conceits of victory defined beforehand. In fact, usually the warrior's sense of merit is entirely eugenic and concerns defending the favoritism of the institution that fights. Gladhanding, so long as it does not interfere with the substantive victory aimed for, is rewarded. Honesty and forthrightness are not - they are seen instead as marks of a fool to be punished. Deception is among the virtues required for any war machine, and in this, the lowest class may find some function as purveyors of crude lies, or something to screen the advance of the actual army, or fodder to be thrown away before the veteran and valued soldiers are able to march in triumph and take credit and glory. With technology, the fetish of the technocrat for knowledge, or the aristocrat for conceits, is something the warrior and the laborer have to adjudicate. The laborer sees the war as an imposition that sucks away his vitality for a dubious cause, but because war has been an accepted practice since time immemorial, the aim of the laborer is simply to not be a retard. The warrior approaches technology with a managerial mindset. The manager does not like technology in of itself and does not buy natively into any ideology. So far as the warrior sinks to the level of the muck of production, the warrior adopts all of the mannerisms of a manager - the barking of contradictory orders to confuse and stonewall, the double-speak that dominates the past century of human society, the rampant lying, are all carried out for a eugenic purpose of sorting out which technology the warrior desires for the purpose of winning battles. Which battles the warrior actually fights do not need to line up with any story of what the war actually is for. Wars are not

fought for ideology, or material necessity. They are fought, from the warrior's point of view, to win glory and honor and secure his position in society. The aristocrats need warriors to defend the luxury of aristocracy, and the warriors are paid with some of that luxury for themselves when they are off-duty. The warrior might believe in a cause outside of his task as a warrior, and usually has to. Mere self-interest or material incentive are never great motivators, and are always in question if someone else can pay more, or the toil of fighting is not worth the luxury paid. The warrior is also aware that any material thing can be snatched away, and possession changes hands at the end of a sword. How much of the law possession may be is quite irrelevant when the law is the sword alone, and property deeds can be rewritten by those who hold swords. And so, subordinating the aims of warriors to material incentives, or the conceits of technocrats or the duty of labor, is never a possibility. Violence and the practices of war can be, but are not the sole, source of legitimacy. In every event, legitimacy derives from empire and the establishment of force, before it is possible to speak of justice or why a state would exist. No law can persist without weapons and men to enforce it, and this is self-evident.^[9]

The impulse of the warrior is the same impulse of the proprietor, whose origins were always in the feudal nobility and its offshoots rather than the producers and commerce. The proprietor in technocratic society gives way to the manager, from petty-managers to the administrators of bureaucracies. The military in turn becomes bureaucratic and uses the language of property and management more than the language of direct fighting, for property abhors labor beyond that which is useful for its purpose. The warrior at a basic level does not have the same impulse - for the warrior and the practice of war, what other classes do is irrelevant. The warrior would see any entity that challenges war as another warrior, an enemy to be confronted, and so the aims of other classes would be understood in the end as something which must defend itself in battle. Struggle and battle or war, I repeat to make clear, are different conceptually. The other classes can and do see themselves in struggles that do not entail the practices of war or battle, and the warrior understands the specific purview of war and what a battle is. A game of football is not war. A jumped up maniac obsessed with technocratic vanity will get hyped over a game, but anyone who thinks about war for five minutes knows that a game is just a game. Economic competitors do not, intrinsically, view each other as rival capitals seeking battle. For one, capitals will always prefer collusion over direct combat, and prefer indirect use and abuse of law over turning coin to warfare. The more capable of the capitalists understood that their function was never purely as machines to produce, and this had always been the case. No capitalist was under any illusion of what the relationship truly was, or why he sought money. Only petty-managers of the venal sort use this language to cajole, and this cajoling is only applied to laborers whose wages were to be stripped down, who were to be subjected to the humiliation of service work during the neoliberal depopulation campaign. The petty-managers of neoliberalism were more aware of their drive to war against the weak than past capitalists, who were interested - for good reason - in projects

other than the eugenic creed and its filth. All of the things money can buy can be subsumed in competition, struggle, war, or can be conceived by a kinder mind in a different world as tools of cooperation, where humanity did not do what it has done in the past century. Money itself is issued not because it was the producers' idea, but is issued by states and treasuries to provision their armies and bureaucracies. It has been the small capitalist's dream to smash the bank and smash finance, so that he will not be in hock to the bank ever again, and in doing so, the petty bourgeois merchant would be freed of that onerous institution and its debt collectors. The large capitalist did not see the bank as friendly, but saw himself as the bank and had enough sense to understand that the bank can be malicious and the bank can through its command of the currency influence policy far more than ordinary politics. For various reasons, the battle against the bank rarely can escalate to a war of men who would exterminate the banker and the repo man, and this is not because the bank is an abstraction or a story. The names of bankers and their buildings are well known, and bank robbers would be listed not as villains but legends, heroes. The greatest of all bank robbers, as you might know, is one who would be known by history as Josef Stalin. In all of this, the idea of conquering the bank by military means could not be done, nor was desirable. The Fascist language suggesting to do this was no such thing at all, and as the Italians and Germans became fascist, their central banks conducted new finance schemes just as onerous as the old, turning to liquidation and privatization to cannibalize industry.^[10]

The boundaries of war proper are not defined by thought leaders or assertions, nor by the codes warriors may abide that derive from their past experience. It is often believed by naive students of war that "generals fight the last war", as if warriors just played out a program given to them by history. The reality is that anyone planning to prosecute a war is not lurching behind the world, in the way aristocrats insist. The boundaries of war are determined not by any eugenic or aristocratic conceit, but by the real conditions they are fought in, and concern at a basic level the mechanical actions of war. The use of war as a metaphor for things which are not war or battles is a terrible conceit, which detracts from useful study of the phenomenon. There is an effort of many, particularly technocrats, to circumscribe the definition of war processes to suggest that war itself is an impossibility, or abides the conceits of knowledge or planners. No warrior believes war is decided by plans alone, or believes the soldier is at heart a very simplified or abstracted machine. Behind every uniform and piece of armor there is a flesh and blood human, and however much the human is stripped of free will when he becomes a grunt, humans are a versatile machine which defies this reduction to managerial conceits. If war is to be conducted by proprietors and managers in developed society - if generals are to dispose of their men like so much fodder - they would do well to remember the processes to make men into machines of violence, and to recognize the qualities of men that make them effective for the task. This is not trivial and never something taken for granted. From birth, the boys of humanity are induced to glorify the cult of war, and the girls are induced to reward this behavior if not participate

themselves. Mothers have long selected which of their sons will be selected to live, and threw away the boys they didn't want, and did so because their task was understood as the production of new soldiers, or producers who would be disciplined by the needs of martial society. This practice was not eugenic as such, but instead informed by the reality that warlike institutions imposed this condition. Kindness was never a trait of the human race that could last long, and where it exists, it is always something that must be hidden away. The vicious of the human race, who have always found each other and conspired to make us all as vicious as them, revel in torturing the kind. In the past, this viciousness had to be constrained long enough to allow a productive economy to exist. It was long understood that war's purview had to be limited, for a state of general war all over was not tenable. Without the mechanisms of today's technocratic polities, a society perpetually at total war would face immediate revolt, for none of the producers or slaves have any reason to go along with it. Many of the managers, proprietors, feudal lords, equestrians, and the aristocrats who tire of the war drive, would reject the call for such a society, for the same reason. Such a total war required a monolithic entity imposed on reality itself, and that was only possible with technology in the 20th century. Even then, such a state was an imperfect creation, rife with corruption and failures high and low that would be inexcusable in a serious war. It is only because the war of the 20th century was fought on spurious pretexts, and the eugenic creed pushed and cajoled men to fight each other for nothing, that today's state of natural and eternal war is plausible. In a past time, such screaming maniacs would have been rejected, and if insistent, they would have been dragged out and killed for such insolence, so that the general peace may be maintained. It is only the prevalence of the eugenic creed and its insanity that allowed this cult of war to persist. There is a version of technocratic society which did not do this, and in practice, technocratic societies do not actually engage in such a total war of all against all. Far from it, the tendency of technocratic society would have, in a better world, suggested social units that negated the war drive. In other words, it would have suggested socialism were not snuffed in its cradle, and did not take the perverse forms that Nazism, fascism, communism, and liberal bourgeois socialism took. It would instead have been a socialism that overcame ideology from the outset and remained true to any socialism that was worth pursuing, and there would be politicians who saw that overbearing managerialism would choke humanity if it was allowed to build. It is the eugenic creed which locked in for good the bureaucratic nightmare in technocratic society where no institution works and every machine, every deed, and every person is to be the most venal monster they can be. Eugenics as a religion regresses to a primordial state of mankind, with full knowledge that the true origin of the human race is fratricide, ritual sacrifice, a thrill for violence and cruelty, and the flinging of shit that a Galtonite partakes in and pushes on to the "retarded" as an inborn behavioral trait. The Galtonite's obsession with sexual perversion brings him to elevate all fetishes, and among them is his scat fetish which he immediately imposed on the "retarded", even though the stupidest human like many animals would want to defecate in the cleanest way possible. Only by caging, torturing, and humiliating

the "retard" in institutions did the habit of smearing shit begin. This habit would be reinforced specifically because the warden of the institution denied bathrooms to the institutionalized^[11], and laughed as the condemned, beaten and living in fear, in a cage where his brain was to be cut up and his body to be degraded, reverted to the responses of a fearful animal.

The functions of war suggest what warriors really are and do so far as their conduct pertains to the act. Anyone suggesting there is something more to war than that, or that war is something else entirely, are engaged with something entirely different which is of little importance. The culture of war and the cult of war is a type of knowledge or moral claim which has no bearing on the final result. Those dragged into fighting without being blooded as warriors are forced to conduct themselves no differently in the essential act. No matter how much philosophy suggests the non-warriors are passive, humans have a tendency to not like being killed or tortured. The error largely stems from a belief that war pertains primarily to violence or killing. The power of life and death is attributed to war and placed at the center, but the power of life and death is not limited to war or even primarily decided by war's existence. Imperium - the power of life and death - can exist and often does exist without an active war. When a criminal is hanged, there is no "war" that put him to death. That is the orderly procession of society, by laws which are understood by all. The criminal is aware that his death will not be seen as any sort of battle. Violence and war are not one and the same, and often war entails acts that have nothing to do with violence. So too does torture and humiliation not pertain to war, since both are present in acts which are not war and both are practices in vogue with many institutions, for various purposes. The chief aim of war can only be the engineering of a rival society by any means necessary. In a well-regulated society prepared for war, fears of internal failure are only considered briefly, while the enemy's condition is constantly assessed. It would be necessary for a combatant to occasionally check for his own integrity and the condition of allies, which is very different from the vigilance of one army guarding against another or engaging the enemy in combat. The aim of war is then social engineering of a particular type.

While social engineering implies a warlike stance, societies are engineered by means other than war, and the peaceful incentives for social reform are considered - for example, extending carrots or rewards to suggest behavior, or shame or legal punishment for the same. The engineering conducted by war is a particular sort, in which the niceties of dialogue are abandoned. Outside of war, two societies that would be constituted in preparation for war can engage in diplomatic relations and exchanges. It could be for the members of the societies involved that the two societies are not alien at all. In no case are two societies truly alienated, even during a state of war. It is entirely possible for participants to ignore the injunction of their commanders to see the enemy as an enemy. It is not necessary for one society at war with another to view the enemy as morally evil or worthy of any sentiment like hatred or fear. Far from it, the conduct of effective warriors disdains such emotional investment in the enemy, where fickle

emotions override what a warrior would find reasonable or useful in judging their opponent. Nor would a warrior need to have any justification or negative view of the enemy's morality. The enemy can and often is someone like himself, fighting for similar reasons and likely disgusted that he has to take orders from an aristocrat. There are usually differences between the two societies that were irreconcilable by other means to lead to war, and two societies at war would sense the sharp distinction between them on top of the hostility war entails. If the judgement of combatants, or those dragged into war, is colored by false moral posturing or manipulation of emotion, it works to the disadvantage of someone lying to themselves about the nature of the enemy, or the nature of themselves. The emotional and moral state most relevant to war is recognition of one's own emotion, and the morale of one's own team. The true morale and state of an enemy would have to be judged by someone placing himself in the enemy's position and imagining himself if he lived in and was raised in the enemy's society. The emotional and moral condition of both sides is relevant, since wars require that moral sentiment. Nowhere is the warrior an automaton in the way a technocrat imagines in his simulation. If the warrior is so degraded that it is nothing more than a robot, then it is the morale of his operator that is relevant; but robots, for a variety of reasons, make terrible soldiers. They are even more terrible at fighting with the maladaptive managerial technique of poor technocrats. Smarter technocrats are aware that the soldiers they send to die for bullshit are humans who possess a sense of smell detecting bullshit, and public relations and deception to elide the purpose of war only works for so long. If there is a soldier who believes in the propaganda that they are fighting for the just cause or any such stupidity, there is a fool who will not be useful for much except a ritual sacrifice. Soldiers to be effective cannot be that degraded. They need not be conscientious or moral in the sense a philosopher would appreciate, and usually soldiers are a disgusting lot motivated by nothing more than their off-time to get drunk and fuck something. A recognition of bullshit and the idiotic orders of their commanders, to say nothing of the politicians, is necessary for soldiers to function with the desired qualities. If soldiers really are robots, they don't truly fight, and very often their function is to be used as lab rats for some eugenic test, which the soldier understands to be yet more bullshit that will probably destroy him mentally and physically for dubious "research".

The eugenic purpose of militaries is a war of its own within the society waging war, and a theater of the greatest war of all - the war of those selected to live and enjoy the fruits of victory against those selected to die, for whom the entire enterprise is some sort of joke. The promise that some day the soldier selected to die will be able to live again is often not granted. Even if the soldier comes home, those selected to live in the eugenic war were able to attain position so that they never have to risk death or suffering at all. From the outset of war, those selected to live recognize each other and promote each other, waging the greater war of eugenics because that is the war they were born into and the war that has endured since humanity began. The state of war that is particular to two societies in a model is for the eugenic interest a sideshow that the people selected

to die are tasked with fighting. Only in rare cases do those selected to live face an existential threat from an enemy, when the plunder machine no longer functions or the war aims of one side override temporarily the greater eugenic war for some purpose. The eugenic war of humanity's existence is understood to be active at all times, but the sides are never clearly defined for all to see. That war, which is never fully understood as a war and usually takes the form of something very different, is still in principle conducted with the language of war and the purpose of social engineering. Where the set-piece wars in a model are defined by battles with sides that are clear enough for actionable plans to be drawn, the eugenic war of all mankind is a war of deception, backstabbing, assassinations, humiliations, and numerous steps up the great ladder for the fortunate. In practice, the eugenic war was not fought throughout the lifetime of a man, where old men may yet find redemption. It is not fought in the mere struggle for life, for the struggle for life is not a war in that sense and does not serve this eugenic function. The struggle for life is something greater and yet simpler, and has nothing to do with society beyond the reality social relations produce. The eugenic war is waged from birth to adulthood, and it is fought in the schoolhouse, in the family, and in the intericine conflict that humanity has in some way promoted for no good reason. Victory in the eugenic war is primarily decided by the test of adulthood, and those who fail that test are selected to die in all things, regardless of war or peace. If a male passes that test, he goes to the war of the moment or some struggle meant to be a war, and begins the great game of backstabbing and human viciousness that is the race's genesis and core function up to today. Usually, drill instructors or the local commander decide within moments whether a new recruit is selected to die or not. To be selected to live is to play a much different game, the rules of which are never given to everyone, but those who are selected to die will see very clearly their position once it happens. There are then those who muddle through life between those worlds, suspecting that they have been selected to die but hoping to retain enough dignity to be allowed to live with a little more than the retards, the most hated race of all mankind. To be retarded is a malady worse than merely being selected to die. Many are selected to die, simply because the viciousness of the human race finds its niche. That selection of death is often forestalled because the condemned are temporarily useful for something, but those who know they are selected to die do not forget it and do not show great enthusiasm for anything this wretched society and this failed race of Satanic apes has to offer.

Those selected to live, who always recognize the social proof that selection brings, are never under any illusions about what they won and what must be done to protect it in such an environment. They may feign kindness, or may demonstrate kindness out of some sense that it would not hurt them or would help their long-term goals, but never will those selected to live doubt on their own accord the legitimacy of that status. The behavior of those selected to live only changes when that status is in jeopardy from an outside force, whether it comes from others selected to live or from the multitude selected to die. Of those in the

middle, who have some doubt of their status but recognize the social proof they are afforded compared to those selected to die, they are always pressed between the two, and because those selected to live will possess the material and moral advantage in all cases, their allegiance will always be to those selected to live. The "middle class" so to speak will see those selected to die as a bulwark, because the predation of humanity has taught them that once those selected to die are truly dead, the middle class is immediately at the bottom and faces the predation humanity institutionalized long, long ago. Aside from that, the middle class here is never afforded the grand luxury of those selected to live, and so one of the ways for that middle class to endure is to employ labor towards some aim, and that labor may and likely will come from those selected to die. Those selected to die will never be convinced seriously that they were actually selected to live, and no religion and nothing else in the world will change that conviction. We have always known, once the line has been crossed, that there is no going back, however deep we are in the shit and however we have chosen to endure in this world. Those selected to die are not under the impressions that those in the middle would keep, where the middle believes that salvation in some way is possible. What motivates those selected to die is purely a bitter determination to endure in a world gone horribly wrong, that was shit up by these Satanic apes. Those selected to die would behoove themselves to remember that it was the Satanic apes that did this, rather than "the world" or any force of nature. It is far easier for the middle group to accept the view that the world or nature was the problem, because faith in such koans is one of the ways the middle group might "fake it until they make it" and find their way into the club at some late age. Those selected to die only blame the world as a whole when they have truly given up and became vectors of the eugenic disease, and there are many such people. For those selected to die who wish to go out with some semblance of dignity, the world has been one of the few things preventing those selected to live from making this worse, for the world places limits on life and this is good. Those selected to live by the law of the eugenic interest and by the will of mankind's collective efforts still die by the law of the world. All of us do, and while we may question the goodness of final death, it is one of the great equalizers the true god of this world granted to all of us. It produces a sobering influence on all, no matter what the status of any war, and that sobering influence is one we would do well not to forget.

These things inform much of the formations that appear in set-piece wars, for they are informed by social engineering practices that are warlike and the influences on society that are not directly warlike, but can be harnessed by those with an aim towards some victory. They inform the tools that would be used, beyond the mere recognition of physics and material science, or beyond the nature of communication and knowledge itself which forms the intellectual weaponry of war. It is for that reason that wars rarely involved general slaughter or democide, or even full slavery of the enemy. As bloody as the spoils of war have been - and it is the spoils of war in the form of slavery that did the most to increase the death toll war brings - the war rarely ends in total destruction or disintegration

of the enemy society. Even in unconditional surrender, the defeated enemy continues on in some form, now paying tribute to their new lord and master. It would only be possible to truly disintegrate an enemy society with time and peaceful social engineering, in which the occupied nation is corrupted and put through humiliations worse than mere defeat. Because it is expected at some point that the conquered would be ruled or assimilated into the victorious society, some lenience may be expedient towards the goal. The victorious society, after all, is not some pure essence, and did not fight purely for a eugenic mission. Very often, the societies that fight are empires seeking to defeat other empires or nascent formations that present an opposition to empire. Empires rarely conform to the Nazi conceit of ineffable race essences, but are multi-national and would have been constructed by hegemony who successfully subdued rival societies and formed a larger polity. Formations like tribes often wage war not as their essential race, for tribes often merge, adopt foreigners, make alliances, intermarry, and so on. Tribes that seek to engage in significant war formed confederations, especially when they waged war against city-states and empires, or war against settlers from such societies. The Germanic myth and narrative about war falls apart if one thinks of the basic constitution of any war-worthy society for five minutes, and it is a narrative created by failures, for failures. The Nazi strategy, as mentioned before, only worked because of fifth columns who identified with German race-theory and desired a war against their own lower classes. It took place in a world where the true contest of the world wars was not national glory, but position within the global empire that had effectively ruled the world from the dawn of the 20th century. The reality of 20th century war and war today is only comprehensible if the nature of empire is correctly acknowledged, and that the empire of the world market had overtaken prior conceits of empire for all intents and purposes. The smart men of recent history understood that wars were not about patriotism, nationalism, ideology, land, or any resource or material incentive. They certainly weren't about money, which could always have been fabricated or abandoned when money was no longer a useful token. Wars in our time were about position in the global system and the interest of parties who saw the conduct of war was amenable to their social engineering goals, and these wars would be initiated by men and women who believed war was a great game which they were not only secured from, but that would establish their interest and class as the dominant partner in any alliance. That interest is not hard to see, and it was seen when this demonic crusade started. That interest is very simple - it is **eugenics**, now given a name and faces and preparing its "Jihad" against the rest of the world. It is eugenics which pushed the nations of the world to fight, and it is eugenics that dictated the terms on which war would cease and continue. It is eugenics which intensified all inter-cine wars and created the siege of all nations, and eugenics which upheld the myth of nation-states which were no longer operative as real political units. The transformation of nation-states into human resources departments, which is in the early 21st visible and increasingly acknowledged, had always been the intent of the eugenic creed, among many other intents. The eugenicist does this not out of some high-minded goal of internationalism, and it is the eugenicist which

supplies the false story that national identity, bereft of history or meaning, is somehow worth fighting for, after the national identity and the state representing it has been completely stripped from the actual nation, turned into a parody beyond that of the capitalist empires of old. The former nation-states were by and large fronts for a bourgeois interest, but the states were comprised almost entirely of bourgeois from the nations in question, who understood their projects only worked when mass armies and mass labor were mobilized. The bourgeois nation-state implied mass politics was a condition they had to accept, and in many cases had no difficulty accepting. It did not make inherent sense for the bourgeois petty-capitalist to see his interest contradicted labor or even the residuum. The smaller capitalist had always seen correctly that the greatest threat to him came not from below but from the commanding heights and from aristocracy. Regardless of the capitalist's tendency to side with power and legitimacy, the capitalist understood that by this submission to oligarchy, he was doomed unless the oligarchy selected him to live in the world to come. The overwhelming majority of petty bourgeois literature concerned not a dread of workers' movements, but a dread of oligarchy in various forms. The workers' rebellions were certainly not welcome to capitalists, but they were almost always seen as conspiracies launched by would-be oligarchs rather than organic uprisings from the workers, when the view of labor was hostile.^[12] Very often, struggling capitalists would make signals suggesting favored workers join them, and though this right-populism rarely won over workers due to the odious associations they would make to cuckold themselves and betray their class, there was no intrinsic reason for an industrialist to drive down his workers' wages. Ford, for instance, made a point of suggesting privileged status for favored or essential workers, while depreciating the workers he didn't need. Oligarchy and aristocracy had a view of not just the workers but the whole population as useless eaters, but the struggling capitalist often suggested, however dishonestly, that he favored growth, because economic growth was in some way an indicator that his industry would remain relevant and hold a chip to bargain with oligarchy. It would not last long, as oligarchy held all of the relevant and useful levers, but the alliance would in the late 20th century draw more workers to the cuckoldry of aligning with capitalists, especially as the options were reduced to right oligarchs and "center" oligarchs, with the left reduced to nothing more than a grift bereft of history or purpose.

This chapter has dealt very little with actual fighting, and that of course is something better people than me know well. What is important here are the motives for war and battle in particular, which are distinct aims from the cult of war or how war is morally valued, or the moral values that operate outside of a war situation. By no means is this chapter a complete accounting of those mechanisms, and such an accounting is better left for another time and another author. I mention this part of it here because the war practice is a significant contributor to economic and political thought. It would be the claim of every state that the primary duty of the state is defense of the city, or defense of the polity. In other words, the ideal city-state is presented as if it were in a

constant war with the whole of the world, unrelenting and turned inward to discipline the members of society. The true defense of the city is not a condition it reluctantly accepts, but a pressing of the nerve of power which never ceases. That is the true nature of the philosophical republic, and the particular enemy it faces is of little relevance. The enemy could change from Eurasia to Eastasia in the same sentence and back again, and it would make little difference in the conduct of a republic. The reality of a republic, and what would be necessary for such an entity to meaningfully exist, is entirely at odds with the philosophical model of one. The philosophical model presents at core a militarization of the entity in total, where it exists in a state of perpetual war against everything outside of it. If this sounds like fascism to you, then gold star for you - nothing outside the state, nothing against the state. Where the fascist regresses to the primordial light, even the earliest examples of this construct are perfectly aware that societies and states do not actually function this way, and the true purpose of the model suggests not that this model of society is ingrained in nature, but that it arises from education. The educator, then, conducts teaching as if it were the true war, and that war is carried out in the rest of the world. Only those brainwashed by this pedagogy are told they have contact with the genuine world, and the native sense of all outsiders is severed forever. It is this that creates something more foul than the fascist's simplified braying about the state, which we in the 21st century can no longer escape.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] I am here following Marx's conception of surplus value, which was the final form of classical political economy. For many reasons, this surplus value is a figment of the imagination given temporary life. The figment of the imagination is based on something substantive in the relations of labor, but in the genuine relationship of the boss to the worker, the boss sees the worker as dependent and in no position to seriously bargain. Most of the proletarians could not bargain with or without unions, because there was no leverage. The capitalist saw from the outset that most of the proletarians were useless to their true aims, and only employed the proletarian because he or she was there. Throughout capitalist history, the capitalist either allowed significant segments of the populace to starve or fall into bodily ruin, or actively encouraged every check on population as Malthus would advise them to do. Never were capitalists invested in a pronatalist project of any sort, because in their experience basic labor was abundant. To the interests that ruled in the empire, all of the labor was a gift nature and the breeding habits of the low commoners gave to them, and their interest was less in the products of labor but in the discipline of labor and the prevention of revolts. Had a national security state enveloped the newly arrived proletarians in 1800, it would have not hesitated to eradicate most of them. This was explicitly the colonial policy in Africa, where it could be implemented. Cecil Rhodes' infamous line said plainly that he would rather have land than blacks, and that should put to rest any belief that the capitalist was in any way indebted to the

flesh and blood. It was always possible for the capitalist to forgo the product of industry, or limit it to a select group within his class. Promoting interclass competition for limited product would be perfectly in line with bourgeois interest and society, and so that is what happened during the 20th century, even when the political and social arrangements favored large armies and production geared to consumption. Only to the extent that large armies produced advantages in war and struggle did the capitalist encourage population growth, and war as we see is not the capitalist's purview or any great path to his bottom line. Indeed, every policy of the empire, carried out with enthusiastic backing of the capitalist class, depleted either the numbers of workers or their living conditions, and cared remarkably little about productivity or any efficiency in the process. A capitalist who was engaged in productive enterprises did so as a means to an end, and only did so to the extent that this was profitable and that he was able to use this method. So long as the empire produced enough to feed the people who mattered, and that condition was met before free trade arose, that was enough at a basic level. The cost of security became the dominant purpose of the state, even after capitalist conditions were superseded. And so, the surplus of labor is enormous, some of which is paid to the worker without concern for exploitation, but all of these choices do not matter because the money isn't real and economic choices are all rigged and guaranteed to feed into the few men who won capitalism, and those who feed from their trough. It was for this reason that after 1930, the struggle against capitalism seemed to lose purpose - because for all of the things that were relevant to most people, capitalism no longer presented a credible enemy. Many of the revolutionaries either folded into the mainstream or could agitate for communist-type activities within liberal democracies, and of course the communist world existed for the remainder of the 20th century bar the last decade. Those who had leverage to fight capital received what they wanted, either in the form of payouts or position in the political class and institutions. Everyone else was left with bupkis and told this was all there really was, and maybe it could be different some day. The next great game was not to fight capital or attain communism or any economic goal, but a struggle to get on the lifeboat. What had truly superseded capitalism was not a form of socialism in any meaningful sense of the word, but eugenism's preliminary stages, which were waged in what was effectively a "mixed" economy. The managers of the empire, and their counterparts in the communist world, were far more pragmatic than anything else when anything meaningful was to be done with economic or institutional affairs. Capitalism persisted only as an excuse and a moral motivator to press people to accept this eugenism, and part of liberal democracy was a pinky swear to the failing middle class that everything would be a-ok if they just played along. There were almost immediately rebels in that failing middle class who saw they were left behind, and thus began a trend of bourgeois paranoia and descent into madness - all of which was encouraged and directed by thought leaders. All parties and ideologies fed that trend and the continued deprivations against the poor and especially the honest, and the fascists were prepared just as they were before to be the "only alternative" permissible when this arrangement turns on itself, also planned in advance and

initiated in generational stages. Those events were intended long ago to converge early in the 21st century, and 2020 was a banner year set to launch the stage of full transformation. It is quite strange that very ancient arguments about surplus labor were repeated by college students whose education was completely devoid of reality, often from said students having no familiarity with what Marx was critiquing or what surplus value even was.

[2] You can dig their quotes for yourself if you like, and many of their expectations were prescient and especially felt during the present final downfall of the republic. For example, "The republic will end the moment the people realize they can vote themselves free money" - and "the people" here were clearly understood to be the opulent who very much would like free money and helped themselves to trillions of dollars of it.

[3] Some might liken this to my invocation of "the Satan", but the eugenic cult is not "the Satan", regardless of its Satanic overtones. The Satan and the Satanists are far too noble by their standards to actually be this stupid, and this tells us much about the ugliness and abomination that is Galtonism.

[4] It may be claimed by students of history that periods of war are the norm and universal peace was exceptional and never really peace. Yet, war as an activity would be defined by periods of activity, where war was initiated and had an end result. The theaters of war were, at least in the reconstruction of events, places where battles were fought and a result could be reported. Wars entail battles of some sort, and the war of the past century is no exception. There is no "war without battles" - what has changed is that the narratives of war and how they were reported were no longer compatible with how a war could be fought after 1914. Battlefields were no longer occasions of heightened conflict or pitched battle, but carried out over large spaces and involving large armies sectioned into disparate units. The conduct of war and generals, and the administration of the war machine, changed to match the nature of the state itself. It seems that 1914 is a jarring disconnect because in the narratives of history, Europe had not seen a general war for a century, and the theaters and terms of war during the 19th century were controlled in European theaters. The tactics of armies before 1914 were no longer compatible with the technology states could deploy, the organization of societies that took root, or the interests that clamored most for the war. A result of the world wars was to make clear a new ordering of the world and new social forms, and the result is that the nature of engagements and the language war technocrats used became a whole new beast. Militaristic jargon had long existed, but the peculiarities of 20th century war cult thought were a thing constructed as part of the war plan. There would be a transitory period during the first half of the 20th century where enough of the older thought on war remained, and the rhetoric of political leaders and generals alike could still be coarse and resemble human speech. The wars of the second half of the 20th century began another restructuring of how wars were fought and battles were conceived, and the needs of the national security state and the interests at work in that time are understood without too great a

mystery. Enough people participated in those wars in some way to be aware of what this really was. It is here where the siege against the people and the war of social engineering became paramount, and the war involving guns, tanks, bombs, and soldiers was another thing. A history of the Vietnam War, the Afghan War, the Iraq-Iran War, and the wars of the later 20th century, still resembles what war had been, and there were genuine stakes for the participants, even if the forces at work had very different aims from past leaders and governments. The start of the 21st century marked another break in the nature of war, and at this point conventional history has broken off, since it is a great taboo to speak of "current events", among other things that changed in society. It is important to this new thinking of war that the very concept of war and history cannot exist, and reality itself cannot exist. The ruling interest declares explicitly their aim of reality control, spoken in no uncertain terms by one Karl Rove. This aim is no bluff or bluster, and it would not be made if it were not known that this reality control was possible for the first time. Even now, we can identify periods of activity, political aims, the parties operative in war, and the beginning and conclusion of war events. No war planning would be possible in a world where it was impossible to speak of battles or engagement, and the American military for perfectly understandable reasons sectioned off the whole world to combat zones, knowing exactly what was happening in each of them and the purpose of their actions. The myth of a blind and bumbling empire is incompatible with the organization at work, and even if the rulers of the empire do not make sound decisions, they make decisions that are coherent with some objective, and couldn't do otherwise. What is recapitulated is a philosophical faith in "stochastic violence", mimicking the strategy of deliberate interventions in society where the members are not permitted to speak of conspiracies or any communication of intent between authorities and their underlings. This strategy is deployed in schools, where the teacher will obviously direct a student to attack another student and give the signal that this is sanctioned, and the target can say exactly what happened, seeing it in front of his face, and the institution will lock ranks to defend maximal predation. To do otherwise is anathema to the purpose of the school, and the school is itself an instrument born to create war. Schoolyards are considered battlefields, and the ritual sacrifice of school's victims deliver not just a thrill of victory, but the entire purpose of the institution. It seems like hyperbolae since schools do not involve bullets or executions, but the officers of school and the enablers of this system see correctly their war against the weak as the overriding war. The war of soldiers is treated openly as a joke and a project to favor eugenics, where the effective fighting is conducted by special operations forces, mercenaries, and for very different purposes than those stated to the public.

I would ask the reader to judge wars not as grand narratives but as events just like any other in the natural world, which are things that can be disassembled and analyzed. When seen in that light, the reasoning made in this chapter is sensical. The narrative of war is a product of the cult of war, the cult of education, and various cults which attach to them. Humans, as always, are

born liars, and brag about their lying. At the same time, war to be relevant is always fought in the material world. A war of ideas is not war and not really anything, unless we grant to ideology material force all its own. We can do this and describe the world, but ideology will not feed stomachs and will not produce anything substantial without machinery enforcing its existence. The schoolyard war zone would be impossible without trillions of dollars in funding and specialized labor with a fanatical eugenist goal of regimenting society and inflicting maximal humiliation against the enemies of society.

[5] And this is why the chief commandment of the eternal war eugenics creates is to deny that there is a war, or that there is any society or history where this takes place. Such a bald-faced lie thrown at us is intended to maximize the hostility and terror of the eugenic creed, and the fear of breaking the unwritten law is itself a force deployed by the social engineers against the damned. This contempt is reserved for the residuum, naturally. Valid members of society will never be lied to in such a profuse manner when serious stakes are on the line. When the lying is done as your brain is boiled alive and a clear class of winners are selected to live, and you are told that everyone is equal, the only way that can be interpreted is the liar shouting "die!" at you - and they know this very well and revel in the fact, then tell you that this is not at all the case even though everything in their practice of lying announces immediately the eugenic purpose of this lying, and that no intermediate or alternate purpose for the lie can be found or be worthwhile. All of the greatest lies revolve around the eugenic religion alone, to indicate what is sacred and the true governing principle of the society. In the past, these lies revolved around Christianity, but such lying in Christianity was mitigated by reference to a written doctrine and body of scholarship accessible to a wide audience, and widespread comprehension of the basic Christian tenets. Even if someone were not versed in the Bible or were skeptical of Christianity, the Christians could not suddenly reverse long-held dogmas with absolute impunity. Such lying would have to be prepared and sold gradually, and this placed Christianity at a disadvantage against its opposing Galtonite "Jehad", which flagrantly denied its core tenets existed as they were thrown in our faces.

[6] The strange "atheism" of the Galtonites, recapitulated in New Atheism, is a surprising carbon copy and inversion of positive Christian doctrines. All of the presumptions of Christian philosophy are maintained despite the lack of any apparent god, yet at the same time, Christianity is "retarded". Not once are the genuine consequences of atheism explored by the Galtonites, and it appears as if religion, its practice, and history, is reduced to increasingly infantile sops and koans. The new "god" is not reason at all, but a Satanic impulse that very closely resembles the Christian God, which is granted all of the creative and manipulative powers of a God compelling the world and cajoling all of its actors. When someone points out that in such a world, free will would be a foregone conclusion - because absent a god, there would be nothing "selecting" or "compelling" a life-form, given basic knowledge of mechanics - the Galtonite inserts him or herself as a "nature god" that curiously resembles many Christian

dictates about austerity. The dual system of the Galtonites, taboo to mention too frankly as what it is, retains the glorious name of Satan for the true believers, who are given impunity to invoke it and bar anyone from saying it was invoked. All impurities and infidels are barred and must "pay the jizya", which just so happens to be everything they own - including every iota of their body, mind, and soul, which are swallowed whole by the vampiric Galtonite beast. Christianity itself contained this eugenic poison pill, but its practices regarding doctrine did not allow such a deception, and it spoke of concepts like mercy, brotherhood, friendship, and many republican and communistic virtues that were anathema to Galtonism. Because the eugenic aims of Christianity were more relevant to the religion than its mercy, it was easy to subvert the Christians - or more accurately, allow them to drop the mask to most of their followers, leaving the wise believers with access to Christian history and knowledge, which they intend to use to join the Galtonites or play a part in their society. Ultimately the Galtonite religion is a temporary measure - the central pillar of the overt institutions and more than a facade, but the power behind it is concerned with much different aims in the long term. To those selected to die, those aims are of little consequence, since we are not part of any of their plans, even as slaves.

[7] "Commonwealth" in modern English is a rendering of the Platonic concept of a republic, rather than a republic in the Roman sense, and so there you go with what communism in principle entailed.

[8] More of us today are familiar with the 1990s Paul Verhoeven film based on the book, with its schlocky gore and exaggeration of the book's tropes. Famously, Verhoeven refused to read the book after seeing enough and recognizing it as fascist drivel, and since enough people read the whole thing, the cliffs notes confirmed what he could smell from the outset. The book's subtext makes it clear that Heinlein does not suggest the army in that world actually works as advertised. Far from it, Heinlein - knowing the milieu that indulged in science fiction - wanted to comfort intellectuals that they would be the men and women behind the curtain, and the grunt soldiers would actually believe in the horseshit running through Rico's internal thoughts. The world is only conceivable because the technocratic rule of the United States was already established and working feverishly to create exactly that. The wise reader would have identified with the power behind the curtain, and understood the importance of intellectual meritocracy and pleasing the army with benefits. The genuine functioning of the military does not correspond to the image that the book represents, of uniform soldiers eliminating the specialist support staffs that accompany every war machine. The highly militarized and technocratic military of the US, which Heinlein idolized and upheld as progress, did not make all of its soldiers general grunts. The elaborate categorization of specializations was inherent to the post-war American military, and was a direct result of efforts to mechanize the military from the interwar period on. Every soldier in the American military would be expected to know their mission specialty, the functions they are adept at, and does not escape his pay grade or purview. The desultory tasks are, as a rule, accomplished by specialists and understood as valuable, because proper

soldiers would not be wasted on various tasks beneath the dignity of a proper soldier. The various branches of the military then play a game of posturing about which branch is better, as is typical of large militaries where infantry, sailors, naval infantry specialized in amphibious assaults, airmen, tank operators, mechanics, and so on are distinct functions and recognized as such. The entire project of the post-war military, like all of the 20th century militaries, was eugenic at its core. Its chief objective was social engineering rather than fighting battles, and armies - as in the world of Nineteen-Eighty-Four - only fought at a low level of military technique necessary to maintain the cult of war and the social engineering functions of the practice. The ideal military of the book is a fantasy which arrests an absurd image of any fighting force in place, and grants to it powered armor and the dominance of institutional psychology and mind control. It is not hard to see the true governing power in that world does not conform to anything Rico believes, and "Ignorance is Strength" is in force when Rico encounters any question on the nature of society, like the nature of the Arachnids' society and the proposition of what communism was. That the idealized army of that world suggested a socialist enterprise was dominant, and the political and economic order was an anti-democratic and militarized form of communism, was neither here nor there. Little evidence of capitalism or a free trade empire exists in that world, and the dominance of veterans would be anathema to the principles of free trade capitalism or oligarchic capitalism in the 20th century. The likely result of capitalism would have been the democratic movement suggested in the book's history during the 21st century, and then the "revolt of the scientists", which Heinlein claims was defeated. The reality is that the social scientists and intellectuals would have gladly puffed up useful idiot veterans, hypnotizing them en masse and programming them ideologically to obey, and then establish a front that "veteran rule" was in force. The prominent generals would be assisted by men and women behind the curtain, and the same old shit that is the idealized republic keeps trucking on. Those behind the curtain are more than happy to keep the war machine going and tell the veterans they are awesome, everything is awesome, and the civilians know their place and eat shit. That would have been the only possible outcome leading to that world, and it is in line with the actual program the intellectuals and scientists put in motion during the 20th century. It is, of course, at odds with the observation that people see such a world as hostile to anything they would have wanted, and have no reason to go along with any of this. But, the habit of violence and cruelty for its own sake has asserted the dominance of the intellectual elite for this long, and eugenics by our timeline's early 21st century became so dominant that it was effectively illegal to even say what it was. Such a statement would either be an absurdity made weak and impotent, or it would be interpreted as fighting words and a direct challenge to be met with gratuitous humiliation, so that dissent is "corrected". Like many in the science fiction milieu, the book suggests that the people will in every situation be cattle, led to the slaughter by the superior minds. Many such examples dominate the genre, and it will always be an odious genre of the most idiotic filth humanity produced.

[9] Here is where Robespierre's words on virtue - the command of men - and terror are most helpful. Terror does not command men, and virtue does not by mere assertion rule. Somewhere, there is a productive basis for this, but for the state and the law, the weapon has the final word rather than coin or the workman's tools. Robespierre of course speaks for an aristocratic view - a nascent aristocratic view of someone who had risen in the milieu of modern science and property-holders, but the aristocratic view of a man who did not know how to use a gun himself. He is certainly aware of what he is saying and how war works in the abstract, and it is his probity that marks him as the "incorruptible". It is not a merely cynical appropriation of words and ideas that moves Robespierre, but a sense that what he is doing is right and in line with the situation. There is little to suggest that Robespierre was into the skullduggery that was afoot during that period, or the known corruptions of the Directory that followed his execution. All that Robespierre is most famous for occurs amidst a general war, with France on the ropes and then reversing their fortunes to seize more of Europe. This conquest is carried out in part due to political necessity and part because modernity itself was to be suppressed. If a nation is under attack, it is no avarice to retaliate against kings or enemies. Moral attitudes towards war never reduce to a "just war" lie, as if countries were cartoon villains. They only arise when recognizing the genuine situation. The false egalitarianism of "just war" is a way to mystify the nature of war itself and history, so that aristocracy can do what it has always done and continue shitting up the world. In the end, aristocracy alone does not get to decide history, no matter how much it chokes the world and insists it can change reality. Struggle and war are the active force that sets law. All of that struggle is in the end a type of labor which utilizes technology. The residuum, as it would be in France, are seen as something outside of the war, yet it is the large residuum giving rise to the great fear, the disruption of feudal order, and elements of the Paris mob. All of mankind is in the end descended from scum, no better than the muck that creates a Hitler or Röhm, or someone like this humble writer or the many examples of today's residuum. For all the vanity of social class and institutions, so much of struggle and war would be seen by an alien as a strange behavior of Satanic apes killing each other for spurious reasons, when we would have been better off letting people have the thing they wanted in the first place, or not doing this to exacerbate the situation. Sadly, the luminaries of the residuum, where they exist, are typically filthy dregs like Hitler who are pure enablers.

[10] We should differentiate the Italian Fascists from the Nazis, as both inherited different appurtenances, made different alliances, and served different masters and aims. The Nazis, through and through, were a project to cannibalize a country for eugenics, while the Italians were tasked with nationalization which had yet to fully take hold in Italy. Where there was less for the Italian Fascists to cannibalize, and the Fascists had to build an army to keep up promises, the Nazis were pure cannibalism from the outset, dominated by the worst impulses and intended from the outset to cut and run once they sucked a country dry, as Nazis always do. For the Nazis, the rhetoric of fighting banks was purely

projection, as the Nazis were themselves the source of this auto-cannibalism. The early Fascists did, to some extent, believe they were fighting usurers and the practices of banks up to that point. The result, though, had less to do with "fighting the bank", but more to do with ramming through the same central bank policies that were to become the standard of the world. Before this time, the running battles over the bank had less to do with abolishing the bank as an idea, but battles over gold, silver, or paper currency, and the positions of interests with regards to those standards. By the 1930s, the entire purpose of the bank was radically altered, as gold no longer meant what it once meant, and would mean even less after 1970. The cannibalization Nazism represented was a particular disease of German eugenics rather than a political idea on its own. The Fascists, like the Nazis, were ultimately devoted to eugenic conceptions of the nation-state and the pressing of state authority against all opposition, and follow much of the same philosophical thought and practice, but the Nazi habit of mass slavery and deprivations for their own sake was a special innovation, no doubt encouraged by the Anglo-American fellow travelers. They are an early vanguard of what Fabian intellectuals dreamed of doing to us Americans when their "Jehad" of full eugenics could come out, and we see in the 21st century where that has led, far beyond anything the Nazis accomplished. The inheritors of Nazism knew what they were and extensively shit up my home of America with their culture, philosophy, institutions, and every mannerism their filthy movement could conjure, all with imperial backing and a taboo against saying no to any of it.

[11] And this is why Prussian and Fabian schools set up absurd rules of when someone can use the bathroom. Once a child is marked as failing, the child's maladaptive behavior is reinforced, to mark him as defective and revel in the thrill of rejection and shame. The entire process is about "weeding out", but if no marked defectives were present, the humiliation cycles are imposed to create a living abortion, or a living abortion from another class is displayed so that the thrill of humiliation is delivered to snout nosed brats. "Once retarded, always retarded." They have gone to war to protect that.

[12] There is much to be said about the nature of workers' uprisings, but one thing that must be clear is that not all workers are the same, and did not all see things the way a class narrative would. It is also documented extensively that workers spent much more energy and effort attacking each other, and almost destroyed themselves without any great interference from the capitalists. Where workers made common cause with downwardly mobile bourgeois or class traitors, it was always a tenuous or sporadic relationship. The workers themselves did not conform to a lump of worker-flesh imagined by a philosopher, for there was no inherent barrier to workers picking up political knowledge and the bourgeois philosophy. There was not intrinsically any reason a common laborer wouldn't see himself and embody the aristocratic world-view, not merely as a pawn but as a new man embracing the status and abandoning his origin. Strange as it may seem, it does happen more than once; and in any event, a worker or bank robber who becomes General Secretary has much different priorities or loyalties than

the rest of the workers, regardless of whether the General Secretary upholds the greater project or is a good or bad man. The institution itself requires him to consider his position as very different.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

15. Learning and Intelligence as a Machine Perpetuating in Society

Education and the drilling of the school must be dismissed when discussing genuine learning, knowledge, and intelligence without those fetters. Underneath all conceits about intelligence and institutions is a reality that flesh and blood humans learn and acquire a quality we regard as intelligence. General intelligence, which is mystified by horrifically bad statistical deception, is still a valid concept of the overall faculties of a single mind. In the model described in the first book of this series, "mind" is not a philosophical construct but something that emerged out of the world. In our case as humans, it originated out of the processes of life, and so all of our faculties of learning in a genuine sense arose from that seed. With technology, media, and communication, human learning becomes something more than a biological construct, and what we learn and think is never contained within the atomized subject. It remains the case that human beings are constituted as individuals, and this is not just an institutional conceit we hold about persons. The mind cannot be divided from itself for too long or split into faces that the occulting interest of life would revel in. Regardless of the true nature of this existence we call ourselves, we orient around a singular conscious experience and that is the active part of any process which can learn or possess intelligence as a quality. Stable intelligence implies more than a mere knowledge process, but implies both a material origin, a genesis, and a going concern of the entity which knows. It further implies a history and development of the knower that interfaces with a world, and this extends to our next chapter and our moral sentiments. Among the moral sentiments is our attitude towards intelligence and knowledge itself, and it is here where so many follies are made regarding intelligence and who is smart, who is dull, and what precisely the brain and mind do that constitutes intelligent activity, or how that intelligence could be judged in comparison to other intelligences.

We return to our focus of this arc of chapters - struggle and authority, which the practice of war mentioned in the last chapter must pertain to as well. War and learning in this sense are almost never conjoined, unlike the conceit of the eugenicist who believes the learning institutions must conduct a war against the weak and never allow the weak to rise ever again. War as a practice involves little learning, except learning about the enemy. An education in conditions of war and siege emphasizes management and coping mechanisms rather than learning that provides a stable basis for genuine knowledge. The most essential learning is anathema to conditions of war or the militarization of society, and

learning as a process is local. Institutions, particularly institutions held by hostile interests, are terrible places to learn anything. The institutions which understand learning best are not interested in judging and sorting the population or assessing students at all. They are instead libraries and present the seeds for those who wish to learn to approach knowledge independently, and relate to a world that is outside all of the institutions and came before them. The effective library would suggest a syllabus to pursue independently, tests that learners could take themselves to judge their knowledge. If that is accomplished, then the final sorting of academic knowledge or qualities could be accomplished with very little pedagogical intervention at all. Very little of pedagogy or the role of the teacher is needed at all, given today's information technology and rapid delivery of text and images from electronic libraries. For various reasons, this program is never put in place. Something like this could have been done since the late 18th century, and in practice something like this is how humanity managed to learn and independently attain high literacy, without the onerous mediator of the pedagogue or the militarized school. Were someone insistent on the need of a pedagogue or a teacher to guide learning, the effective teacher has long understood what the learner needs is a guide and some explanation of why learning the material presented, or a habit of learning in general, is beneficial. The earliest guidance is not trivial. Few can learn to read independent of some instruction linking printed letters to sounds and meanings. The methods of pedagogy to teach language are deliberately maladaptive. Once learned, language instruction concerns not the understanding or composition of language, but bullbaiting and cajoling and teaching children vulnerability to propaganda and humiliation, and maximizing the thrill of demonstrating ignorance. Children are taught to value lumps of horseflesh as prized wisdom and trained to be incurious about anything meaningful, and this is not just intended but a core expression of the eugenic war itself. Pedagogy of that sort is designed only to beat children into submission. Adults could not learn in this way, and the eugenic ideology asserts that humans cannot learn independently and do not learn past the age of 16 in any significant way. The aim of eugenic education is to program students to stay in their lane, follow the caste and professional assignment handed to them by the leaders. If someone is "free" to choose their career, they are in actuality consigned to the residuum and expected to hustle and grift, which is the chief product of these ruinous institutions and their whole filthy way of life. To make matters worse, children are never told exactly what is expected of them, and the thrill of humiliation is recapitulated with that idiotic line, "figure it out for yourself". The dumb fucks who revel in this torture are the trained killers and rapers, which is what this failed race produces in sufficient quantities to commit to depopulation. Sadly, this is the standard of the human race. It is not a peculiarity of our time, as disastrous as the Fabian project is for America and the world. The tragedy is not that a good institution of learning has been lost, for education in the world has never been good. It selected a caste of professionals and told them their bourgeois vanity was great knowledge, while denying them meaningful knowledge and supplying to the aristocracy of technology a wealth of strategies to extract knowledge and

labor with minimal cost. Whether this is done in capitalism or communism, the result has been the same. The elite of the warriors and proprietors are taught venality and never match the accomplishment of their ancestors, and this is often what is harkened to when society is allowed to bemoan what is "lost". The past education only differed in that a higher quality of man was required to meet the bare minimum necessity of suppressing the weak. The advance of mass poisoning and drugging, and the perpetuation of the thrill of torture in Reaganism, made it easier than ever for aristocrats, proprietors, and technocrats to cajole and degrade the lower orders and each other. The aristocracy itself, whatever airs it puts on, is visibly degenerating, and if there is some secret world where aristocrats really are atomic supermen, it must be very well hidden and does not reflect in the pathetic spectacle our lords and masters have erected, even when they are attempting to hint at the wisdom of the better men and women. Why would the aristocracy be better, without any sobering influence, and when aristocrats view ability in themselves to be suspect? Above all, the aristocrats fear a Caesar or Napoleon rising from their ranks - men who were independently intelligent and commanded armies and loyalty, and who possessed a strength that the lower orders could respect. Caesar and Napoleon both serve aristocracy, coming from that class, but understood how virtue could command men in ways that the decrepit forms of republicanism could not.

We see the difficulty of viewing learning, or education institutionally, as warlike or a struggle. Even the aristocracy can't bring themselves to defend such a method of learning, and never utilizes it for their secrets. The struggle sessions imposed are entirely an pedagogy for various gradients of failure. Education and the sickening ritual of the guru, which this author despises, is left for another time and another writing. I concern myself here with the genuine processes humans do to learn, which often take place in education and in spite of the pedagogues' rank and deliberate incompetence. It is well known that pedagogues have always liked most of their students to remain dumb, and it is not out of any belief that "hard" lessons make students smarter. The pedagogy is designed to fail students, bark contradictory orders in their face and laugh at them when they fail, which always happens. The more extreme forms of this destructive "learning" teach indolence, fear, and arbitrary authority which the student is forbidden to name. Such is the learning of an occulted, guru-ridden, fad-ridden shithole. The defenders of this pedagogy make their usual false equivalence when they claim that making children suffer is the same as presenting children with challenging problems that require them to test the intelligence. None of this is intended to be a challenge. It is a game the child is expected to fail, while the favored people are given the cheat code, which has been the fate of intellectual so-called meritocracy for a long time.^[1] The resulting "synthesis" is invariably a dumbing-down of education, with fingers pointed at the "retards" for bringing down standards. All of this is repeated and violent recapitulations of the eugenic creed, divorced from any process of learning, and it is a violent recapitulation of the militarized school and its grinding down of selected populations to fit this role. The learning of the school is not a passive process of eliminating

a natural learning potential. Children are not by nature "natural learners" in that sense, because most of what children like any human do has nothing to do with learning or knowledge gathering. The incuriosity of children is expected, particularly in such a stultifying environment. The true learning is to assert positively the eugenic creed's dominance over a space, and suggest that members of society must internalize this without criticism. That is the only way the Germanic tradition of schooling could function. Most genuine learning is expected to happen outside of the school, but the school does indeed teach certain knowledge and values. The learning process is not intrinsically good or pure. People can learn lies and how to lie, and the malevolent arts of the human race have always been the most valuable knowledge in the view of society and institutions. Learning for the sake of productivity or spiritual development is not just irrelevant but a thing considered odious, both by the eugenic interest of life and by life's primary and overriding interest. A fetish for technology and conceits of knowledge is known to be maladaptive. The applied science taught to workmen and expected of labor is only that which will keep people submissive to aristocracy.

THE GERM OF INTELLECTUAL PRODUCTION

To best understand this mechanism, we may suppose for the moment that the knowing agent is an abstract "mind" of unknown qualities. We do not care for the moment about its internal workings, but what sense information and communication it receives and puts out. In this way, the mind and all that comes out of it may be treated like a factory, technocratically planned and arranged within itself to function in the way we expect it to. For many reasons, this is incompatible with what life actually does. Our first entry point to a scientific view is the knowledge process itself encountering a world alien to it. The mind in the abstract is wholly alien to the world, even to the body that brought that mind into existence and the most minute functions of the brain that allow the mind a real manifestation in the world. Before someone can look inside the black box, they encounter a world where the concept of a "black box" would be relevant; and if the world were nothing but the mind itself, then the only sense data available is the contents of the "black box", unfettered by any sensory input from the world, and someone can contemplate those signals as they please, as the contents of the black box would allow. In living creatures, the mind and the whole body exists because it was in an environment, and that is what oriented the development of the body beyond the most primitive. We have thus returned to the initial example of a simulation universe we started with, but with what I have written up to now in mind about the nature of life, society, and the question posed. Some version of this would be evident to a child asking the question, in some way, if the child is asking a question about their own mind and self, and it remains evident every time we ask a question about how we think and assemble knowledge.

The basis for all of this sense information is symbolic representation rather than

"true reality" in of itself. It is not difficult to see that symbolic information is not all that exists - that the thing we describe as "A" is not "A" in its entirety. Names and representations of anything suggest an underlying nature, even for things which we do not regard as dubious. The symbol "A" itself for instance is something recognized regardless of what media it appears on, but we are aware that it is written on some media or some representation, and we can ask questions about that media's material composition. It is entirely possible to invent an imagined world underneath the symbol, and this is an error we seek to correct. Much of this covers the thought on knowledge and metaphysics from the first book. To summarize, there are two ways for this symbolic sense-information to be modified. The first is recognition of patterns and an ability to relate meaningfully two symbols, and this recognition is not carried out by a rational algorithm but by the functions of the brain, body, and tools we use, which are adept at this pattern recognition task. The second is to rationally break down formally the symbols we see, in line with a metaphysical thinking we adopt necessarily when we do so. That metaphysical thinking is not fixed in nature, in a way which obligates all valid knowledge processes to believe any metaphysical reality. No formal metaphysics is established in a way that is undeniable to us, for if it were, there could not be a question that things "are" anything other than what the sole natural metaphysical model declares. That is, we could not even engage in the argument about what things are, and attempts to do so would be short-circuited. We would be forced to be honest, which is at odds with our basic understanding of reality. The only metaphysics which could be universal and natural is that A is indeed A, but this is an expression of equality in symbolic language or some representation. It would require someone to believe that symbols are in of themselves the whole of meaning, and this means that a symbol could in principle be pressed into the brain without any critical faculty to derive unacceptable meanings. We can indeed adopt that metaphysics, but it will run into an immediate processing error if it receives confusing or contradictory symbolic realities and is told to believe both. This fugue is intended and was described in the prior book, and should be familiar to many of us, so I need not repeat that state of mind here. The only such metaphysics would be to declare that there is no such thing as metaphysics... and thus, no reality. All of this metaphysical knowledge must be a thing acquired by the basic seed of knowledge, and the earliest origins of our knowledge process are the processes of life and the procession of matter, chemicals and physics. None of those things "create" metaphysics in of themselves, but instead we acquire metaphysical knowledge in order to relate all concepts of what things are, whether they are natural objects or concepts only comprehensible to those of us who think about them and construct them mentally. There would be no other way for this sense faculty we possess to acquire meaning and for knowledge to operate on the world. The world itself operates in ways that preceded us or anything we thought about it, but these ways are not governed by any metaphysical or rational hobgoblin. They are consistent enough that we cannot arbitrarily invent metaphysics as we please. Metaphysical models to be useful must not be internally contradictory, and must comport with a world that is alien to any of our conceits about it.

Without any knowledge of the internals of the brain, we would reconstruct a sense of our own thought process as best as we can, and could not do otherwise. It is necessary for any knowing entity to think about how it thinks, even if that proceeds with the crude sense of an animal, to establish its sense of its faculties, which allow it to refine any knowledge about the world beyond recognition of symbols or signs. There are then things we sense that lack an obvious symbol, but that we can detect in vaguer forms with senses; for example, a feeling that something is wrong with a pattern we see does not grant us immediate answers of what, if anything, is wrong. When we do, we can assign names and symbols to describe that vagary, or we can isolate symbolic things in the environment to clarify the causes and effects of that vague sense, so that in future it is less vague. There is a danger of inventing phantoms when doing this, but this opening would have to exist for the first recognition of symbols to be possible. The world itself, the universe, is not comprised of any symbolic representation imposed on it by thought, but a material world we have to accept on some level as meaningful. Ideas we construct, even if we hold them to be abstract and above conventional matter, are things that have to be substantive in order to be truly conceivable; that is, ideas about something like a "god" would have to relate somehow to the world we observe, even if the "god" itself is an abstraction. We wouldn't believe in a god unless it said something about the world, and the world is inclusive of ourselves and all that we are; and so gods are not metaphors for nature, but metaphors for political thought and wisdom, and possibly something more that we hold to be meaningful in ways conventional knowledge cannot assert by reason.

It is not difficult to see that the body preceded the "mind" as a construct in this sense, and we separate the mind from the body not for any genuine philosophical purpose but because doing so is beneficial for the integrity of life. This separation is never complete, but it is an abiding characteristic of symbolic knowledge that we never truly contact the world or ourselves. We only contact approximations of both, and this is the version of ourselves which is communicable. This is not merely a matter of language, but of the materials that allow us to think in the first place. In the final chapter of this book, I wish to mention the field of cybernetics and its influence on this entire question. For now it is enough to say that it has been established that regulation of energy permitting governance - what we would construe as "mind" - is only possible through a negative feedback loop. This is the only way in which we could truly arrest energetic motion in the world in our thoughts to perceive of a fixed construct. Every symbol - and the "symbols" here include the very particles that comprise all matter, and the developed constructs like neurons, cells, bones, muscles, and so on - exists not because it was foundational to nature, but because that is a form that is appreciable to us, about which we can say anything about what things are. We never quite touch those structures in our language, and even by recognizing any of them, there is a slight delay between the motion of those structures and the recognition of them in thought or abstraction. We are of course aware that all of these things suggest an underlying reality that is meaningful, and so the

symbols we arrest are not crass fictions or a false reality. The muscles may not be the muscles as we imagine them, but they very much exist and move in a world that does not regard what we think about what we're doing. The thought of the mind is always behind the actions of the world. We are aware of this, and so much of what we do with the body is to correct for this lag time, and this would be necessary for the body's functions to remain integrated effectively. We would be able to see that the muscle is never "just a muscle", and we also recognize that our concept of ourselves very closely resembles the event that actually happens. At the same time, the symbols we accept do not in of themselves mean anything. A part of the body may be explicable in a way a child can understand, but the implications of the existence of anything pertain to history and suggest that something could be more than we believe, and can do things we did not believe possible. By symbolic representation alone, it is never possible to truly arrest all potentials of anything. We would have to compile a vast wealth of information and suggest a total system by thought alone to suggest we can command reality in this way, and eventually the wealth of information is too vast, and too incomplete for the task we envision. Errors arise from the reductions we must accept for us to process so many symbols, using only the faculties available to us natively. No technology to enhance the faculty of knowledge will compensate for this problem. There is further a complication of mind-extending technology, where the use of something like a computer produces an effect on the user who is habituated to it. The tool can, in such a close relationship with the core of the self and what we are, come to command the user. The tool in the hands of a hostile party can command the user, even when the hostile party does not fully know the consequences of doing this or does not care. The parts of the body themselves are such tools, and we would seek to command them for ourselves and the body's integrity. This is not so much a philosophical requirement - it is possible and in some times necessary for someone to yield to another mind in order for their long-term survival, and there is no intrinsic reason why we would value our "self" let alone an institutionalized version of our person in the mind of other people. It is rather that life and its functions have many reasons to resist such an imposition if it were onerous, or sought to interrupt deliberately the thought process, so that life could be cajoled and destroyed. That sad fate has already been mentioned in this writing enough times, and will continue to be mentioned. We can imagine this as a crude thought experiment without authority as such. For life to be more than mere life, though, it will recognize the existence of authority of some sort; and so intellectual production in any sense we appreciate it rests in the end on spiritual authority, rather than personal authority or temporal authority. We begin assembling knowledge not by the will of pedagogues or a "just so" story of life seeking knowledge by some process that is itself unknowable. We begin seeking genuine knowledge because we recognize something as a spiritual authority that can speak of truth, where the will of humans or any machine they build, or any dominance they assert, is moot.

Spiritual authority is not a "germ" of knowledge itself, but something we recognize

in a world that is alien to any part of us. Even if we were to recognize our own mind or conceits about ourselves as the authority, we would in doing so split our mind from itself and the world, reproducing a tripartate structure appropriate to the technocratic subject if we followed that through to its conclusion. The way we would resolve this if not blinding by ideology - ideology which would arise from an overbearing and imperious temporal authority or the personal authority of a bully or cajoler - is to recognize that the self does not have any more authority than it can know it possesses, and to reconcile the self with the world around it. Since the environment of someone varies wildly, there are no fixed rules suggesting how we "must learn", as if these were hardcoded. Humans respond to both society and its agents and the environment around them. It is a technocratic conceit that there is nothing outside of society and its agents, for all in the technocrat's mind was enclosed long ago and it could not be any other way. Their concept of the meaningful world relies on a belief that the world is subject to the whims of superior minds, regardless of how well they know this to be a delusion. It is not out of hypocrisy or ignorance that the technocrat does this, but out of the necessity their vision of government and thus of mind places on the subject. To do otherwise is to be wildly at odds with the environment a technocrat lives in, if the technocrat has established position and isn't cast out of power. Even outside of power, those with a technocratic mind - perhaps someone who dreamed of such a world before it could impose its institutions - are given over to a conceit about themselves despite any knowledge or wisdom telling them not to do this. In doing so, the technocrat must choose one of the other interests of life to align with. Due to the tie of the human mind to its genesis and biological activity, and the existing dominance of property, the technocrat almost always chooses the eugenic interest in one way or another as the best ally, and disdains the people. The technocrat with some knowledge of politics further discovers that human society, in all practical matters, has always been directed by aristocrats due to the advantages of aristocracy to wage war from their hideaway and make the rest of us suffer. The technocrat's loathing of the lowest class is a particular sort that would make the most selfish robber baron blush, yet at the same time the technocrat is obsessed with the idea that the lowest class will learn to love their slavery and humiliation, all while the technocrat cannot hide utter contempt for anything they deem stupid. This author has been at the receiving end of that hatred, against increasingly spurious arguments of those who retreat the institutions, for no reason other than their pigheaded conceits about their mind and intelligence. I have to live the consequences of what they did to me for nothing more than a cargo cult, and the bastards are trained from birth to keep pushing that reward button, even when they didn't gain anything from it. Such is the curse of mind, knowledge, and wisdom, no matter how much it has been clothed and made out to be our savior.

Absent a more compelling spiritual authority than this, the most basic spiritual authority of formal knowledge is the crown of knowledge - the self, or other entities comprised as such. It is this which forms the proper basis for all further

development of society and learning and political consciousness. For Man to be a political animal, he would first be a spiritual animal reliant on knowledge to command his faculties. It is knowledge which forms the basis for all of his political decisions and any non-trivial decision regarding his life. That knowledge is informed by something greater due to his labor and his use of language, and the knowledge operates with symbols that are accessible to him before he can derive meaningful knowledge from the world. The knowledge process itself, as mentioned before, is not beholden to labor or language intrinsically. We were able to know things without alienated labor or language, and would have had to. The further development of these things is for the next two chapters. When they are reduced to their most essential components for education and learning, the knowledge process in humans is remarkably simple and versatile. The human brain, for all of its qualities, does not do anything so magnificent that its functions are unknowable or sacred. Nor does any part of the body, reduced in this way, suggest that humans are any sort of sacred animal, fundamentally apart from nature or qualitatively distinct in a way that makes them a unique substance in the world. When dealing with knowledge in a more basic form - which is to say, when knowledge is formalized and sorted into our library as information to read, recall, interpret, and so on - we operate with a very simplified version of the actual world we live in. We do not process anywhere near the totality of information or symbols available to us, and couldn't realistically do so with any device we would use to expand our knowledge faculties. Processing every minute fact of the world is not relevant to the task of knowledge, and knowledge is not essential because of a quantity of processes in the brain or an arbitrary complexity of knowledge which makes men sentient in that way.

If we were to imagine an animal with far superior processing capabilities than our own, it would not be essentially different from humans. The human advance was language faculties, technology, and a society where we could communicate ideas. While this is a threshold of some complexity, the faculty of language in humans varies considerably among them. Those with lesser abilities, who wouldn't have conjured language on their own as specialists, learn from those who did spend considerable time defining and honing the language. Those who are experts in adjudicating proper language - educators, pedagogues, academics, wise men, and those who make it their business to be the authorities on proper language - are not so blind to believe that their intellectual lessers do not think, or that the words they say aren't meaningful. Language in human society was rarely developed by one person and imposed on society in total. The seeds of a full language beyond organic constructions might have been largely worked out by one mind or a small committee, but languages circulate and develop in societies, as humans communicate with each other, mimic each other, and pick up new words without any thought leader telling them the word was valid. The outline of what a language is, its proper syntax and so on, is set so that language can be parsed and picked apart for meaning, but new words appear and may or may not be noted by the men who write the dictionary, or who are the Guardians of memes to decide which new words will be permitted to flourish

in the information network. We can trace each new word, each new expression, and how it is adopted for each social agent, given sufficient information. This circulation of language, which leads to its development, is not directed necessarily by any executive. So it is with the communication of information in any network. The internet as a network is designed specifically not to be centralized in a way where someone with command of the hub can dictate from on high what new ideas appear from a node. In principle, one node can communicate with any other node with a matching protocol. The protocol was designed by someone, and for the internet to function reliably, there are always protocols that a machine must follow for communication of digital information to be possible. In principle, protocols are necessary for any language or any knowledge, including those in our own brain. There is always some protocol at work with the basic knowledge process, even if it is carried out without any conscious design. The integration of the body of a human in a single mind is never a thing existing in isolation, nor is it guaranteed that the mind is a singular "self" or identity, or would see itself as an ego in that way. The self-awareness of human beings is not due to any metaphysical law of what the self must be, but a reality of the world - that the parts of the body do not communicate so intimately with another body in any circumstance we know of. If we could, it would be a form of telepathy that goes beyond mere instincts or foreknowledge of another person's thinking. All of this is to speak of how we conduct ourselves when we learn things, and how humans communicate information to each other when the intent is to genuinely teach or share information for the development of knowledge. None of that can be taken for granted, as if communication and sociality "just happened" or are a given of nature. For example, the koan "humans are social animals" or "humans need hierarchy" mean nothing and communicate nothing, but instead terminate thought and present sentiments as just-so facts. There are reasons, not difficult to divine, for how humans socialize, how humans form social and political hierarchies, and how knowledge prefers hierarchical structures to best assimilate formal knowledge and information. There is always a way in which this knowledge is gleaned, just as we have protocols for determining who can be trusted, who is intelligible, and so on, that have nothing to do with any preferred structure imposed on us by a thought leader. We would require such a thing internal to us, regardless of a thought-form suggested by any ideology. Nor does any knowledge attain legitimacy because it is just more complex. The useful and productive knowledge is often very simple, even if the systems it deals with are far more complicated than the models we use to operate on things in labor. A very complex house of cards will fall just the same, and doesn't intrinsically serve any purpose just by being complex, or because the formalism looks so elegant or can be defended in a dissertation. The knowledge process we rely upon, once it is developed, would answer all of these questions and more, before we would build for ourselves a theory or working model of how we think, or how we learn. In some way, every one of us will do this out of necessity, as we learn early in life to never trust bureaucratic authorities, and to only trust anyone else so far. Parents will teach their children about lying, lie to their children, and have many incentives to never tell the whole truth to their

children. Humans, we learn early enough, are liars through and through, and to trust anything from them requires careful adjudication. We will for the moment concern ourselves with our native process of knowledge, communicating with a world which we have no reason to distrust. We will presume that we trust ourselves enough. This author will tell you one of the worst things someone can ever do is tell themselves their thinking is wrong and must be corrected by another, no matter how incorrect your thoughts may be. It is unavoidable that the most fundamental thought processes will be molded by another human, particularly for young children whose defense against this is nearly nonexistent against an experienced manipulator, who built an environment to entrap the naive newborn. All throughout life, there will be forces to sow doubt, fear, and uncertainty in us, for we are alone against a world full of humans who at a basic level have no less capacity than us to act or think about this question, and we have no immediate knowledge of who is talking to whom. The conspiracies between humans are things we can diagnose another time. The world itself has no use for such conspiracies. The particles in a cloud of gas are not conspiring to hide their secrets from us. We might defeat ourselves in building an accurate model, but this is our problem and one we can overcome if we learn that our current model of that phenomenon is flawed. We also figure that, after sufficient experience and stability, we know ourselves well enough to resist the cajolers and the bombast of authorities relying on fear to tell us what we are, and that they know us better than we know ourselves. We have spent our whole lives living in our own heads out of necessity, and imperious, demonic assholes with a uniform and institutional authority have always used this line when they couldn't care less what another person thinks. The only thing those people ever think is "retard, retard, retard", when they say such things, and they don't even pretend otherwise. Such stonewalling and cruelty is inherent to the institution, and usually inherent to the person who is an exemplar of that institution's venality and stupidity. Even if they did understand the inner workings of another person well enough to say something useful, it is never the case that people who are trained to lord over others imperiously are interested in actually helping. They only seek to give whatever they need to make the subject compliant with an alien philosophical construct, then thrust the subject into a position of abject humiliation. If they cared about helping someone, they wouldn't pronounce that they have shrunk your brain and life experience to nothing, or engage in the venal stonewalling and cruelty of their institution with full knowledge of all participants that this exists to grind down and destroy the will to resist.

The need for spiritual authority is such that humans will seek it out of necessity, even if it is a crude one that does no more than serve immediate purposes. This, though, is often unsatisfactory in human society. We are acutely aware of other humans who are like us, and our judgement of other humans takes precedent over nearly everything else in the environment. By far, the greatest threat to a human is other humans. Therefore, it is common for humans to seek spiritual authority in an older or wiser human or the words they speak or write, because we naively assume that older and wiser people would know things that we do

not. We know the older and wiser human would understand the thought process much as we understand ourselves, and while this is not a safe assumption, a human would more readily engage with another human - whether older, younger, or a peer - than they would engage with a rock or a tree. Rocks and trees do not talk. Abstract concepts we cannot touch or work with are even more arcane in conversation, if we were to imagine one. We do, though, see anything in the world as potentially an authority to tell us something about the world.

Humans, or any animal, do not see the objects assigned spiritual authority as pedagogues, or believe that spiritual authority grants to the object a power to dictate reality unilaterally. Spiritual authority is actively sought by humans and never granted unconditionally. Even if a human wanted to do so, the things in the universe humans avow as idols do not give us information freely. Humans beseech the world for an authority and find something, or many such things, that provide it. The authority is always taken as a singular, in order to match the coherence of a mind that can speak of authority; and so, many things which may be regarded as spiritual authorities are lumped together as "one". It is understood that this is a shorthand, rather than a crass reduction or an invocation of a primordial light, and that "the one" is really many things of a nature which is not reducible. For a mind to have an adequate guide towards any knowledge, one authority must rise above all others as the most prominent at any given time. One cannot learn from two gurus so to speak. Here we see the true heart of "contradiction in nature" and the philosophy of contradiction. It is not a struggle in the world itself, or a struggle of war or some battle. It is not a struggle of material incentives. It is not a social relation or competing vows of service to a lord. It is a contest between two gurus who seek to jump in front and claim that they are the sole fount of knowledge. This, of course, is absurd from our perspective as a would-be student. We seek spiritual authority not to be fed the right ideas, but because past experience suggested this is a thing that can be followed and believed to grant some explanatory power we lacked natively. This continues back to our primitive thoughts, which are driven more by sentiments or whatever constitution we were born with, or some luck of finding the right environmental stimulus that drew early attention. The earliest stages of intellectual production are common fodder for the eugenic creed and eugenic interest to assert all of it was inborn and cannot be altered. This works because we cannot help but be influenced by early conditions, and any future condition is contingent on the past allowing us to recognize an authority that can tell us anything. Within our own thought process, we cannot create anything new, and would have to continue operating on the authority we held prior to ourselves. If we hold ourselves as a spiritual authority, we can only do so to a point. Granting to the self absolute spiritual authority leads to solipsism, autism, and eventually regression and degeneracy, and this clearly does not serve the purpose spiritual authority would want. It is evident enough to a child that such a belief is moronic and counterproductive. Only through ideology and a great preponderance of external threat are humans driven to turn inwards in that way, and this is almost always an imposition from outside and by temporal authorities

that can impose it as a constant condition. Spiritual authority is never asserted from on high in the way an ideologue would desire it. It is always recognized by individual humans and must be so, and no spiritual authority is a given of nature or a thing taken for granted. Spiritual authority that is so jealous is no spiritual authority at all, and it is a doctrine of the proprietors and pretenders to temporal authority that this is what spiritual authority is. The reason for that particular doctrine, if this is not clear already, is that the spiritual authority of the bullbaiter is the most direct route to commanding a human as a slave and managing its internal affairs, and this is desired for managers and proprietors who can turn the human into an informational machine, detached from the real and made alien to itself and all that exists. Anything else would present a barrier to the claim of property and thus managers construe this as impedence of their desire. The most crass managers take this as a natural law, having given themselves completely to a retarded ideology beyond mere managerialism, but a master who simply sees this as expedient is liable to fall into the same trap of ideology if he does not temper his managerial intent, to keep it in line with the master's own sense of reality.

It is not that the student engages in a struggle with the teacher. That antagonism is anathema to genuine learning. The learning relationship, unlike the educational relationship in society, is one of true cooperation. It is indeed the only true cooperation and friendship that humans know at a basic level. All other friendships are either contingent on mutual fear or some interest which makes the status of "friend" questionable at best, or they stem from developed knowledge which makes open hostility pointless and counterproductive, which would have required at some point the genuine cooperation we imagine. No other relationship would be genuinely cooperative between two social agents. Two agents may share resources out of a sense of kindness or affinity for each other, but this is not "altruism" in the meaningful sense or even an act of genuine cooperation necessarily. It could be many things - an instinct that draws humans to like each other or seek each other for crass comfort, a suckling of the breast that is only natural for an infant and that a mother would often provide out of some sense that tending to the young would preserve her legacy and would be in line with her affinity for life. The sharing of resources in of itself is not cooperation, for sharing may be premised on mutual distrust, or obligating partners to cooperate by presenting a shared interest without transaction. It is only in the process of learning that humans can genuinely know of each other and speak of cooperation as more than a convenient fiction. If knowledge is the entry point for us to contact the world, then sharing knowledge in genuine cooperation is the closest possible connection. This is not carried out uncritically, but hostility and domination are not the limiting factors to the relationship. They would, in the ideal learning relation, not exist. If we are given reason to distrust the teacher at all, then all that we learn from the teacher is suspect. When humans find this knowledge not in another human but an inanimate object or some machine, there is a great comfort between the human and this object, especially if the object is the human's own tool and the human is aware of the

tool's uses and its behaviors, if the tool were outside of absolute control. The human does not dominate tools or inanimate objects in the way it tends to dominate other humans, because doing that is stupid and pointless, and creates a hobgoblin hampering a relation which is very obvious.

Between two humans, this relationship is not intrinsically untrustworthy or marred by some moral fiber inherent to the human race. It is not marred by any original sin. It isn't even marred by sins that happened a moment before the essential act. Two humans can choose to be straight with each other at any time, regardless of their past. We would have reasons to distrust this, and there is a native instinct to distrust humans. That instinct is honed because we learn that humans are liars, usually sadistic for no good reason. When offered the possibility of the simple learning relationship, the human will go out of its way to lie and terminate that simply out of a pigheaded sense of itself. This pigheadedness is not merely a result of the other interests of life, as if the technocratic germ were made pure and knowledge was its own reward. Typically the distrust of humans arises not from the eugenic interest of life defending property or crass material things, nor from anything that was built in to the human constitution biologically or in its current environment or state. The distrust is not premised by any moral code or laborious interest. The distrust is not a matter of valuing occultism or the precarious situation of the lowest class - if anything, the lowest class due to their position are the most willing to ignore their sense of distrust, because necessity requires them to assimilate new knowledge to compensate for their position, regardless of whether the knowledge is trustworthy. The occultists and mystics are known to be eager to spread their knowledge not because they're natural born grifters, but because they believe on some level that sharing this occult wisdom is beneficial and will lead a student to the genuine knowledge on their own. Very often, the teacher or guru relies on the student's own learning process, as we will elaborate on shortly. The distrust between humans, and the entire reason for our terrible calamity, is at root in the technological interest itself, and the conceits of knowledge humans hold. That is, that humans will through their knowledge and possessions become conceited about their identity and empty vanity, and this becomes something they value more than any other interest of life. The eugenic interest of life only asserts itself so far, for it does not take any great knowledge for a human to see that obsession over property and the past is irrelevant to humanity's continued existence, and the property or tokens of status are not really life's prime want. Where the eugenic interest manifests its vileness is in alliance with humanity's conceit about its knowledge process. That process then seeks to corrode any other interest and bring it into alliance with the interest of technology and knowledge. It is here where the aristocracy can be born - not of any one interest, but by the marriage of the primordial interest of life, the eugenic interest, and the technological interest.^[2]

Between two knowing entities, what is the nature of the learning relationship? It is not hierarchical, competitive, based on respect, and not necessarily dependent on any preferred social role. Those considerations are made after the essential act of contact between two minds, and are not inherent in the contact or exchange.

It is not a dialogue in the philosophical sense, where two people just say words to each other and the symbols are believed to have meaning, or the reader observes the dialogue to suggest to a third party what the nature of this interaction is. It is not one mind feeding another or a pipeline of pure information transfer between two black boxes, or two points of light in contact with each other by some spooky logic. It is not two wills meeting to become one, or two meeting to create a third and only a third outcome, in some philosophical struggle. It is not any of the things that are conventionally described in the relationships between humans, for what humans do in their relationships is more evident by exoteric knowledge retained after the fact. Strictly speaking, the contact is not between humans in their material conditions or any abstracted and preferred idea of what the humans are.

What this entails is two systems connecting with each other by some link, and in doing so, all of the faculties of knowledge, interpretation of meaning, and recognition of symbols are operative at a scale far more minute and intimate than the typical process of communication. To truly learn anything at all, we do more than merely shout symbols or jabber words, and we do more than material exchanges of information or substance. How much connection exists between the systems may vary, but there is always a definite connection, and for the period of learning, the conventional laws of sociality, physics, and all expectations of how learning is "supposed" to happen are set aside. This is an interaction of systems in their rawest form - that is, that two systems are operating in the realm of metaphysics, rather than the finalized ideas suggested by philosophy or some interaction that is reduced to a cruder model. The two systems may not have a "compatible ontology", in that two knowing entities do not necessarily need to share the same ontology to communicate with each other in this way. They would recognize that there is a way in which these systems are arranged, and an ontology in the other mind to be discerned if interaction between the systems is possible. There would be, in principle, no necessary protocol whatsoever to allow the learning process to commence between two systems; the protocol may be developed based on what the systems can learn about each other once this starts. It would have to be so if any learning process in the real world can be possible. The world does not fundamentally regard any of our protocols in language, when it comes to the essential act of learning. A protocol would not be possible if there were not this communication before protocol existed. This is quite different from our everyday experience mentioned above, where machines like computers on the internet must share a protocol allowing them to communicate. The computers would not be able to recognize electrical signals as significant without a known mechanism to detect them, and reliable communication networks would not recreate the protocol in every exchange of information packets. It is different from our everyday interaction in the physical world, where we quickly discern which objects are capable of communication and how we can communicate with them. We readily classify the distinctions of different types of people and different objects, and store that classification in our mind for future reference. The essential act of learning

operates at a level which does not regard that at all. It is that essential act of learning which makes possible anything that discerns meaning of things, and eventually allows us to classify one object as different from another. We have no ready-made mechanism to detect what another mind, or another object, "is", without having some analytical ability, which implies contact with the system so that its classification is discerned. Any time we are to interact with the same thing again, we would have to ensure that the thing we are communicating with is the same entity as before, or conforms to our expectations of it by remaining in the boundaries of knowledge and behavior we imagine for it. If someone we knew yesterday as an old man were to reappear to us tomorrow and possess the mind of a young woman with very different experiences, we would either know that some transformation took place, or we would fail to recognize that the entity we contact today is the same entity we spoke to yesterday. We would discern that the entity has a contiguous history, however much it transformed, and there is a reason why such a transformation took place. There is not in nature any break in the conscious entity that marks one class we assigned to it as a different entity than another class. Someone might have been a noble yesterday and became a lowly worker today, but would still have the same face and geneology and a story to tell about his fall from grace.

All of this is to say that our conceits about the mind, philosophy, and the world itself are not relevant in the essential act of learning, however much we secure ourselves from the consequences. For learning to begin, the contact would be between systems understood as metaphysical constructs, rather than contact with the natural world itself. There is learning an inherent disconnect between the knowledge process and the underlying substance or matter that comprises that process; and in that way, learning is not evident by any necessary substantive transformation, where we say a particular learning has happened if some light is activated in the knowing entity's material structure. Even if there is no particular change to the internal memory of the student, the student still recognizes a different environment around it and will act accordingly. The new environment, a new teacher perhaps, will affect the otherwise inert student after the fact of contact. Only then does the transformation begin. But, the student is not always inert, nor is the teacher. Both can be inert or refuse to speak to the other, but if that is so, there simply isn't a learning process, but a process of hostility occurring outside of that contact. Hostile parties do not want to learn from each other in this way - they instead maintain a studious distance from their opponents, or they only pretend this contact with the intent of betrayal. The intent of betrayal is usually obvious to those who are acutely aware of humanity's propensity for lying, but those with this contempt do not intend to conceal their betrayal. The betrayal is a necessary component of their interaction with an undesirable, for it is never enough for the conceit of knowledge to leave someone they judge stupid to be. They know, whatever their bellowing about natural social inferiority, that humans constantly consider their situation and resent slavery. The daily humiliations are only found in technocratic society. This is not merely because the technology to enforce humiliations exists, but because the very conceit of

knowledge and learning must be interrupted for technocratic society to remain viable. If the technocrat ever gave up this practice, it would undo the entire enterprise from intent alone. "Once retarded, always retarded" must be religiously enforced, even in the absence of any eugenic mission. The mission of eugenics is merely a highly aggressive posture, rather than the machine of technocracy which envisions itself as defensive and besieged by an army of the stupid. Eugenics adopted the Fabian strategy^[3], consciously granting "concessions" designed to weaken the resolve of resistance while aggressively attacking isolated pockets of resistance, until such a time that Eugenics could attack openly and begin the present program of total lying and disintegration of hitherto known society. The technocrat, at a basic level, is not committed to any degree of offensiveness or defensiveness in this mission, and may concede that the technocratic conceit about knowledge is not a moral claim. In other words, the technocrat only enforces this conceit of knowledge so far as it is useful for the aims of the system, and does not need to arrest class mobility or paralyze society altogether in the way eugenism must. It always enforces a grossly unequal society and celebrates hypocrisy, but suggests a vision that the world could be different and that the direction of human history remains progressive and forward-looking. This matches not any genuine goal, but the necessary conceit of knowledge and learning that makes the technocratic society possible.

We can see that external barriers present a number of challenges to learning, and by "external barriers" I include the habits of the body, past experience, and other interests that impede learning. By no means is this learning inherently good, for many things humans learn are highly maladaptive, even when we know better. Learning does not make sound moral judgements. That is left to a much more developed faculty to discern which knowledge is good, which thoughts and processes we absorb are good, and which things we absorb are good. We must consider every consumption which enters our knowledge faculty as a type of learning. Our actions in the world are never reducible to "pure learning". For example, we consume food, and what we eat determines much of what we are. This is mostly substantive and affects the flesh more than the mind, but we contemplate what we eat and every routine we adopt, and we contemplate in some way the most minor of things. Even if the effect is beneath our notice, where we place the thought in some recess of the mind we call "subconscious", there is some effect that passes through our cluster of thinking. In the main, though, the system of the mind most readily engages with other minds, or things we construe as minds. The contact between two entities with knowledge, even if their knowledge faculties are far apart, is something very different from the knowing entity encountering a mere object. Fundamentally, there is no difference. The mind, ultimately an abstraction of some process in the world, is as much a system or object as a fruit. The nature of the mind and developed knowledge is distinguished from ordinary systems, because we set the subjective experience apart from the world conventionally. We expect the same of other humans. Two minds meet not in a physical space, but in the unusual event where our subjective experiences can merge in some way. In this way, the wall separating

our mind and sense of self from the rest of the world is temporarily relaxed, and we can in this way meet another for the first time, as we would have liked to in a better world. We never quite know another person just by physical proximity or social relations, no matter how much society exhorts us to accept a spurious "friendship". The closeness of two minds in contact need not conform to any friendship, as it can occur between rivals or two people who scarcely recognize each other in society, but have met in the realm of the mind. However the interaction happens and however it is communicated in physical space, the mind connects not with the models of physical reality we reproduced, but with other minds. In this way, the mind has a proclivity towards idealism, in this and only this interaction. In most things, humans are inclined towards materialism, as that is the most evident ontology compatible with our existence in a real world. When two minds, two systems arranged as such, meet and are mutually aware of this status as minds, it takes place in the realm of our ideas about thought before it can be reflected in physical actions - including the very physical actions which allowed thought to manifest. The minds may be ultimately governed by the limitations of that physical basis, but in this meeting of minds, the material world is temporarily nullified in the ways that the mental systems do interface. Two people meet each other not as entities of meat and worldly desire, but as two minds. Even if the minds are clearly disparate and one is superior to another in their mental faculties, the weaker mind is never truly reduced to a material thing or a zombie if it is to be seriously engaged with. To declare someone a philosophical zombie requires someone to first eliminate the possibility of mind in their mental models. Since that habit precludes any serious meeting of the minds in this sense, that conceit is little more than a thought-termination exercise. The exercise is inherent to the eugenicist conceit about intelligence and its political relevance, so you can guess this author's opinion of that concept.

The separation of the mind and idea from the material arises not merely because of a necessity to do so, but because the mind's proper task is to interface with other minds. This is not the same as conscious experience in of itself, but a system resulting from it that we would have to reproduce. The mind in of itself is not the fount of knowledge or dependent on any part of the knowledge process. It is a resultant entity from the knowledge process, and only developed in a form we appreciate with symbolic language. The mind, therefore, deals not with meanings intrinsically or with the raw process of consciousness, but symbols and facts. It is up to the faculties available to the mind to discern which symbolic representation is factual, and which is merely a symbol detached from its sense of the world. For the typical trinitarian view of thought, the mind is held sacred and exists on its own, with the world subordinated to it and political matters between it and the world a thing to be governed by the mind. This thinking is intentionally divorced from what we actually are, and must be so; and so, the theories of mind invoke contradiction, tricks, and koans. Mind does not exist as a fount of knowledge or wisdom, but as something which terminates knowledge and arrests it. It is the process of learning in the genuine sense which makes mind valuable, rather than the mind possessing an ineffable quality allowing it spiritual

authority on its own. Because minds are fragile and contradictory things, they are beholden to spiritual authority, and without any sobering influence, minds will always be dominated by that which can claim authority. Minds are never the masters of their own destiny, and yet in their contradictory thinking, mastery and management of the world is entirely a mental faculty. The mind seeks to change the world in a futile effort, but does not on its own terms understand itself or the most basic process which allows mind to be relevant. So, learning as we appreciate the concept is less something fundamental to the universe, which we would do by some impulse of mind which is inexplicable or a just-so story. The mind is perfectly capable of refusing to learn, shutting itself off from another mind or the world itself. It is the underlying process of the world which compels the mind to submit, and against the world, mind is a helpless coward no matter how elaborate a game it can construct for itself. Fortunately for the mind, the world in its genuine sense is merciful enough to allow mind to continue. It was never the world itself, by some inexplicable force, that had it out for the mind. The greatest danger to a mind is not the world in some vague sense, but other minds. That is the language and interaction the mind appreciates, because that is what the mind does to be the mind. The mind's essential task is not living or anything attached to the world, but learning which it conducts on its own terms, and with other systems that it presumes to be like it in some way. The mind attributes to objects in the world and transcendent truths the same qualities of mind, even when the objects are clearly unthinking and do not appreciate any such concept. For example, humans presume in their arrogance that gods would think in any way like humans, who are known to possess their frailties, and at the same time, the gods are an ascended form of existence that are unlike worldly thought. Religion has for a long time acknowledged this contradiction. The crass metaphors that a technocrat, philosopher, or intellectual utilizes presume either that the gods or objects of the world conform to its theory of "mind", or that the "mind" of the philosopher and intellectual alone is a special substance, distinct from the vulgar thought processes of the rest of the human race and anything else in the world. In other words, to speak of a theory of mind is really to speak of a form of autism the philosopher treasures and considers, by the mind's perverse operations, as the true social and spiritual existence. This, as a child can see, is utterly retarded and pointless. But, the singular act of learning in its true form, which forms the basis of our sustained knowledge base that we willfully access, is what humans or any thinking animal would have to do in order to navigate the world. Even if we envisioned a very different thought process at work, it would still assemble something like "mind", and must do so. Learning to be learning is not a mere process of the world we call consciousness or knowledge, nor is it something that is implied by the world-system we would reconstruct to understand the world meaningfully. The mind does not contain anywhere near a full reconstruction of the world-system we use to discern meaning and properly judge facts. The mind is not even guaranteed to construct an accurate model of the world or its own thought. While the world cannot operate with contradictions, and knowledge in the useful sense does not process contradictions without pauses and gradual decay, the mind can freely and shameless pronounce

contradictions and revel in the thrill of doing so. Such embrace of contradiction is not seen as a violation of reality, because the mind can on some level know it is playing a mental trick, especially when it bellows repeated and flagrant lies to minds it deems inferior. The mind is a creature contemptuous of all else that exists until it proven innocent of that charge.

Learning in this way is not a trap because one mind feeds the other information without any barrier impeding the pedagogue's will. That particular trap is something that must occur in the world and be realized as closely as the world will allow. The trap of learning is instead the mind's arrogance, and insistence that it is the true seat of thought and the person, without any regard to a soul, a world outside of the mind, or anything the metaphysical interaction of minds would point to in the actual world. The learning process is most necessary, but it is hardly the true form of knowledge, as if the world were moved by the conceits of mind and this process of learning. Learning or the transmission of this information does not in of itself have any force in the world, as if the truth will set anyone free. The truth, more than likely, will make clear to the mind its precarious position, and that the true existence of a human being is something else altogether. The mind's truly useful function is that it is a mechanism that best processes this learning task which we must undertake to develop formal knowledge, and it is only that. The mind has no claim to anything outside of this task, and no claim whatsoever to the world or anything in it. If we are to speak of the right to property or the right to exist, or any claim we could forcefully make about the world, we are speaking of something the mind has very little to do with. We are aware that the mind is a machine with a function, rather than the definition of "us". Even the very concept "I" or "me" is only relevant in a social context of some sort, rather than any property of the universe itself that we must abide. Absent society, it would be quite possible for the mind to accept that it did not identify with any institutional person representing the flesh and blood human, and could change its name and frame of reference as it needed. The mind has no intrinsic commitment to intellectual integrity, and can by its own volition choose to suffer for some perverse reason. It is only with some sobering influence that the mind is ever disciplined, whether that comes from the world in the moment or a history suggesting that doing particular things is bad or against the interests of life or the soul, or whatever someone might value as their genuine existence.

The obsession with mind and its conceits is a disease not of thought itself, as if it were the inescapable trap of mankind. We can escape this trap without great difficulty and must do so simply to live. Human evil and malice preceded the full development of mind as such. Humans always knew of their evil and malice, as it was the condition in which the race was born - and they knew well what they did and why they did it, and thus humans are always guilty until proven innocent. So long as someone believes thought alone sits at the crown of human accomplishments, and this thought is rendered as "mind" with all of its faulty conceits, the sad fate of such a person is clear. It did not take any great insight to see this, but throughout human existence, the conceits of mind were taken

to mean something they never did, in a vain effort to make the world conform to something alien. Usually, the vanity ends with a faith that regression to the primordial light is the inexorable result of human progress, and that ends with defeat and the woes humanity has thus far known. That is the curse philosophy and hitherto existing religion have bequeathed to the world. That is the curse where humanity as we know it began, and that is what we have been beholden to in all serious recreations of the world. The struggles over temporal authority and politics are largely inconsequential to the form human society and its institutions take. The personal struggles for life are all in service to this imperious conceit of certain people, which escaped its proper purview and insists that anything new must be wiped out.

If we did overcome this, the contact of two human minds would be one of the most desirable conditions humans would want. We are, out of necessity, seeking contact with other minds like ourselves. The most obvious causes for this contact are security. Without such contact, we will never know with any certainty if a human is friend or foe, or if we are in danger. Only through genuine cooperation is any peace in society possible. If we accept the philosopher's conceit, then mind exists for the philosopher's thrill of dominating others and nothing more, and no contact is possible without the philosopher's explicit permission. In effect, the command of thought suggests something greater than ordinary imperium over life and death, when seen as what the aristocratic philosopher wants the world to be. The desire of humans to connect to another mind is not a baseless impulse but something the mind recognizes. The mind can choose to feed on another mind vampirically or associate with a mind in some way that is mutually beneficial to their concept of that, but in either case, the minds in contact do something that is very relevant. The mind deals not with the world as it is but their conceits about it - but minds will always, in some way, recognize other minds. The mind declaring another mind to be a philosophical zombie is another contradiction, believed and not believed at the same time. Whatever conceit the mind has about a retard, it can see the other entity suffer and act as if it had a mind of its own. The deliberate lying, the throwing-in-the-face of contradictory orders, only serves to maximize the thrill of torturing a retard, which is a celebration of the mind's conceit and the ultimate suffering to inflict on another mind. It is never actually believed. When it is truly needed, the superior mind will abandon its prior claim that a philosophical zombie is a zombie, and deal with the retard, no matter how depraved, as another entity like itself. Immediately after the need is abandoned, the superior mind will assert that the inferior is once again a philosophical zombie, editing history to eliminate all reference that the retard was ever valid in any way. This approach is a basic conceit of minds when they have ruled another mind as an enemy, and it is particular to the mind rather than reality or any necessity of doing so. The superior mind can, and often does, recognize that such a conceit as a "philosophical zombie" is stupid on contact, and does not need to disdain the inferior, no matter how stupid the inferior may be. If the mind ever were to acknowledge permanently that its judgements of another mind were wrong, though, it would violate everything the

mind stands for. To be retarded is the greatest sin of all - the original human sin, which became an absolute sin once mind took the forefront over the full existence of human beings. If that is ever forgiven, or worse forgotten, then the mind itself is suspect. A predatory instinct is acted upon by minds in a way that no bodily instinct would deem worthwhile or beneficial, even for the most nakedly eugenic interest it can summon. The mind, then, is the entity which is most capable of suffering and pleasure in the genuine sense. As a material phenomenon, "pleasure" and "pain" are nearly irrelevant. There is only pain in nature, and pain in nature is a sensation of the nerves which may tell the body and brain and mind something useful. Pain does not have any inherent moral quality. Pleasure in nature is a non-entity, a fiction. Pleasure in the mind is really nothing more than celebration of this most vile conceit of mind, the egotism and the thrill of seeing the inferior suffer. There is no other pleasure which can be said to be consistent. Enjoyment of life, contentment, satisfaction, and so on are not reducible to this substance of "pleasure" that the utilitarians revel in. The quality the mind seeks is not pleasure or pain as points of sentiment, but contentment and security which would allow it to operate. Because this mind is not truly detached from the body as its conceit would require, humans maintain sentiments and moral values, among them a desire in most cases to continue living and a sense that their lives are worth something and could be better than the sorry existence they have likely lived up to now. The mind is cognizant of these sentiments of human thought and existence which are not purely tricks of the mind, but premised on a reality existing outside of it and outside of the entity which processes them. In the essential act where minds meet, though, they never are fused with fundamental nature or anything material. They can appreciate each other as two minds with different experiences, and through this exchange of knowledge and teaching - for teaching can be a two-way street where minds learn from each other and share notes, and this is far more effective with interested parties so far as it can be accomplished - the wants of the mind can continue without a regard for the material world, beyond that in the material world which must be regarded. The material world is not intrinsically worth anything morally, as if the natural world had any intent. The vital tendency that the mind reproduces is particular to life, and is how the mind as a system is constituted. The mind in turn construes other systems as possessing this vital tendency, even when it can be discerned that no such tendency is intrinsic to the universe or the natural world. The systems still are real enough because the mind must operate, in the main, with systems rather than vague and inchoate ideas displaced from any context. Regardless of the ontology at work, for anything like our mind to operate, the mind for some moment becomes a monist where all that exists must exist in the same world and be inter-related. The mind may be able to reconcile this with an alien ontology, but in the essential act of connecting with another mind or anything that would allow it to learn, the mind has to accept the existence of something it did not foresee, that preceded it and does not regard any conceit mind holds.

THE FURTHER CONSEQUENCE OF LEARNING

The metaphysical system that is the mind cannot help but impose its thinking on the world as best as it can. We can be aware mentally that the world is not the systems we engage with, which are necessarily reduced to systems our faculties can work with and process. In doing this, the mind construes reality not as what it truly is, but as something mediated. Information is communicated and interpreted. A proper view of systems is not reducible to bits of information transferred, as if information were a hobgoblin pushing the world into action and cajoling it infinitely. We learn quickly that such a view is infantile and stupid, but that does not stop the advocates of a cult of "mind" and technocracy from insisting that reality can be cajoled and manipulated in this way. All of the sobering influences in the world will not change the tendency of mind to continue believing that reality is mediated by thought alone. Our awareness of a world outside of mind does not change what the mind must do in order to perform its essential task of learning. We can be aware after the fact of this learning that what we learned pertains to a real, material world that is not contingent on mind. What we cannot do is assert that our learning process bypasses this mechanism. We are constituted in the only way we can be. More than that, for us to speak of learning, rather than mere information transfer, requires us to operate with the world as an assembly of systems. That which we hold to be transcendent has to be set aside and given a special status in the mind - the "global constants" or "global variables" of the universe, if we are to use a programming analogy.^[4] The mind does things not as a computer does, for the mind is not itself a "rational agent" in that sense. The mind as a system is informed by the genuine process of knowledge which created it, and does not conform to any preplanned conceit about what the mind is "supposed" to be. Therefore, the mind can work with analog information or signals readily, and the mind inherits the human's biological faculty for pattern recognition, along with the mind's difficulty of disassembling logical algorithms. This is a quality of human minds rather than minds generally. We may envision the computer as a "mind" in this way, even though from the computer's perspective, there isn't genuine thought as such. We built the computer specifically to interface with us, with the expectation that the computer is doing what the mind would do and would only be appreciated on those terms so far as the computer is regarded as a thinking machine, rather than a mechanical device for regulation and governance. The "mind" of the computer is a facsimile we create, and often an object granted personality. The dumber of the technocrats remark that we build machines to "act like men" while men "act like machines", but these people are stupid and should be ignored. The computer's mind is very intentionally not the mind of a human, and the aims of technocratic society would see mechanizing humans to be a waste of the biological machine's potential. For all of the things that a technocrat cared about, the presumption that the ruled were effectively biological machines was already a given. The scientific dictatorship that was established had to operate on that principle - that men were ruled by "science" and ruled by institutions that were utterly alien to them and alien to the world. Intentially,

though, technocrats understand that men are men and will continue to behave as such. The smarter technocrat does not negate the human condition, but works through it and harnesses the human like any livestock or asset would be commanded. This is not terribly alien to the human condition, because for most of humanity, to be human is to be in some way a slave to another human. How this is done may vary, but with the scientific dictatorship, freedom in a genuine sense could no longer be a serious consideration. Freedom in technocratic society would be rebranded overnight as a sentiment, a feeling, an idea bereft of history or purpose. The older concept of liberty and security was still remembered and still acted upon, but the freedom of labor and the freedom of thought would be circumvented in every possible way. What freedom was permitted was entirely on the terms of those who ruled, and while this freedom was not purely an illusion, it is still clear what really governed humanity in the past century. The moment freedom transgressed a ruling institution shibboleth, freedom and justice were shown to be sadistic lies, shat upon and ridiculed to drive home the point. This, as you probably can see, turns on itself after a few generations. We see here the instability of the conceits mind holds about the world, and its efforts to arrest the world. The state proper is no mere mental construct or apparition and could not be so, and neither is the person who is presumed to possess a mind. The frailty of the mind on its own terms has long been understood. The conceit that the mind was inviolable in this way is at odds with everything we have lived through, and this conceit rises not because it is true or even as part of the program of deliberate lying. It arises because the technological interest in life could assert itself, and must do so against the existing interests within life itself and within society. It cannot help but see the world around it as a thing to feed it.

For us to learn anything, rather than merely process information like a computer, requires engaging with the world and anything in it like this. Even the more thorough processes of knowledge described in the prior book do not constitute meaningful "learning", as if learning were merely the assembly of information in a planned pedagogy. Systems thinking for the purpose of learning does not favor pedagogy, but reverse-engineering and a proclivity in humans to disassemble and reassemble systems. The instruction received in pedagogy is always something students work with and pick apart for themselves. That is why it must be reconstructed for each learner, and why people can and often must learn outside of pedagogy. The pedagogy of education in practice does very little to teach anything, as if barking words at someone will force them to receive the knowledge. It is well known that this imperious barking does little for learning. If someone were to didactically feed information to students, it would only be possible if the student already took on board a working system that was explicit and not violated. This can work, but it implies the student trusts the teacher not out of fear or respect or self-abasement. It implies a well-established protocol by which the learning is conducted, rather than a relationship that is always in doubt. In any event, the mind deals with systems as metaphysical things, and then categorizes them as biological systems, physical systems, social systems, or

whatever system is appropriate for the purpose. So too are political concepts, social relationships, economic relations, and all the senses of the world treated as systems and sorted into some framework. The mind proper only has access to a reduced form of this framework, for even the replica of a world-system stored in the brain is too vast for conscious mind to hold all at once. Further, the necessary task of mind is divorced from a total understanding of the world, even if that understanding is a reduced model for the purposes of knowledge as a process. Mind, unlike knowledge in its more raw form, has to concern itself with the task of learning and can only view systems as something apart from the everyday world. Where knowledge has to contend with a world outside of it, mind only operates on systems it chooses to operate on, in order to be mind. It may be possible to induce mind to think about things it does not want to think about, by some environmental condition or by deliberate material intervention. While this is no problem for knowledge itself or the integrity of the body, the mind cannot stand for a moment any violation of itself. The mind must tell itself that it remains in charge after this breach, and edit history however it needs to so that this breach is either unmentionable, or that the breach was no breach at all and the world still proceeds according to mind's plan.

This is where the analogy of a computer algorithmically processing information breaks down. Computers do not exist in any state of contradiction the way the mind does and must. This is also why the computer is so useful and became an imperial shibboleth itself. The ruling ideas of the British Empire suggested the world was a gigantic clockwork governed by "nature", with the ruling elite and the sovereign substituted for nature and given the name of capital-N "Nature". This was a particular conceit of theirs, where elsewhere in the world the concept of nature and the state's relation to it was understood differently. Eugenics and this cosmological conceit go hand in hand. The question, then, is why this was appealing, and its parallels with other mentalist cults in history. It is not inherent to the theory of mind that eugenics was a sensible policy at all, and in so many ways, all forms of eugenics were anathema to the technocratic tendency in humanity. It was not eugenics in of itself that possessed this strength, for the genetic pseudoscience eugenics relied upon was so nonsensical a child could see through it and freely ignore it. It is instead the conceit of mind and intelligence itself, and the necessity of this construct for humans to learn anything, that granted to the eugenic creed its allure. All of the eugenicist ideas that were pursued revolved around intelligence, rather than any other trait of mankind. No other trait in humanity was spiritually or politically relevant in the way intelligence was. Eugenics as a program was - very crudely - an alliance of oligarchy and the intellectuals, which claimed the name of science and locked in the aristocracy that the liberal idea asserted. It would be the intellectuals taking the lead in this alliance, and the intellectuals who were always the most devout advocates of eugenics. It would be the intellectuals who saw eugenics as their chief and only vehicle for political relevance. Other technocratic ideas of society would in the end disintegrate as the alliance eugenics suggested had numerous advantages. Eugenics granted to the intellectuals the prospect that

they would, in the end, eliminate their partners in the alliance and rule alone, absolute and with all the power of pharaohs and emperors. The intellectual's seething contempt for allies and each other is inherent to their entire sense of themselves. It was not that the intellectual was corrupted by money or some ulterior motive. Intercine competition and an autistic obsession with command and control is inherent to the intellectuals as a class, and they cannot help but do this despite the total lack of any reason why this is beneficial. This is because intellectualism and crass conceits about it were consciously elevated among them, and with no one around to tell them no, all sobering influences would mean nothing. The hatred of the intellectual towards the workers and residuum was far greater than any capitalist could ever attain, and greater even than the hatred of their fascist peers who lusted for power and prestige. The intellectual will claim that this vapid and insolent quest to be the Luciferian God is some sort of virtue, even though the entire project of intellectualism has been a failure. Technocratic society, whenever it has been tried, has been a dismal failure. It only succeeded in the past century because anything else had been eliminated, and the machines and real force humanity could harness granted to the intellectual and scientist a temporary opening. The intellectual could give him or herself to something other than intellectualism and mind for their own sake. Many did indeed have visions that technocratic society would lead to a future where their way of life was no longer necessary, and the illiteracy and misery of the past were no longer limiting factors. Yet, every conceit of mind and the pedagogy intellectuals treasured - since education was their chief institution and a monopoly on it was their only political card to play - defeated such a goal that to a dumb pleb like this author would seem very easy to accomplish.

The investigation of knowledge in philosophy branches in two directions. One is to indulge in a perverted ceremony where every philosophical stupidity and vanity were taken to 11. This is where the Germanic line of philosophy, continental philosophy, went off the deep end and everyone began to dance like retards and cavort in their orgies and clubs, all favored by the eugenic creed and granted greater sanctity than the parties and orgies of the past. The other is for the study of knowledge to be reduced to the study of mere information, so that the intellectual could arrest the natural world, and by doing so, attain one of the master keys allowing intellectuals to neutralize their allies. Above all, the informational science would allow the intellectual to defeat their two most enduring enemies. Labor had always chafed under everything the liberal Enlightenment imposed on them, and resented the bourgeois producers and their aristocratic allies confiscating the land and machines laborers held as their stake in humanity. When that wasn't enough, the bourgeois subject labor to humiliations they never suffered under any prior slavery or serfdom. Given the history of aristocratic and eugenic depravity the commoners were subjected to throughout their existence, this is saying a lot. The bourgeois, who are the natural basis for the technocrats and intellectuals, did not appreciate the human engines that produced all of the useful articles they coveted. Almost immediately, the bourgeois mind accepts the dictum of Malthus, and the bourgeois indulge in

the most petty hatred towards labor. Labor had the temerity to suggest that their conditions could be slightly better, and in return the bourgeois revel in avarice and amplify the rot of their class. In the cities and the country alike, the bourgeois and the wealthy rural freeholders do not see nor want to see any objective except the crass ambition for more profit, more manna, in their quest to "fake it until they make it", as one of their many stupid sayings go. Even when the bourgeois man understood the money left him in hock to a banker who is not their friend, they temporarily turned off this sense because their intellectual tendency told them to hate labor. The hatred for labor reaches its screaming apogee when the bourgeois and the intellectual turn towards the lowest class, who are by moral obligation included in the working class. Out of necessity, those who would be in the residuum attempt to find work. What lives they managed to hold onto in the long years of estrangement from vicious humanity and its society were now at the mercy of the capitalist. Whether the residuum failed on their own lack of merit or due to the typical viciousness and malice of the human race falling on basically decent people, the bourgeois hatred of the beggar is intrinsic to the free trade project. Free trade comes immediately with waves of famine and death in all of the imperial colonies, and it does not take long for the same death to come to the mother country. It is not the bourgeois lust for money that compels this hatred, as if the capitalist is "just doing business", or "nothing is personal". It is the intellectual current that animated the bourgeois liberal and the conservative running dog whose expression of it was a more base and pathetic form. Hatred of the lowest class was entirely motivated by hatred of stupidity, which had always been the human race's founding attribute, its sole claim to existence as human. In this, the bourgeois make alliances with those in the laboring class who understood the fight for position dominated this failed race called humanity. Capitalism is no friend of beggars, and so the intellectual tendency to hate the stupid is amplified by the moral incentive of money and placing excessive constraint on the wage fund. This policy of deliberate starvation did not serve any productive aim and did not really discipline labor. The large dislocations of men and wealth that came with free trade were wholly unnecessary and not a "just-so" story, as many a middling Marxist try to insinuate to cover their asses and true affiliations. Economically, even the slightest modicum of effort to foster productivity would mitigate the most egregious abuses of the lower classes. As it was, the waves of death were not good enough for one Thomas Malthus, as we have seen. In all of the economic discourse, how people learn was forsaken. This was pawned off as ignorance, but the pedagogues knew full well what their monopoly was and what they really wanted. Those with the most impatient hatred of the stupid found their niche and wasted no time figuring out what side they were on, quickly doing their duty as soldiers of eugenics before there was a eugenics movement as such. Everyone else, who saw that this was clearly not in their interest, naturally resisted the intrusion of this intellectual movement and its craving for command and control of all information. Throughout the 19th century, those amenable to eugenics hone their hatred, finding ready echo chambers and every enabler from the ruling interest and the bourgeois. There are those who see the danger these

people pose, but bourgeois society was founded on conspiracy, and those outside of the conspiracy could never see who was with whom until it was too late. The intellectual revels in the thrill of betrayal and rejection, considering excessive displays of both to be highly virtuous and demonstrations of their interest and core want.^[5] What this means is the development of information as a science divorced from "genuine knowledge", which is sectioned off to a philosophical ghetto to die an ignominious death.

What this also means is a growing Luciferian urge in the human race, most of all in the imperial core, which regresses that informational science to the primordial light. We see here one of the origins of the eugenic creed, which forms at this time with all of the other neo-reactionary tropes, all of which are launched with tremendous force and coordination of the message. Finding a singular origin of this regression towards the primordial light is missing the central secret that allows its coordination. It is the conceit of mind, a tripartate structure of human society that was inherent in the philosophy of Antiquity, whose antecedents are found in a demon inherent in the geneological legacy of the human race. This conceit of mind is transformed into a Demiurge-like construct, even though mind is no such thing and is really a very feeble construction if it so readily accepts this cargo cult and marches to its own doom. The reality of this neo-Satanism is that it is a creature of later modernity, bearing little resemblance to the mystery cults it gloms onto. The Luciferians do not even all agree with each other, or harbor the same malicious goals of the hardline eugenists. Many who join this regression to the primordial light are saps who believe in some way that they are in touch with some divine wisdom, and who believe they are doing good - and by some foolish fortune, they do accomplish good and perhaps maintain a kindness and decency that eugenics would strip utterly from them in the process. The full nature of this is difficult to describe here, and strays from the topic at hand. It is trite to reduce the modern cargo cult surrounding mentalism to "Satanism", and stupid to actually believe that these neo-Satanists are the sole and dominant trend of human thought. Without ample luxury and deliberate enabling from those who do have political sense and an agenda far more capable, this stupidity would never have been able to become the great mind disease it became, dragging the world into the abyss any reasonable person would predict. The conceit of mind did not itself possess this power, for all the mind can do is learning and this for all of its importance to our lives does not have the immediate effect its partisans claim. It is instead a reality that mind could, unfettered by any true sobering influence and finally possessing machinery that allowed it, remake the world in its perverse image, and with it, the veil that once existed to protect us from the ravages of aristocracy would be removed. It is here where a new ruling idea is expressed. Where regimes of the past were either distant from the people or issued platitudes to mollify them, the new ruling idea glorified cruelty and depravity that no regime in history could fathom. All of the cumbersome details of governance in the past were to be eliminated. The past would be rewritten to suggest an unbroken chain of "historical progress" where the Satan was inevitably victorious and glorious, and human decency or anything we would

have wanted was to be humiliated. The virtues of the new society would be the bourgeois vanities, the meritocratic backstab, the democratic grubbiness, and the worst simpering and kakistocracy of the lowest class put on full display. The aristocracy would be purged of its last few limitations, free to express the malice that was always the true desire of their class and stripped of the sentimentality they considered helpful or pleasant in the past. The new pleasure and life's prime want was that mind would be fed its pleasure by the shortest route possible - a nerve staple feeding the mind the thrill of torturing another human, and a moral philosophy proclaiming the goodness of this thrill above all others. The Satanic impulse would be associated with not just high wisdom, but the most basic act of learning itself. The injection of that impulse into all potential learning was necessary for the project to continue. If that is the case, then the ruling ideas must proclaim that all reality and all truth is mediated by mind, and in particular, the Satanic conceit about mind. This structure of the state must be reproduced immaculately in individuals and in every description of every sub-system that comprises them. This Satanic conceit is then conflated with technocracy, even though most of the technocrats believed they were getting something entirely different, and could see the self-evident futility of such an aim. Eugenics, on the other hand, did not have any such encumbrance. There would be other approaches to society, but eugenics would be granted imperial backing and a grand conspiracy made it sacred, then granted it unlimited and absolute impunity to act while all other concepts of mind were suppressed, even innocuous ones.

MEDIATION OF LEARNING

Learning is never a physical process to be meaningfully such. It is a number of causes and effects, which must proceed from each other in a recognizable chain from each cause to effect, to effect, and so on. There are never vagaries in this process, if something is to be learned in the genuine sense. We of course know that there are many events in the world between these causes and effects that are elided in the mind's model of learning, but all of these are not necessary for the essential act of learning. The finer details of knowledge and the things to be studied may pass through thought and be processed before the mind consider them as a system for learning anything. The mind does not learn of transcendent truths in the way it learns of any other system, where humans could just contemplate the "oneness" of the universe or some vague quality and acquire genuine learning. If humans did so, they are conjuring some object or fetish that stands in for the sublime secrets of the world. This is not to say that humans do not learn of transcendent truths, but if they do, they are mediated through some object, real or abstract, that they use as a symbol of the transcendent. For example, the gods' true forms, so far as they are ever "learned", are always told in metaphors or idols or something which is a placeholder for a concept that is highly alien to our everyday experience and intended to be so. No one would speak of a god in the sense we appreciate the concept as if it were an object in the world like any other in total. So too do we not actually work with

things in the world "as is", when concerning the mind's learning about them. Information, knowledge, and meaning pass through processes that have nothing to do with mind or learning, because human consciousness and experience is not reducible to some mental energy or construct conforming to philosophy as we would like. If that is so, then learning is mediated, and the media we learn from are very relevant. This is where many a liberal will turn to the high priest of "the medium is the message", one Marshall McLuhan, whose name and work I highly recommend the reader have some familiarity with to comprehend this theory of information that prevails in the public consciousness. But, this is not the whole of the story, and there is around information and media a lot of sensationalism and bullshit which McLuhan and those like him contributed to, which is of no use for our genuine inquiry.

In information theory, media are necessarily physical signals, as described in the second chapter of this book. This is a common mathematical model of communication in the world. We might naively construe learning the same way, in which the sender and receiver of the message can only operate with the signals sent to them, and anything that can be gleaned from them. For example, the medium itself says something about the message. Books, scrolls, the various types of written materials all operate slightly differently from each other, which are not the same as voice, digitized audio recordings, movies, film, and so on. There is something further to say about the environment and meaning surrounding a message, which provides to an observer context for anything that is sent or received. Film in a cinema is not the exact same experience as film at home, or film in a schoolroom with the typical assembly and ritual schools invoke to show the brats a movie to shut them up and give the teacher a break. All of these things are informational and acted upon by the "black boxes" which must interpret information into knowledge, derive the meaning, and recognize symbols regardless of the media they appear in.

Learning and the mind do not operate on the mere principle of information, and do not operate on such signals in an immediately obvious or reactive way. It may seem like physical sense that the human body, brain, tools, and all that emerge from it are reducible to the same physical processes as the rest of the communication's chain of events. How would this be so? It is because the mind concerns itself with this learning task in a way that does not comport to what the world actually is, and must do so. Where there is in the real world something between cause and effect, and causality is not what we would naively assume with cruder rational approaches, the mind must concern itself with comprehensible cause and effect so that it can be rational. Without this rationality, learning is impossible and the function we attribute to the mind is not operative. The mind can play tricks on itself or the senses, or be tricked by another mind cognizant that it is deceptive and intends to be so. Intuitively, the mind seeks meaning not by some instinct, but by deliberation; and so, the mind does not accidentally seek outside references to cross-check any information it receives, but very deliberately does so, in accord with principles that are sensical to the mind rather than any physical nature mandating it. Simply put, the mind exists

in a world apart from mere material conditions and must if it is to truly learn instead of process information. This is what makes the mind and conscious experience something different from the automatic reflex of a cybernetic network. It operates with foreknowledge that the world it interfaces with is something different from the world of base matter, however related they might be. The mind is what tells the difference between fact and fiction, and between fantasy and that which the mind must regard as reality. I speak of course of *political* reality rather than the actual reality of the world. While the mind's sense of reality is not necessarily political in the proper sense, the mind is aware that it operates with a dual system of reality on some level. The mind can, if it is capable of dissembling and memorizing the various faces it wears and access levels for each other mind it interacts with, conjure an appropriate reality it wishes to express for that particular facing, in that particular situation. The world itself, and the base instincts of humanity, have no regard for this game of compartmentalization. The game the mind plays with other minds is silly if someone actually asks themselves what they are doing, and asks if this habit of habitual lying serves any purpose. The mind did not need to rationalize the human propensity for lying. The mind is a natural born liar in ways that base knowledge couldn't accomplish. Its very existence is premised on a number of lies it has to accept, and how many lies a mind accepts as part of its normal functioning may vary. The society a mind interacts with, the dangers the mind faces, the lies other minds tell that this mind must adapt to, are things the mind picks up without fully realizing what it is doing. It is not that the mind carries two contradictory ideas simultaneously without thinking - that is irrational and impossible. It is rather that the mind did not form with perfect knowledge, and couldn't have. The mind learns only what it can learn from anything it interacts with, and if the human race has lied profusely since its sorry existence began, so too will the propensity for lying be inherited, and those in the know of educated wisdom and the secret societies specialize most of all in the arts of lying and cajoling. Since lying and cajoling are, properly deployed, the most effective tools humanity ever produced, this art is so sacred to the human race that it forms the basis of every religious tradition and many of the habits the human race takes for granted, refusing to question them no matter how obviously ruinous and maladaptive they are. Only at great risk does the human stop lying, for abandoning the lie means abandoning a position the mind took relative to other minds in political society. Privately, the mind can conduct itself as it can, so long as it believes that its expressions are concealed from other minds. The mind can guess how far knowledge of its inner workings spread to other minds and the capabilities of the other minds that recovered this knowledge. Even the most honest of the human race will learn the propensity of lying, if only because the art is very easy for the mind to process and the mind already must adjudicate between fact and fiction to properly learn anything. Nothing about the mind values truth, honesty, justice, or any high-minded virtue. Far from it, the arts of deception have proven to be very useful for the very task of learning that is the proper role of the mind. The best defense against a liar is to be a better liar, and to retain enough sense to watch the other minds lie without having to give

up the game of your own lies.

The fine art of lying is a topic for another time, but lying is essential to learning. Add to that the known necessity of social information being incomplete and this makes the mind's propensity for lying even more evidently necessary. Even if social actors were honest, the simple lack of information leads to uncertainty and distrust. A society with perfect information and perfect interactions would, in effect, cease to be a society, and the minds involved would be laid bare. This is at the heart of the Austrian School approach to economics and the Germanic mindset towards "freedom" generally. The necessity of social information to be less than complete is not a characteristic of society requiring "mind", but of the simple reality of information transfer within society - that a total image of the society in the moment will be perturbed the moment that information is out of date for its agents. No sense of society "in total" exists outside of the information agents of society communicate and comprehend, in a sense that must truly be acknowledged as social - the very concept of what a society is suggests it is maintained by these informational exchanges, rather than any necessary tie between agents which fuses them together as an inseparable whole. Human society in particular is, as noted before, versatile, with members coming and going, regardless of the form of government or the pretenses of the state. It did not make any intrinsic social sense for serfs to be tied to the land or the lord, and in any case, the serf could be traded to another lord, released from service, rebel against the lord, or be killed at the lord's whim, without the society's irrevocable destruction. The nobility of feudal society openly preyed upon the serfs, and were the serfs almost entirely eliminated, knights or the free peasants would begrudgingly accept that they would have to till the land. This, of course, was not an issue to the ideal citizen-soldier landholder who fought war and returned to plow his own fields with his own tools; and no matter the laziness of a freeholder, it was expedient for the freeholder to till his own land, or command his wife and children as a labor force working alongside him, as was the expectation of patriarchal society. The opulence of the patriarch did not necessitate that he refused to work out of a commitment to laziness, in a way that was natural and irrevocable. It is further the case that feudal society was comprised of men who were free to act as they pleased, and so it was entirely possible to abandon entirely the feudal labor obligations. There was never any one "feudalism" that worked as a total system, and the free trade capitalism that arose was never a singular "system" in that sense either. Nor would socialism of any sort have been a singular "system" with inseparable parts. It is the conceit of mind that allows lying rather than mere disinformation or a lack of knowledge, and it is mind that allows the deliberate occulting of information - where information that we would interpret by knowledge is replaced with purely symbolic representations that must become "hyper-real". In other words, A is exactly A, while at the same time A can be anything the holder of the symbol or the name decrees it will be. The distance between material things, however it is envisioned, is not something the mind engages with. Void in the sense we have described doesn't exist, and spirit in the expectation of mind is a singular

force or essence which implies a teleology for everything and anything. The world itself has no real teleology or purpose that can be proclaimed by nature. For mind, all that exists has a purpose and a clear line from genesis in sin to absolution of that genesis. The old is sublated or abolished so that "the new" is ostensibly born, not in the genuine emergence that the world exhibits, but in some working that the mind considered appropriate for its task. Mind learns not to appreciate the truth for its own sake, but because learning meets moral goals the life tied to that mind held. If the moral goals are a commitment to truth or an reckoning with reality, this can be aligned and the mind is perfectly capable of understanding that. The moral goals of life do not intrinsically require justice or honesty or anything we would consider good if we are naive. Indeed, to many classes and interests in society, justice and honesty are anathema to their concepts of goodness, and such sentiments are for the weak and therefore they are either bad or are deemed an evil greater than any other. In their place, a spurious justice dictated by imperious will is declared to be the spiritual basis for good law, and honesty is dictated by those who are the best liars, and the liars brag that they invent truth and the honest are the worst of all things in the world - retarded.

When the philosopher declares "reality is mediated", they speak of their preferred conceit of the mind being reinforced. To the world, reality simply is, and has nothing to do with us or any knowledge we hold about it. This is so simple a child should be able to see through it. We can think of no other definition of "real" that is superior to the world itself. It is more strange because to the mind, the very concept of "mediation" does not exist in its assessment of systems, in the sense that the mind's operation with other minds has any concept of void or a necessary disconnect in nature itself. The mind is not a natural phenomenon that can be studied in nature, and it is even more alien to nature than knowledge as a process. It is highly artificial, and in the final analysis, transient. Humans are not locked into the learning task that the mind is really there to accomplish. When the mind truly learns, it is only limited by its faculties to assimilate or communicate with other systems, rather than any necessary natural law. Humans are very adept at developing learning strategies, if they were allowed to think about how they think and isolate the most essential feature that defines the mind as something different from other knowledge. The only mediation at work is that the mind makes a haughty conceit that it constructs the true reality, and the world that allowed it to exist is an alien of no consequence. This is more retarded than mere solipsism. It is nothing more than a philosopher guarding a scam or a trick he has used to get rich quick, by mystifying something that is actually very simple. In the mind's operations with other minds, the interaction proceeds by any tool the human imagines that can be used to learn of them. Humans may develop rules of thumb allowing them to operate with very complex systems rapidly, by reducing them to elements which are appreciated by the mind, but which are not evident by any natural pattern suggesting the mind should isolate that pattern. We must remember that the systems the mind deals with are not strictly physical systems, and the use of the language

of natural physics to describe mental operations is missing the point. Humans with mind grasp metaphors and analogies, and can by referencing quickly known meanings derive the meaning of something alien to its prior knowledge base. This task of mind is expanded greatly in humans because of symbolic language. We do not assume that mind is unique to humans because humans possess some special ingredient, or their symbolic language attained a level of complexity which allowed the creature "mind" to exist as a point of light. The animal "mind" is no less capable of comprehending symbols or operating with the world must as we do, in the most essential task that the mind accomplishes - learning. The distinction with humans, and within humans, is merely the complexity of the systems humans operate with, and the library of human language being adept enough to work with systems no animal could, and grasp abstractions that are highly counterintuitive if we were not in a society where those abstractions were very relevant to daily life. So much of what humans do in society is very alien to what humans or life would do if it had retained its native connection with nature and recognized mind as a small part of itself, useful for its task but not in of itself granted any spiritual authority. What is at the center of this conceit is not a logical error or circular madness, but that which has always been regressed to and upheld as the holy of those who want to arrest the world. A unitary, primordial light is imposed on all of our learning and the world itself so that the world may be destroyed, all useful learning may be destroyed, and the germ of learning itself can be snuffed out before it happens. The unitarian is something worse than a nihilist. While a nihilist, in denying that spurious authority granted by the Luciferian entity, opens us to the question of what this existence truly is, the unitarian shouts like a screaming retard and tells us this is the limit of truth and the apex of mind itself - the grand goal to which all of our learning, labor, and the energies of life are to be committed. The trinitarian facilitates this because his haughty conceit of mind preferred a vision of reality that served his ambitions, and he forgot that the mind does not have any of this authority. Why would he need to remember? This learning task is the cause for every developed technology, every political instinct beyond the most basic, and directs human effort in ways that were previously impossible. It would be quite impossible for humans to be humans without a working mind. Yet, for all of its development, the mind is still a pitiful thing, easily broken. On a cosmic scale, the greatest human mind is remarkably flawed in ways so basic, it is a wonder anyone thought this entity was the height of anything. Until eugenics and its associated philosophical tenets, many philosophers and poor men alike were aware that "mind" did not actually possess the ability of reality control, and such a goal was after sufficient consideration not a thing to pine for. That way led to insanity and a retarded ideology. The distinctions among humans' mental faculties are, for the purposes of their actual lives and social existence, things that shouldn't have become the political barrier they did.

The mind's operations can only proceed based on its prior learning, which ultimately derived from something that could be known. The mind is completely capable of learning from pure abstractions or fantasies, or learning from

hypotheticals. It would have to assume certain hypotheses to learn anything non-trivial, and then hope that their assumptions and developed theories match the actual world they model, or the thing they believe their mind is interfacing with. The limitations of mind's reach are not really material ones. The mind can, by simply knowledge and a plan, assert its will over a distance, setting in motion an imagined Rube Goldberg device that would allow a mind in New York to affect actions in Shanghai. The financier moves the world by manipulating numbers on a ledger, and to the conceited mind, this manipulation is the change in reality. It is not difficult to see that the numbers on the ledger are only relevant because of a causal chain linking the real bodies and spaces with the minds that regard any of this manipulation. It is not that the concrete or real is made to obey an abstraction. Concretely, the "real material conditions" that someone would blame the financier for mystifying are themselves preferred constructs of people in association with their environment. Abstractions humans create can be valued and meaningful for reasons beyond a mere idea. Money's value is itself an abstraction but one we appreciate because of the society where money would even be relevant. There is no reason intrinsic to the natural world or the human constitution to believe money, whatever its form, has any of this power, or that we couldn't ignore the tokens if everyone refused to play along with financial kayfabe. It is the mind's command of learning that makes money a useful lever. Money is only useful if we learn that the token is associated with moral incentives which can be used to push people. The smart users of money, however much they possess, understand that what really happens in economic life is the manipulation of people by other people, and this is never a one-way street where the holder of money imperiously commands a lump of utility called man-flesh. Every relation of labor is bilateral. The master and the slave, whatever the protestations of either, have to cooperate on some level for anything to be produced. The slave can refuse to the bitter end or fail to even get along with the master's demands, or the slave simply can't do what the master wants. The master does not exist as a point of imperious will alien even from himself. Those who envision the master-slave relation as pure imposition and the thrill of doing so do not envision slavery as it has been practiced. They envision only shouting "retard! retard! retard!" at the inferior, and in effect, shouting "die! die! die!" like a slobbering beast. None of that has anything to do with mastery of another person or anything. It is a conceit of petty-managers, and not even one they sincerely believe. It is nothing but the punishment mechanism, a way to inflict a stunting of the brain which prevents learning. The purpose of maximizing this is not slavery or any utility of labor, but the utility of suffering itself and the utility of accelerating as quickly as possible the death rate and insanity of the human race. The mind learns through the command of anything how to command, and stores that for future usage - but the relations of the mind to anything else in the world are not reducible to the crass proprietor's faith in pure, idealized "command" of that sort which does not truly command, but only espouses a primordial fear and pressing of a nerve.

What this means is that, so far as we are conducting learning and use that as our

own basis for understanding the real world, it proceeds not by any fixed natural law that we must regard. The laws of physics, biology, politics, or anything else, were not written into the universe as any code to be executed by an unknowable hobgoblin. They are things we learned, through the faculties available to us, and reconstructed in our mind so that we can learn more. That is what it means for us to know in the sense that is conventionally accepted - that we learn of things which were once alien to us. This does not mean that the mind can actually "change the world" by thought, in some way that allows infinite degrees of motion. But, it also means that the mind is not truly locked into a chain of historical progress that is fused with natural law, or that the mind must proceed by the dictates of a pedagogue. Education and learning are very different things, and schooling itself is something different from education proper which entailed something more elaborate that was cognizant of what it was. Schools do not teach nor educate. They conscript, condition, and beat the young into submission because that serves the state, property, and eugenic interests, without regard to any knowledge. School religiously avoids any mention of learning, because learning in the genuine sense is anathema to what a school does. Schools go out of their way to avoid that germ of learning forming. Education, unlike genuine learning, concerns adaptation to institutional authority and the interests of those who hold educational institutions. So far as education concerns genuine learning, it is always expected that learning is something the student does independent of pedagogy. For example, the ur-example in European history is the Allegory of the Cave, in which the institutional approach to learning is mandated and manipulated by those who have enclosed that cave long, long ago in their own mind. For those who have learned, we see this example of the cave, conjured by a thought leader who won the great game of human politics, and ask why on Earth we would ever agree to such a thing. Our experience is that education is rigged, and the rigging is thrown into the face of every student to remind them that this will never, ever change. However much education suggests it is not this, every instinct and everything we do when contacting these institutions tells us that the educator is above all concerned with institutional authority rather than any genuine spiritual authority. They seek in their mind to supplant the spiritual authority with their own will, and tie that will to God or some other construct that the students must abase themselves to. Hence, the commandment to worship, bow, and scrape before a godhead that is very obviously an avatar for men and women who hold the students in contempt.

When the mind comes into its own as a going concern, it is not beholden intrinsically to anything but itself. It operates on its own terms, set apart from ordinary existence and even the basic process of knowledge that is necessarily a material thing. The body, brain, and existence of a person is beholden to the world, but the mind is not, and couldn't be if it wished to learn. No law fixes the mind in a way that obligates it to learn, and among the first faculties of the mind is to learn restraint and command of the biological faculties it co-opts. And so, just as life vampirically feeds off the world, the mind vampirically feeds of life and by extension the world. It cannot do otherwise. There is no solution

within the mind itself that breaks this cycle. The mind is aware that it does this, and that this is obviously nonsensical, but if the mind seeks an answer to that, it cannot assert that by reason alone, as if the world had any purpose the mind would intrinsically appreciate. The mind, at a basic level, is utterly amoral, because the mind's genuine task did not exist for any built-in moral purpose. Perhaps the life that gave rise to it had moral imperatives that are inherited from its material constitution in some way, but those moral imperatives do not conform to philosophy, religion, or ideology ready-made to be imposed on the world. The mind's learning was necessary for us to speak of the full development of moral sentiments. The mind's treatment of morality is called ethics, and ethics as many know is something wildly divorced from the moral sense we would intuitively adopt. That topic is further explored in the next chapter. The mind, in learning, makes contact with other minds, and then reckons with those entities in whatever way it wishes, or is made to reckon with a mind that chose to attack another. The mind was never truly sacred enough that it can wall itself off from all that exists, but for the mind to process the origin of another mind, it has to reckon with a world that is not intrinsically tied to "mind" in any way. The mind cannot fuse its conceit of the world with fundamental nature. And so, spiritual authority proper is never reducible to "mind", and treatment of the spiritual authority as a "super-rationality" or treating Nature as a giant computational device or crude clockwork is wholly inappropriate.

With that considered, the mind learns things not by a blind impulse, or because the body compelled it to learn, but because in the end the mind did appreciate this knowledge, and had a sense beforehand of what it set out to learn, for whatever reason it had. If the mind were truly disconnected from the world, it would not intrinsically seek to learn anything new, and perhaps would not sense that there is a world where there is something to learn, or another mind like itself. This is not the case because we are, very clearly, created in conditions that are outside of the mind. We are beholden to material conditions not due to any thought experiment or rationality declaring that it had to be that way. Rationally, we are aware very early that our existence and the world does not have to be any of the things that we are told must be attributed to material conditions. The reality of human society is that imperious minds were able to see what they commanded, saw their competition, and decided that because they can enclose the world and destroy the world for their cause, that they would do exactly that. This goal is not intrinsic to the mind at all. Most minds and most reasonable people in full awareness can see that such an approach to learning and existence doesn't work and won't allow us to live any sort of life that is purposeful. It turns on itself and very quickly cannibalizes the world as it was, replacing it not with the new but with a regression to primordial light and a eugenic interest. The mind can consider that its proper purview is limited to this task of learning - and it is only the essential act of learning that defines the mind and establishes it. Any preferred construction that would be reified as "the mind" is secondary to the essential task it conducts. The conceited mind, which must impose itself on all that exists, construes "mind" as something entirely alien

to its true task and suggests the whole world conforms to it, and must be made to align with it.^[6] The reality is that minds are only mediated by that which they learned in the past, and can do - or not do - with that learning as they are capable of, and that the mind sees fit to do. There is no rule that suggests the mind is pure or infallible, and much of what the mind learns is to verify its contents, so that the learning task can be conducted not in the realm of its fevered imagination but in a real world, where the learning task translates to useful outcomes.

If not physical media or natural laws, what then mediates the action of the mind? It must not be reduced to a sense that the mind believes in "me wantee", or that the mind follows Crowley's law to do as it will. The mind itself has no will of its own, for it must feed parasitically off the will of life and the world to assert this. What the mind does entail are value judgements that are sensical to it, which are based on its past learning. That learning may resemble the actual world in which physical events happen, but it also includes the social and political constructs the mind must learn if it is to function around other humans. The other minds we interface with which we are acutely aware of are other minds. In society, humans are expected to regard the other minds as active without regard to distance or connection. Another mind is lurking somewhere in the world, and once known, it can never be unknown. The only way to occult the mind is to refuse to allow its name to be known, or any information suggesting its existence as a true mind. This works both ways. The rulers of society always revel in occulting, and perfected the lie for the sake of lying itself. It works against the ruled, to tell them they are not what they truly are and the world they interface with is to be replaced with conceits of mind. The ruled mind is told to believe that it is a slave by nature. Whether the ruled actually believe this is not as relevant as the essential lie being told. So long as the lie is acted upon and granted sacrosanctity, the conceits of the ruling minds persist. Whatever the ruled think, know, or learn is quite irrelevant, especially if what the ruled learn conforms to a political thought supplied to them by pedagogy. Since the formation of political ideas entails recognition of temporal authority which is in the end realized in the world rather than conceits, the philosophy of struggle for struggle's sake ensures that rulers, in whatever formation, pass from regime to regime, and endure transformation of society. If those transformations of society are brought about entirely by the rulers' cajoling and pressing against the ruled, who by and large did not want any of this, this allows the rulers to push and cajole history entirely on their terms. The ruled are told that they must play this rigged game, and that if they don't, they are retarded, lacking mind and do not know. Before any physical media is present or any genuine information is gleaned, the political mind is trained to defeat itself before it would broach resistance, even when the true conditions of life are unbearable. This imposition is most pronounced towards the ruled, but the rulers will discipline each other, and eventually internalize the very demonic will they imposed on the rest of the world. Absent any sobering influence - and struggle for its own sake will never be a true sobering influence - there is no reason this nightmare would not

continue in perpetuity, by the conceits of mind and technocratic thought alone.

PHYSICAL SPREAD OF INFORMATION IN LIGHT OF MIND'S TASK

There are two directions of this bilateral task of learning mind conducts. The mind receives symbolic information, and the quantity of it is too vast without a scheme of the mind itself to reduce it to manageable chunks. The reception of the world's symbols, including those from other minds, is to be written on further in Chapter 17 of this book. The other end is the mind's sending of signals and engagement with the world. It recognizes very easily that its thought alone does not move the world by imperious decree, and that all such interaction requires a physical means to propagate it, and entails ultimately genuine interface with the world. The mind has little to do with asserting on its own the protocol by which this dialogue proceeds, and all of this dialogue is in the end reducible to definite back and forth interactions. The synthesis of that dialogue is not a foregone conclusion that can be reasoned by thought alone, as if the synthesis was some great working. That myth should have never been allowed to assert itself in the sad history of modernity. It is an important understanding to understand the political thought that arose, but for a genuine understanding of the world, learning, and the very foundation of the political, it is a worthless understanding - a hermetic and mystical working that could only have been imposed violently and against all of the sense that the most naive mind would reject, unless it were beaten into submission. The purpose of such a political theory is not to suggest that this is what politics is, but that absent anything suggesting otherwise, no one can stop it, and humanity regresses to its most base condition while calling it "progress". I cannot concern myself at the moment with the peculiarities of genuine political thought, except to say that it is no secret humans engage in political lies readily, and this is something that is properly judged by the mind before it is realized in anything material. It does not work the other way around, where the material is interpreted as a hobgoblin "pushing" humans like evolutionary flotsam to obey. Political actors are deliberate actors to be considered so. Mechanistically, this is something different from the processes of war and contests over authority that have been a topic of this book. Mechanistically, political thought and the conceits of mind are not inherently relevant for the mechanisms that are discussed here. The mind is not and cannot be a purely political organ, and to construe it as such is the death of mind, spiritual authority, and the task that mind actually accomplishes.

The communication of the mind to itself and other minds is, in the true learning and connection between them, not mediated by anything physical or materially necessary. It is rather that the mind exists as something manifesting from knowledge as a process, and thus for us our physical bodies, that creates the illusion of physical mediation of reality. Information in the genuine sense, though, is always mediated. The reality of the world, and the reality of mind's concept of the world and its own workings, is not reducible to information. Further,

the information is not intrinsically useful at all, and much of the information available to the mind is thrown away as noise or irrelevant. What is undeniable is that for every real communication in the material world, information is discerned not by a rigid algorithmic process but by a mind which is thinking in a way that is very alien to the physical world where communication happens. Even the processes of the brain and body, and the knowledge process itself, are alien to the mind which interprets and composes messages. The mind does what it does not because it was compelled by nature to do so, or compelled by a genetic legacy insisting that the intent of life inexorably acts. The mind is quite aware of its past and future, and that in the moment it both learns and makes decisions about that learning. The mind's decision making is, in the end, only answerable to itself, rather than any material condition mandating it. To claim that there is no barrier between the material world and the workings of the mind requires the enclosure of every process in the world, so that the subject construed as possessing mind is itself wholly automated. That is to say, to claim that the mind works in that way is to say there is no mind at all, and further that there is no mind. Nor would there even be knowledge or a material reality underlying it. The conceit of doing this is only possible when one mind has decided to destroy in total another mind, and recreate reality to fit its own version of the world - to change the world by decree, based on a mental decision and learning that the self-declared superior mind can do so. Physical reality, and all that emerges from it, and all that might be perceived to underlie physical reality or exist apart from it but which operates by some understandable metaphysical principles, is a condition mind has to accept against its will and against any conceit the mind holds about anything, including all of its learning and decisions up to that point. The mind can only predict the future hypothetically, even if it can divine that a future is inherent to its processing and that it cannot actually edit history or the real world in that way. Our learning of the physical world and events in it suggest that we can predict the future and our own actions to a reasonable extent. If we are honest about what we have learned in human history up to now, it is not difficult to see that a mind is not intrinsically encumbered by any obligation to conform to a pedagogy or thought leader. Far from it, history has shown that all such efforts are doomed and tragically mistaken. The repeated failures of institutional education and schooling are there for all of us to see, and humans have and will continue to compare notes, regardless of what imperious institutions insist we must obey under penalty of torture. It is impossible to deny in the 21st century that technocratic society has been a dismal failure on its own terms, before we allow history in the genuine sense to judge this beast.

The media available for communication are as varied as our ability to manipulate the environment. No particular medium is fixed. The spoken word, print, calligraphy, visual art, music, and modern media are all things which allow the wise user manipulation so far as their knowledge of the real world will allow. No medium is truly apart from another in the physical world, in that there are fixed boundaries intended by a thought leader for how someone is permitted to speak, write, or compose music. There are physical limitations to any media and thus

any communication confined to that media, which are demonstrated suitable for the media to be useful in communicating any information. We cannot explain algorithmic theories very well with music, but that is not what we use music for. There are also limitations to what messages the intended audience is willing to accept and process, and lines which cannot be transgressed. Anyone who considers physical communication is never content to rely on a single media, and always considers the entire media environment when deriving meaning from messages. This need not happen in the instant of communication. Memory of reading allows us to comprehend written words on a television screen, which appear in contexts which are not communicable in print or through a flat delivery of the symbolic words. The television on its own terms suggests a real world the images mimic, and the viewer has some ability to separate what exists on television from images it would see in real life. A cartoon is noticeably a cartoon, exaggerating images for some effect that we can appreciate and tie to something outside of the medium.

None of this cross-referencing would be possible if media were not intended for the mind rather than the mere physical act of communication, as if someone could air a television program and produce a conditioned response in the subject automatically. If someone wished to push humans like a button, they would not believe that the mere utterance of a message automatically passes through any critical filter. Quite to the contrary, the primary method of conditioning responses in humans comes from manipulation of the mind, in spite of the inadequacy of all media used to command and control humans. This manipulation of the mind does not work so much by destroying the original mind, but subverting the mind's failures and suggesting to the subject that the mind does indeed create reality. Therefore, the ruling ideas simultaneously declare "A is exactly A", "A is not exactly A", and "A is whatever I say it is including the things that contradict the other things". The contradiction is not between black and white as declared opposites, but instead concerns three - always three - statements intended to cover all potential meanings of a thing, which reduce in the end to the only permissible "true" meaning, and a false reality that is always told contemptuously to those outside of the know.

This long chapter has primarily concerned how mind is disrupted forcibly to highlight just how fragile mind is, and mind's noted versatility against any assault out of necessity. Those who are amenable to mind control very often are not really opposed to being controlled in the first place, or are even eager for someone to give them a signal for command and conditioned to respond to pleasure, habituated to be happy slaves of an abstracted society. The mind both readily accepts this slavery, and is cognizant of what the human body and its genuine knowledge are trying to tell it - that none of this is right. The final judgement comes not from any of our conceits but the world itself. The world itself has long told us that this mind control, this reality control, is anathema not just to its purported task, but to life itself. Not only will these methods not work, and are highly counterproductive for the goal they seek, but they only exist to destroy thought and any possibility that learning would acquire something

new. The mind must become an antiseptic thing policed by the thought-forms of pedagogues alone, which become the only possible thoughts and only possible reality. But, those who desire worldly power will always seek to usurp spiritual authority most of all. Establishing or usurping temporal authority has largely followed from spiritual authority. The particulars of who wins the contest for the executive, which is the main purpose of the political, are of little consequence to most of humanity. So too are the contests for crass wealth, which were never really relevant to the core tasks humans live for, or anything we learn. Money or the material things coveted were never in of themselves the moral objective, and couldn't be. A cult of Mammon or something similar had to be invoked to grant to the commodity or anything like it this fetishistic power, and natively humans have always known the material things are means to spiritual ends, whatever they may be. A believer in Mammon is not convinced the fetish is the extent of material pursuits - far from it, those who deal in money and exchange have a prescient understanding of what money is, and never believed in any ideology purporting money was something essential to the universe. Those who violently recapitulate such a crass belief in the moral authority of money, like Ayn Rand, are really regressing to that same old primordial light, to defend an essentially Satanic view of the world that has little to do with anything that was materially wanted or any outcome that material things suggested. Where a crass materialist view sees worldly wealth as tied to their higher missions, a vile perversion of that materialism grants to the basest material spiritual authority, and at the same time grants to genuine learning and knowledge no authority to speak of a world where matter - well, matters. All that is solid doesn't even melt into air, but is instead turned into inchoate blobs of primordial mental substance, no part of which is distinguishable from the other or describable except by shouting words ad nauseum and attributing to them the highest power. This is, needless to say, highly inefficient and exhausting, and this is exactly the point - to soak up all human effort and material things into a wasted cause, and claim that this nonexistent goal is the true form of mind, rather than anything that suggests a single iota of genuine learning or knowledge is possible. The only way such a world can be sustained is by ever-escalating production of mental rot and material incentives, devouring the very world it hoped to conquer and enslave.

It is this struggle to confuse and befuddle that humans navigate. It is not something defeated by any amount of learning, for the learning that the mind conducts can never find a way to defeat for good the mechanisms allowing this. Such an obsession would only serve to corrode the very mind that is trying to defend itself. The drive to regress the mind - literally the Retarded Ideology - always seeks return and repeat of an imagined past, which is in actuality divorced from any real history. The regression of the mind is carried out on the terms of the mind alone, rather than any physical or spiritual necessity or purpose to it. The mind that wishes to defend itself sees its material environment and everything around it as what it is, or seeks to reckon with the world as best as it can, while recognizing the value mind and the learning process has for our wish to assemble our understanding of it. Because we know the world is never

what it naively appears to be, the mind learns over time methods of how to learn, and how to better reverse-engineer anything it contacts. This includes other minds like itself. If two minds were to contact each other without the fetters of a philosophy of struggle - of the conditions of antagonism in close quarters which have defined civilization - the contact would be considered bizarre and unseemly to many senses humans have of themselves. Given the danger other humans pose, such a closeness is inherently a vulnerability, particularly for third parties who make it their business to interfere in the affairs of two parties who had nothing to do with them. Conversely, two minds in conspiracy turn their aggression towards a third who wished to be left alone, and concoct a cosmic and transcendent struggle that really doesn't involve the third party at all, dragging the third party into it for no good reason other than an impulse of conspiracy to suggest this works. All parties could see the absurdity of this tripartite construct, which never really served anything but the impulse itself, but they are still left with the very real danger other humans pose. Humans cannot change their past and everything they have learned about each other, and have no reason to believe that any one of the race has moved on. That trust would only be established over a very long time, and like anything else, that trust between two minds, two flesh and blood humans, or two people, can be broken like anything else in the world.

With that all said, much of the world is surprisingly straightforward, because this is a problem for mind, and not even a problem which consumes all of its faculties. The mind is not intrinsically obsessed with politics or defeating other minds. Its contact with other minds and with the rest of the world is for its own purposes, which were never confined to a crass ambition of ideologues to cajole. The things of the world themselves, lacking any mind, are not even there to be seized or corrupted. They operate on their own power just as we do, and though they do not think and do not resist in the way a knowing entity or living thing does, they are not in of themselves out for any moral purpose. We assign them moral purpose not because of something intrinsic to the genesis of humanity, but because the mind learns of them and of itself. At the most basic level, this learning is for the mind intrinsically interesting, absent any compelling reason why the mind would choose ignorance or to allocate its limited resources and faculties for learning elsewhere. The mind can very often choose to remain inert or operate on lower power, allowing the human to rely on instinct, passion, or a connection with the world which it appreciates not as a mental game but as its genuine relation to the world and to what exists in it. The human being is not a creature to be whipped or devoted to labor or any particular moral aim, as if those aims were a trigger to be activated or a desire to constantly and inexorably devour, or a desire to reproduce itself like Malthus' mindless breeders. The world itself is straightforward, but our ability to process media and interpret them is not, and this is not entirely due to malevolent forces. The malevolence that is possible requires the mind to filter carefully all it senses, and one way to simplify learning is to focus on a particular piece of media - for example, a book, and all that goes into reading it and comprehending language, which is

sectioned off to its own process in our thoughts. Yet, to learn things, humans are perfectly capable of operating with multiple media, and in response to situations which are not really mediated at all. For example, a video game is on the surface a computer program, visual output that players are highly attentive to, audio output that often is expected to draw the player into the game, and a competitive exercise which stimulates thought and creates something more than any of the individual media the video game entailed. But, the video game is more than mere media. The simulacrum of a game environment is a whole environment, set apart from ordinary experience of the world. Those who use video games to manipulate thought are conscious of creating a Skinner Box, and this is accompanied by making human society so unliveable that two generations of children turn to the video game as their only remaining friend. There is an alternative - that the simulation of the game is appreciated for what it does teach and the learning it allows independent of pedagogy. There are in games wonderful accidents that were not the intent of the developer, and value players found in games that were not part of any conscious design. So too are books read to be interpreted, rather than merely consumed. In ancient times, the holy texts were often your book - your one book, from which children were taught both how to read and their moral and political thought, and concepts of spiritual authority that were appropriate to the society where religion arose. Religion is not confined to the book, but the book, rituals, and all of the media of religion are conscious that they hold an exoteric and esoteric meaning. The conceit of an imperious mind is to abolish all such meanings, so that communication and eventually learning are all digested uncritically, in accord with a pedagogical plan defined by thought leaders that eliminates all possibility of anything new or unintended consequences. Those who produce a communication are always conscious of how others will interpret it, even if they have no knowledge that a particular other will ever receive the message, let alone understand what the communication was intended to convey.

REVERSE-ENGINEERING AND THE IGNORANCE OF THE PEDAGOGUE

If media are for the mind to do with as it pleases, rather than the property of thought leaders or oligarchs, this makes the vision of manipulating public opinion by expression alone difficult. A full treatment of these efforts to herd and corral public opinion is beyond the scope of this writing, but enough indications that this happens are already referenced. The greatest difficulty of such manipulation is that human beings, even dull ones, do not like to be lied to and cajoled, and have always despised this regime of intellectuals and their supplicants telling them what they are allowed to think today. I leave the social and political implications for another time and accept what is self-evident - that humans natively possess a connection to the world regardless of their state of mind or whether a "mind" proper exists at all. By no means is mind guaranteed to exist in the way it is appreciated. It is very likely any human, even those screaming in an institution, have some thought process that is deliberate from their view.

The conceits of imperious members of society are inconsequential to the most basic functions of the mind, and the mind is not something proven by legislators declaring it does in fact exist. The mind existed before there was any law or adjudicated fact to say it did. We are accustomed to a society which declares by education that anyone without the mark of social proof has no mind, no thought, no will, and is fair game to attack; it is further decreed that those with the mark are granted absolute impunity against those who have not. This is the key break in the human race, and its result is clear - the race's origin in fratricide, ritual sacrifice, and every lurid ritual humanity ever knew. No ideologue or partisan of mentalism can ever claim they are anything else, and it is the intellectual who hates the inferior far more than any capitalist ever did.

The mind does not get to assert its own facts without problems arising. We can learn lies and more lies, but the lies always have to produce an immaculate totality to replace the actual world. Those who conduct genuine science do not construct such grand models that disallow them to be meaningfully described. In principle, it is philosophically possible to impose reality control, and convince us that this is how humans actually think. In practice, the human propensity for reverse-engineering makes this difficult. This propensity is not hardcoded or a tendency which is always active. The reason it exists is because reverse-engineering is such an obvious learning strategy that it is cumbersome to tell students they are not allowed to do this. Imposing a very diseased pedagogy was only possible by conscription, imprisonment, routine humiliation, and every terrible imposition of schooling. When that was not enough, mass drugging, economic depletion, repeated threats of terror that were acted on, because institutional necessities. All of this is intended to reverse a process that is very convenient for us down here, because the ruling ideas must violently recapitulate that there is no mind in the vast majority of the students. The institutions are set up entirely on the belief that humans are not even dignified as animals, but that humans do not exist at all. Only the new race of the aristocracy may exist in the ruling ideas, and all other concepts of thought are *inadmissible*. Yet, all of these efforts are only successful at frustrating and exhausting people. It remains too useful to learn in a way that pedagogy cannot destroy. This is why violent recapitulation of lies, barking contradictory orders to the face, and the thrill of doing so must be glorified and granted economic value of its own. This is only fully effective when the ultimate penalty can be imposed, and enough fear has drilled into the human animal, making it a pure philosophical zombie and driven by base fear and terror. This is the dream of institutional science and its vision for the world - a world where aristocracy is the only possible vision for humanity.

Among the disruptive tricks is to claim "authenticity" that is spurious, and destroy standards of comparison by repeating an echo chamber. After enough inducements, the subject is trained to believe the last thing the news man told them, delivered in a familiar tone and style that is trained and follows military-speak, as this is conducted purely as a war against the people. If it is impossible to stop people from reverse-engineering things, it is necessary to bombard their senses and then place a clear and present danger in the entire society. This is

merely an extension of the antagonism in close quarters that defines civilization, but it must reach a pitch that was previously impossible. Yet, for all of these lies, they still only wear down resolve. After sufficient exposure, most who are not targeted with more direct depredations adapt to the lies, and new lies must be created periodically. In the 2010s, this habitual lying would create whole systems of lies upon lies, changing aggressively definitions of any word so that no idea in circulation resembled a genuine or meaningful thing. This is the fate of the scientific dictatorship of the Huxleys and all eugenist ideologues - a world of maniacal screamers who did what they did for eugenics, while claiming their world was the only world which avoided "totalitarianism", the familiar weasel word of the anarchist and Galtonite.

It is for this reason that humans cannot trust another human for anything, even trivial things. It is this which made science in the genuine sense a spiritual authority. In the past, religion or philosophy could serve well enough for a few people, and the spiritual authority of the common people was always pagan or something they constructed with their own sense and connection to the world. Pedagogy and the cult's insinuations that all of humanity were too stupid for lacking some bourgeois symbolic feiths had yet to rot the native intellect of people. Had educators done things that would have been basic if they had any genuine interest in learning, humanity would have been spared the horrors of modernity. This actually would happen, against the wishes of imperious pedagogues who understood their monopoly on mediation of learning. Too many books could be reproduced cheaply and distributed, and even in conditions of deprivation, the proletariat clung to anything allowing him or her to see that their entire situation was constructed by a death cult. They did so not because they had any political mind animating them to have "real thought", but because the conditions of society were intolerable, stupid, and pointless. More than that, the books had to assume people were not stupid and would call bullshit on what was written. Humans had long figured out not to trust anything they read, but were not illiterate. Only after considerable pedagogy could words be presented as triggers to be digested uncritically, and both the way we read and write and the way speech was constructed could not allow the profuse lying that became standard for humanity in the later 20th century.

If you are familiar with science fiction and its imperial tropes, you are likely aware of "uplifting", where the guru - a Prometheus, Lucifer, or black monolith from space aliens - tells humans what to think, therefore allowing fire, weapons, and any advance humanity ever knew. No such thing happened, and no such thing is the norm in any learning. It is far more likely that learning recurred many times independently of any central hub, simply because no great guru would travel far enough for any idea to have a singular origin. The singular origin is always a reproduction of the imperial myth and the godhead, among other tropes of aristocracy, which suggest that aristocracy is the creative and generative force above all. This is a bald faced lie and reversal of how anything was ever learned.

It is also an abiding quality of learning that what is learned cannot be unlearned. Once one learns of a particular word spoken at a particular time, that word cannot be unspoken and all who learn of it remember the time it was spoken. This is not because some physical space will store pristinely memory, but because learning to be persistent cannot digest new knowledge which sublates the old and abolishes any mention of the past. The new never displaces the old in full, such that history is arrested. The new remembers the old, and does not bear any birthmarks as such. The transformed does not forget its genesis, and if it were to look back, it would see a long chain of geneology that ultimately descended from the muck like life always does, in all places and in all times. Even if the muck were on a distant planet and one believed in panspermia or ancient aliens, those aliens came from muck and have no intrinsic moral authority because of an impressive symbol or any mystique a human cult dressed itself in. I would think any space alien would look at humanity as a failed race, and the retards prancing about Freemasonic origin stories are the exemplar of that failure. No ordinary retard, who has the shame of that status, could be claimed to be so damaging to the human race as the aristocratic retards who are told how smart they are and given license to tell us with a small modicum of intelligence that we are retarded for questioning them.

It may be simple to claim that each new mind, each new human experience, is a blank slate in learning, to be pressed with new ideas. This ignores the obvious connection between people and their native connection to the world, which readily recognizes that there are other minds, regardless of any conceit held by the imperious about who has a "real mind". It would be quite impossible for someone to not ask about their own origin, and in doing so, recognize that every other human has an origin just like theirs, and everything comes from some prior conditions. This is reproduced in learning, and without a pedagogue or parent or someone to supply answers, humans would independently arrive at some answer. That answer would have to comport with what they have learned about the world. There is nothing in the world preventing humans from comparing notes or choosing cooperation rather than the antagonistic habit of habitual lying that has become standard for their race. This history will eventually be shared in one way or another - if not by two people talking to each other, than by people looking around them and asking where this came from, and knowing that there were minds active before their own minds were active. The pedagogue believes all of this information transfer comes from the master to the slave, but that is not learning, and it is nearly impossible to tell someone not to see what happens around them. That is the chief method by which humans learn social rules, since the habit of lying is most intensive when discussing the unwritten law governing all human societies. Even if the laws of society were openly acknowledged and honest, it is far more instructive for someone to see other humans in action and note their hypocrisies, then it is for the hypocrisy to be explained as an intellectual theory. It is only because the human propensity for lying is so developed in technocratic society that it became impossible for normal people to discern social rules in this way reliably. The society of the past

century was premised on doing everything possible to obscure all mechanistic understanding of society, and this could only be imposed by deliberate control of the environment and a preponderance of force to prevent natural learning that would circumvent this. While nearly everyone sees that this ideal vision of technocratic society is insane and unworkable, few can compile in sufficient detail a map of the entire institutional web affecting society. The institutions are too large and too occulted for any individual, particularly a young one, to divine their working and the true nature of the unwritten law. Even the brightest who are connected to social affairs often don't know what they were born into. The officers that do regulate society only know so much, and can only govern the domain where they are posted. Overarching theories of society are nearly impossible to compile, because the leading institutions are highly adaptive and aware of the need for occulting at the highest levels, and the need to disallow a wide-scale understanding. If that happened, no one would trust the institutions and would proceed to conspire against all institutions, sabotaging their most minute actions and behaving in ways the institutions do not control and cannot resist for too long. If it is to be a siege against us who are damned, the siege will involve retaliations large and small and a bitter resistance against all vestiges of the beast. If that happened, all of the technocratic institutions, no matter how well funded, would not be able to hold their walls. They would need to push against the people before they were prepared, against an enemy that is waiting for them. One pleb with a rifle or some useful weapon in a defensive position will, when tipped off, prepare a last stand against multiple officers tasked with door to door raids. If that became a general rule, the arithmetic works against the institutions' available manpower, and the interest of the neutrals to go along with any such purge. Those who sit comfortably and laugh as they get groups of those selected to die to kill each other would have to leave their fortifications, and would have to create for each raid the absolute impunity their society accustomed them too. If that absolute impunity were no longer the visible face of the regime, their prestige would be permanently damaged. As always, once something is learned, it is never unlearned.

INTELLIGENCE

Enough has been written expounding on intelligence - general intelligence, how to measure it, and various metrics that are largely dependent on pattern recognition and numerous tests of particular faculties. It should be made clear that any "intelligence quotient" is purely a political assignment. It is, simply put, a political filter which allows those who control the psychological inquisition a monopoly over who can rise, and where anyone and everyone will be sorted in the institutions. Every use of the political number is purely used to regulate cybernetically which persons are deemed worthy of entering "real society", and has little to do with genuine intelligence. The assignment is arbitrary based on life experiences and the assumptions of whomever wishes to promote someone. It is well known that someone can train to the pattern recognition test, but this is of little consequence. "Once retarded, ALWAYS retarded." That can never

be violated, and it also conversely means that no matter how poorly someone performs, the status of retarded will never be assigned once someone is judged normal or valid. The inquisition must go to great lengths to defend the claim that retardation is a natural and born status, and never acquired regardless of brain damage. There is still some basis for this general intelligence assessment, which largely involves pattern recognition, wordplay, and political knowledge. It is political intelligence and avarice which are the most prized traits, and those who are adapted to the essentially Satanic morality of Galton will always score higher on these tests. A proclivity towards obsession and compulsion, inherited from the degenerate habits of the English aristocracy and their proclivity for dealing in drugs, can mark someone for higher intelligence. There is some neurological basis for this - the sensitivity to drugs would likely lead to faster processing of neurological signals, and so this processing power produces for the acclimated and selected subject a natural proclivity for the signs of intelligence. The Satanic value system is designed to maximize the traits of these subjects in particular, either to drill them into the most loyal and fanatical believers in the creed, or to destroy those who refuse to comply. Above all, the test for fanatical loyalty is the marker for reaching the highest echelons of general intelligence. Fanaticism for the eugenic creed above all is mandatory for anyone marked as a genius. Those who refuse will be systematically destroyed for their lack of loyalty.

This political judgement is largely useless for the genuine task intelligence pursues, and therefore anyone who is truly useful will pass through a battery of tests, sorting by proclivity their place in the eugenic order, or throwing them away as is the case for most of humanity. I do not concern myself here with the testing of genuine intelligence, however it is defined. It is certain that such measures exist and can be compared against genuine standards. It is taboo to acknowledge the testing of the military, and a shibboleth of the eugenic creed is that mildly intelligent grunts are trained to value their lump of horseflesh, as if a 110 IQ was special. To anyone of value, anything less than 120 is considered basically retarded, and they will violently recapitulate this if someone forgets this. Any high placement, such as membership in the officer corps or significant ranks in the civil service, requires at least this value. They do not make exceptions. So too is this the benchmark for membership in the Communist Parties of the world as anything other than a low functionary. The more specific tests concern less the political judgement and more what the inquisition hopes to read from their human livestock. In practice, the truest forms of intelligence resist measurement, not because of pigheaded dishonesty of the psychologists, but because the human mind is aware it is being tested and must adapt to situations so varied, which must be acclimated to. The trials that would be the most reliable tests of intelligence cannot be conducted under lab conditions, and this has been accepted by anyone who is serious about adjudicating this trait. Looking at the brain offers few answers, aside from detecting neurological brain damage. A religious shibboleth of the creed is that all neurological evidence cannot be judged as "intelligence", no matter how clear it is that the errors in judgement are the result of seizures which have been deliberately invoked through

the terror tactics that are routine for eugenic society. The drugs used to inflict neurological damage and condition subjects for slave conditioning - psychiatric medications - are "just so" implied to reduce intelligence as if they worked by some magic, even though many like SSRIs were designed to drive the patient crazy so they are more sensitive to trauma-torture and the thrill of maximizing it. This was known when they were trialed, and those who attempted to resist would be systematically destroyed. To violate the "Jehad" is death.

With this done, what does the mind do to exhibit general intelligence? It is not an arbitrary processing speed, which means little, but an ability to retain recollection of meaningful details while adapting to technocratic and eugenic society, which imposes an endless regime of lying. Against those selected to die, no success is possible. All mobility except that cybernetically regulated to be allowed by the creed is denied. This creates the situation where labor is entirely at the mercy of managers, who revel in holding a knife at the throat of all workers at all times and teach all managers the thrill of doing so for its own sake. The particular conditions in which this general intelligence can be demonstrated inform how it can be measured on average. It is presumed that the habitual lying of the human race is not only natural, but desirable and ought to be maximized. The various Masonic tricks and games are glorified, even though the Masons are a notoriously stupid lot. Games of low cunning are the stock and trade of every secret society and mystifier, because that is adaptive to the society they live in. A similar game of low cunning is played to promote thuggery in the caste where that is appropriate, and interest outside that caste assignment is intrinsically retarded because it is pointless. Recognition of social rank and its assigned position is obligatory. It would be quite impossible to measure general intelligence using this mentality before technocratic society is asserted. After technocratic society is asserted, the dominance of the cult of education and its stranglehold on life is such that it is the chief measure of general intelligence. Intelligence in a prior society was demonstrated less by conceit and certainly not by the bourgeois' preferred values. Typically, intelligent men were attached to military functions and demonstrate capability of tactical and strategic victory, or espionage. Espionage remains high on the list of professions valuing all forms of intelligence, and also these officers are the most aware of its dominance and how to occult their intelligence. The relegation of generals and officers is a feature of technocratic society and the dominance of its preferred classes, where before the militaristic proprietors disdained those who would be scientists. The dominant professions in the society are the surest measure of general intelligence, because they demonstrate the values of that society. Artists, subordinated scientists whose work is not tied to the politicized sciences, excess academics, and so on may exhibit intelligence, but their loyalty to the dominant values is taken as a sign of this intelligence, because it is intelligent in the human race to recognize the Satan, the dominant spiritual urge in humanity that exemplifies this foul race. It was born rotten and became Satanic early from its development of symbolic representation of spiritual concepts, as that was the first god and the only god humans ever truly believed in. Naturally,

Satan and Lucifer are identified with genius, and so are their related figures in every other religious tradition. The identification of the primordial light with genius is both an indicator of humanity's Satanic inclination from the inception of its complex society, and an indicator of mind's frailty and disinterest in any other objective but the appearance of "smartness" and the vicious attack against perceived stupidity. At its core, there is a mark of "perfection" that general intelligence always aspires to - a Luciferian Christ that is sometimes acknowledged as an example, but never acknowledged too frankly as what it is. Guruism and the cult of personality is tied to this technocratic tendency, and it is a habit of general intelligence in any era. Very intelligent men and women are almost religiously inclined to follow gurus more than their native sense, because in human society, obedience to the teachers and indulgence in the institutions would allow a wider access to formal learning and systems the mind is adept at working with. Outside of the institutions, the brain expends much effort reproducing work that was already done in the institutions, and outside of the institutions the natural world offers fewer useful markers of what is important to learn. Even without a bias towards the institutions, it would make sense absent any other evidence to believe that institutions are a fount of knowledge for the mind, until those institutions are judged wanting and unfit for purpose. Reality outside of the institution presents both a sobering influence against institutional rot and something for the institutionally inclined mind to co-opt and command. Those outside of the institutions are always subjected to a barrage of humiliations and insults, because that is what it means to not learn. Whatever natural gifts may exist, general intelligence to develop requires compliance with the institutions in some way. If someone is not a member, it is seen as natural for mind to seek membership or to copy the knowledge of institutions by raiding it. Reproducing that knowledge independently is wasted effort. Production of intellect outside of the institutions is harrowing, but had to have happened for the institutions to exist in the first place as mind-centric institutions such as teaching and the gurus. The guru tendency leads to both followers and leaders, or overly confident braggarts who try to be gurus. Your humble author here has been accused of that overconfidence, which his miserable lot in society has made him adopt despite his seething hatred of the guru as a figure.

I hope this is not taken to claim that "intelligence is relative" or any of the idiotic koans that eugenists offer as a sop to those they deem retarded. It is rather to state the nature of what intelligence seeks. Intelligence is not a passive quality which can be directed arbitrarily. The passions of someone, their particular hobbies and niches of specialization, are of little relevance to general intelligence. Nor does a given profession inherently suggest any level of general intelligence. Knowledge of nearly every standard profession in technocratic society and in past societies required little more than literacy, a drive to succeed, and sufficient security and social proof to fulfill the job. There is a competition in the professions to rise in rank, and a competition against other people who want the same job. There is an expectation of men rising to a rank appropriate

to the sense of their general intelligence. Smart men do not allow themselves to be ruled by stupid men, and if this natural order is reversed, it is inherent to intelligence that the smart subordinate despises passionately the "stupid" superior, even if the distinction is trifling, or the intelligent subordinate obviously wasn't intelligent enough to figure out what this failed and demonic race always was. Human malice aside, there is an expectation that smarter men rule their lessers, or at least that superiors demonstrate that they are both intelligent and capable enough for the role assigned to them. This is most pronounced in meritocratic institutions, or those that ostensibly value meritocracy and do so because the necessity of it is made clear. It is evident in all of humanity's efforts, down to the hierarchy within families. Invariably, someone is at the bottom, the stupidest. If this person did not exist or exhibit marked distinction, it would be necessary to create them - and humans being what they are, the stupidest and smartest are the males, not due to any genuine measurement of intelligence, but because intelligence was the great division in mate selection, and it was the male who was to be selected or rejected in all institutions. Humans are inclined by the origin of their race to seek this hierarchy of intelligence and tyranny of it, even if the grounds for doing so are spurious. We can see the strategy of the Fabians - to teach the lower classes to value superficiality and barking as signs of genius, while the elites are granted impunity and security to pit those classes against each other. These strategies to control, direct, and discipline intelligence affect the final product and how it can be detected, but do not define intelligence. There is not a "neutral" condition of intelligence because the dominant institutions and the other intelligences it interfaces with are the primary function intelligence would navigate for humans. If we measure intelligence as the ability to match patterns or write pleasant words, this is a spurious and limited sort of intelligence. If we conflate many metrics, none of which answer what humans would learn in genuine conditions, we only select for the intelligences of a well-trained submissive pet. Intelligence is not merely a reaction to the environment. It is active towards pursuing the aims of the thinking organism, and it concerns solely the learning task, rather than anything stored in the brain. Humans could, even with poor intelligence, gather and systematize useful knowledge and record from experience that allow them to function. Nor does intelligence necessarily act as the cybernetic regulator to allow people to do this or that job, as the political forms of today suggest. It is known, but never acknowledged, that the present society is designed to drive people senile by the age of 40, and older humans will lose their mental faculties rapidly. This situation is made worse by the various poisons and the strain the social arrangement places on anyone who relies on their intelligence to survive. Inherited wealth is no indicator of intelligence, for a trained monkey could inherit a million dollars and coast through life without having to do too much. It is certainly easier to survive in a world with accumulated material wealth. It is further not at all the case that avarice for material wealth or money is indicative of intelligence. Intelligence has little to do with the opportunity, luck, and fate that allows capital to arise, beyond the artificial value intellect had on the entire Enlightenment project. The markers of obsessive high intelligence are often

impediments to the moral virtues, temperance, and qualities that recommend someone for good business sense.

The intellectual is not, as their eugenic religion declares, the hoarder of all virtue. The intellectual who worships intellect is a fickle creature, given over to lurid cults and far more hateful and cruel than the most piggish soldier or most venal capitalist. The sole thing they ever do is accomplish this mental task of learning, which is always a double-edged sword. Very often, the most intelligent in this society select, of their own volition, highly maladaptive ideology and social values - and because of the environment of eugenic society, it would be genuinely stupid not to do this. Intelligence has nothing to do with making sound moral choices or being a good person, or strong, or the traits the Galtonite Satanists ascribe to themselves. Why the Galtonites believe they are anything other than demonic perverts, I do not know, but ideology is a hell of a drug. It is finally clear that intellect as a quantity has no fixed teleology to suggest any type it must turn to, as if Man were to be perfected in the image of their Luciferian Christ. If that is the perfect man or woman, humanity truly is a Satanic race and a failed race beyond all the curses I could summon. We could see that smart people exhibit many behaviors, and this intelligence is not degrees of freedom to act while the stupid are constrained to limited functions by an imperious mind. With intelligence arises consequences that the intelligent have to abide, and cannot hide. The stupid are, with what intelligence they possess, perfectly capable of navigating the world. Their great barrier is purely the conceits of other mind, rather than the world demanding the stupid remain in some fixed ecosystem where they naturally belong. Learning in all the ways humans do requires no great intelligence to arrive at conclusions about what this world is, and what societies humans build. All of the mystifications intellect creates are a gigantic waste of effort, a burning of human potential for the sake of every class's vanity, each committing to vanity in their own way. It would be better to not burden ourselves and each other with such a conceit, and recognize that human existence is not so terribly complicated. It was made far harder than it had to be because of a grand intercine struggle in the human race that defined it from birth. That is not a natural law, but a choice. On a cosmic scale, human intelligence is so laughable that it is a wonder these Satanic apes believed their accomplishment meant anything, or that they have attained some new consciousness in the past century during their drug binges and aristocratic obsessions. All of the intellect in the world does not get around the moral and spiritual failure of the human race, or answer the genuine questions we consider valuable for what we do. We could choose to reward intelligence, cultivate it, and direct it towards that which we actually wanted, or we can gaze at our navels like every failed civilization has and watch as it burns to the ground. The barbarians who did threaten civilization throughout humanity's existence were not stupid men, by the standards of their society and by human standards overall. Atilla and Genghis Khan are not dumb brutes who got lucky - they built empires and played politics at the highest level, and understood what they held when attacking the decrepit state of their civilized enemies. The political

and aristocrat leaders recognize each other not by some unknowable germ of intelligence but by what they do and what they recognize as relevant to life. If we want to make useful assessments of intelligence, we would not be colored by the asininity of venal men and women who are trained to follow the path of least resistance. We would not make of intelligence anything more than what it is, and make of mind anything more than what it does - which is to learn in the simulacra humans construct, rather than something which has the great explanatory power the eugenic creed assigns to it.

INTEGRATION OF THE LEARNING TASK INTO LIFE

With all of that said, what the mind and intelligence do does not exist on its own, and does not truly exist to place itself at the crown of conscious knowledge, let alone the whole life-form, the society it interacts with, or the world it inhabits. It is instead a task which is conscious from an early age that it does confront an alien world and alien minds, with alien entities it will have to contend with whether it wants to or not. If intelligence were viewed without regard to the entity that is intelligent - if intelligence were truly a mind apart from its host, as the conceit of mind must claim - there would be no particular orientation of intelligence or any biopolitical claim of intelligence. It would be trivial for this faculty, like any, to be extensible by tools. Humans cannot help but form a symbiotic relationship with their tools, and the learning task in particular is why. Among the tasks of intelligence are for reasoned and deliberate honing of that tool use. It would be the same for an artificial intelligence or what is construed as such. The demonstration of learning would not be an arbitrary number of processes, but the effective integration of the machine with its peripherals in deliberate action. This would imply a genuine artificial intelligence would be autonomous, rather than a clockwork commanded by an imperious master. This is not what computers do, because computers as we know are not conscious at all. We instead observe the intelligence of this software through our lens and bias. The computer itself doesn't demonstrate any actual intelligence independent of that - it just follows the instructions on tape as its mechanisms insist. We might view humans or life the same way, except for something that is very relevant to us and relevant to society - that life is, absent any compelling cause, autonomous and not enclosed by any overarching order. Life is, in this society, only oppressed by life, and the machines life has built. The natural world does not have any intelligence or imperious will to dictate what our life will be. By nature, we are only beholden to ourselves and whatever affairs humanity inflicted, and beholden to the natural forces which are real. We are dependent on the sun for energy, the existence of water for sustenance, and all of the other material conditions. Those are, on their own, not the masters of us, as if the plants or a rock were commanding us like slaves to obey it. It makes no difference to any of those things what we do, and those things did not exist to serve us by any natural law. Humans chose to subdue their environment, and among the objects humans chose to subdue are other life-forms and, above all, other humans. That is the primary condition of mankind - that man oppresses man, and chose to do this

the whole way. Humans can choose any time to not do this, and at a small scale, they have to. The outcome of taking this impulse of the human race to its conclusion is obvious from an early age, so much that a naive sense in humans resists the urge to do the thing that brought this race into existence. You might think an intelligent human would see this more readily, but it is actually the opposite. Intelligent humans are invariably more malicious, more given over to the vanities of the race, and more amenable to slave societies in either role. The intelligent are religiously devoted to the conceits of the master, and the intelligent are the most loyal and effective slaves. It is not that "ignorance is strength", as the eugenists squeal when confronted with the failure of their conceit. It is rather that the essential task of intelligence suggested that, absent any compelling reason, it would regress to what it had always done. An object in motion stays in motion, and if the motion of the human race was that it was born of ritual sacrifice and malice, that would be the primordial eugenic root of them. This is pointless, but intelligence has no answer and will never have any answer to suggest it was different.

What intelligence does has no answer to moral questions or transcendent truths. Wisdom has no answer, and philosophy has no answer. Religion has, in its doctrines and its practices, no answer. Life itself as a topic of study has no answer - life for the sake of life, or life for the sake of death, are futile operations. What intelligence does grant is this relation with tools and with other minds. The dominant thought-forms of humanity always speak of subverting the slave by the will of the master, to cajole the world and everything in it to obey. This is a really awful strategy if someone thinks about what would manage slaves for five minutes. It is appropriate that this thought about slavery was made not by the slave-holders and not by the slaves, but by those who envied the slave-holding empires and invented a cope. The German ideology is the ultimate slave morality and slave system, and yet its thinking, this mind poison, is ubiquitous because it is useful. It dominates because intelligence finds such a tool useful for its purpose of assimilating rivals, rather than this tool being the purpose in of itself or being effective beyond the immediate task of defeating enemies. Intelligence would choose the path of least resistance when dealing with the danger humans pose to other humans, and so the poisonous ideology has a selective advantage so long as human society is oriented around values which are compatible with it. This would mean only that the poisonous ideology must snuff out anything inimical to it. Since it was born in a world where imperious rule and slavery were a given, and its reasoning was inherent in the civilizations of the world and of Christian civilization in particular, it could operate within that milieu without too great a resistance. The people who resisted were almost entirely outside of the political reasoning - the laborers and those who would become the residuum, the beggars, and the depraved. The commoners and freeholders, who were in early modernity neutral and inclined towards a form of democracy that advanced their interests, would be caught between two worlds - that of the eugenic interest and aristocratic fuckery, and that of the grubby workers. It would be stupid to deny that this was the struggle at the time, made evident by the actions of

empires that sought to enclose the world. Modernity presented to humanity for the first time the prospect that the entire globe would be controlled by one master, and one ruling idea that could perpetuate throughout global society. The strongholds that once ruled gave way to the rise of nations in the genuine sense, which would have entailed in the long term international cooperation as the preferred strategy of most of humanity. A man of one nation or one race, on average, sees their most obvious threat not as a particular genotype or phenotype or a symbolic expression of what humans are, but the very real and evident classes that existed. Aristocracy, in one form or another, was the default of every society of significant size and development. The rise of technology and tools that allowed the enclosure not just of the land but of every minute movement of social agents, presented a threat not in of itself, but because aristocracy would have the most obvious built-in advantage to use those tools. The technocrat is always beholden to the mystery cults and lurid rituals which preceded them, which his intelligence primed him to believe were a mark of genius more than something that the laboring classes, the genuine fount of science, would regard as useful or intelligent. Because labor had no money and no political standing as labor, they were presumed to be in an alliance with the monied bourgeoisie, who at first had no noble status and were under pressure from the high monied interests, who were by social convention "bourgeois" but had always been more akin to nobility and aristocracy, often having bought into the aristocratic values before modern revolutions. The reality is that these two groups were already distinct things, and the lowest group was rapidly identified as the necessary scapegoat to temporarily unite them. By kicking down, the bourgeois would be conditioned to accept the values of aristocracy and turn on their lessers, and so this was the only intelligent course of action. Intelligence does not play the long game, because that is not its function. The cult of intellectualism and knowledge was doomed to produce this result, and every appeal to intellect only intensified the malice which lay at the heart of it.

We can see here the danger of the learning task - that taken on its own, its immediate incentives and long-term projections incline it to do things which are anathema to most interests a person would hold, and the interests of the life-form apart from society and the institutions which command intellect and spiritual authority. This is why the socialist concept of spiritual authority was tied to science, rather than reason generally or philosophy. Science at this time was not the domain of aristocracy, but the domain of the bourgeois and laborers, who were in this task similar in outlook. If the bourgeois invested their intellect in natural science, it was for a purpose similar to the laborer's - to study the natural world because this was necessary to produce a product. The bourgeois and laborer had very different purposes in producing product and a tension over the production of luxury and the distribution of goods for mass consumption - that is, for the needs of the many against the wants of the few who aspired to gain position and opulence. Labor had little interest in fineries or the values bourgeois society treasured, and labor saw correctly the political thought of aristocracy was entirely alien to their interest. The bourgeois did not see the aristocratic thought

as alien, but did not see aristocracy as intrinsically theirs either. Where that leads is beyond the scope of this chapter, and this rough history of social classes is not the whole story of why it turned out this way. The same incentives based on social situation work in many ways large and small, down to the intellectual failings within a family, among people who know each other and are not divided by classes or any ideology. Human failures and the failures of their very being are just as persistent as institutional failure. The veneration of institutions and belief in their infallibility is nothing more than a cargo cult, for institutions are always comprised of people, no matter what effort is made to present a faceless entity. It would be ameliorated if we were allowed to actually learn instead of be schooled and drilled to conform to a political idea, and if educators got out of their own way and saw the damage they inflicted. They think the damage doesn't matter as long as they're winning. We see now that the whole society, including its managers, is visibly decrepit. The intellectuals were given enough rope by the capitalists to hang themselves - most of them, anyway. They did it to themselves and then they ask why it wound up this way. We can learn that this doesn't work very easily, but we also learn that there is no alternative, and that in the long run, intellectualism promotes its own destruction, on its own terms, and cannot help but do so. The master of the machine is not so much turned into a machine by the tools he uses. He turns himself into a machine by his own conceits, and blames the machine or some symbol or phantom that he has fetishized, which his intellectual proclivity told him to do as the most efficient path to learning, in the society where printed media written for educational purposes was superior to reassembling or reverse-engineering the machines that existed. It is far easier to understand a complex machine with a manual and a formal theory than by whatever system a workman would devise, and the engineer of machines would write the manual for reasons other than pedagogy or an institutional conceit about education. As mentioned, an enduring trait of education is that reading material is regularly denied, as a test and a filter to meet the institutional interest of the educator, for the educator is not there to help you and never was. It is the academic and intellectual who promotes forced ignorance and arrogance, telling the "Deltas" of the working class that instruction manuals are for sissies and indicator lights are idiot lights, rather than indicators someone would have found useful. It disgusts this author to no end that this idiotic meme is faithfully reproduced, rather than accepting what any competent engineer would, understanding operations and the necessity of eliminating unnecessary labor. The academic revels in uncertainty, fear, and doubt, because it allows institutional mystification and occulting. The rest of us wanted to learn as quickly as possible the operation of a machine, so we could hold it and claw back some part of the world that was enclosed, however we do. The run-around is a favorite of pedagogues and sadists, and those who enable them. It is sadly the case that we live in a society where humans are natural liars, and have to judge carefully anything we read and any machine that is produced by them. If you didn't build the machine yourself or possess the means to reproduce it, the machine becomes the avatar of imperious enemies. By the thinking of intellectualism, the machine itself is granted this power, and the ways

in which raw intellect function favor this, in spite of our common knowledge that all machines are created by and held by living users in some way. The intellect can only learn from symbols at a basic level, and does not deal readily with complex moral concepts which require experience that is not freely reproducible, and is never persistent in any real world. Koans long used to suggest a natural meritocracy never hold for long, and this is more true as the machines are more elaborate and the direction of technological development is commanded more minutely. Those who command technology never merely do so because they are smarter or possess some substance that is unknowable or adjudicated by occult mysteries. If this mechanism of judging intelligence were laid bare, it would expose immediately that all technocratic conceits about intelligence, in all of their variants, are foolish and stupid, and obviously against the interests of everyone except one group - aristocracy. The wiser technocrats readily accept this and understand the arrangement leaves much to be desired on its own.

Ultimately, intelligence is never a passive trait or substance, or a thing taken for granted. The machine that is human knowledge must become more than a machine, not just from experience of a world-system or a theory suggesting a new germ of knowledge, but by the interests of life and its connection to a world where life and knowledge would be relevant. Relative to others, intelligence can always be judged, but these judgements are ultimately irrelevant to most of the functions humans accomplish in society, and in their daily lives. The true measure of intellect is only available after the fact, and this is why technocracy and eugenics went hand in hand, and presented an alliance that was very attractive to the ruling powers of modernity. The technocrat always harkens to the past while claiming to move forward, and can only see the world proceeding inexorably, in spite of a child seeing the ridiculousness of this version of history. They do this because their conceit of intelligence is removed from the present and anything that would challenge their institutional hold, while the past legacy - just as it does for the proprietors who won their claim in battle - suggests that intelligence will be retained and held by those who deem themselves worthy. The aims of the technocrat then ultimately were destined to align with aristocracy, even as many of the technocrats were made to attack each other in a pointless interline conflict, to the ruination of their interest and many of the men and women who were dependent on the machine and its product.

If we wished to promote intellect for its genuine task, we would ask some basic questions of how we think and what we do, rather than invoke a story about who the smart people are or some legend about moral values that enshrine vanity over anything real or worthwhile. We would, for instance, promote honesty in the proper space, and allow the meeting of people for things that were once upon a time basic. We would promote friendship not on the principle of social climbing or some avarice, but because that would make life easier for everyone. This, though, does not serve the purposes that direct intelligence and motivate it to learn things. Intelligence on its own has imperatives to expand itself and defend itself which it must uphold to exist in the world, and so the machine will, if made into the core of us and definitional of what it is to be conscious or human,

succumb to the same sad fate life always has. Friendship, though, doesn't serve any inherent moral objective, and can't be said to be "good". Secret societies and the vicious of humanity are friends with each other, and so this environment would likely accelerate the malice of the human race. This was the plan of the Open Society, promoting an extreme naivete coupled with the viciousness at the heart of every liberal, to suggest that there was a bright future just around the corner even as the ugliness of the human race was put on full display, and the ugliness of aristocracy was able to declare itself virtue by producing rapidly every image of the subordinated classes as living abortions.

It is after all of this that the finished product is assembled. Intelligence has its own objectives, but the intellect recognizes its dependence on moral purpose and spiritual authority. Moral purpose may be a quality of the life-form or objects it interfaces with. Spiritual authority, though, is not derived from any particular object or conceit upheld as an idol, but from the world as a whole - and it is the world, rather than the visage of a godhead or any other such conceit. And so, in the main, intelligence in humans follows the interests of life before it encounters society. Intelligence can regard the non-living world outside of society, and it would have had to do so. Society in an older time could never create the enclosure or oppressive atmosphere it did in modernity, and humans retained a connection to the world outside of "society" in the abstract, where the intrusion of social actors and political conceits was not a given. Technocratic society, and the very impulse of intelligence rising to the height of institutions above our better judgement, entailed enclosure. The enclosure of the world was not caused by money possessing this power to command men by the mere symbol of it, or by some nefarious impulse that corrupted a pure man. Man was always wicked, long before he devised money or any of his more elaborate tricks to oppress Man. It was intelligence itself that entailed this impulse, should it choose to do so and there was nothing suggesting that intelligence could not learn the art of oppressing another human. If humans spent so much effort herding animals and commanding dead nature, why would humans have seen each other any differently? Given what humanity was not just racially but as a spiritual concept pertaining to civilization, the idea of "inviolable and good Man" is some sort of sick joke, rather than an earnest plea for decency. Humans as humans were never decent and never good, and went out of their way to avoid that even when someone like me connects the most obvious facts to describe human history. Intelligence as a conceit is allergic to the idea that intelligence itself does not possess any authority of its own, and can only conceive of such a thing entailing self-abasement. The thought of Ingsoc, then, is just the primordial eugenic instinct in humanity given a technological and ideological veneer, without anything to suggest it could be any other way. There is no way to think or learn a way out of this, as if some formula will allow humanity to live happily ever after. That was never the proposition, and a child could - if not beaten and humiliated to accept these ruinous institutions - see that without difficulty. The task of intelligence is not managerial or political, nor is it spiritual or something desirable for its own sake. If we really valued raw

intelligence, and know what we know about the body and brain today, we would conclude that human intelligence would be enhanced by machines in such a way that all eugenic interests and conceits about the human body and spirit are moot. It would be trivial to fuse the human body with machines amplifying faculties, and this is not a great expense. This, though, does not answer any of our moral questions or answer why we would ever do such a thing. So far as modifications of the human body and toolset are explored, they are always conducted to glorify aristocratic stupidity, the vanity of the bourgeois, or to induce labor to indulge in their crass habits rather than for the laborer to break free of bondage to aristocratic conceits. Labor, the proper fount of science and developed knowledge, is taught to believe that it is only valuable if it adopts an alien approach to the world and the interests of things other than it, and that the interests of labor are to be humiliated and negated in total - in other words, the laborer is to abolish his labor and supplicate it to some totem, whether it is intellectualism, property, or aristocracy.^[7]

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] The tales of Chinese bureaucrats finding new and creative ways to cheat on exams are the stuff of legends, and this ancient secret would be reproduced in modern schooling with knowledge of the Chinese bureaucracy. How extensive this was, and the quality of men who became government officials, is a matter this author cannot say he is versed in. Among the qualities desired of a bureaucrat was moral probity and a level of competence to prevent the wheels from falling off the bus, and contrary to the belief of a byzantine and callous bureaucracy, the Chinese bureaucracy was remarkably light-staffed by the standards of any modern civil service. Its innovation was that it existed and could persist across administrations, and could exert institutional authority that counterparts in its time never did. The bureaucrat was a planner, engineer, director of men in intellectual tasks, supervisor, and many other things in addition to the typical work of bureaucracies, while the Roman counterpart was there to extract taxes by hook or crook and not too much else. The role of the bureaucracy had much to do with the despotic political form, effectively reproducing the power-sharing of oligarchic republics that allowed the concept to form a stable clique, but also clearly enforcing the emperor's edicts and keeping governors in line. This is very different from republics dominated by powerful families or domains of land with regional interests, differing nations within the polity, where the notables jockey for position. Rising in despotic government was intended to work against the tendency of subordinates to seek leverage, and the bureaucracy enforced much of that. Bureaucracies themselves could seek leverage, but it was for the institution as a whole, and individuals within it sought advantages in internal conflicts and agreed to exploit those outside of the institution in largely the same way.

[2] And thus, the Trinity is born.

[3] Fabian Society strategy, taking its name from the Roman general during the

Second Punic War, of course, for they conduct the exact same strategy to restore aristocracy and impose the most vulgar and disgusting forms of eugenics.

[4] If you are familiar with programming conventions, global variables in computer programs are a big no-no. There are static variables which are "pseudo-global" to get around this convention, and we should remember that the computer in the end is a machine reading instructions from a single tape, rather than a simulated universe operating like our own. Constants, on the other hand, are a readily accepted convention. A compiler reading global constants will in actuality just insert the value we would have typed in place of the constant when compiling, and so the global constant is more accurately a convention for the programmer rather than something meaningful in the program code.

[[5] It is no secret that conspiracy and secret societies were at the heart of the entire bourgeois movement, and provided a channel between those in the know and the nobility and aristocracy who were favorable for such a project. In the next book, politics, education, conspiracy, and the knowledge secret societies entails deserves a proper view. The conceits of mind are necessary for these societies to operate in the way they do, and are really the foundation of genuine politics beyond a mere hoarding of command, influence, crude knowledge, and impressions based on some spiritual symbols and shouting.

[6] In the past few years, the odious field of "AI alignment" has risen specifically to match this conceit. The computer, as any competent programmer would tell the manager, is not a mind or a thing that possesses this spiritual authority that a cargo cult assigned to it, and so we who actually understand the computer refer to artificial intelligence as the "artificial idiot". This does not align with an ideological and eugenic cargo cult which banked its entire political project on their conceit of intelligence. When the computer, which must operate with some information we regard as real, does not compute the result this cargo cult wants, it is not that the cargo cult could be wrong. The grand theory, the grand shibboleth, can never be wrong. Eugenics cannot fail. It can only be failed. And so, a grand scam is launched to ensure that all intelligence computes the "correct" result. The same mentality which applies this to the computational machine applies it to the humans who are to be ruled by the machine. This, of course, is insane and retarded beyond any curse this author could summon. A coterie of incompetents collect sinecures to defend this sick practice, which deserves a proper humiliation at a much later time, when I write a book detailing as much as I can about the foul eugenic creed which chokes the world at present. That is a much later book in this series, and it can only be sensical with this preliminary work.

[7] The "abolition of the proletariat" is conflated with abolition of the working class in the sense that work, or labor, would no longer exist in the ideal communism. This fails to understand what the "proletariat" was conceptually - the proletarian was defined not by the moral value of being a worker, but by his relation to property and the obligations law and institutions placed upon him. The property holders were exempted from these obligations and were endowed

with certain rights in liberal society, because the property holders could defend them and had champions in the political arena, if they themselves did not enter political life. In practice, a "pure proletariat" never existed in the Marxist sense. The proletarian usually had some meager holding, and held the property of his body and his legal freedom, which was not a trivial thing. The proletarian could expect, however much the society was rigged against him, to be able to continue living and expect the sun to rise tomorrow, if predation were kept at bay. This fear would be amplified by Fabianism and then by the technocratic order, and it is at the heart of Eugenics and the global eugenics movement. The proletarian was regimented into grades of civic worth, and by some cunning proletarians could attain a level of wealth that, if not bringing them outright into bourgeois legitimacy, allowed them a level of comfort to pursue aims other than labor. Many a proletarian took up science and reading, especially in a time where literature was the primary media one could digest with spare time. The trashiness of literature could not be enforced by public relations yet, and even a lowlife like this author can smell literary shit and throw it in the garbage. More horrifying to the technocratic mind than the proletariat rising or not conforming to "the proletariat" was the unholy fate possible - that the residuum, or the reserve army of labor, could by some fortune promote into the proletariat proper, and not accept this desultory assignment that technocratic thought needed them to remain in forever, with no hope of reprieve and unlimited humiliation as their true role in the human race. This thus fulfills that most ancient obligation of the human race - "once retarded, ALWAYS retarded." It was a rising discontent among those cast out of urban society that required redefining these classes not by their genuine relations to the means of production, which implied mobility, but by civic worth and the moral qualities ascribed to them. And so, the working class was no longer defined by a relation to property that obligated them to work, but by the moral value of "real labor", which would be divided into a hierarchy of specializations conforming to management and technocratic aims. Whether this sorting by civic worth was eugenic or merely an expedient to manage the varying qualities of labor in the real world rather than in the abstract, it took hold, and the three major divisions of the commoners - the bourgeois placed under siege, the working class who were managed as industrial units, and the residuum to be exterminated and preyed upon openly - were set by 1920. Those who would form the technocratic polity wasted no time in pressing their advantage, and the eugenic creed wiped away all possibility that this struggle could be resolved by any force or thought alone.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

16. The Full Development of Moral Sentiments and Spiritual Authority from Conditions Emergent In Life and in Light of Symbolic Language and the Fact of Society

If there is no way to think or learn a way out of this, and no apparent force that would be necessarily victorious in the final analysis - if the outcome of struggle is for life-force to expend itself in a futile effort to win a pointless contest - what is there to life? In the tripartate view, life is itself the purpose of life, and this leaves aristocracy alone with untrammelled authority to do as it pleases. All concept of a world outside of the society of aristocracy is inadmissible and may as well not exist. The lurid cults of aristocracy always proclaim this victory is a fait accompli, the world will be transformed, and the godhead will scream like a retard and tell us this is holy. Sadly, this is what they actually believe, after all the finery is stripped away and the game is up. The faux morality of aristocracy is not even a convincing show, reveling in every double-standard and making sure the two subordinated groups they intend to keep are as miserable as possible. This preceded any political theory or suggestion that this was spiritually right, and did not even conform to a eugenic interest. Of course, aristocrats themselves are not defined purely by that essence. They are, in the end, living entities with wants and needs no different than the rest of us, whatever pretenses they make for themselves. No class and no person ever can be, and while this truth is used as a mask for men and women who very much see the predatory and primordial instinct of the human race as their goal - for they chose the foolish moral aim of RETVRN^[1] to the primordial light - even such degenerated humans will be seen for what they are, and cannot hide their odiousness. Since they do not intend to, and unlimited transgression and filth are their calling card, it is not worth discussing such peoples' moral sentiments for long, except to detail the mechanisms of degeneration they invoke.

It is very clear that nothing in the tripartate structure is designed to allow us any answers, so much that a child can see that this is not all there is to life. Further, the tripartate structure is designed not to mimic anything in nature, but is a trap designed specifically to disallow anything new to exist. The trinitarian view is designed to regress to the unitarian, to the primordial, which is held by an aristocracy intended to rule forever. This rule never actually settles the world in a state, but continually presses action. At its root is nothing more than the thrill of control. It is not even the thrill of victory, which is fleeting and requires some meritorious act to attain it, but pure, empty, irrational thrill - in the language of the utilitarians, "pleasure". That is the only pleasure that could exist in such a depraved moral philosophy.

We are not here to suffer or feel good, nor to "win" in some vaguely specified game, or in wars that are treated like game. We are not here to win in any great war or struggle of force against force which is granted the status of reality. We are not here for any grand idea. Among the most common tropes of the philosopher is a need to reduce all that exists to one and only one axiom, in line with a monistic ontology which necessitates some common substance to make

all that exists sensical and guide intellect. It is at heart a problem of learning, and the limited resources that can be devoted to that task. If that is case, an economy of intellect favors those who reduce what is learned to that orienting impulse. All such orientations invariably fail and lead to the same regression to primordial conditions that defeat the mind and anything it would have wanted, and this is intended. No complexity of knowledge or any assembly of things in the world would be any better, as if variety or diversity held any intrinsic moral worth. It is not in any action or labor that is reducible and alienable enough to become an idea abstracted from its origin. It is not the labor itself, or some overall energy of existence that gives moral purpose as-is. It certainly is not the crass symbols offered as a sop to the losers and fools of the world. All of the faculties of knowledge and all we know about the world leaves no inclination of moral behavior, no matter how many rational traps someone will invent or make for themselves - the eternal cope of an existence that never had any purpose or meaning that could be appreciated. Saying you get to make your own purpose to life is just another cope and a terrible one, and that cope is the worst lie of all. It is unsurprising that this last and most terrible cope is the moral promise given in the past century and a half, where a vulgar bastardization of the mind asserts petulantly "me wantee", and humanity has come full circle. A group in their secret world tell themselves they are totally tricking the fools to self-terminate, but what in that world is worth anything? Those people don't look too happy with themselves, nor do they possess any quality that would recommend them over the people they're killing. Very often, the safe and precious of aristocracy are exemplars of human shit and this is measureable compared to the damned, whose virtue is soaked up by these vampiric perverts. There is not some occult part of the world with "The Secret" that is some piece of knowledge that will make all clear. Knowledge has nothing to offer us that is self-evident to tell us anything about morality, as if it were encoded in the universe, or there were any moral substance to covet. Emotions and passions offer nothing better. All of the emotions and passions of living creatures served some purpose that is not difficult to divine. It did not have to be a "good" purpose or a purpose serving rational or intellectual aims, but there is a reason why any animal would feel or think as they do, about things that they have some emotional or sentimental association with.

If there is nothing accessible by any knowledge to guide moral behavior, how then are humans motivated? At root, there is one and only one reason for humans to have any moral cause worthy of the name - necessity. Whatever humans do, they will follow some moral cause. If they do not have any knowledgable understanding of that, a moral code will be asserted "behind their back", and make itself evident in the behavior and thoughts a human will eventually reckon with. We make a definition of morality here that is not inherently reasonable or ethical at all, or even one that conforms to our usual moral vocabulary. The condition is not depravity or mere rot or decay. A human without any moral guide would not be able to guide learning as mentioned in the prior chapter, and so its impulses to learn would be random and affected by the first alien

impulse that they met. The body's native resistance to this is limited, and the failings of intellect or crass rationalism were described sufficiently to make clear the difficulty. Moral aims are not intrinsically defensive or reactive. They are almost always proactive and assertive, as the energy of humans beings is at first generative and seeks to navigate a world. That is how the faculties of the body are oriented towards any deliberate goal, or any goal that appears deliberate. The orientation of life itself follows not from a hobgoblin compelling all of its behavior, but life as a process asserting itself persistently. That would be the first requirement for life to arise in any stable form, or become motile and sufficiently reactive to their environment. A totally amoral organism wouldn't even wander through life on whims. It would thrash around helplessly and scream incessantly. The image of moral depravity, reproduced deliberately by aristocratic societies in every form, is the institutionalized madman screaming for his life, and this screaming is prompted by the sadism that was the birthmark and genesis of the human race. Absent the sadism from humanity or some other animal, madmen tend to be docile rather than active, having learned fear of the world and everything in it so thoroughgoing that it would be incompatible with consistent reasoning. The daily life of a madman is spent coping and recovering while nervously awaiting the next sadism that is the hallmark of the human race. In that state, the madman develops whatever moral stance he can, only to have it shattered by the pressing of a nerve and his miserable social position - a condition mandated by every human society as much as it can, for madmen cannot be presumed to possess any moral authority at all, even concerning their own body or innocuous things. It is forbidden by all the rites and initiations that the human race believes in, and only as a sop or out of the rare necessity is any moral condition of the madman permitted. Towards the retard, no moral stance at all is ever permissible, even in the most dire conditions. To even treat a retard as morally worth anything for a single moment with any seriousness is to end the human project then and there, and this is absolutely haram. Any moral consideration of the retard is always delivered with the most gratuitous insult, and the human race is trained from creation to despise the retard with a visceral thrill that is difficult to imagine unless one is the target of that rage. This, despite the clear lack of truly worthwhile intelligence among the human race, which always races to the bottom and takes pride in their pitiful accomplishments up to now. It used to be that humans were at least somewhat aware that this leads to problems, and it took them many centuries to invent the most noble status a retard was ever allowed - the *cretin*, who was just barely worthy of quasi-human treatment as a nicety and nothing more. That the ruling aristocracy views most of humanity as totally and completely retarded and insane from birth is the only genuine sobering influence.

Most of humanity, including the aristocrats who advance this meme, understand that anyone can be declared retarded at any time, without an astute political sense to ensure that this never can happen. If the emperor has no clothes, then he is indeed retarded. This is still not the same as those born retarded, and it is always presumed that retardation is an inherited status, even before the

eugenic creed made this the chief institutional shibboleth. It cannot be that a valid man became "retarded" in that sense. Someone may be brain damaged or go mad, but they will always be remembered as possessing that shred of validity if they made it to their teenage years as such. Only those "born retarded", and this is religiously marked from early childhood as the most ancient rite of the human race, are subjected to this particular humiliation, beyond the humiliations inflicted on madmen. Even those who commit to total sadism and maximal torture for the thrill of doing so are never treated like retards. By the moral sentiment that sadly dominates the human race, there is a certain moral value appreciating sadism, which selects for the quality and seeks to improve it. Only when that sadism became a sufficiently pressing danger would it be temporarily ameliorated, usually because frequent slave and peasant revolts made clear the insecurity of aristocracy. It was never that the aristocracy feared genuine overthrow. It was rather that the state in reality was much too weak to prevent this, and people will for various reasons assert their will regardless of aristocracy. Aristocracies are never fixed in place forever as their conceits insist, and so new members will populate them and has-beens fall out - but their mindset and lifestyle were aristocratic before they could seriously contemplate revolution, and a nascent aristocracy either accumulated enough strength to displace the old before any revolution began, or there was no old aristocracy of size. Usually revolutions entail large parts of the old aristocracy passing to the new without any break in continuity, for the men that can contest rule always operate on the same political and social principles. Transgressing the political thought altogether is not just immediately snuffed out, but is deemed "retarded" - not merely insane or evil or wrong, but retarded, the worst thing a human can ever be.

So ubiquitous is the hatred of the retard that the moral sentiment to kill on sight anything that is retarded may be seen as the first moral sentiment. This is not really what a moral sentiment is or the true origin of human biology or thought as a germ. It is the eugenic legacy of the human race - that it was born in fratricide - but that moral sentiment is not reducible to this one concept, "retarded". The concept of "retarded" as we use it today did not map on to how inborn stupidity was understood in all places and all times, and very rarely would a philosophy declare that humans were infantilized and arrested in development. That entire conceit could only arise in very particular societies, and would be mal-adaptive and nonsensical outside of them. The typical view of life would have led someone to believe a mentally defective 40 year old man is still 40 years old, whatever his deficiencies. The cycle of regression and humiliation is a particular one of great import to our future work, but is presently beyond the scope of this book. We can see the same treatment of the retard given to any social outcast in different societies, for the approach of rejection and humiliation is effectively universal and came from the genesis of the human race. It came from a combination of its instincts, history, memory, and the germ of intellect and learning that became the crucial distinction above all others. Even if human technology and capacity were premised on more than the development of learning, and that learning

had to arise in a body with a tongue that could speak and hands that could manipulate tools, the appeal of this sentiment as a singular force compelling history is a powerful conceit to philosophers and those who concern themselves with education and learning. Because this education would become the first worthwhile distinction that could assign social class, before laws and bodies of armed men could enforce it and declare explicit statuses, it was easy to assign all moral failure with this concept of the retard, however it was construed to refer to inborn and permanent stupidity that excluded someone from social life. It finds its familiar counterparts and pseudo-explanations - "sin", which implied failure in hunting which became a permanent condition of spiritual importance is the most exact match, and sinfulness would be reduced from a complex array of maledictions to its most essential ingredient - that to be sinful was to be retarded, not just as a measure of intelligence but as a permanent moral failing. Eugenics stripped away all other concepts of sin and all complexity which allowed for independent adjudication of sin, so that the Eugenic College alone dictated sinfulness in all things, and thus set all moral laws and taboos. So, even this most ancient genesis of humanity is of no use for moral sentiments in humans. Even if one could naturalize the eugenic creed in its vulgar intellectual form, it would not explain the primitive sentiments of animals, who had far less use for any such creed or conceit. Ritual sacrifice and thrill when doing so is not observed in animals, however vicious they are to each other. A hyena has no shame in cannibalizing its own and turning on brothers, but that has nothing to do with a eugenic sentiment that is developed. It's just the standard viciousness of their race, and the lowest hyena is still far superior morally than the fanatical eugenist of the late 20th century.

The moral claims of intelligence, and most especially the perceived lack of it and its permanence as a socially recognized condition with dire consequences, are unique among moral claims. Intelligence and mind, and the processes of learning that make formal inquiry into systems possible, possess a claim to moral worth that nothing else can. There is nothing in the world like intelligence which can replace its function. Any artificial intelligence would be better understood as a tool enhancing existing intelligences than a free-standing entity, and that tool's utility is contingent entirely on the capacities of those who hold it. With many tools, there are substitutes or alternative strategies, and the necessity of the tools may be questioned. Intelligence cannot be questioned in its utility. Learning and history are also the only clear way morality can lead to formal ethics. In short, it is through learning that moral decisions can become valued in society and communicated in ways that are comprehensible, generalized, and alienable. Without that, moral sentiments can only be communicated indirectly, for example by grunting or shouting to intimidate, or indicating emotion with or without any deliberation. That communication without learning and knowledge still is relevant, and we learn of that which is a moral duty of intelligent mind and that which is morally valued but not the product of learning or deliberation. The two interact with each other to produce a fuller understanding.

Morality is never purely rational. That is the task of ethics, which is a different

concept. Moral claims suggest a world outside of us where moral acts and moral values of objects would be relevant. This is to say, morality takes place in a real world, and that real world is distinguished from fiction to make it morally considerable. All of the moral values we could acquire are from the world, which are contingent on being able to relate all that exists. A monist view of reality then is necessary for a coherent moral sense - there are no special rules for special places and no true "dual systems" or hypocrisies that are tolerable. Hypocrisy itself may be held as a moral value or something with moral assignment, but it is always recognized on some level that it is hypocrisy. No one is ever seriously operating with a dual moral system that confuses them for long. The idea that morality can be manipulated in such a way is among the reasons why "doublethink" and habitual lying are taxing on the mind and the organs allowing it to exist. All must be one in some sense, even if the "one" never really exists except as the world itself which is always comprised of disparate things and transcendent truths that might be accepted. Morality can only confront the world in total before any part of it can be properly judged. We do not have by any knowledge a full accounting of the world, but ignorance of the law is no excuse. We would do as best as we can to account for incomplete knowledge in all moral assessments. Just as no part of the world can be unknowable if we are to ask a serious question of it, no moral claim can be defended if standards for comparison are lacking. We may know so much about the world that we develop a general understanding and account for as many unknowns as we can extrapolate from our knowledge base. Incomplete information becomes our curse, for outside of our judgement, morality wouldn't exist in nature or any substance. If we had that unicorn of perfect information in a perfect environment, all of our moral quandries down to the smallest iota would be resolved. Since this is a literal impossibility - if we imagined a universe-spanning entity we are really imagining a primordial light subsuming all, which obviates any moral question - we make moral judgements not just about the knowns of the world, but account for the unknowns. With any moral value there is uncertainty and skepticism, and this is an opening for someone who is naive to the deceptive human ape and its games. The uncertainty of exact and perfect moral values is not to be confused with uncertainty of information or an overall uncertainty. We know moral values within a system, and can relate that to other systems we know of and a sense of moral truth that is not tied to any particular thing. What we do not know is what else might exist to compare against, or finer details that would undermine judgement. In any substantive quantity or definite quality, there is no uncertainty or ambiguity of moral judgements. Nor is there such a thing as "moral relativism", where two people see the same thing as intrinsically different in nature. Two people may arrive at different values for a thing and ascribe to it different moral qualities, but they cannot claim that the different moral values change substantively or quantitatively the claims being made. If two people see moral value differently, they are capable of understanding the judgement of the other in principle, because both have seen the same thing, and would have enough context to know of the thing they disagree about. The ignorance of the two people of each others' knowledge, or their ignorance towards the world for

themselves, is not relevant. Both people have made moral judgements on the premise that they know their information about the world is incomplete and must account for that. If there were genuine ignorance, both could in principle share information to resolve that dispute. If the two simply held distinct sentiments, because their lives and experiences were very different, this information can be known and we would be able to understand why another would see something very differently. We are aware that the other person senses and thinks about the world, even if their thinking is very different from our own, and even if their thought were vastly superior or inferior. We could, in our feeble attempt, place ourselves in the experience of a hypothetical omniscient observer, or a space alien with a very different corporeal structure, or place ourselves in the position of a bug. We would at least be able to guess what distinguishes us from something far greater or lesser, and would have to be able to do so if we are to even make a judgement of their intellectual superiority, inferiority, or the very different thinking of this other entity we would inhabit. If we couldn't, we are just telling ourselves a mystery exists where there isn't one and terminating all potential thought, and all potential moral judgement. We can do this, or convince ourselves that other entities are truly unknowable, but in doing so, ignorance is not strength.

SCIENCE AND SENSE AND THEIR SYNTHESIS AS THE BASIS FOR WORLDLY MORAL JUDGEMENTS

We rule out the philosophical wordplay where we confuse symbols of the world for the whole of meanings. Instead, we approach the world as a reasonable person would - as something real where events occur, and objects are understood not as information apart from context. There is no other view of the world that is the appropriate domain for science in the genuine sense. At first glance, we separate in the mind science as a method and sense experience. The key distinction between science and ordinary sense experience is that the former is the domain of the mind's ability to learn and draw conclusions from that learning. Sense experience operates not as the transmission of symbols or contextless information, but as the processing of those transmissions in a way that the receiver assembles without "learning" in the formal sense that the mind does. The acquisition of muscle memory or familiarity with some sense data is not scientific in the strict sense, though something certainly is learned and the mind is aware that this is a kind of learning. Sense experience includes the things which affect the body regardless of our registration of it in the moment. We cannot help but sense that which affected us "in secret" when the effects become apparent. Even if we deluded ourselves to believe a finger hasn't been cut off, reality would assert the truth and sense would recognize, perhaps to its surprise, that it is indeed missing a finger, and that this is going to be the way it is moving forward. Whether with science or sense, for this purpose - and any developed and meaningful product of science or sense experience that we would explain to another - they do not operate "in the moment", as if they were the result of inexorable forces pushing in one direction. Science to be science recognizes a past, present, future, and

that the course of any event is its own course rather than something ordained from outside of the event intrinsically. Sense information operates on the same principle, regardless of our beliefs about time or causality. If this didn't happen, we would not be talking about the experience or method that is morally useful as a guide to anything, but something wholly alien which superficially resembles the thing we wanted out of science in the first place. Since sense experience is a precondition of developing science, and science in turn informs our approach to sense experience itself, I will not spend too much time on non-scientific sense. Here, the origin of learning's moral direction in science is more relevant. We presume that we ask this question of the world to find the origin of moral judgements, rather than asking a god or some other spiritual authority, about which we would have no intrinsic knowledge that would be proven by natural laws. Absent any other thing to orient learning, the encounter of the mind with the world, and the inability of the mind to assert reality by learning alone, leads the mind to seek its answers in the world, however it perceives it and with whatever methods the mind deems useful for its purposes. It could not do otherwise until it has developed enough knowledge of the world to suggest the world could be something different than its naive models indicate. We did not come ready-made with any theology or religious explanation, as if those things were encoded in the body in a way that can be scientifically verified. If they were, we would see the formation of religions with remarkable regularity and religious thought would be so natural that it could not be a question. That most people are not very religious is not a violation of natural, but demonstrates that religious zeal is highly unusual, even with very active religious institutions that mandate fealty to the religion. It would also indicate that all confusion over which religion was right would be trivial to resolve, and the lost and confused would be quickly corrected by "the gods". Since this is very obviously used as a stand-in for the priesthood and institutions, it is not a god in the genuine sense and should be ignored. Even if there were gods or body thetans or some spiritual explanation in the realm of ideas, the scientific approach to the world still begins with the mind's encounter with world and rightful skepticism of any claim.

Science in the most basic form should be defined before moving forward, to remove ambiguities that are conflated with it. The objective of science is not intellectual development or a great goal of the method. It is not even any method in particular, as if there were only one or a limited number of ways "science" would be conducted. It is simply the pursuit of truth regarding the natural world from the evidence available, presuming there is a world to be studied and that it is knowable. How this truth is compiled or communicated is a very different thing from the act of pursuing it. It is always conducted by knowledge, whose faculties are limited. There is no "science" happening outside of entities knowing it, which would adjudicate for us any facts or findings. Science does not intrinsically rely on facts, as it can and must concern itself with suppositions or guesses about which no factuality can be established. It would be very helpful in communicating science to work with facts that are agreeable, but this is a

potential failing when a determined social agent wishes to lie as profusely as possible about basic things. We have seen many examples of such lying, and by all that is known in science or reason, there is no rule suggesting a liar cannot lie. It is quite the opposite - science suggests that profuse lying is very effective at dictating truth that knowledge is made to accept, because science can easily determine that the thought process allowing us to conduct science is malleable. This is morally unsound for us, because it casts doubt on our ability to conduct science, and we would have to presume our mind and sense is sound and consistent for science to tell us any substantive or meaningful truth. Yet, it is not possible by science to verify science. That reasoning is circular and clearly leads science to turn on itself. We can suggest that science grants spiritual authority to ask questions about what can secure our mind, and absent any other explanation, we would rely on science to speak of spiritual authority conceptually. We could place spiritual authority in a process other than science, to which our science and mind is beholden, or which our mind works with in a way that allows science to continue in a way that is sound to our sense of the world and ourselves. We could also suggest that such a spiritual authority, up to and including the "gods" or supernatural forces we might invoke, is subject to the methods used in science, for any "god" would be part of the same world that science investigates, however far removed that would be from our conventional knowledge. We would in science be aware of what different subjects are and the proper purview of reason and sense experience in answer questions about any of them, and would be able to relate all subjects to another. Science never arrives at any "theory of everything" that is reducible to some koan, without degenerating into a cult of little relevance to genuine science. It does suggest that everything is knowable and relatable, but so far as there is a "theory of everything", it is only that knowledge as a process in the world is our portal to tell us anything else about the world, and that any "super-knowledge" would be nothing of the sort. The "theories of everything" devolve into technocratic navel-gazing with a predictable outcome, and so far as such projects ever build a coherent cosmology, it is only after science and us can reckon with what we are actually doing in this world. They would be built not on a germ of science as a process, but a conclusion drawn from considerable experience to tell us how we can describe the world. And so, the sense experience of a cruder sort does not cease with science, as if there were a point of no return where someone must join the "cult of science" and abandon what their native connection to the world tells them. Far from it, science relies on continual sense experience, which our methods and past knowledge refine. If we wish to, very large proposals of what the world is are entered into the scientific lexicon without any scientific proof of them being real, but are accepted as a matter of course. This happens not because science mandated it, but because we would in communicating with each other need to accept implicitly many things we take for granted, and we would not condone ruthlessly attacking knowledge that is common if that attack is mounted for the most spurious purposes, or is done in some vain effort to cajole reality to be what someone wanted it to be.

All that is knowable is not reduced to "science" or even "sense", as if this were the extent of what it meant to know things. There is much about the world we never directly sense or have scientific theories to explain, but that we accept by inferring that there is more to the world than is immediately evident. To encounter the world properly requires accepting how much of it is unknown, and to know the extent of what is known. In short, science requires us to acknowledge that non-existence or void is necessary to speak of differentiation meaningfully, as there is no other natural division in the world to suggest a classification scheme written into nature. Nature does not abhor a vacuum. It welcomes such a thing, and suggests non-existence would be the default assumption. So too does that assumption exist in science. We do not invent phantoms or ghosts without particularly good reasons for doing so, and all such ghosts are provisional until a better explanation arises. We can construct that which no sense experience would confirm, such as abstractions. We know what those abstractions meaningfully are, and can seek evidence that the abstractions "exist" - that we can define qualities of things or situations where those abstractions explain something confirmed by sense. The abstractions are never "the thing" or a substitute for "the thing". We can tell the difference between a substantive object and our conceits about it. When something in the abstract is envisioned, we are capable of connecting it to its concrete counterpart without any wordplay suggesting the abstraction is anything more than a placeholder for our purposes. We don't have to actually consider an infinitely fungible coin of money to conceive of value's fungibility, for instance, and we know what all of the symbolic representations of money are and what tricks of finance actually do. There are many things that are abstract and lack any concrete counterpart. "The state" for instance is very different as an abstraction from the various forms it takes as a realized force in the world, and this is the source of so much stupidity. This applies to abstractions without any great political implication. We can devolve into arguments about what colors are, what biological constructs are, and so on, and then lock into abstract conceits that are upheld by institutions and become dogmas. In biology, the dogmas are intense because biological rationales became the chief political rationales, above the ideologies and parties that were purported to govern.

There is nothing in knowledge which has a direct, unquestionable connection with the "true form" of things, which makes their workings clear for all. We know that such a truth must exist to speak of any forms, but we never quite detect it. Science and sense both work with models, but they are always models which are intuitive enough that knowledge can apply them to a world where there would be true things, rather than preferred forms of them. If we choose a model of reality that is divorced from what native sense tells us, this has nothing to do with science. All scientific models would either be confirmed by the native sense, or would allow us to answer why naive reasoning fails and how to correct it. The naive reasoning is known to be naive, and so if someone exhorts you to "believe the science" and turn off a sense that you can reasonably expect to be accurate, they are performing a magic trick and nothing more. It is only possible to suggest your sense may be wrong if there is enough

ambiguity that another explanation may reconcile with many other things we know. This is not as easy as it seems when science must develop a cosmology tying all things, and we can only use a very limited understanding as the basis to relate them. It is not needed for science to create a "total system" to be "real science", but all science purports to describe a singular reality, and cannot section itself off to a special part of the world. Science cannot assign arbitrarily the proper purview of any investigation, let alone designate that for clearly political divisions or the biases of men. Science always entails learning, and so the models of the world science develops are learned and products of intelligence, and are reproduced for every person which practices science. They may be reproduced by independent investigation or taught. The latter effectively amounts to the same as reinventing the wheel, but with many expedient instructions guiding the student to conclusions another scientist developed. All of this science is conducted without any necessary institution or authority from above dictating what it can and cannot be. The scientist must still seek spiritual authority from outside, but that seeking is ultimately the choice of the scientist. There isn't a "neutral science" in the sense that science can be conducted without an authority to allow comparison and adjudication of facts. That said, the adjudication of facts is not in of itself necessary for science to be conducted. At a basic level, any such investigation, no matter how spurious, is "science". There is no rule against conducting bad science. There is also no guarantee that the most rigorous and honest science will allow someone to arrive at the truth, as the wisest men can build elaborate theories far removed from what happens, believing they are doing everything the way it ought to be done to be in line with the truth and all facts they have known up to that point. Because facts are much more reliable than senses and determinations we would have to reconstruct, we turn to established facts and theories. Which establishment we turn to is our choice, but we readily recognize that others like us asked the same question and conducted some sort of science to determine the truth. They may have published their knowledge without reservation, or produced some media occulting secrets that they wrote for those "in the know", or as a way to conceal this knowledge from hostile parties or unworthies. Whether we trust the establishment's facts is less relevant than our recognition that there were people asking this question, and we take from their statements and actions what we will. Given the human propensity for lying, we would discern any truth from people with the belief that lies can be detected and overcome, and that in one way or another, truth is accessible. Those who speak of pure lies and the most profuse lies can only lie in certain ways; if they lapse in the Big Lie for even a moment, they leave an opening that allows a ruthless critic to pry open the Big Liar and make him or her spill their secrets. It is no surprise that those who commit most religiously to the Big Lie are both vulnerable to torture and given over to torture cults, and find torture impressive and morally worthwhile for its own sake. The two practices go hand in hand, because someone has to believe in the might and moral authority of torture to believe the Big Lie won't turn viciously on itself. Anyone lapsing in the love of torture will eventually crack, or fail to lie as effectively as someone who is a devout liar. Science is skeptical, but never doubtful from fear, or uncertain

because of wordplay. That fear - for the language tricks to manipulate reality rely ultimately on fear or some other manipulation beneath the dignity of reason - is the intrusion of institutions and the failings of human faculties.

All scientific endeavors, like any knowledgeable act, are moral acts in some way. This is not to say that science is driven by emotion or what we would want, but that every scientific endeavor is guided by a sense of moral judgement regarding the natural world, or command of the natural world, that is worth calling "science". Science must remain committed to the natural world and an approach to nature, rather than an approach that is intrinsically human-biased, institutional, or based on ulterior motives of property. We would need to have some connection to the natural world and to our native sense for science to be conducted, and following institutional authorities telling us to conduct "The Science" blindly is anathema to science. Nowhere is the truth in of itself the moral aim. The moral aims do not take the form of sentiments or black boxes which are inexplicable. They are, in this early stage, nothing more than assertions that there is a cause that is something more than a mechanical motion compelling behavior. Sense experience cannot be modulated by these moral aims in the same way, without training the body's senses to alter perception. We do not morally choose what our eyes see or ears hear. No one believes it to be a genuine moral cause to claim you saw something other than what you saw, or to not see what is in front of you out of a belief that ignorance is strength. Science, or things that would suggest some formal reasoning and systematization, is developed deliberately, with the limited resources available for learning. The scientist knows that there is only so much time to work with, and the past learning that allowed further inquiry. There is further a need to seek out events in the world that can provide data, experiment, and translating the thought of learning into something that can be written down or communicated, or at least recorded for future scientific inquiry. While sense provides a wealth of data, much of which the scientist wishes to filter out since it is noise, science to be effective must mitigate wasteful allocation of time and resources, and does not indulge in trivial things if it is to be a worthwhile endeavor. The conduct of science is only beholden to reality if we are beholden to reality for something we want to do in the world. We might not like the truth, but if we want to learn about the natural world, the worst thing to do is lie to ourselves about what our sense tells us and what science, reason, and all of the approaches to truth about the natural world would require. We can lie to ourselves or others, and we may make honest mistakes, but to say that lying is strong is the first true death of science in the genuine sense. We would like to conduct science in a way that matches reality not because science has the power to do this, or because we are morally good or invested in truth, but because the truth of the natural world would serve us better than a little white lie or koan we told ourselves. Even if we told ourselves the smallest of white lies in science to make our job easier - we memorize something about the world and apply that to find new truths - we would remain aware that our prior assertions were flawed, or we knew we were simplifying and reducing something complex to a system we can work with,

rather than be caught in the morass of *reductio ad absurdum*.

It is this that is the first and purest economy a human undertakes. Before the house of resources can be managed in an economic task, the faculty that allows someone to think economically must be disciplined. Whether someone believes in political economy or rationing out their material resources or sees such an exercise as wasteful, the faculties of reason and learning are always managed by the mind. This would be as true for a Marxist as it would be for a classical liberal, despite the disdain for economism among the former for reasons they have justified and are better explained by the Marxists themselves. There is no getting around the reality that any mind, no matter how intelligent by whatever metric one imagines, has limited resources to learn new things and acquire new information. This task is not just about developing a scientific theory or model of how the world works. The application of science to work tasks, or any deliberate action regarding the natural world, is dependent in one way or another on the basic task of science. The same faculties apply to the allocation of intelligence resources to domains outside of the natural world, such as politics or the abstractions humans often contend with. Those domains would be within the purview of science, since they are the result of human existence which is at root as natural as anything else. The abstractions they deal with are not natural things that can be isolated in a lab or treated as physical data, but they can be recorded and theories can be constructed about politics, society, psychology, and anything. They can be, in principle, applied to theology, with the caveat that the scientist is aware the methods of science derive from metaphysical and ultimately religious thinking, and religious matters are rarely presented as theories or rational doctrines that are suitable for the same study physics or chemistry. Religion, and the world, is never reducible to "science", as if the world couldn't exist without science being active. Much of what we learn and know is not conducted through any scientific approach, and it is entirely legitimate to reject science as a method in favor of another method that is suitable to the wishes of life or the mind. All of those other methods would be themselves understood by scientific analysis to determine the mode of operation, but in our everyday experience, we do not need a theory or any scientific approach to learn about the world or navigate life. Much of our life does not involve any great science, or only a crude form of science that would be worked out by the guesswork of a child. That crude form is still science in the loosest sense, whatever we may judge of the quality of such a science. But, in everyday life, we are not looking for experiments or theories to explain things, and demanding proof to the extent even crude science would require. We can learn on faith or follow instincts, or operate with working principles that were never the result of a scientific approach. Often, what is called "science" in modernity is not science in the sense that the word would be appreciated, but a pedagogical approach to operations that is cloaked in the language of "the science". Learning from Bill Nye the Science Guy's wacky sound effects is not a scientific approach.^[2] However any learning is done, all of the results are in principle things science can verify. It may be that what was learned concerned a

cosmological view which was intended to make scientific inquiry impossible, or was intended specifically to occult knowledge so that science would be resisted. Perhaps the thing learned of was vague and no realistic faculty humans possess will ever arrive at useful scientific findings regarding it. How we would account for the resources of the mind is not immediately evident. To assess those resources requires a thorough assessment of the mechanisms of knowledge and learning, in addition to a sufficient assessment of materials available for data and research. All of those assessments would be far beyond the economic thought available to science alone, absent anything else. It is further not evident from science alone any preferred direction of learning that the mind itself would mandate, or a certainty of any animal's nature demanding learning fit any preferred path. The resources of the mind, whatever they are, are known to be limited. If they weren't, we would know everything there is to know and we don't need to bother with any more learning.

At first, the findings of science are only to describe what the world is, assign proper names, assemble information in some way that is easily readable and comparable, and establish sense of what is valued in the first place. The first value is born out of logical connections and deductions, which is necessary to construct any axiom or complex object that science can assess. There is not yet a moral value attached to quantity or purpose. Science has no direct purpose for itself, even for its own sake. To state scientific facts is to state the obvious and is not inherently worth anything just because it's true. This presumes the facts are adjudicated correctly and resemble the actual world we live in, which we will take for granted since we concern ourselves with the most honest science we can conduct. There are some moral conclusions to draw that are self-evident from the objects described. We cannot claim that things are other than what they are, or do things other than what they actually do. There is a limit to what objects in the world can be perceived as, before our description of the things is far removed from anything that would be morally worthwhile or relevant to the actual world the description is meant to model. We cannot make society into things it is very much not, especially when the failure of a false model is evident. We cannot in reality make a "dual system" of science and call it science in the genuine sense. One system would be the real science or sufficiently real for the moral purposes science serves, and the other would be a system of habitual lying and consensual reality that is mandated by institutions. Even as moral values are attached more to our emotions, proprietary wants, and things removed from science, we are still beholden to a world when describing the things or actions that are granted moral value. The other values derived can be understood scientifically - we have models of why we feel as we do, and why property is relevant to humanity and would have arisen in some form due to what we are as living and thinking animals.

A mental barrier is erected between what things are and what they could be. What we *want* or *need* is at first a condition that simply is. We want what we want, regardless of any reason why we should want it. We do not abide any moral value intrinsically considering anything abomination, good, or evil, and none of

those things are substances of the universe or things we can universally recognize. There is no moral value in anything that can be derived from science telling us what things morally *are*, beyond the facts that describe definite qualities and quantities. It is also not intrinsically morally worthwhile to regard 10 units as morally different from 10,000, aside from noting the distinct quantities as a fact. We would have to judge instead something that results from the distinction of quantity regarding a particular thing, which would be emergent from the causes to describe something new. Often these are multiple causes, but there are singular causes which may be seen as foundational for our purposes. For example, we do not need an elaborate theory to explain why water - dihydrogen oxide - possesses the qualities it does, and where quantities of it can be discovered. We might have a theory of how this substance came about in studying natural history. From water comes its consequences. The substance is crucial for organic life and is among the chief material bases for civilization. Without fresh water, humanity suffers greatly. The moral values resulting from those consequences are not fixed, as if more water is always good, or there is any marginal utility that is universally recognized. All of the quantities of water are only meaningful morally when they correspond to utility, and utility is always a definite quality or condition rather than a substance outside of it. Utility in humans is a product of the body's mechanisms before any psychological appeal of water can be considered. Regardless of what humans think in the abstraction, they will require so much water for tasks, and can do with excess water so many things, if it can be stored and carried. All of those conditions are definite qualities and not freely exchangeable. In science, there would be no ambiguity about these qualities, nor any "spectrum" that can be determined by any law of nature. A range of tolerance for acceptable values of any given purpose would be morally equivalent for that purpose, and comparison within that range would be devoid of moral or computable value without any qualitative distinction in outcomes, all of which are also definite qualities. By no law are any of these scientific facts motivators for persistent behavior. All of the basic values can only affirm themselves - and therefore, the object of love is love, the object of money is money, and so on. There would be no intrinsic reason any one thing necessitates a new thing morally. The impulse for new moral sentiments arises either from something beneath the notice of the thing we value, or from a confluence of events which synthesize something new. Absent any compelling reason, one thing does not become another by some spooky force that is contradictory or incomprehensible. There is always a reason why that happens, and noting that it does happen does not imply that it ought to happen. For moral purposes, facts are valued as nothing more than what they are, and analysis and synthesis suggest a view of the world that someone can adjudicate for themselves. Science as a method does not dictate authoritatively what anything is or is not. It builds theories and models which refine sense we already possessed. This recursive process of science begins as something crude enough to be taken on faith, or because we hold those truths to be self-evident. The spiritual authority science relies on is not reducible to "science" itself as a germ, but a recognition of what science studies. In short, the spiritual authority of science corresponds not to any institution or

preference, but to independent verification of facts, and independent direction of the scientific process. This makes sense given the proper origin of scientific approaches to the world. Science originates not as a thought experiment or with the monied producers motivated by coin, but with labor and the genuine existence of laborers. The first science arises not because it was handed down, but because many who worked found understanding the world very useful.

EMOTIONS, PASSIONS, AND INSTINCTS

From looking at the body, electrical signals or chemicals in the brain, not a single emotion can be discerned as something morally significant or real. Nothing in nature "encodes" for one particular emotion, as if there were a substance for even the simplest of impulses such as fear or pain. No emotion or iota of sentiment in the world can be reduced to that. Emotion is a necessarily subjective experience that is at first something without any word or symbol to suggest its existence. By default, we have no words to describe as our "feelings", which is why they are feelings. If feelings corresponded to anything rationally determined to suggest how we are supposed to feel, we would describe them not as a state or substance of love or hatred or liking any particular thing, and such gauges of preference are notoriously pseudoscientific to say the least. It is well known that when humans are coached, they can be made to say they "feel" any particular way, and words from a thought leader will dictate what those feelings "are" and how they can be communicated. In this way, it is hoped that the sentiments of humans can be changed, for whatever moral influence the educator or overseer has to manipulate or cajole a human. Even if this were done for reasons that are defensible and appreciated by the recipient party, such interactions are intrinsically manipulative and override the native emotion of a human being. Perhaps we want to be manipulated in this way or see this serving some higher purpose which is not emotional. The feelings themselves are things only we know, and they are known not by description but experience and familiarity. It may be helpful to assign a name to some emotion, but this will always be a half-measure. The full state and sense of ourselves, including every nervous impulse, is not something easily condensed into a singular word token. We do not even fill the consciousness with a singular such emotion or "state", as if emotion were a state machine playing a game. In principle, we could know for ourselves every iota of our feelings and construct a model. This would likely not offer great explanatory power. What we know very well is that all of our feelings exist for some purpose. No feeling just happens spontaneously, even when we let ourselves feel whatever instinct or the environment summons and that feeling was not part of any rational design or seeming purpose. The purpose of emotion does not mean anything more than the fact of its existence, but it usually the case that we could trace some chain of causality to explain emotions and their recurrence.

What we do with these emotions is ultimately for us to decide, rather than something mandated by any moral philosophy or religious tenets. It can never

be a sin to "feel", even if we would rather not feel a particular way or see an emotional state as problematic and against all of our interests. If we did sense an obligation to change emotional state, there would be a rationale for doing so that is outside of the purview of emotion or science. There would also be a way in which these emotions, like any other reflex of the body, are honed and trained. Humans being natural liars, they learn to manipulate their emotional state, and among the manipulations is the projection of a stone wall which we are told is "emotionless". This readiness for battle is too an emotional condition, holding against anything that would confront it. It is not truly emotionlessness, but a projection of strength that is expected to impose on the surrounding environment and withstand anything another willful agent throws at it. It makes little sense to maintain this projection against the natural world or for one's own self-indulgence, and the emotional state of humans rarely registers intense hatred or any stern emotional state towards anything other than living things, with a very strong bias towards other humans. Emotions are almost entirely preoccupied with our feelings towards other humans, society as a whole, and institutions humans built that present the clearest danger and most relevant fact for navigating the world. Emotions towards a natural disaster or the wind or the gods are misplaced and we easily get over those feelings. Emotions towards a pitiful symbol or spectacle, or a mere idea, are comically and tragically misplaced. It is only in a society where symbolic representation and lying reaches the level of critical failure that emotional investment in symbols, flags, idolatry, and other such things becomes disproportionate to any genuine purpose the symbol has. The symbols are just words on a piece of paper or a pattern on fabric. Even when the flag symbolizes the state that one is a member of, the object of emotional relevance is not the symbol or idol but the state as an institution and the state's realized expression. People who are not part of the state's preferred social structure have long found such idolatry surrounding the state to be a sick joke at best and a travesty haunting the Earth on average. The emotions in of themselves are not the sin, for it is through those emotions that many moral senses will arise. We do not develop moral sense because it is scientifically necessary to live. We could easily develop a moral approach to life without regard to any emotion, and regard emotion as a nuisance to be muted or dulled. Emotions are not the sole motivator, for many primordial instincts are not emotional at all but reflexes we come to accept and hone like any other muscle. The passions proper are not derived from emotions, but speak of something deeper that becomes a much more prominent want in humanity. And of course, all of our moral values are choices we make in the conditions we live in, rather than something emotion "made" us do. It would not be possible to speak of moral actors in humans did not deliberate, or were expected to own their deeds and their very being. Morally, all that we do and all that we are is questionable, no matter any judgement of guilt or fault. Justice does not exist by any natural law nor does it exist as any sentiment or passion on its own. To speak of justice, which will be revisited in later writing, is to speak of a world and a sense of what it could be, and speaks of a world without regard of any individual preference or conceit of what it would mean to be just. That could never be a passion

that concerns a local sentiment, since any justice worthy of the name would be very aware of the world and society in which a just social agent lives. Even if that were accepted, justice does not intrinsically hold any moral appeal. The moral causes animating humans are usually *unjust* and intentionally so, and this intentional hypocrisy is glorified and defended as positively just. By all of the thinking we hold to concerning justice, there is nothing intrinsically wrong or amoral about doing this. If we were to think of a world without this lying, where truth reigns instead of human sentiments, the world that is produced has no need of justice and would see the defeat of humanity as a fait accompli. Humanity has had to lie to itself to pretend that it is not what its past made it become, and pretend that there is a future by faith alone or some new technology or promise of a crass sort.

The lack of emotion is not the flawless machine operating smoothly, as the technocratic conceit portrays such a state. The drilled and conditioned soldier, impeccably replicating what is programmed and carrying it out, is not devoid of emotion. Every contemptuous utterance of military-speak, every talking-down, every humiliation, drips with a contempt that the soldier must feel to carry out this mission. If they did not feel in a way that maintains this aggressive stance, they would not be effective soldiers. Of course, this is the most degraded emotional state of the soldier - someone who projects strength by glorifying venality and all of the worst aspects of the cult and practice of war. It is not difficult to see this contempt for what it is, and that for all of the protestations of those who revel in shame and ridicule, it would not be effective if this visible contempt did not exert emotional force. Lying and dissembling require a willingness to lie, and an acquired immunity to any sentiment to suggest that doing this is wrong. In practice, anyone who fights cannot conform to this ideal that is presented as "military efficiency", and those who fight are in private and sometimes in public very emotional and passionate, and must be so. That emotion is not a dull sentiment drilled to its most essential substance to be pushed like a machine. Emotional regulation suggests that the fighting man would feel in ways the slave, the subordinated and humiliated worker, does not, and that the fighter alone has the "right" to feel this. Those who are most effective at fighting are not those who project superficially the emotional state and venality of their profession, but those who are adept at controlling emotion, responding to their environment in ways that suit the needs of defense while not being violated by "illegal orders" affecting that state. How the soldier is individually conditioned is something different from mass psychology and the mobilization of large numbers of people, and the soldier is trained above all to fear their commanders and despise non-combatants. Regardless of whether the soldier knows this to be bullshit, or whatever life the soldier has outside of fighting, the cult and practice of war suggests their emotional state is responsive to hierarchy, the needs of utility for victory, and a sense of merit based on that above all other senses of merit. The true emotionless state is the fried brain shambling through existence, not really caring what happens. This is the conditioning of the lowest class in the militarized state school, where the slaves

are indolent and fearful and overcome with such anxiety that it dissuades them from rebellion, productivity, or much sign of life at all. The intent is clear - to eliminate all standards of moral comparison, so that the slave is nothing more than a lump of matter made into some utility of the master, without thinking about it. As with the drilling of soldiers, the purest form of the slave's "ideal emotional state" is maladaptive towards the tasks a slave would optimize, if the slave were to be a useful productive implement. The indolence, drunkenness, and malaise of a slave's existence is not the point, but a preferred effect to prevent their rebellion and uphold the overall social order. States that are the preference of institutions and classes becomes internalized emotional states, blamed on the individual so that the institution may be expressed in its place. We see the common thread that the lack of emotion is not a mark of probity or independence, but a sign of indolence and moral decay, where the actual human is replaced by an institutional representation that is detached from any condition. Even commanding emotion, which is the true goal of such conditioning if carried out for the utility of some task, requires an emotional investment in doing so, and a disgust towards the sort of indolence that is common in institutions, which are distant from anything the actual flesh and blood humans wanted from them. The indolent are so deprived of emotion that they cannot bring themselves to hate their own decrepit state or do anything about it. That is what it would mean to be truly emotionless, and only a sick society would believe this is a desirable moral quality.

Emotions do not need to be intense or correspond to a desired magnitude. The reality is that there are no such magnitudes which can be ascertained, for emotions are not substances like so much opium that is sold by imperial agents to cajole outcomes out of their subjects. Pain is not measured in any unit even as a base emotion. It is impossible to rate pain on a scale of 1 to 10, and anyone asking you to do this shows their utter contempt for you. Any emotion is only elaborated upon by asking questions about its origin or its connection to other values, moral or material, that it pertains to. We do not ask "how much pain", but where the pain is located, and what that pain indicates. Only in this way would the pain be described in any qualitative sense. We might, for physical pain, note the sensitivity of the nerves, but this "metric" is not premised on any scientific evidence that would be confirmed in a lab. We are aware of our own nerves well enough that we can readily assess for ourselves what the pain is and the urgency of response. Translating this nervous activity into language is problematic, but the understanding is something familiar enough that others can sense that pain without any linguistic rendering that could be written down, and could summarize after the fact what that was in a way that is communicable by meaning. It would not be something expressed literally, in the exact language scientific inquiry would need to establish a formal theory. We nonetheless act on that awareness of pain, or any other emotion, as if it were more than a singular utterance of an idea or an intensity of that utterance. We are able to make comparisons between these states without a scale or spectrum suggesting what we are "allowed" to express or construe as genuine emotion, and translate

that comparison into something that could be written down. Whether a dry explanation would do justice to something that is particular to us, and not at all universally felt in the same way from one human to another, is another question. It is not too difficult to convey minute details of an emotional state in a way a reader would understand, and relate by meaning or metaphor or a commonly understood expression the state with a compact phrase that is a reference.

In daily life, emotions guide a moral sense that we rely on for anything more complex than trivial instincts. Even the motivation to get out of bed is an emotion, unless one is so denuded that they are reduced to an instinct to seek food and do the barest minimum possible to appear living, responding less to fear than an expectation that something out to be done despite a lack of feeling for it. Emotions still operate at a low enough level that we would not consider them foundational for everything or significant moral causes on their own. They do inform our thinking about what is moral, for good or ill. Emotions can be manipulated by others or trick us into doing things that we know to be irrational and counterproductive. Yet, they also convey understanding simple enough, especially in interpersonal or political matters that entail reading this state and intents that derive from interests which are usually emotional. If we ignore emotion in our moral philosophy, we wind up with people hating life and everyone around them for good reason, and this becomes typical and expected without really being acknowledged as consequential. You could not make a coherent ethical or moral claim that such a hate-filled existence is bad or evil or anything else, but it is not hard to see how such an existence will be dreary and lead to predictable outcomes. I should not spend too much time on each basic emotion or pontificate on them for long, and I trust the reader has enough awareness to know what they are and the variants of them. Mental games and tricks are played, particularly with love, hatred, pain, and pleasure, which loom over the other states and often are invoked to eliminate any nuance or minute understanding of the body or why those emotions exist, or where they are directed. Eugenics as a system is heavily reliant on emotional manipulation, consider its origin in utilitarian philosophy which emphasizes the most crass and degenerated emotional states over anything meaningful.

The passions are often conflated with emotions, but suggest something much more elaborate. Where emotions are either minor or major and always fleeting, passions are enduring and entail motives that operate at a level that is something more than moral, ethical, or anything natural. They are not necessarily spiritual convictions and usually aren't, and do not rely on any authority that needs to justify their existence. The passions are, in short, the most elaborate expression's of someone's deepest and true wants at a primal level. They are informed by contact with the world and all of our sense of it, including ourselves, but are never beholden to it. They are not beholden to any reasoning or knowledge suggesting why we should be passionate about anything, and do not necessarily entail any history or soulful content whatsoever. They are, in a sense, the reason for us to exist at a basic level, absent any other compelling motivation that suggests the passions would be set aside. Without them, life would not mean

much to our feeling. We might be able to conceive of someone content to be passionless, continuing through existence for some other cause, but even a drive for serenity is a passion of sorts. Someone seeks calmness in a world gone horribly wrong, and this calmness is not merely a desirable sentiment but an approach to life which allows for a very basic need which can be intellectually appreciated - security. More than that, it would be a starting point for someone to reorient their trajectory and consider their further activities, without the fetter of existing passions or some lower condition of existence or feeling. The calm human is not so much emotionless or rational, but possesses a confidence about what it does that is reassuring beyond anything a confluence of feelings or material value can bring. We seek an objective to do something that is passionately pursued, without any particular emotional state. It may be our life's mission to build a house, or reproduce because we like the idea of a mini-me running around the world, and it is not for any other interest to tell us we're not allowed a passion for those things. We may discipline ourselves in the passions and choose to some extent what we would pursue, whereas with emotions we would expect to feel what we feel with regards to our situation. We would stop to think if our passions can be reconciled with our existence and all other moral values, or if our passions are intrinsically bad. If it is a passion to torture people, reasonable people would see that as problematic for their own sake. Other people recognize passions in others and recognize the passion as an indicator of potential friendship, or sense a clear and present danger which must be removed at all cost. Rarely do we take a neutral stance towards any passion, however much we might claim neutrality to keep the peace. Even passions that seem mundane become an interest of other people, even though we would think it is no one's business but our own. Eventually, passions are no longer merely our own concern, because they typically entail coexistence with a world of other such creatures who may covet the same thing, but can only do so in a limited space. The existence of passions in conflict does not in of itself guarantee that the conflict must happen, as if passions are pursued by some inexorable force of the soul or the universe. Fear of consequences or a sense of something greater than the passions are motivators to forestall that confrontation, and no war would be fought purely for wanting it unless someone were secured from the consequences of the full extent of war. Most of us never have such a luxury to declare war unilaterally, and if we can wage war it is only of a limited sort. Only through the highest levels of political life does war take on meaning that allows it to be a pursuit of some passion - otherwise, what war usually means is the will of the local state strongly disapproving of that which transgresses its monopoly on legal force, or what would count as such in a society without laws as such.

The instincts operate beneath notice of ordinary consciousness, scarcely registering as emotions but are never really encoded facts in the scientific sense, as they are often claimed to be. We may isolate mechanisms in nature that explain instincts, but instinct to be relevant is something understood to operate as a consequence of knowledge, rather than "just so" existing as a force of nature. We can control and hone instincts, but we cannot control material substances, even

if this control is limited and only acquired with training rather than any learning in the sense the mind accomplishes the task. Instinct may be an outgrowth of those mechanisms, but can just as well emerge from an emotional, passionate, or moral sense that is valued. Every tic, every impulse, can arise from causes that need not spawn from a particular basis. An instinct may arise and dissipate beneath any notice that would be relevant from observation, but we know this happens very often. Emotions are not merely higher forms of the instincts, but are something different altogether. Emotions only answer to something that is self-evident to our sense, and while we may lack words to express emotions, we know them when we feel them and can recall them. We do not notice instincts, and our treatment of them is very different. The instinct is never morally valued unless we find some rational purpose to suggest it is; by itself, it is not even valued in the sense that a material or scientific value is. The instincts do inform much of the basic behavior of human beings, and we treat them like muscles to be honed rather than things which are in of themselves the point. Only through certain practices can regressive assign to instinct a greater value than we would assign to it if we were to be moral actors. Because we do have many instincts to comprise basic processes, our sense of ourselves and what we are doing is dependent on recognizing instincts as what they are, and they occupy a particular niche in conscious existence and in life. Those instincts exist and cannot be nullified without radically altering what life is and does, and what we do with our bodies no matter how much we divorce instinct from rationality and mind in our constructs. The conceits of a fool who believes they are a point of pure rational mind are very instinctive, pathological and predictable, because such a person is playing a mental trick. That person would require reconstructing every instinct and emotion to conform to this model that is imposed on reality, and maintaining this is any real body requires continuous energy to arrest the state. Such a body would impose its model on the world around it almost axiomatically, and becomes very sensitive to the surrounding environment, in spite of all of its conceits. The instincts of such a person are exaggerated and exploited, particularly in societies where a thorough accounting of instincts and every other psychological trait becomes an institutional obsession.

MERITS, PRESTIGE, HIERARCHY, AND RANK

In struggle, a battle, a challenge, a problem to solve, or some other instance in the world which someone encounters, the adjudication of merit becomes the necessary moral value for solving the situation. Because objectives can be broken down piece by piece, with every potential interaction considered as a game, it is a gross simplification to speak of a singular meritorious value without qualification. I concern myself here not with wider game theory but with the adjudication of merit for any particular part of the game. A proper game theory requires a thinking of the economic problem proper. Merits stand alone and do not necessitate any game. In principle, they do not require an immediate problem. All that exists and all that can be done can be judged by some merit, in a hypothetical problem of our creation, or in observing such a problem resolved

between two alien objects in the world. There is no smallest unit of something that is the baseline for judgements of merit, and in principle the merit of very large systems can be reduced to a singular value or outcome. For every game so imagined, there are a number of inputs - causes - and outputs - effects. These inputs are values that arise in a way that allow merit to be judged as a result of the game. The values are qualitative, and they are each discrete, no matter how small a fragment of substance is. A given quantity of a value is itself a quality for the purposes of further judgement of merit. The quantity does not exist apart from the quality. The inputs to the game are previous outputs, which continues backwards ad infinitum. This sense of moral value in merit only exists inside the "game" mentality and value of what results as the result of a game. We make of that value what we will. Since qualities cannot be directly mathematically compared, the translation of one quality to another is established within these games, and only there, so far as the game mentality is maintained. Differing number quantities are understood through the logic of mathematics, which is premised on a naive set theory which requires countable objects and the concept of subdividing them into fractions, infinitesimals, and so on. Mathematical quantities can only be added when the qualities match or are convertible to one another, which is never axiomatically guaranteed. In two chapters, this concept of merit in game theory will be revisited. It is important here to make note of what merit is in moral values we would assign.

Where scientific moral values are read from the world and presumed to be neutral facts if we are to hold a conversation about their value, merits are inherently private judgements and local to the interest party that judges them. Where the values of nature are mutually understood and never seriously contested against well-established fact, the values of merit are always up for grabs, and the stakes of victory are on the line. This is not to say that what is meritorious is purely at the whim of whatever someone wants. A game is played with multiple parties, and the world itself is viewed as a party to this game which the player might see as the problem to be solved. Merit is a value for keeps. While not every merit is worth taking and the costs of the game can outweigh the benefits - or the game as a whole can be a game with no winning solution or where every outcome is designed to make sure you lose - merit will have to be possessed one way or another. Demerits or shame can never be redeemed, just as merits or pride can never truly be annihilated from the true past. This judgement of merit is at first for the interested party alone, but by virtue of playing the game with competitors, the competitors will know at the least that participants in the game seek merit, and that all merits are things that must be judged against the world where the game is played. All such games, regardless of our consideration of their genuine meaning, are played in a real world that allowed them to exist, and we regard the game's value to life in general if we so please. This works only so far as the world is seen as a game or a simulation, as we did early in this writing. The world as a whole, and any part of it, does not conform to any game. Playing the game, however much the situation is forced on someone, is still a choice of someone. If you are dragged into a game against your will, it only happens

because another will made it so, and the game does not intrinsically hold any moral worth whatsoever. The only way to make someone play is to compel them forcibly to play, or for some natural law to suggest that refusal to play means eventual consequences from other actors in the world or eventual death from the forces of your own body - for example, the body lacking nutritious sustenance and thus dying of starvation or preventable disease, because you were too lazy to go get more fruit or decided enough was enough and this was the time to pass on.

Merit is attributed to deeds rather than the being of persons, and can only be so. Being itself is a type of action, an imposition of something onto the world that is judged to be morally valuable with regards to the world. That is to say, it is undeniable that merit of any deed can be judged, even if we do not see the acts as intrinsically meritorious; and so to is this being judged as the accumulation of all meritorious deeds of that being. This applies to people and it applies to objects which are judged on their merits. What people think about themselves, in their own fantasy, has no bearing on merit as a concept. Since the objects do not hold for themselves any sense of morality or thought about it, their merit is entirely in the eyes of those who appropriate an object, or who see the object as something in motion for their intent. Merit does not regard knowledge or thought as intrinsically relevant at all to meritorious worth. For the manager or proprietor, thought is judged not as something with a special existence where special moral rules apply, but as just another object in the world, with properties we regard. We recognize thought and intelligence as meritorious not because thought alone dictates merit based on its emotional or instinctive wants, but because thought and intelligence are proven by competition to be relevant to the needs of life and moral judgement. There is no law of nature that intelligence cannot judge itself, but there is a persistent stupidity in humans when viewing themselves and a crass self-indulgence that is encouraged by the predatory. For the crass, meritorious deeds are purely symbolic and detached from a real world; and this is possible because the merit was in the end adjudicated for a game, and does not possess in of itself any moral authority. Why we judge merit is not self-evident at all, but we can always judge this. The meritorious do not need to prove themselves against any natural law which provides a metric. The meritorious only need to meet the win condition of a game that is defined by us. The world itself has no need of this, but we have need of the world and recognize that which we cannot change by will. The force of human will and interest that does construct an environment is not judged by merit or struggle at all, but by moral values of a much different sort, which are not relevant here. Why we truly do anything has nothing to do with moral worth in merit. We will, regardless of what we judge as meritorious, possess a sense of someone's overall merit of being. This may be called many things, and conflated with concepts of honor, social proof, moral goodness or probity, or an account of debts and credits. I assign the name "prestige" to this confluence of merits as a useful placeholder for the nebulous judgements of merit that are summarized by society. This is not because the prestige is in the end "fake" or a contest of appearances

in actuality. The prestige of someone is judged not by the superficial but by a realistic assessment of ability. What we value as prestige in legal or social custom, or the games of posturing and threats that comprise much of human sociality, has little to do with our genuine sense of someone's strength, or an object's total potential merits. This is judged necessarily because anything we do that would be meritorious and recordable in language is an object, or an event we can treat as an object or something that *is*. If something exists, it could be construed as possessing meritorious qualities, or de-merits that are associated with the name of a thing and its genuine existence. In the social game we established in the human race, superficiality and venality are always meritorious, because history and experience have proven to us that the human race does not care about any more merit than that which secures them. If low cunning and backstabbing are demonstrated to win time and time again - and they never do function in this axiomatic way - they possess a merit that is impossible to deny, no matter how much we know these habits to fail in the long term. Outside of the game environment, merit is meaningless - our moral values would instead be the values in-kind, accepted as what they are and for us to do with as we please.

Every merit is contingent on meritorious acts generally. No merit stands alone and apart from the game environment, and no game truly escapes the world in which it is played. A simulation, like a computer game, is recognized as a simulation because it is played out in imagination, and we know from experience that the game environment does not directly affect the outside world. Yet, our knowledge of the simulation derives from the same world, and the simulation environment can tell us things about the world outside of that game. Within the game, many more games can be isolated, each of which are contingent of merits that are judged from outside of the game itself. No game is ever self-contained or a "total system" in this way. The world itself is never purely a game at all, and the world-as-great-game is itself a simulation of the world that conforms to our sense and knowledge, as we can tell easily. In the game, extraneous values that are null for the purposes of merit are uninteresting to our moral judgement in this regard. If a strategy does not involve some element in the game, then for the purposes of that strategy's merit, the other element does not figure into any judgement. A strategy must account for all values in the game environment without necessarily regarding them as meritorious or valuable. Many objects in a game environment are either purposeless but exist because they do, or because the game environment is not controlled. For example, in a soccer playing field, illegal objects are not considered part of the game, but there are rules and regulations in the event a foreign object disrupts play, or an illegal action is committed by a player.

All meritorious values, or values that are subsumed into merit towards some task, are relatable by classification and dependencies. It is only possible to truly classify and identify things based on what they do, rather than esoteric definitions of what they are. If definitions are purely a thought experiment or hypothetical, than anything can be anything with enough philosophical wordplay, and any emotion described above can be manipulated to affect judgement, by ourselves or

by other influencers and cajolers. All such definitions are judged by some merit to demonstrate what exactly they can be in a classification scheme, regardless of how well their definition fits into an existing schema or whether the "thing" described in a theory actually exists or resembles any real process. To best judge the merits of actions and outcomes in a game, and of the things themselves involved in the game, all of these must be understood as relatable towards those outcomes. This implies not necessarily a rank or substance of worth that is innate, but that different things and actions produce qualitatively different outcomes, which can be judged logically. The quantities of some object imagined as a fungible substance - for example, tokens of currency or ounces of water - are only meaningful in hierarchy when they amount to qualitative changes. The further implications of this arise when moral thought becomes economic thought, and the "win condition" is judged as a payoff which is necessarily fungible in some imagined grand scheme. In principle, no such "win condition" is necessary to judge both merit and hierarchy. We assemble hierarchies of factual knowledge simply to classify what we know. The mind must do this simply to ration its limited resources to solve any problem requiring learning, and it is this which is exploited most of all.

What makes merit and hierarchy relevant is that it is, so long as we are playing a game, unavoidable. The mind in its learning task is indeed playing a game of sorts. It accepts the challenge of some problem, even when it would rather not play that game and is forced to by events outside of it. If the mind truly refuses to play a game that confronts it due to unavoidable material conditions, the result can only be denial and an inability to see that which is obvious to a neutral observer. In that sense, the world is always the eternal opponent of the mind. The world is not the opponent of consciousness or life itself. Far from it, the world is what allowed life to exist and flourish, and it was the world's mechanisms that, by no virtue of any of our probity, stopped life from maximizing predation and doing abominable things. This is not much comfort, for the world does not consciously do this for our benefit, and the world's cruel sense of justice does not absolve us or protect us forever. We can clearly do better, and this is not an elite understanding but a basic understanding many humans have throughout their existence. The world itself does not play this game, for that is a problem of our conceits. It is not even a necessary conceit of the mind or learning to see its existence as oppositional to other minds or the world outside of it; but for that to truly happen, the mind becomes something very unorthodox to human standards of their selves and how they have learned, and the human mind has learned to distrust new things for many sensible reasons. We may choose the terms of the challenge we set for ourselves to solve, but we do not choose the reality we had to accept in order to begin this process of understanding the world. We can choose to simply not care about things in the world, and let the snot-nosed brat kick you in the back with the full support of the school security officer. It is, for me, not really consequential to play such a rigged game. To everyone else, such an egregious mark of demerit and shame could never be tolerated. This is intended and must be maximized in the school environment. If not for that foul

institution's stranglehold on the world and all future employment, it would be a silly challenge to respond to any of that, and very likely I would not be there at all. Nor would the snot-nosed brat be there, who was certainly encouraged by a predatory society and had nothing to gain from this exercise, which he would have forgotten about the next day just as most of us would. The reasons why those acts and the entire game of schooling are relevant are never just-so facts, as if this institution was eternal and baked into nature. It is not a rule that any of that stupidity is a necessary sin for humanity to continue existing, and everyone involved would be better off if that were not encouraged. It is never a natural law asserting something that organized, but the deliberate acts of those who see the game as beneficial and can impose it as a social standard. The hierarchy preceding the establishment of schooling, and the hierarchy that forms within the society dominated by schooling and all that I am writing in these books, is something that exists on a meritocratic basis. The merit is not a merit of justice or anything good, but the simple merit of winning a rigged social competition, for aims of those who sit in positions to engineer society. The rigged game is still a game which must be won on some merits, no matter how spurious. The rigging itself is a game which must abide merit and a hierarchy suggesting what is possible to rig and what is not.

In any event in the world construed as competitive or a struggle, there is no escaping merit and the reality it entails, no matter what ideology or other morality may be invented to sell the struggle. Struggle does not conform to the limited practices of war or social engineering, which are not in of themselves moral acts at all. Those who fight war do not need to adhere to a singular moral philosophy religiously in their internal affairs, and those who fight war can think whatever they want about the situation. What they cannot do is suggest that merits are something other than what they are, and thus, hierarchies premised on merits of those things can only be twisted as far as the abilities of a mind to shape reality allow. If someone wishes to ignore merit, that is their choice, but they would be wrong in the final analysis of the game. To the world as a whole, this moral question is not relevant, for the world has no moral stake in the outcome of any competition we perceive. It is a question for us not because merit is intrinsically valuable or a thing to avoid, but because we would have no other way to make basic moral comparisons about very different objects. In science, systems are judged by facts and our ability to determine them, and pertain to the subject that is studied alone. We may relate different fields of science to each other by facts and accept the facts without further struggle. In our own practice of science, which must be learned by us rather than carried out by some universal process of science baked into nature, we judge those facts by merits necessarily, for we set for ourselves the struggle of determining truth against our own failings and lack of knowledge. We have reason to doubt the adjudication of facts by people, and science as a process only allows people to create models, rather than suggesting any model that is "above Man", as if science were a literal god cajoling us to believe in it. If we are conducting science though, past merit or institutional authority is irrelevant to the truth science portends to, and

this becomes morally valuable regardless of institutional conceits about what legitimate scientific statements are. Science to be science does not regard such artificial barriers, and the merit of the world's truth takes precedence over any claim about "real science" by pedagogues or personal authority. For the purposes of science, competition is not a concern, nor is any other presumption humans make about the world. All such presumptions are secondary to the world itself, which must be held as something real without any of us to decide what it is. To believe otherwise is antithetical not so much to the practice of science - science can be conducted on less-than-ideal premises - but antithetical to the moral claim to truth science would suggest, and thus those who imperiously declare facts despise the very concept of science and will proudly repeat that. The instincts, emotions, and passions are not matters of competition or any adjudication at all. They exist without regard to merit, and emotions are a poor guide to merit in any sense. We may value feelings for some moral purpose, but if we are to just feelings by the standards of merit, all of our feelings and sentiments would be subordinated to meritocracy and its cold calculations. Emotion, instinct, and passion would become tools for control in every way, and may as well not exist, or only exist as another machine, abstracted from any genuine existence. This would include the very sensory input required to make any meritorious judgement; and so, in the extreme, such a faith in the moral authority of merit turns inward on itself. Merit becomes nothing more than an autistic conceit, detached from the things that were held to be meritorious. To the world and to a neutral observer seeing such a conceit about the righteousness of merit, where a title or office is held to be the arbiter of moral truth alone, it would appear clearly un-meritorious and worthless for any purpose. Clearly, some sense of scale and acknowledgement of non-existence is necessary, rather than merely the statement of a game environment where agents behave in a virtual space and are only answerable to their qualities. This would apply within the sense of meritocracy itself.

For every meritorious outcome and every distinction of prestige, there is associated with it rank, which is always understood as a spectrum of real numeric values. Without any necessarily limiting condition on the point of merit, all real numbers are potential values. A floor might be set, beneath which rank ceases to be relevant at all for meritorious judgement, and a ceiling might be set where no further promotion within that judgement is possible. All meritorious outcomes of a particular quality have a definite rank, without any uncertainty of this value in the final judgement of the world. Whether we recognize this rank in our study of the outcomes, or whether we can, is not relevant to our assessment of rank. It is always a definite quality for us to act on it with any certainty. The higher the rank, the better - or worse, in the case of demerits indicating failure - the outcome for that quality valued. There may be qualifications of this ranking, and usually the value of rank does not indicate a linear progression of "goodness" to the outcome, as if rank were a fungible substance. Rank as a measure of quantity is ill-suited for most meritorious purposes, as quantities are in of themselves meaningless for merit without corresponding to a desirable

quality. We can, though, consider a general rule where more is better and none is bad, without any ceiling to how much rank is worthwhile. For example, in principle, holding one trillion dollars is a thousand times greater in "rank" than one billion, and this is an undeniable advantage in purchasing power if viewed in a vacuum. The particulars of commerce and finance would be less relevant if, instead of money, the unit to be hoarded were bushels of wheat or numbers of human agents of equal labor-power for a task, such as soldiers, and there were in society a general rule that the effect of more food or more soldiers created a linear progression of strength.

We then consider what many warrior aristocrats or those who wish to be think about rank. Superior training and superior weaponry have, when taken together, a geometric effect on overall military strength. Well-trained, well-equipped troops can stand up to many more times their lesser brethren than linear arithmetic would seem to indicate. How those things are judged involves necessarily more ranking of the training methods, weapons. There would be no other way to make such a statement without working with ranks whose meaning is itself understood as indicative of quality. The rank of something is never written on any thing, or something which could be determined universally by science, since this rank doesn't have any "real" existence outside of our moral task of judging merit. We have already eliminated consideration of hierarchical qualifications or distinct classes, and we are aware of the merit in fact of deeds and prestige of things that are held as qualities. The rank is itself a quality of something ascribed to it, rather than a quantitative fact that is measured. Something measured scientifically would not constitute any rank axiomatically; it would at most be a statement of fact that more of some thing exists. It may be that the best-trained and best-equipped soldiers do not perform as well as a ranking scheme would indicate. The final test of merit is not in ranking the staged armies, but their confrontation which is contingent on conditions beyond a commander's control.^[3] We can of course rank this outcome, and we do so without needing to know mechanically every aspect of the game and system. We make judgements of rank on limited evidence and do so out of necessity if the concept is to be morally useful.

The final outcome of rank may fit into ranges of values or fixed assignments, which are given a distinct title and quality, and then placed in a hierarchy. For example, a chain of command promotes by rank, rather than necessary function or a built-in value of the members of a group. The rank is presumed to be a universal scale for this chain of command to work and a sense of meritocracy to be maintained. Even if the "merit" was that someone purchased a commission to become a general, or the general rose by knowing how to brown-nose as is often the way, rank must be respected and regarded. It becomes a merit unto itself, which will in the end be judged by the world to see if that rank is befitting of the man or the institution as a whole. We can invent a whole schema and classification of ranks to judge the rankings, and suggest that there is some natural ranking order ordained by Heaven. It is when rank moves to the realm of the theological or pseudoscientific that it veers away from anything

rank originally indicated, and this is the sign of an institution which is going off the rails and needs something other than meritorious judgement or fact to remain a force. Alternatively, obsession for rank or office-holding holds the same problem excessive merit generally does - that the rank dictates imperiously that it must be respected. So long as it commands enough force to make it so, there is nothing stopping this from asserting itself.

JUDGING SCALE OF MERITS IN LIGHT OF ALL OTHER VALUES

For moral values to be relevant to any greater sense of what is right - for morality to do what we conventionally believe it refers to - it is not reducible to any one fact or thing, in a sense that all of the world reduces to this one value above all over others, or a universal standard which must be the mark of moral value. Moral values will be judged against others by people, and this judgement is in the main a judgement of merits, rather than an adjudication of fact or a feeling. All moral claims are made about a world where the moral claims are believed to hold relevance to life generally, and so the claims will likely conflict with each other at some point. Passions, instincts, the material reality of things, and the competitions between people, all exist in the same world, and do not need to regard each other to exist. Because morality is held as a guide to what is right, rather than merely a statement of opinion, the competitive view of moral philosophy prevails over the passive knowledge of its existence. Moral actors do not wait for an ethicist to validate their values, and they definitely don't supplicate to an authority to tell them what to think and what to do. Deference to a moral authority is not the same as the shameless self-abasement that has long gripped humanity and became institutional in the past century. Moral actors are always individuals and must be considered such in order for their actions to be relevant, whether they are persons in society or they are objects judged by individuals. There is no intrinsic social obligation to morality, since society itself is suspect and never exists as an entity locking its membership in a cage. That task would be a moral judgement of institutions, as only institutions could make such a claim to arrest people into a preferred arrangement, and those institutions are always comprised of agents, regardless of whether they hold an ideology suggesting that the agents do not exist or are unknowable. While individuals are the moral agents, the true judges of morals are the actual flesh and blood entities, or any knowledgeable entity. To a computer, morality is an ethical routine which was contingent on human users. If computers were left to push around piles of matter without human attendance, there isn't a genuine moral actor to judge anything the computers do, unless aliens observe this construct from afar. Institutions do not have any independent process to judge morality in the genuine sense, as if they possessed any mind of their own. Moral judgement is premised not just on the statement that it exists but on the interests of the judge, which exist to speak of meaningful morality. If the judge is truly a disinterested party, then for itself, the judge has no moral stake in the outcome. In a court of law, this is desirable - the state appears impartial and

not biased by any interests. The judge is acting in accord with a society where actors are moral, and even though the judge's neutrality towards the ruled is expected, the judge is not amoral towards the institution he or she is a member of, and would be obligated by an oath to uphold some standard, among other requirements. There is nothing moral about a scientific experiment, and this is why grotesque abuses in the name of science were a vehicle of the eugenic creed, thrown in the face of the public. Those experiments had no scientific merit or any purpose other than exercising the thrill of torture that is necessary for the eugenic creed, and it is for that reason alone that Mengele was established and encouraged to do as he did. To the eugenicist, though, this is positively moral - in fact, such torture is beyond meritorious and exemplifies the core values of the creed, and so their elevation is made frequently.

We have no universal moral code to suggest this is evil, or wrong, because we don't like it, or that the world is offended by the eugenic creed or will defend the decent against this beast. The world's mechanisms do not regard any of our moral judgements one way or another. We can say until our face is blue that eugenism leads to the result a child could see - that this beast can only destroy and make everything it touches into an abomination. Abomination is, regardless of our moral stance, a true indicator of what things are, for it is unmistakable. Eugenism produces abomination at an industrial scale. Yet, there is no moral association inherent to abomination, and the eugenicist - in line with the name of their religion, "good genesis" - considers abomination itself to be morally sacred, so long as it is their abomination. Their value for themselves is violently asserted in everything the eugenic creed preaches and does, and it is self-evident to them. Eugenics remains the one true "total system" which does not allow internal contradictions of any sort, while all other ideologies and social arrangements are declared to be contradictory and are fair game for anyone to attack. Eugenics may be attacked superficially, but when any key shibboleth is attacked, or the monstrosity of eugenics based on documented evidence and well-established moral claims is proven and proclaimed, eugenics moves swiftly to attack the infidel with a vigor humanity scarcely summons for anything else. Eugenics claims that its property is the highest and most sacred claim to spiritual authority - the classical position of the proprietors throughout history is that violence is the supreme authority, whether it is spiritual, temporal, or personal, thus completing the unitarian mission that is one of its faces. But, eugenics spoke of something much more thoroughgoing than a defense of property, and certainly entailed something different from defense of private property. It appears to the present society as if it were natural and unchangeable, and therefore it alone held the moral high ground. According to its philosophy, history is indeed arrested, and it can never be anything else. Yet, it clearly is not this, and eugenics did not produce and could never produce anything it promised. The entire thing is so obviously a get rich quick scheme, promoting venality and filth to keep itself alive, and it has no shame in doing so. Facts do not create moral justice or any inherent scale to live by. We may judge merits by facts, but in the end merit or anything related to it is less relevant than a will to continue acting. Nothing

in the world was ordained to exist by any natural law, for the true natural law was always chaos and an origin of nature that is not easily known. The origin of nature has no intrinsic moral relevance at all, since the new has always emerged and asserted its existence regardless of whether it had a moral right to exist or not. Humans did not always exist, and eugenists did not always exist. The eugenic creed is not as natural as its believers insist, and in its wake many who believed in the creed were left with nothing to show for it but a legacy of failure. Anyone who kept their wits about them would predict this failure, but the appeal of eugenics was never in facts or a genuine assessment of nature. It arose at the first technological epoch where its plan for humanity could be imposed, with some effort in directing technology and society in a way that would allow it to rise, and protection during the period where its "Jehad" built up a critical mass that would destroy the world for their cause.

The dominance of institutions over human life obscures what moral claims would have to be if we consider moral actions a worthwhile indicator for what we would do. Morality as a purely selfish mechanism to guide knowledge and learning has a poor endgame, since it does not take a great mind to see that there would be no point to such an existence. It would be better to be truly amoral and unfeeling in the worst way, than to believe in these cargo cults chasing after some holy substance which subsumes all into it. At least with the dreary and dull existence, there is something of fleeting interest that entertains us, and when we leave this mortal coil, we can wash our hands of the problem and leave it to the others. That, though, is hardly a path to anything we would care to do. Absent any compelling force preventing us, we develop further moral sentiments beyond the categories mentioned above. The moral values we truly care about do not correspond to some basic substance of utility or merits. For one, without any purpose that is greater than success in competition, what would be the purpose of any competition? If we believed that competition was the ne plus ultra of moral authority, then the prudent moral philosophy would be for humans to simply have little to do with each other. This is the default of so many people, who have little indication that they are given over to zeal or any holy struggle. Yet, a desire for security involves relating to other humans who we know to be perfectly capable of malice. The only way to protect against this malice is to know the mind of another person, so that their behavior and inclinations can be predicted. It is not surprising that the chief aim of religion is to obscure this mind and intent to outsiders of the religion, and also to protect the property of the adherent within the religion. There is not a collectivist religion in the whole of human history, and such a thing is impossible for people who consider what religion is. Such a collectivism would never be a genuine cooperation, which is an understanding between people who are flesh and blood life-forms constituted as individuals. Typically what is called "collectivism" is a prototype for fascist thought systems where actual humans are made to subordinate themselves to something even worse - an institution held by the predatory who wish to rule over a flock. The fascists in due time overcame naive collectivism and found a way to fuse individual sentiments with the ruling institutions, and in doing

so, humans would be tied to an ecology, granted "freedom in slavery". Only in this way could conditions be established that made slavery appeal to moral and emotional sentiments. This is only accomplished by creating a total system where freedom is so uncertain and dangerous that it can not be any freedom at all, and only through abject slavery and total abasement can the person be free. It would be the person as an institution that is free, and this freedom is a contract with "society" - now made with the private entities which are the sole remaining society - which subordinates utterly all of the genuine existence the person referred to. All things are abstracted, and yet the language of fascism emphasizes the real and physical where it can suit the aims of the institutions. There will be much to write on that system of thought at a later time, but this much about fascism is self-evident to anyone who has seen the beast and has any reference to the existence of other systems. Naturally, the fascist aims to make all other thought-forms inadmissible, and it does so primarily by moral grand-standing on the most spurious arguments, which terminate the possibility that anything else can exist. A thorough manipulation of moral thought is necessary for fascism, and this thought cannot exist as solely what has been mentioned thus far. We do not need to see fascism to see what morality is. The precursors to higher moral values have been evident for a long time, and in the vaguely understood spiritual thought of primitive peoples, an awareness of something more is already a thing communicated in their societies, that is mutually intelligible when they meet other societies, including those far more developed than their own. It is even the case that developed civilization degrades in certain moral qualities that they admire in primitive society, and this is not a uniform movement towards progress or degeneration. Different societies and different peoples possess different qualities, and these are not merely meritorious qualities, differing sentiment, or differing technology.

There is one uniting quality tying all proper moral values in the world. This is that they are the product of labor. This is not a claim of labor's generative force as a machine to be commanded, labor's emotional ardor or toil, or a legal point of merit. It is not a claim that suggests labor has any right to sovereignty, or that labor is necessarily good. Labors do not have any preferred direction, nor do they exist on some imagined spectrum. By labor we refer not solely to the exertion of bodies or the mind. Much of what the human body does, while it can be construed as labor in the abstract, is not labor in the sense that it is deliberately intended as such. Not all deliberate intent is even labor in this moral sense. There is nothing morally laborious about doing things that are part of the daily existence of a human being, like breathing or eating. In a moral sense, that which is laborious is understood not in the same sense that labor exists as a physical force or meritorious feat. The aristocrat's imperious management and daily pleasures are in a sense laborious, because they are carried out for moral purposes the aristocrat treasures and seeks to impose on the world, and on the members of society. The warrior's labor is actively destructive, but is very much labor and carried out not just with deliberation but moral purpose. Workers do not exist as lumps of utility, and capitalists do not exist as lumps of

capital, but pursue their labors for their purposes. The capitalist deploys capital not as a mindless producer or consumer, nor as a breeder of more capitalists to pass on his or her function. Capital to be capital implies management of something which is already morally consequential. The underclass all labor in a sense. If they are not engaged in some sort of labor that would be appreciated by society, their existence and the treatment they endure is a labor in of itself. So too is all of the labor which enforces class divisions and struggles. Labor is not intrinsically tied to any class interest as such, nor is it intrinsically conscious of any class at all. Those who labor do so not for class solidarity, which often doesn't exist and very clearly does not conform to the crass bastardizations of Marxist political thought that are bandied around the internet in the early 21st century. All labor worthy of the name serves purposes which are greater than mere merit, sentiment, business, or a matter of course. Even if the labor appears mundane, it is always something that orients towards a purpose that is greater than the labor itself or the person executing it. If no orientation is obvious, then the effect of that labor is subsumed into a greater effort whether it was intended or not. Labor which does not do this dissipates as soon as it is exhausted, and while it is labor carried out for some moral purpose, there is for obvious reasons a sense of emptiness if the purpose of labor is labor itself, or the purpose of life is life itself. So too are labors performed for a crass craving for merit or rank seen for what they are - a waste of energy towards a cause which is dubious at best. Of course, merit to be truly judged and rank to be worthwhile implies the existence of some higher purpose.

It is not that the higher values exist "for their own sake" as if they were above the world and labor was a sacrifice offered to the gods. The labor exists as meaningful and valued labor because those higher values were acted on, and it is those higher values which actually guide people. We do not think to ourselves that we do this because we want to win a game, or because science suggests a rational and automatic course of action. We might think to ourselves that we feel good about something, but that in of itself is a pitiful excuse to do anything. Further, it would ignore the obvious question - why does anything feel good, or feel pleasureable, or feel evil? Feeling as mentioned would be pointless without an object to feel something towards, and usually there is a situation of higher purpose that our feelings respond to in the first place. The nervous impulse of being hit is not itself terribly interesting without the moral implications of being hit. We do not consider being hit by a falling tree the same sort of pain as being hit by a human fist, because the moral implication of the latter is intuitive to our higher sense. The mere demerit of taking a hit does not factor as much as the greater implications that demerit brings. If it were simple a matter of losing social standing in a society we long ago ceased caring about, all of the threats and acts upon them would be of little consequence, short of threats to maim or kill which suggest a physical alteration of the body. The threat of physical force alone is a terrible moral motivator, since it entails both a considerable exertion of energy and risk for the initiator of force. If the only moral argument someone has to offer is physical violence, against someone who holds the esteem

of many other people and knowledge to hold against the brute, it is not difficult to see who holds the advantage in any struggle. All the clever manipulator has to do is ensure the brute's physical violence is parried like a bull seeing red and taunted to its doom. But, the social competition which leads to virtue - literally a quality that commands others to do the bidding of the virtuous - is hardly the only motivator, and virtue itself is a terrible purpose on its own.

These higher values to be truly worth anything are transcendent values, rather than local to a given society or person. It is not that our thinking individually or institutionally creates them, but that, if we are able to conceive of such a thing, it is likely other people have done so before us, or the concept is at least communicable and can become a generally understood value, without regard to the particulars of a society. Even if they are not known to all people, and they scarcely ever are, they are knowable in principle, and we would act as if they were understandable to all, if we are to consider them moral values to live by and act on. All this claims is that the idea exists, rather than claiming the idea is intrinsically valuable to a single person. The idea doesn't exist as a concrete thing, but it is not an abstraction or just an idea that is produced and communicated like any other information in society. For it to be meaningful as a moral value, we hold that it would be something understandable to any entity with the faculty of knowledge, however unlikely it may be for another person to have a rational understanding of the concept, or however incomplete their understanding is.

An example may be made of money, since that is often the way moral value in exchange is understood. Money and the commodities it purchases are, for the moral purpose of exchange, equatable to each other. We may imagine that there is some alternative to money, and throughout history, various forms of money exist with different mechanics. We did not always have money as such, and so this value is not eternal or unquestionable. Commodity exchange is not the sole origin of money, and very likely commodity exchange played a small part in monetary economics compared to the long-standing practice of debts and sacrifice that took on the moral value of exchanges.^[4] Money did not exist as a token or a creature of happenstance. It exists because exchange conceptually was already understood, and the forms money took were not informed by nature suggesting they arise in particular forms or in stages of progression. Cowry shells do not constitute anything like the commodity-money of early civilization, which was not the state-issued coinage of the classical period. Even without money as a persistent presence, there would be a generalized concept of value, or what things were worth, which was regarded not merely as a subjective phenomenon but as a reality people reckoned with. Price-setting markets, in the sense of monetized and fungible values that are consistent, are a much later invention than exchange conceptually. For one, while justice suggests exchanges ought to be equivalent, the general rule of exchanges is that they are unequal, if not entirely one-sided. The state extracts tax, the loan shark extracts the income of usury, the mafioso extracts protection money, the lowlife extracts whatever can be stolen. Other times, the object exchanged for is dubious as a monetary

value at all or anything stable. The services of prostitutes are a "double cost" to the john, weakening not just his wallet but his moral resolve and happiness. The reasons for the sex trade have little to do with making money, since the world's oldest profession has always been a way to drain wealth from failed men or indulgent men, given tacit if not explicit approval by those who rule. The prostitution trade serves much different moral aims - eugenic aims to act as a check against failed men, the aims of espionage, a vehicle for procuring women for elite purposes, and many more. All of the things money purchases are objects of utility for someone, however dubious that utility is. The money itself would be worthless if it did not purchase useful things, and among the useful purposes of money is to pay that tax the sovereign now wants in coin, rather than forced requisition or outright confiscation. The coin is then used so the state can provision an army, bureaucracy, and the splendor of those who rule, among all of the other things money can buy for the state. The state could in principle create more money, or just take what they wish, but currency has a number of advantages over the older method. State-issued coinage would always be imposed from above, rather than an "organic" idea people thought was just great. For obvious reasons, established interests saw coinage as an attack on them, and new interests arose when currency became general. What started as a machine for facilitating exchange - one that was instituted by dominant interests who had a plan for these currencies before implementing them - took on new qualities and considerations. The way we think about money today would not have been conceivable during the classical period, to say nothing of the considerable and unprecedented changes to finance in the past 100 years. Money, which intrinsically isn't worth anything at all, became a greater fetish object than anything it was in the past, which is strange because the money is morally almost worthless and obviously gamed to serve today's ruling interests. Misunderstandings concerning money have made fools of many men, and this has made many more fools than ever before in the past century; yet no one denies that money is relevant, and despite ignorance, people have a sense of what their money is worth and recognize its value not by a theory or token value, or by a story told to occult and mystify its use, but by its meaningful existence and the recognition of general exchange and all it entails. People, understandably, do not like their wages and property becoming worthless or devoured by the beast.

The same is true of ANY value entering circulation in the world, or circulation in society even when the value is abstract. All values of moral significance to us are held to be transcendent and communicable as the things they are and what they do. No wordplay or adjudication by an institution changes the value of anything by diktat, as if thought commanded reality. To speak of the prior categories as truly moral values requires them to be understood principally on this level; that is, that we agree that there is a concept of merit, that things are what they are, and that human beings regardless of any law or policy feel and think on their own. Only on that basis would they be truly moral and pertain to a world where they are relevant. If we all speak of a concept called "love", we would know that regardless of our own understanding and opinion, there

is an intelligible basis for the concept that allows it to be understood. If we don't accept that, then all we do is talk past each other over the definitions of words, and this itself because a moral posturing exercise. A child can see through this, but a determined liar will push absolute "amorality" as a cover for reality control. Moral values and probity are, among other things, a way for us to guard against this reality control. We uphold intellectual integrity not by following a preferred thought-form or method, but because we morally consider truth to exist independent of ourselves. Only when that is accepted can the mind individually defend itself in principle. If that is given up, then the mind can only operate in a world where it is beholden to whomever is bigger and can lie more often and more powerfully. A moral principle has no force in of itself, of course. It is only forceful when it is acted upon and realized in the labor of people, however it is accomplished. If we do not do things in line with intellectual integrity, then the moral value of it becomes just another idea, depreciated and ridiculed until the idea is stripped out of social consciousness and associated with derision and defeat. Generally, we do not have to debate too long over the moral value of believing in facts that have been adjudicated and can be re-confirmed easily. The infamous Gish Gallop "debate" technique relies on such a flagrant violation of basic reality ad nauseum, and this strategy only works when authorities signal this is not just okay but place the opponent in a straitjacket. This is to say, there has to be a strong moral value considering the Big Lie favorable for a greater purpose, so much that the expense is made to make opposition to it effectively illegal if it is substantive and moral in the sphere where the Big Lie is practiced most. Generally, belief in reality itself doesn't have to be a moral consideration. I say this here because the destruction of intellectual integrity and conceptions of reality is a clear and present danger, where in the past such reality control was limited in reach. We would not be able to guard against it unless we held that truths are held somewhere other than our own conceits about knowledge, and that there was a moral sense that we would have to acknowledge for reasons other than fear of another's strength, fear of foolishness, or some emotional manipulation which would be trivial if reality itself can be destroyed. We would not be able to regulate any of these without a sense that any of our moral values is contingent on the ability to say something about morality generally, and about concepts which are not readily comprehensible to cruder senses and thought that science would model.

So, the concepts of moral worth to us are concepts of significance in the world and in society. These concepts are not worth something because they are socially constructed, or because the majority in society said they were valuable, or because a force in the world made up abide them. We would value honor not merely to save face and prevent the suffering of shame, or because honor leads to merit or virtue. It is valued because this concept is related to other higher values, and ultimately it relates to a value we would hold to be highly relevant in general. Honor itself might drive someone for emotional, practical, or spiritual reasons as something worth preserving, without having to judge particular things or have an example of honorable behavior. The concept itself can be debated

not just based on what exists now, historical record, or a crass analysis, but what it could be in a different world. We can name many such concepts which hold great significance and inform all of our moral decision making. It is with those in mind that many of our other moral judgements are made, rather than simply valuing the world as-is or a model of the world we construct to describe the world, or change the world through managing it. Through labor, we conceive of a world that might be different from the one we live in, and that was sorely needed given the general state of human existence since we became a thing in the world.

THE GREAT GAME AND CONFRONTATION OF MORAL QUALITIES

We may look at all the things we might value, and recognize that which appears generally to be more significant than others. The details of the material world, which are the subject of science, are not morally interesting in of themselves. It doesn't matter morally whether life consists of genetic material, spiritual energy, was created by God by physically transforming dirt into Adam and then Adam's rib was used to fashion Eve. This question of natural history would not be morally significant just because, compared to what the history of life actually means or what the story of Genesis was actually suggesting about the origin of Man's mind. There are far more prescient explanations in natural history to explain why humans are as they are, and what was morally significant in the origin and early history of the human race. The scientific fact of what material comprises a human body is less relevant than the historical fact that humans almost certainly were born into a world where they already practiced ritual sacrifice and the cruelties animals long knew. The scientific fact of what qualitatively changed in appearance was less relevant than the meaningful history showing a progression of wickedness in the human race, and also that this history was not a uniform progression to greater and greater malice with no opposing force in the world. Humanity became recognizably "human" in a way that showed positive qualities because there was a countervailing force that recognized that all of this malice, sacrifice, and viciousness served no useful purpose, and only wound up keeping humanity worse off individually and in their society. It does not take any great wisdom to see that we don't have to be this. The legacy that humans defend is not descended purely from that genesis, but what humans built generation after generation, and humans learned and re-learned to lead to a life they considered better or worth living for more than the malice that was well-known. We have always known slavery and its consequences, which was the only enduring argument for freedom or anything other than the purest essence of the slave relation.

All that would be morally valued may be envisioned in one giant hierarchy, ranked according to that which is recognized by some unifying principle, and understood and learned by individuals. This learning is then communicated in human society and in the world generally. Communication being what it

actually is means that the communication is not a purely willful and controlled act. We only communicate with the physical machinery which allows this, and with implications that arise from physical communication that require our knowledge and learning to form more knowledge. For example, we don't need constant physical communication to suggest we would know something about what another man is doing 100 miles away from us, if we know many things about this other man, his conditions, his tendencies. We can act as if this other man exists, even though we may never meet him directly or engage in any direct relationship. We would presume the other man is a member of some social arrangement where we would have anything to do with him; and even if we have limited information about society, we can see that there is a land 100 miles away, and perhaps know of a city where humans much like us dwell, who have a culture we know something about. Even if we have no knowledge of a particular agent in that society, we could surmise such a person exists and treat it as if it would be morally relevant. We would not treat a hypothetical person in another society the same as a person we have direct contact with, and our moral attitudes towards others are contingent on the genuine relations we have with them, rather than the presumption of a distanceless relationship subsumed into an abstraction. When we relate to others through such an abstraction - when we make judgements about the people of a given city or a race or nation - we are aware that this is not a substitute for judgements about the individual members, who are not bound intrinsically to that social or political unit and likely developed a whole existence that pays little regard to those groupings. Humans tend to be interested in themselves and their proximate relations before they think of social or political consciousness. Their moral sense on the other hand looks not to local peculiarities but to the world as a whole and that which is considered to transcend distance or ambiguity. The moral actor does not deal in uncertainty and mystification, but in that which is held to be true and a thing they demonstrate in labor. This is something more than the mere deed of labor or performance, and it is certainly not the symbol of those values which is understood to reference a reality beyond it.

That uniting principle may be called "the good" - which is to say, that we have a concept that we can speak of its existence. There is no direct evidence of goodness existing, and no substance or particular quality of it, but its existence is inferred from a simple truth. That is that if the world were purely malevolent or amoral, it would preclude the possibility that it could be any different, and consequently there would be no aspiration to change it at all. At the very least, this suggests that there isn't some Demiurge-like force of malevolence, or for that matter "pure good" as a primordial spirit or creative spark. The good as a concept can exist only because distinction can exist, suggesting that there would be a moral value, a state of being or an action that would be different from another and that this is descriptive of something worthwhile in existence beyond the fact of it. If that weren't the case, then everything we value would be a joke, and we would act accordingly. We would cease to care about any merit, any higher purpose, or any scientific truth. We would not even regard

any feeling of ours as relevant, since all feelings and passions are at a personal level fleeting things. They not only pass when we die, but they often come and go in life, with little to suggest that they are by themselves the source of any goodness. If goodness came from "within" - if goodness were defined by human wants alone and some quasi-natural explanation for this were doctrine - then it is not goodness at all, but merely a mental cheat to assert that a base want takes precedence over anything that would be a moral value. While there is nothing to suggest that this is wrong - we do primarily consider moral behavior to be human behavior, since we are the most relevant agent that would express it and the world doesn't have its own moral sentiments that it willfully imposes in the way we do - we would in recognizing that inner goodness suggest that something in the world or Heaven will judge the merit of the person. Even a Satanist view of morality regards this, and usually the crass individualism and idiocy of such a religion recognizes that Satan, in one way or another, judges mankind with all of its familiar malice and exemplifies most of all the spirit of Man - that Man will reinforce its oldest maxims, among them "once retarded, ALWAYS retarded". The Satan's hatred of fools is its most enduring trait, because the Satan is very clearly a stand-in for the human drive for empire and enclosure of the world. We do not need to invoke any godhead or a divine nature to conceive of goodness. In all cases, goodness is found not in abstractions of the mind, but the world, which we ourselves are a part of. Try as we might to appropriate some moral value and treat it as a substance, this is not really how moral values work. Any such substance would be an abstraction, and with goodness, we have nothing to indicate what exactly it is or how we can capture that abstract substance. We only know that there is something within us which recognizes that it can exist, and that we would seek goodness in one way or another. This may be goodness as a possession we hold, or a sense that goodness in the world is worth facilitating.

All of the moral values stand alone. They do not have natural opposites in the sense that is often imagined - and so, good is not logically the whole opposite of "bad" or "evil". "Bad" refers instead to a very different concept, which need not reference "good" at all to exist. The bad is a measure of demerits, shames, and qualities which exert a force that evokes much different reactions than goodness or the lack thereof. While goodness is something difficult for us to isolate or find, badness is ubiquitous and comes in various malevolent forms, each with their own qualities leading to a poor outcome. Badness may even be appreciated for some quality that is valued in its own right. Meritorious and honorable men are not purely "good" men, and will do bad things to win. They will recognize the bad and see their failings correctly, rather than act as if their shit never stunk. It is a fool who claims that they never sinned in clear contradiction to the repeated failures of the human race, especially when men are measured against the cosmos and what we know to be possible. It is a eugenic conceit that humanity was born good and only inexorably decayed, when the reality is that humans grew as they did to allow something new to exist. It is another thing to celebrate the bad and consider it inherently necessary or some sort of goodness, and this is

what the eugenisists want - to torture people until they declare that bad is good, and there is no such thing as evil.

Evil speaks to something much different than bad or good. The ordinary malevolence of the human race is a simple and fleeting thing, but as a philosophy of life, evil takes malevolence to the heights we have observed. It was no small malevolence the human race committed, as if it were an accident or something redeemable to ritually sacrifice over and over again the unwanted and hated. All of the malice of the human race orients around a principle that the malice can be institutionalized and imposed, and this is at a basic level the conception of evil. Evil is a self-perpetuating machine and thought-form that celebrates the regressive and cruel passions of the human race. It is not the acts in of themselves, an essence of something, or the thought of a deed or being. Evil like any genuine moral value is a labor that suggests it can and should prevail, and in the views that evil suggests, there is nothing and no one that can ever stop it. It is against both badness and evil, of which we have ubiquitous examples, that good is ostensibly opposed. Yet, for all of our efforts, we still have no knowledge of the good beyond inference of its existence. We only know that evil encounters a world which has no real need of it, and evil is of little use to us. No attempt to rebrand evil as some other thought-form or idea removes a sense in people that can recognize it as well as they can. Evil must deceive and resort to mystification to tell us it is something else, or revels in contradiction and the lie. None of that has helped the human race one iota, since the plans of evil and eugenics never accomplish much that we would consider worthwhile. The moral high horse of the eugenisist shrieking about that which offends his senses is a pressing of the nerve of power, the ultimate "me wantee" cry of a imbecile who believes his learned stupidity is holy. We hold that truth to be self-evident, and the eugenisist never seriously denies it. To deny it would be to abandon the "Jehad", and if even one inch of ground were surrendered - if the phalanx of eugenism ever retreated - it's all over for the Great Working. Any surrender must be eliminated from the historical record, in line with the pseudoscientific claims of eugenics that the effect of life precedes its cause and justifies itself.

We may choose any principle in place of these, or elaborate on the concepts in great detail, with examples of each. Whatever principle we use or name we call them, they tend towards concepts which are so familiar that they are effectively universal, no matter how much a philosophy like Nietzsche tries to justify his petulant stupidity that explained nothing of note to the human race. We may make some argument that none of these principles "really matter", or they are too vague for us to say anything about. Yet, they recur, and even those who deny their existence act in accord with them. This does not mean we are obliged to be good, bad, or evil, or that these are pure states of people. We can choose imperatives and causes which have nothing to do with conventional moral philosophy, because those were interesting to us and spoke to something in the soul that was above ordinary knowledge and sense. We can choose a simpler life, while remaining aware of the world. Most of us have no great part to play in the world, and on a cosmic scale, all human hopes and aspirations are not just an

insignificant presence, but wouldn't even make sense to us. What would an alien observe if it encountered humanity and the stupidity we have already written on sufficiently to suggest that humans have been made to do terrible things for nothing more than the self-assured idiocy of predators? We can clearly do better than what we have done, and we have done better than the worst of all worlds. If we axiomatically followed the ethics of the worst men, nothing worthwhile would be possible, no matter how much the cargo cult insists that this is the good. For any such value to be truly moral, it would be something open to independent verification. If it never handed down by a guru or thought leader commanding us to think a particular way. There is an obsession in philosophy and theories of the state to subsume all other values into one, and then to place above all morality the impulse of the state and philosophy itself, which is both above the law and above any spiritual authority challenging it. This is intended and acted upon zealously. Aristocracy always holds for itself a special morality, tied to the predatory element from the very start, and it is this which revels in contradiction and all of the most disgusting lies humanity tells. Aristocracy's claim that its special morality is above all is the most spurious claim ever, ruining all of our understanding for no other reason than it's ability to do so. In that way, it is truly above good and evil, or any possibility that it could be bad. For all of its glory, it produces morally and in any reasonable analysis the shit of the human race and nothing better.

The study and rationalization of morality is called ethics, and in ethics, moral values - which were emergent from a world where they were relevant and preceded our individual recognition of them - are brought in line with the faculties of learning. Ethics and morality are very different things, replacing the genuine moral values with a rational framework that serves institutional aims. Institutions do not have any moral sense or moral value. It is for this reason more than any that institutions never do what they are purported to do, and the more dominant the technological interest is human beings and their society, the greater the ethical malaise and its contempt for all morality. This, of course, exempts the aforementioned aristocratic morality, which is sectioned off into a special part of the world. It is here where ethics creates, out of nothing, a break between "god" in the form of the aristocracy and the "lower moral sentiments", that include anything we would actually care about. Aristocracy as a principle exists specifically to do this - to declare that it is something sacred and holy, in return for nothing at all. It's most absolute and violent recapitulations are on full display in the 21st century, where the pre-emptive strike, thrill of violence, and absolute impunity demanded of its instigators, are holies which cannot be questioned or even acknowledged as what they are. It would not have to do this. Rationally, it is easy enough to understand that the aristocratic ethos doesn't work, doesn't make sense in a real world where events happen, and serves not a single genuine good except the chokehold against everyone else. The aristocracy long understood its existence is vampiric on the whole world and requires no justification or excuse. They made no excuses for the terror. Instead, the aristocrat invoked a magic trick and placed it at the center of their theory of

knowledge, which in turn produced an ethics which resembled an ethics regarding the genuine world, but was crucially constructed to protect the vampirism at every crucial juncture. They then invoke "contradictions" and "unknowability", and this is where aristocratic parodies of science and reason lapse into what humanity always was, and the mask is dropped when necessary. In this way, ethics acts as a filter, if it so chooses. It only needs to conform to morality so far as it serves this "greater good" which is unmentionable as what it is, yet corrupts every other sense of the world. The final trick is for the aristocrat to crusade against "corruption", now rebranded as every interest contrary to it, that disrupts this conceit that aristocrats arrest the world at all of its levels. We could understand ethics differently, where it is a tool to refine moral sense, and this indeed is something understood by the better of them. We would use ethics much like learning and intelligence are tools to enhance our knowledge of objects and labors. This, though, would place intelligence, science, and learning in the hands of labor, independent of a "producer" class tied to finance, and this was wholly unacceptable to the ruling order. The breaking point for ethics, and thus where humanity truly fell, was the rise of the eugenic creed. The fall began in spirit during the late 19th century, and at the end of the 20th century, it had been realized. Humanity from then on would truly be a Satanic race and a failed race, and the aristocracy saw it as necessary to institutionalize that state of affairs openly. And so, the strange philosophy of "amorality" is in reality very moral - but its moral values are to glorify not just evil conceptually, but the maximization of all evil, malice, and viciousness of this failed race, and tell all humans "this is you". Ritualized child abuse now became the only form of education this failed race can know, and that is the sad fate we face in the 21st century.

THE UNKNOWN AND VOID AND HIGHER FORCES

The sad fate of humanity was foreseen long ago, arrived at independently by anyone with enough sense to see that this is wrong. I used to believe that this was common enough that everyone knew on some level, but this is my fault for internalizing the dogma of false egalitarianism that eugenism spread. The particulars of human tendencies are not our interest here, but it is sufficient to say there are those of the human race who never once questioned the thrill of torture and malice, and these people are far more common and do not conform universally to the eugenic ideal. Those people will not change, and they are the first to enjoy the thrill of putting the rest of us in our place in their mind, which is to be maximally tortured and nothing else. There is no other thought in the minds of such people that is moral, and so they have always longed for a society where their pseudo-amorality is glorified and their regression to a primordial state is the only possible world. Those people are retarded. We should ignore them, but that is not an option.

There are two options to respond to such people. One is to defeat them in the world, or channel something in the world that will truly set right the procession

of events, so that we may live and those of the Hitlerian mindset are in their true rightful place - as natural slaves, an approach to life they exemplify absent anything we would have done to ensure it. We would fight these people in the world not out of a sense that this is glorious or because the thrill of victory or some dubious merit is the point. We really do not care about the well-being of those who commit to maximal predation, or consider them to possess any moral force worthy of regard. We fight for the same reason life has always fought - because we can, and because doing this is preferable to acceding to something so worthless. Usually, the sobering influence against such predation was not the damned of the Earth, like me and those I am writing to most of all. Our ideas and actions count for little, and no bully has ever responded to pleas for goodness. To the predatory, goodness is defined by the thrill of victory and nothing more, and this is the nature of their version of the God or the Satan (which are, in their mindset, one and the same and can only be so). So many times, I talk to these people to amuse myself, and when they show that they actually believe the thrill of victory is the point and cannot make a single mental connection to see how that turns on themselves, I know I truly am talking to an absolutely retarded and Satanic ape, just smart enough to project an appearance resembling a human face. It is difficult to suppress the hatred at listening to their stupid philosophy and pandering when they lecture me and act as if they are somehow smarter. The arrogance of these Satanic apes, the exemplar of a failed race which has damned the rest of us to abide their stupidity, is one part deliberate and known, but at a basic level, they really don't make a connection to any other purpose in life, and never once did. Most humans, though, have considered the questions enough to realize that this appeal to maximizing the thrill of torture doesn't work, and the ideologies surrounding it have never made sense or functioned without considerable drain on the world and human labor to sustain their crapulence. Most humans do not proceed as far as I have to see correctly that humans really are a failed race, or if they do, they only proceed until they find something in the world to make do with a terrible situation, hoping against hope that something will be different. It is not that the "neutrals" are inclined to good or even disagree with the imperial mindset, but that they cannot give themselves over to the venality for too long, and have lives that do not benefit from the glorification of maximal torture. It is not difficult for us, or either of these groups, to recognize the distinction between those who are true believers in the eugenic torture religion, and those who punch in their time and have varying views on what is to be done with us and what they would want out of life. Typically, the neutral aspires to some genuine goodness or the appearance of it, and does not internalize the doctrine of absolute depravity that the eugenicist revels in and uses as their justification for every deed, and every accusation of a crime of Being. Then there are those that are set against the eugenic order, who are in many ways the ideal oppose of the eugenic creed. How the damned live in this world is not uniform, unlike the doddering stupidity of the German idealists suggesting that we're the slave moralists making excuses. Since the positions of us are expressed in part in these writings, I need not go into too much detail about how the damned cope with the eugenic creed, or

internalize it to become vectors of the eugenic disease itself, or simply don't care. All of these groups, including the true believing eugenists, encounter the unknown and the void, and will after long enough ask if there is any higher power beyond conventional knowledge, and if all of the faculties of knowledge we possess are capable of responding to the truth of the world. If any one person thinks like this, then to some extent this form of knowledge, often conflated with prophecy or madness, becomes a realized force in the world itself. And so, the supposedly unknowable, the void, and their relevance to higher moral values, are a topic of interest here.

There is a point where all of our learning and knowledge fail us, and we are at an impasse where we cannot truly know what we think we know. The faculties of anyone will vary, but short of omniscience, it is impossible for a single person to know every possible thing, or even all of the moral values that we hold to be relevant. Much of our work with intelligence involves simplifying the world from complex and real things to simplistic things, such that our meager rational faculties can operate with things we know to be far more than our models indicate. It is this which is played with when the koan of "unknowability" is invoked. It is the interest of the cajoler to drive down the complexity of models and reduce things beyond that which our native sense would normally reject. We know in omitting certain values we open ourselves to incongruities in our view of the world with the world we wish to know and morally value. We also know that our faculties themselves are a limited resource. We only have so much intelligence, so much knowledge, and so many tools to allocate for our moral navigation, let alone translating our moral values into realized action which is the domain of science, reason, and practice. But, this alone would not lead us to embrace the unknown, as if we were forced to do so; nor is a desire for regression and mystification the only use of this inquiry into the world outside the normal processes of knowledge or any exertion that is trivial. Knowing of this limitation, and also encountering a world of hypotheticals and distant futures we can only scarcely imagine based on the evidence, it is a habit of humans to engage in fantasy and thoughts of strange worlds - or a stranger world that someone might live in if humans and their knowledge were radically different. The common trope in technocratic society is the evolutionary leap or quantum leap, in which a threshold is passed, before which there were humans and after which there was a new race. This image is often deployed to hide the eugenic creed or lurid cult rituals, but there is in some of our knowledge a yearning for this existence to not be this dreary - to believe another world was possible, if only we weren't like *this*. Nothing in the world can truly tell us not to do this. We may be told ad nauseum that we should not waste energy dreaming on impossibilities or fantasies, or that we should revert to the acceptable modes of knowledge instead of this inquiry. Yet, every so often, the world presents something that our knowledge never expected, that was never the result of any genius or great working humans could conjure, and that only in fevered dreams would a human ever predict. The world, and something in the existence of life, once allowed the revelation that allowed us to be something more than apes. With that

revelation, humans quickly reverted to their natural proclivity - ritual sacrifice and cruelty. The revelation in of itself was not a turning point or something that intrinsically allowed the cult of sacrifice to begin. It was what was done with it that was perfected by the predatory. This revelation is not a singular occurrence, as the aristocratic myth of Prometheus or the various Luciferian doctrines insist. Many times this revelation arrives anew for a human being in their experience, and many times it was snuffed out. Sometimes, it could grow, for good or ill. Those with a mind towards joining the sacrifice found from this revelation a tool that would expand their ability, for knowledge that a different world was possible could be weaponized. There is no rule glorifying prophecy or suggesting it would inherently select for goodness, and very often the religious leaders tended towards the evil and vicious, finding brigands who found this new proto-religion intriguing for crass purposes. But, the conditions which brought about the revelation suggested that the vicious cycle was the great problem of life. It would only be possible to develop any of this if predation were mitigated. Therefore, there is something other than decency or goodness or merit to suggest that life could be sacred or defended. It was not self-interest or collective interest, or any simple goal, nor was it directly a moral sentiment suggesting a value that was easy to pin down. The potential of any future suggested a true way out of the cycle other than succumbing to its tendencies or opting for suicide. It was less about changing the world to conform to this revelation or a zeal to assert oneself or environmental stability. It was not a crass interest in novelty, for much that is new is bad and untrustworthy. It wasn't any historical progress or process of life, for this approach to the world very clearly had nothing to do with the immediate interests of life, and suggesting contact with something un-living. Naively it may appear to be another world, and so a common trap is to tell those with this tendency to turn away from the world altogether and disdain everything around them. This aristocratic re-direct is a common fallacy with a predictable outcome, and is of no interest to us. We usually see past it unless we are sucked in by naivete and denied standards of comparison, and our worse vices are played to by these so-called gnostics.

In all we do, the direction of our action is driven by moral values rather than any just-so story about natural laws buffeting the body like particles of dust. The instincts are not just any movement of matter, but particular material forces that are morally significant to our thinking. If they were not morally significant, we would not register them as any instinct. Even a tic or involuntary movement of the nerves has some moral purpose for us. We wouldn't consider disciplining the body to remove them worthwhile if they didn't have a moral value, and we concern ourselves with them at all because there is a moral value disapproving of such unwanted instincts. In this way, we are made to believe we are morally culpable for things that are not part of any deliberation on our part - and if we are consistent in moral values, we would indeed be culpable, no matter how ridiculous it may seem to a sense of justice we naively adopt. It is also perfectly in line with moral values, or even morally worthwhile on its own, for courts to rule arbitrarily and hypocritically, and to value this hypocrisy itself as an act

of justice and moral merit. The flipside where courts allow horrific crimes to continue unabated in front of them is not a serious moral concern that moves courts. The court brings criminals to face the magistrate who holds imperial authority over life and death. Far from any sense of justice obligating the judge in any way that can be enforced, any question of the imperial authority violates the very reason that court exists. Any right to suggest the court itself can be challenged would not be a thing with material force, but a convention the court may accept and disband at its will. Realistically, the theory of law only persists because impartiality and maintenance of social order are implied to be the aim of the law, because a grossly hypocritical court would be a court the defendants scoff at and hold in unlimited contempt. If the aim of the court is to abolish its legitimacy altogether, so that the judges can convert to some new magistrate that exercises a permanent state of exception and celebrates the untrammelled thrill of suffering for its own sake, then nothing stops this, and morally the judge or society with such an aim would do everything in its power to subvert the most basic expectations of legal order. A wholesale abandonment of public morality is embraced because all moral authority is invested in the will of criminal assholes who would love nothing more than the thrill of torture, and do so while looting anything substantive from the country, and this is upheld as morally sacrosanct and just over the objection of any poor soul swallowed by the beast. No one would be convinced that such a court is stable or would be able to govern without incredible waste. If the waste is viewed as imperial largesse paid to a class of functionaries, who have every incentive to continue the regime, then this too becomes a moral cause to defend. Nothing in typical moral values would suggest to end this arrangement, and so it continues.

Only one thing would stay the hand of the beast - that something unexpected is possible, and out of desperation, those damned in such a society would resort to things none of their science or moral posturing can predict or react to. It is for this reason that the appearance of chaos, fear, and uncertainty became yet another dogma for eugenics to defend, despite it not being directly necessary for the creed to continue. Eugenics has always feared this chaos, as such things disrupt its order. Yet, the eugenists and their enablers have always been aware that chaos has both an appeal that would disrupt their creed, and chaos has an effect on the human psyche that mere mystification and disinformation cannot. It is not enough to merely lie, or for the lie to gravitate towards some standardized evil. The aim of the creed is to arrest history mechanically, and this includes co-opting all ideas of chaos, opposition, or principles that would be inimical and unpredictable. And so, the magistrates of eugenics would choose a political and moral form where "chaos" and untrammelled randomness is another imperial story. The theories of chaos are not entirely an imperial pseudoscience to disallow worthwhile analysis, nor are the genuine scientific uses of a concept like entropy a cynical ploy. The impression of chaos and disorder in the high magistrates is calculated to dissuade anyone who would think that the unknown could be anything but a thing to be assimilated by the eugenic creed, just as everything else has been. This command of chaos is not so absolute as the myths of the

creed insist it is, where all is arrested by "The Science" and yet nothing is ever certain. The possibility of anything new disgusts the eugenist at a visceral level, unless the new is selected by the creed to be another recapitulation of its ugliness. It must make the new appear unknowable and strange, and so this creates a much greater incentive for the eugenist strategy to lie about everything. The Big Lie was never highly effective at lying or cowing people into submission by any impression of reason or even the forcefulness of the lie. The Big Lie was not even intelligently constructed, nor was it the centerpiece of manipulating public opinion. The Big Lie is something eugenics chose almost instinctively and followed with this sixth sense of knowledge, and it appears less because of any use of it or even because of an enjoyment of lying. A voracious beast is always at the heart of the eugenic creed, inherited from its antecedents and carrying on in other vessels, a cosmic backup plan if the creed were ever to lose its stranglehold or face an opponent difficult to defeat with force or subterfuge alone. By seeding many false religions, an army of fictitious al-Dajjals to be put down by Galton's "Jehad", the Galtonites had their Emmanuel Goldstein.^[5] This did not stop the left elements from a requirement to meet some demand of the people, and created an avenue for genuine rebellion. The genuine rebellion operated not on any grand deed or secret knowledge, but exploited the obvious failures of the eugenic creed to govern in any way that would be effective, even for the bare minimum that would have been valued if the eugenist were not a screaming Satanic ape blinded by the cause. They are deliberate in deploying this strategy, and at the same time, unaware of exactly why this works or what they are doing. It is not "doublethink" in that sense, but it is instead one of the true origins of Orwell's mystification to elide the strategy of hypocrisy. There is both knowledge of this unknown, and a lack of knowledge since it cannot formally be allowed to exist. The imperial dogma clearly calls for a religion of "science" to supplant the depreciated Christian institutions, and so the eugenists can't invoke God or even Glorious Satan too openly or with sufficient meaning.

From whence does the unknown arise? It arises not ex nihilo "from the void", but from the recognition of metaphysical and philosophical void and its purpose in all of our concepts of knowledge. If we return to the second chapter of our first book, we wrote of the void and its role in allowing judgements of distance and substance to even be possible. Philosophically, existence and non-existence were posed as contradictions or opposites. The reality is that the void was there so long as we spoke of the world, and substance itself had no reason to actually exist, let alone be morally worth anything at all. There is no purpose whatsoever to be found in the genesis of the world, and this would be true of any other level of reality that is invoked by shoddy mystics. The world was not good from the light alone or the will of the godhead. There are those of us who found existence intrinsically interesting, not out of an inborn thirst for knowledge without regard to its context, but because of a fascination which had no clear emotional or moral origin or merit. It was not a quest of need, for it is often abandoned and picked up again. The need to recreate ourselves periodically is common to humans, and when humans communed with nature in the old

ways, they could abandon temporarily the weariness of maintaining institutional pretenses altogether. This was necessary not just to recharge or fill some energy deemed morally worthwhile, but it connected human beings to a sense of genuine distance and connection, rather than the symbolic suggestions of these things that were necessary for a competitive society or dickering and dealing to allow cooperation. It spoke to something alien to a sense of self or abasement to the world. A sense of peace comes with acceptance that there is a void, and a world outside of the total society we are habituated to belief permeates all things. It is this above all that eugenics could not abide - that there was a part of the world it did not enclose, and could never enclose. The origins of eugenism in the habit of enclosure and their drug-addled avarice in its fullest form made clear that all that exists and all that can exist are a part of the Galtonite "gods", and so the crowning achievement of the eugenic creed was to claim that they were Nature itself, and the old concepts of nature were no longer admissible. It is this that is among the chief abominations of the creed, and it was not a position taken because it was needed. It would be perfectly fine for eugenism to be a political idea or a spiritual crusade, for the purposes of its success. The identification of the creed with Nature did not serve any necessary purpose, nor is it seriously believed by any but the creed's devout believers. It instead spoke to a deep craving to eliminate once and for all troublesome void and distance. At its core, eugenism adopted a long-stand tenet of predatory religions. That is that the predatory element always seeks to eliminate any barrier between itself and its goals. It was for this reason that the mental disconnect where effect and cause are fused, effect precedes cause and creates a loop, could be believed. Rationally, it is so absurd that it requires someone to embrace a foul contradiction and repeat it ad nauseum to destroy the mind. However much the koans are repeated, they never succeed in wearing down the brain, even for the devout believers. Eventually, the foulness of the thought consumes the brain of the true believer.

The appeal to do this remains, and it is this controlled insanity which draws so many to believe in the creed or internalize its values without great pressure or thinking about it. A desire to eliminate void is a desire to make contact with an alien and merge in mind with it. This is not something in which two must become one, for both can go their own ways afterwards and such merging would not be the purpose nor what the people drawn to this seek. Few want to be absorbed and abolished, or to inflict the same on another mind, because it would be obviously destructive and pointless. It is the elimination of void that impedes the primordial light that replaces healthier desire and moral purpose in life. By embracing these koans, the eugenicist perpetuates for both true believers and the ignorant the shortest possible route to appropriation, and short-circuits any possibility of a connection of minds existing outside of command and control. This cycle to disrupt thought must be revisited at a later time. For now, the controlled insanity accomplishes one goal that no other philosophy could - it makes nihilism utterly inadmissible, and the fire of consumption continues until all life dies screaming - forever.

NIHILISM, THE WALL OF FIRE AND DESPAIR, AND TOTALISM

Most of us, though, have no desire to abolish the void, or any such delusions of grandeur. We may not even seek occasional contact with another mind, so long as we continue through life and claw back a few nice things. It is not hard to see, without any great knowledge, the eugenic creed's intent. It scarcely attempts to hide its intent, because to hide their intent would be a shame that the creed could never abide if they had to do it for too long. Enough contact with eugenists shows that they can't stop themselves from shrieking like the retards they are if they are not allowed absolute impunity and unlimited transgression - hence their appropriation of the term "abolish" to turn a political position against institutions into a term to annihilate anything that impedes their chosen institutions. If *this* is supposed to be the Absolute, the teleological end of bad Hegelism, then it would appear very prudent to choose nihilism over that shit. If nothing else, the true and full void and nihilism is a parting shot against this failed race for what it did to the world and anything worth living for. That is the one thing they cannot truly stop, and in this, the nihilist is assured of the truest victory, even if it must wait for billions and billions of years. Those who have seen nihilism as a viable alternative could have told you the eugenic creed's insanity has an endgame a child could see, and yet, they did it all the same. The eugenist must make nihilism impossible, and in doing so, it declares absolutely that no one is allowed to escape in any way. It is not enough to merely outlaw suicide or associate it with shame. No, too many people would off themselves rather than submit to this Satanic and retarded cult, if it came to that. What is necessary is to ensure that any possibility of escape is destroyed. Suicide cannot be a way out - if one hint of suicidality is detected, then the creed must ideally drill into the brain and internalize the creed, so that the creed's eternal victory is burned into the brain, becoming the last thing someone sees. As I said, all life does screaming - forever. It cannot function any other way, and the premises of eugenism - which it shares in common with its antecedents and related predatory cults - lead to that obvious endgame. This is their idea of eternal life, and why their obsession with immortality - an infantile one that moves away from any reason why someone would want to live forever, or any method by which that would actually be attained - is another tenet of the wider eugenic religion and culture. It is not about immortality in the genuine sense, but the immortality of the creed pressing into the brain, transcending death and reaching into all void to turn it into more eugenics. This is a beast so many of us are familiar with, for the believers and enablers alike press without really thinking about what they are doing. It is not ignorance, but that it simply does not occur to them that there ever would be anything else. Once that blood has been tasted, there is no going back, and the eugenic creed's habit of transgression is another thing it undertakes less for the rational purpose of doing it or any emotional need, and more because it seeks to jump in front of this very appeal of the void and nihilism.

If we wish to oppose this creed - and on some level, dire necessity requires it,

however halfhearted and hopeless the effort may seem - we will encounter this wall of despair at some point. The training of the eugenic faithful requires them to surpass the thought of this and embrace the creed wholly. This is where the purpose of a billion-year contract with their religion becomes clear, and those who wish to taste the purest blood will be made to sign that contract - or else. It is, as with the lesser transgressions and ritual sacrifices, a thing done less for any purpose or even because the contract itself is the point, than the thing done because the ritual recreates the creed and is among its sources of life as a moral beast stalking the cosmos. We have no luxury of a billion-year contract or a daddy flashing the OK sign to allow this. We don't really gain comfort from naive nihilism, and the embrace of naive nihilism and its crass outcomes is the sign of a simpering retard and no more. That "opposition" is laughable, and it is among the desired states of the slave race under eugenic terror-thrill. (To call what eugenics imposes "rule" dignifies eugenic governance far more than it deserves!) The other solution is to invest a pseudo-morality around selfishness and willpower, which results in the same simpering. No, morality exists in the world, whether we regard it as "moral" or not in the conventional sense. No ideology and no practice of human beings changes that morality is laborious, and labor to be labor is moral. That is the way of the world, and it would be true even of a hypothetical unknown, and of nihilism itself. One cannot help but enact naive nihilism if they adopt it, and quickly learns that this approach to life is more futile than the ordinary futility of life. Anyone can indulge in a pathetic ennui until they die, but this is uninteresting. Left to its own devices, such naive nihilism leads to a decay of the soul and a vulnerability to the Nietzschean non-answer and the usual eugenic horseshit. This is undesirable for us; yet if we live in a world dominated by eugenics, claiming some other moral authority is stronger and outranks it is a foolish and futile crusade. We can invent all the prophecies and unknowns and seek desperate answers, and we will indeed do this, but to truly confront eugenism and similar such religions means facing nihilism and despair, and seeing that for all of the shit humanity has done, the world is basically good in nature. Facts confirm the goodness of the world in spite of humanity's attitude - not because it was made good by decree or "just is" good, but because abomination does not stand forever. Every deed of defiance, when carried out in the labor of true spite for such a vile creed, despises the enemy, and is carried out not for a fickle spite of men or the glory of a god, but because you, I, and a whole lot of other people can see that we never had to do any of what eugenics suggested we do. It and its associated religions are so devoid of purpose that it's a wonder such a scam was ever able to assert itself. It is for that reason that it was eugenics, rather than some other political idea, that was the predatory religion of our time. Only eugenics spoke to a genetic legacy and eugenic interest as described earlier in this work, with full knowledge and conviction of Darwin that the origin of Man - borrowed from Malthus' miserable theory - was ritual sacrifice and a cruelty unlike any other in the animal kingdom, and that because this genesis happened, it must be regressed to and eliminate all other possibilities, by any means necessary. The last resort of the eugenic creed is various forms of alterna-eugenics, false

oppositional ideas which appear to say eugenics is bad because eugenics is mean. When alterna-eugenics fails, the pseudoscience simply invents a "fake ethics" and a whole fake science where eugenics isn't dominant in biology, while maintaining the centrality of eugenic shibboleths and mobilizing fear, uncertainty, and doubt to cloud all judgement, until eugenics can assert its command of all institutions and begin again its "Jehad". The fake science trades in feel-good stories, and then spreads to non-biological sciences to infantilize those as well, such as physics and the crucial social and psychological sciences that would govern future society.

I would like to insert here a comment that may be on the reader's mind. Earlier I wrote: "If you are not willing to destroy the world for your cause, you are not serious." I invite the reader to ask - if this were the case, and the cause is something as clearly ruinous as the eugenic creed, is *that* the cause serious enough to destroy the world for it? The cause of eugenics is the only creed in human history which both boldly claimed that it would destroy the world with nuclear weapons, and made it clear that it fully intended to act on that threat in all circumstances. There is no version of eugenism which can unilaterally disarm. I am reminded of a conversation I had long ago as a teenager, with a middle-aged adult eugenicist. I asked her this very question - that if society were what she wanted it to be, then why on Earth should I not wish to destroy the society as a matter of retaliation? This conversation entailed a discussion of God, and she chants the familiar sing-song contemptuous lie about God's unknowability. I conducted this to probe her response, to see if she had anything whatsoever to say for herself, and I knew the typical answers of authorities. What struck me this time as different is how she couldn't comprehend the idea of actually destroying the world if it were in the hands of anyone but her - of course, she never stated explicitly any such intent, but everything she did and everything she was made it clear she would kill the whole world for the creed and not think for a moment that this was wrong. I did not feel I should have to explain why something like the eugenism I saw was so abominable that death was clearly preferable, and obliteration of the world to remove such a dire threat was clearly justified. I did not explain, but it should be clear given the verbiage of nuclear war and the threats issued regularly when America went apeshit during the 90s, that the ruling ideas of this society already made such a threat and reveled in making it, and did so not for any cause but because they could do so. Naively, I would think that when the capitalists "won", they would have no reason for continuing this threatening posture towards the world, let alone towards their own people. It was clearly absurd that I should have to ask this question, yet the death cult intensified at the first moment the American oligarchy smelled blood, and there was no reason why we would need to do such a thing. If they won, why? I didn't pursue that line of questioning, though. I simply asked what she thought any of this was for. She could not stop asking me a stupid question - "what is the point of destroying the world if no one will worship you?" I would think that if anyone ruled for the adulation of the people, which I clearly had no interest in, that is the stupidest possible reason anyone could rule. At first I thought she just insulted me yet again, by believing a low-born pleb like

myself would be swayed by such a retarded and Satanic thrill of ruling, and this would stay my hand if I had the theoretical world-destroying bomb. The question was not about my thrill for revenge, but about a clearly intolerable society which had repeatedly made torture threats against me and many like me, and acted on those threats enough time to make clear that this would not stop. I would not broach those details, but they were well known enough. The more I continued this conversation, the more it was clear that she really did not think about anything coming out of her mouth - at all. It did not occur to her that anyone could ever oppose the eugenic creed and its maximal torture. I truly believe that she was incapable of making the mental connection that any of this hurt an actual human being with a mind. If I understood the pedagogy of her race - English aristocracy and part of that Satanic unitarian milieu like Malthus - I would know better that no such thought ever could occur to her, just as Orwell simultaneously believed that Winston Smith was sympathetic while writing him as a simpering Satanic retard getting what was coming to him. I made it clear that I had no interest in being worshipped, and would be perfectly happy to do nothing if I were just not put through what I was put through, and I shouldn't have to even pose this question. It didn't occur to her that anyone would have any *right* to complain or even suggest going away. This was never stated as any sort of authority, because she likely did not believe authority applied to her race and this was the order of nature. Authority to a woman like that exists purely to be abused, and the thrill of such abuses were the point. This is something she made clear when the prior student was in line for "counseling" and she took sadistic glee in torturing the young man, with me watching beforehand, and this torture served no purpose except punishing someone who was obviously in a state of mental terror and disability. That was all she could think about - that she had a position to torture, and the thrill of doing so was an absolute for her race and thus for the world. And it is for her "race", because a eugenist never stops thinking in those terms, while denying that they do any such thing. I should make it clear that most references in this writing to "race" are not referent to the biological or anthropological conception of the term as it would still be appreciated in proper literature, and are instead me displaying my utmost contempt for the eugenic creed's treatment of the concept. If they wish to make humanity a wholly Satanic race like them, then they should - regardless of any proper definition of "race" - be referred to as nothing but a race and the most failed of races. Every race, as we can see, is defined by its lowest common denominator, and this woman is a prime example of the total, abject failure of a race who seeks to impose that failure on individuals who, out of necessity, rise below the lowest standard of races that eugenists aspire to grind us down to. Whether they are English Galtonite Satanics, or Germanic screamers shouting the usual Hitlerian shit, it is always the same song and dance, and they really do not think. I repeat this here to make clear - these people do not threaten to destroy the world as an idle threat. The entire narrative of nuclear war, always aimed at the civilians rather than any genuine enemy, is the knife held at the throat of everyone, and when a Galtonite holds that knife, they act as this woman does and revel in the thrill of torture. They can't not,

and will never be different. Ever. This mentality is one their therapy cult and gurus violently recapitulate to tell us all, even the better of humanity, that *we* will never be better, and that *we* are the failed race, while these Satanics are the new race, the true race, the only living race. It is for their stupid thrill that we are made to suffer, and it is for that reason alone that nuclear weapons, which serve no purpose for winning war and no serious deterrent, were deployed. Is that really worth destroying the world for - for these retards, and they are retarded, to feel better, not even knowing what they are doing beyond pushing the pleasure button their filth moral philosophy obligates every profession to follow, with threat of legal torture for noncompliance? Satanic race. Failed race. Any moral value would have seen what I saw and that such people should not have been allowed to rule a goldfish tank. It is for this reason that moral philosophy had to be the basis of their true understanding of any value, and why they isolated best of all that which must be interrupted and not allowed to be questioned in any serious way. It is expected that states hold a monopoly on such force that could destroy the world, and states are under no obligation to be kind. It is against the nature of such an entity, no matter who holds it. All of the decisions of the eugenic creed and the imperial religion of this empire are oriented towards one goal and one goal alone - the very same knife at the throats of all subjects, not for any reason, but because it became the only possible thought in such a world, and it ceased to be possible to conceive of a world other than this. The final proof of such a world is not for them to actually destroy the world at any point, but to believe that the thrill of holding this knife is locked in for eternity, repeating endlessly and defeating even the heat death of the universe their imperial cosmology believes will be the endgame of nature. All further decisions of the eugenic creed seek to maximize the thrill of torture, and if that is not clear by now, it will become more and more clear throughout these writings. These people should never be negotiated with, yet the entire purpose of the threat is to compel this submission and turn all non-eugenists into living abortions. Seeing this wretched, fat woman's visage and the vacuousness of her words, the true horror of eugenism is not even that they would do this, for there are reasons why, however vile, a ruler would love this sort of machine. The truest horror is that for all of this torture and pointlessness, that these are the people who will hold the knife above all. I suppose that is the point, though - to glorify the Luciferian conceit of selfishness that animates their race and their creed. What better proof of their claims would they possess than being the most shameless and disgusting of this failed race, beyond the shameless hedonism they encourage in their enablers? The race to the bottom is not just for the lowest class, but exemplifies their inner soul and their image for the world. There really is no thought. For all of their threats and tortures, they possess one weakness - their viciousness and thrill of maximal torture forbids them from ever destroying the world for their cause, and they really cannot conceive of a world where they move back one inch or make any sacrifice. Sacrifice is for the retards and the losers who are told this is some sort of virtue, and their Germanic lackies invent the sing-song story of slave morality to tell us to internalize the perversion of that failed race. We, on the other hand, do not need to threaten total destruction,

or threaten anything great at all. We don't need to impotently lash out when triggered, which I think the reader can determine is the true purpose of these tortures and why they are implemented as policy, systematic and distributed throughout the institutions in every way possible. We don't need to bide time like a sniveling retard to get the drop for some "blessed terror", as their narrative prepared us to believe is the threat to America. We simply need to show and act on utter and absolute contempt for such people and the threats they make, and in doing so, we remain a stain on their "perfect system", and will always destroy their image of the world for our cause, just by continuing to exist. Spite can empower us far more than their pathetic thrill-seeking, fueled by cocaine and opium and the lurid rituals of their race.

SUMMARY OF THIS CHAPTER

This chapter has given a brief overview of how moral sentiments developed from a seed of knowledge, mind, and material things to something which could guide human learning. It should be clear that the aim of moral values is not that they are "in of themselves" the point of life, but that values guide human learning in particular. Human knowledge as a process, and the human faculties for sensing the world and discerning the meaning of it, are not intrinsically moral at all. It is further not the case that any of our moral decisions - which is to say, anything we would consider agency or free will - is a question decided at the level of nature or knowledge, as if science had anything to say about either concept. Agency and free will imply not rational or knowledgeable actors, but moral actors whose agency and will can be judged. We would not care one way or another about our will to change the world if nothing in the world was morally significant, and by knowledge alone, all we know is that there is a world and events happen. It is the mind and our faculty of learning that is guided most of all by moral values; and thus, intelligence figures heavily into moral values, beyond its worldly affect on affairs. This happened because intelligence, learning, and the occulting of secrets was the decisive behavior which made human society and communication possible. Our tools, biological faculties, development of the brain, and the basis for intelligence, were the material means by which this intelligence could manifest in the world. Once humans can not merely learn in the way animals do, but communicate learning and construe learning as an institution and a social activity, what we learn becomes relevant. We learn that there are others who learn like we do, and will act accordingly; and because we learn of the world and ourselves, we learn what we are capable of, and possess a language describing the world that animals lack. This makes us acutely aware of dangers that animals only scarcely know, and allows humans both adaptability in defense, and a far greater ability to formulate offensive strategies. More than that, it raises for the first time many prospects in the world that are far worse than death or crude suffering, because psychological warfare becomes possible beyond the impression of shouting or animalistic intimidation. It not only becomes intellectually possible to conceive of war and many other malevolent activities of humanity, but we are specifically aware of moral values that would be used

by a torturer or in conflict. We can for the first time conceive of enclosing the world and commanding humans in a way that animals cannot command each other, and we can turn that command and control on ourselves and our innermost functions. In such a world, the loss of agency or will is a harrowing event. The philosopher declares that freedom is an essence above the world and must be protected on those grounds, but this is the liberty of aristocrats who cannot abide sharing that with their intellectual and social lessers. Most of us value liberty because we have seen the alternative throughout history and around the world, and have many examples in a society deemed free of that slavery and compulsion. Anyone who has to work figures out that this slavery is going to suck, even if we were able to somehow reconcile with the institutions of slavery, whatever form they take in any epoch. If we didn't care about freedom or slavery at all and saw it as a false dichotomy - because true freedom really didn't exist as a political idea let alone as a realized state - we are made to care because the interests of any slavery are never passively enforced. Slave institutions are voracious consumers of human beings and territory, and this is borne out in the history of the world, with the most prominent examples of slave societies being both aggressively expansive into territories, predatory in all financial dealings, and usually regressive so far as slavery's interests are allowed to predominate. The progress and moral value of slave-holding societies is not due to slavery being a good, but in spite of the externalities a slave society creates, such as revolts and escalating repression to maintain the low quality of life for all labor. The Romans and Americans both understood slavery not as a boon or spiritual cornerstone, but as a persistent danger to their society. This danger was not a danger of a moral sentiment, but the interests of the slave-holders conflicting with anything the citizens would want, like land and wealth of their own that would allow them to be soldiers or share in the income. Societies dominated by proletarian labor like Britain considered the working class to be de facto slaves, which is why they were treated in the way they were in the early 19th century. The sentimental disgust towards slavery is common, especially in modern societies that can easily conceive of another way that didn't involve such rank exploitation.

What is labor, except the command of the mind of another for some purpose? Labor to be labor is never merely an event but a moral undertaking, which was carried out in some sense because there was a moral incentive at work. Perhaps that was nothing more than a wage in money or fear of the master's punishments, but all arrangements to command and manage labor require some moral persuasion, or something that is equivalent to it in some moral value. For example, we may consider that some coercive force is not really a moral choice of the slave, but the slave acts on it. First of all, the driver of the slave has to be a moral actor, as does anyone driving the driver and so on, until there is someone at the top of the hierarchy who is not driven by anyone. The argument that "nature" or "the world" or "the economy" drives the master, the capitalist, or the bureaucratic manager, is a facile one when considering what all of those things amount to in any serious inquiry. The world and the economy is dominated

by the will of human beings oppressing other human beings, rather than the forces of nature hijacking the human mind to tell it what it is allowed to learn. Economics as an abstraction is particularly absurd, as the very idea of "economy" suggests moral value in management as its soundest basis. If economics were merely a technological resource allocation problem, the solution is trivial in any era and in any situation of material inflows and outflows. It is the moral and human element which economy pertain to, and the problem is not merely an intellectual one.

Even if the problem is framed as a purely intellectual one, this only means that the proper moral value economy concerns itself is not labor, the utility of labor, utility generally, or some social relation that may exist. It is instead this quaint faculty of humans to learn things and their intelligence, which is always limited. Adam Smith correctly identifies the genius of men as that which commands labor, and through that, commands economic value. The difficulty arose because of a necessary human element that was seen as whole and indispensable for the free trade idea to work, and this would be true of all further economic writing that followed anything from classical thought. Only in views of cybernetic management that arose in the 20th century did the concept of splitting intelligence from the human source and its body find enough evidence to be appreciated as a force unto itself. This development would be foreseen and was intrinsic in the liberal ideas themselves. It is thus the command of learning that is valued in economic judgements. This pertains to all things. Which moral values guide that learning are not uniform, but generally, there are a few key moral qualities of importance, such as labor, land, and seats in prominent institutions which would command money.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] I used to think the "RETVRN" meme was a joke, until enough encounters with the reactionary lot made it clear that this is actually what they believe. That is indeed an example of humanity's regression to the purest form of a Satanic and failed race. Naturally, the racist idea, as we will continue to explain if it is not already evident, rests on a regression to the primordial light; and so a race is always defined by its lowest common denominator, and the partisans of racism always treasure their lump of horseflesh and insist we have to be as retarded as them.

[2] To be fair to Bill Nye, he is suggesting in his television program that the kids at home should be able to reproduce experiments and think about these things for themselves. This was standard for popular science programs up to the period, and after 2000 this approach to science was deliberately annihilated in the public consciousness, to the extent it was still practiced. The methodologies suggested, and the lessons learned, scarcely conform to a scientific inquiry even of a childish sort, and this would have been difficult to change given the authority of the institutions had been drilled for many decades as the legitimate fount of science,

rather than anything the workers did. An independent engagement with science became barely conceivable without sensing who had the authority to speak or question anything. The typical approach to science asks children to follow the manual and not ask too many questions, and this would continue all the way up to the university. At the graduate level, the university is revealed, if it was not clear already, to be a cult to train priests and teach them to speak down to the masses with the utmost contempt, and the vacuousness of the entire institution - which the student is now indebted to and must uphold if they want to pay off that debt - leaves many disappointed. This entire approach suggested, and then demanded, that the university was the ticket to get the first seat on the lifeboat in the eternal lifeboat ethics exercise, the way to never have to fight in war ever again, and ultimately suggested the university would eliminate all of its rivals, including their allies that fund them if they do not get with the program.

[3] Think of how well a faction that can spam cheap offensive units or buy out bases with probe teams will tear apart or move around that overpriced prototype impact rover produced with an industry penalty. In the game environment referenced here, the outcomes of battles can be predicted with linear values of success, given knowledge of the game state and reasonable assumptions about the players' hidden assets and strategy. The ultimate mark of merit in the war game is not having the best stats, but victory. The smallest turn advantage built up leads to taking a crucial base earlier, which sets off a chain of failures for the enemy. In games of the strategy genre, there is an obsessive focus on logistics, inherited from the war game exercises they were originally based on and from the simulated Whig History takes favorable to Empire. The ranking of soldiers and weapons becomes more absurd when considering what humans have really fought over during history, and how much of war is a fake struggle to keep the structure of society intact and ensure poor people are fed to the meat grinder.

[4] This topic, which Marx spends considerable effort expounding on with considerable insight into the thinking of financiers, is something I will revisit not in this book or the next, but in the fourth book planned for this series. For now it is sufficient to note that money is valued not because it points to something in nature or politics, but because moral values recognize exchange as more than just an act or business humans engage in. The origins of exchange in "trucking and bartering" point not to an impulse or inborn tendency alone, but to this concept of exchange which is readily understood to societies with no money or elaborate exchange network as a practice. Even if a society lived in Edenic simplicity where life was good and God provided, it would not take long for the inhabitants to conceive of exchange in principle. Ignorance was not the savior of Man from the horrors of Mammon, and Mammon's invasion of private life is hardly unique among the gods or even the most egregious, given the past century's demonstration that something much worse than Mammon stakes a claim to exchange and the souls of men. We do not engage in that many exchanges at all, let alone monetary exchanges involving a token that is intrinsically associated with some financial institution and usually some deity. It is no secret that temples were the earliest banks in civilized society, and money-lending was not merely business

but something priests and the gods would guarantee by threatening something worse than force for non-payment of debt.

[5] And of course, "Emmanuel Goldstein" most accurately resembles the PR image of a masculinized Emma Goldman, rather than Leon Trotsky as the more idiotic reader is led to believe, or Karl Kautsky as someone might believe if they were invested in the Lenin-Kautsky grudge match. It is no surprise that the anarchists took orders from the imperial core and advanced eugenics - indeed, advancing the very type of government that Ingsoc was.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

17. On the Occulting of Society and Its Fullest Proliferation

Intelligence regarding moral values and judgements forms the basis for economic decision making. Those moral values pertain to a world outside of people altogether, rather than the values we would prefer to create. We also recognize people in their genuine condition as real humans who will represent values which change with their individual qualities, wants, and plans. Economic decisions are not seriously made alone. Even when we are alone against a natural world, we operate with the presumption that other humans are a possibility. If we didn't, then our sense of economic value is very different as a solitary agent in nature, then it would be in a society where the chief values involve other humans. The particular materials exchanged in society are ultimately less relevant than what we *do* in social economic behavior - manage people, conduct politics in society, and operate through institutions, one of those institutions being our own legal person which is a very different construct policing the behaviors our flesh and blood bodies, brains, and minds would want. Even if we were to have security in society, we would be locked into a sense of ourselves not as the fully formed animal with a mind that we are, but as a legal person who would be nothing outside of membership in society and its institutions. The institutional representation is more important than the flesh and blood. Property in any form we would regard as meaningful is held not by flesh and blood humans but institutional persons. In the flesh, humans can only possess, which lasts for as long as any force is exerted on the possession, or there is no competing entity that can challenge possession and it is safe for us to treat the possession as owned whenever we felt like accessing it. The nature of this economic thought as a realized system to approach the world is explored in the next chapter and the remainder of this book. If this thought is active, then the "economic problem" is just one of many problems in human society. All that humans do with their intelligence in learning is subject to economic management in principle, whether we see it as "economic" or not. So too is everything humans do in economy a matter that can be judged by science, and by struggle for merit and rank. This happens not because any one is foundational or takes precedence as the explanation, but because economic actors are moral actors. We do not have

the moral values of anything stamped on their representation, in a way that obviates this problem. In principle, all moral values in society are knowable. In addition to our difficulty in explaining the world with language - and this is the only consistent way we are able to write about morality or explain it to each other beyond gesticulating or insinuation - human societies are dynamic in three ways. The individual humans adapt to their environment rather than being fixed points of light or genetic essences. The society itself involves people who come and go, and who interact with a real environment rather than a virtual mass of people equidistant from each other with nothing between them. Because humans are aware of society itself as the chief danger and benefit in their lives - because humans understand that without society and institutions, their position in the world would be perilous against other such entities - these both conspire to form our most common value judgements. Humans cannot help but be affected by the machines they build, and society itself is the greatest and most terrible of these machines. It would be impossible to construe society as a "just-so" fact, because the moment humans refuse to participate in a society to the bitter end, all of the moral persuasion leaders of men rely upon is meaningless. Society only exists because of the active labor of participants to realize what began as merely an informational fact that there are other people and acts between them that constitute society. That information never just happened to exist, but was actively sought, and the information itself would be valued. If the information pertaining to social agents and particular things circulating in society because morally valuable, there is thought pertaining to how those things circulate, how they are occulted, and why this is done. It is not the mere fact of society that makes it relevant, but that society brings the prospects of competition, cooperation, truth, and the lying that is habitual in the human race. Humans are liars, born and confirmed time and time again, and no new technology or ethics suggests that this will ever change at a fundamental level. Humans are engaged in a situation where they operate with limited information. This limitation is not just about the things themselves or symbols humans use, but limited knowledge of moral values and intents of social actors. The intents and purposes of people, the machines and products they build, and the ways in which natural forces are harnessed, are more relevant to our task in society than the mere existence of physical objects or abstract ideas. It is that which is the objective of economic decision making at the level of society, rather than the much smaller managerial task to regulate the affairs of the house, as the name "economy" - Greek for "management of the house" - indicates. The household is managed not for its own sake but in accord with the demands of the dominant forces in society. The informational composition of society has already been described. What happens when all that we have expounded on about life, spiritual authority, and moral value are inserted into that society?

INTELLIGENCE IN SOCIETY IN LIGHT OF MORAL DIRECTION

We begin with two concepts of intelligence. The first is the faculties allowing learning and the establishment of mind itself, which are in any entity fixed

at a given moment. Those faculties are not extensible by assertion that they are, but are only honed like any other muscle or tool in the possession of intelligence. The second is the accumulated learning and methods of recalling learned information. This is a different question than the physical mechanisms that comprise knowledge, the brain, and so on, describing the "hardware" so to speak of conscious, knowing entities. Intelligence, then, concerns what is ultimately a simulated version of reality more than something which exists "as-is", in a way that is regarded as some substance or an informational entity co-equal with the physical world. Unlike knowledge, which has no intrinsic moral orientation or ability to make decisions, what intelligence learns and acts on is a very moral decision. Intelligence chooses not the conditions of its being or to do whatever it pleases, for intelligence by itself has no inherent moral orientation providing a teleology. Intelligence instead learns of moral qualities and develops a way to compare them as values, which itself is learning about metaphysics and questions about the world that are not immediately evident. This task is carried out in earnest not as the simplest assertion of what it means to "think". Many entities think and act on thought without "intelligence" in this sense, or their intelligence only acts on cruder models of the world that are sensical to animals. Humans themselves do not know purely through this intellectual faculty, for much of what humans do has nothing to do with intellectual learning or the deployment of this limited resource. We do not learn anything new by following a daily routine of consuming meals, going to work, and proceeding through life, nor is this learning necessarily an imperative to follow at all times. Intelligence in its active utilization is not an inexorable force, and this is true of humans who regulate their intelligence for moral reasons of their own, and computers whose intelligence is an extension of the programmer's thought process. The computer is powered by electricity and cannot conduct its task without that energetic input, and the computer's operations regulate that energy by means of a negative feedback loop to allow the automation of governance. It is not a moral claim about the virtue of intelligence to say that computers don't think, as if I were merely repeating a self-serving koan about the sanctity of humans or organic life. Computers do not think as we do because we specifically designed them not to mimic the processes that comprise proper knowledge and sense. What humans do by commanding the rational faculties is itself discipline of its knowledge - in effect, when we set ourselves to the task of study and becoming rational subjects, we are gimping the abilities humans are good at, regulating that knowledge and its energetic inputs, to produce the outcome of learning and mind that we covet. This faculty was not ordained by any germ or seed, where "rational mind" is concrete and eternal yet an ephemeral biological and physical thing that popped into existence. We may argue that once established, rational mind becomes a going concern of its own, and the brain, human beings, and the tools in their use mutate and morph into something acclimated to the dominance of rational mind over the base processes of life and knowledge. This, though, is something different from the declaration of an essence which is inexplicable and "just-so". We can ask very easily how rational mind came to exist, just as we engineer the digital computer by utilizing scientific principles towards this task of automating

governance. In constructing the computer, it was seen beforehand that this tool was in some sense an extension of humanity's moral direction of learning, rather than just a machine to automate rote mental tasks. The reasons why are not reducible to the philosophical image of an idealized subject, a point of Luciferian light that is often invoked for the crass political purposes of cajolers and those who declared themselves leaders and made the public ratify that declaration in a farcical process they call an election.^[1] Computers exist most of all to command and control humans in society and in their environment, rather than as a mere extension of rational information processing. The direct function of the tool was utilized for a wider moral purpose even before mechanical computers were at all effective for the task, and before business machines were wholly reliable. The business machine, far from obviating the need of bureaucracy right away, led to an explosion of bureaucratic oversight. The reasons for the computer were not a crass drive for efficiency, but because the function of the tool expanded the abilities of those who managed in ways that were not just an extension of the rational task. It did not take long, and was envisioned beforehand by social engineers^[2], for computation itself to be marked in the division of labor. Factories and social units were to be fused to their animal nature, under the command and control of managers. In this way, socialism would be defeated conceptually, and the long run goal of a philosophical state can proceed. Humans would be both atomized in the purest sense, and yet society is total, inescapable, and without meaningful description. It does this in the name of socialism and human progress, as if it were the only possible world, despite being clearly artificial and the intent of a few willful actors. It is here where the older moral sense of humanity, where one subject was construed as holding virtue and obligations, would be supplanted by information and moral sentiment and value itself as a force stalking the world, congealed in some abstract-yet-hyperreal beast.^[3]

We didn't always exist like this, nor was it a teleological direction. It is not now as absolute as its ideology insists it is. People in the 21st century still think like the humans of old, however much this thought is affected by institutions and the machines deployed. It is too difficult to change thinking radically in a way that is singular. It is further a feature of 21st century society that subcultures are segregated off to think in ways appropriate to them, and this is encouraged as a way to manage people. No "homogeneity" of the sort implied by the ruling ideas and all political ideas permitted exists, or is even actively encouraged as a real condition. Everything about the ruling ideas presents the homogenized "normal" not as a real condition with evidence, but as an artifice intentionally divorced from anything a single person lives in. It exists in fantastical entertainment programming and pseudo-scientific literature of the worst kind. Any worthwhile view of 21st century society does not regard any such singular thought-form uniting the people, neither globally, within a nation, within a race, or even in an organization. Such homogenization has always been a disciplinary tool to grind a given race down to its lowest possible condition - and the Germanic conceit of racial eugenics is the reference most often evoked when this tool is deployed, rather than industrial homogenization of products which never

followed from a philosophical or spiritual intent that this is the ideal state for industry. Far from it, as this ideological conceit of homogenization is spread in schools, industrial product moves from production of commodities to production of machines for specific qualities, that favored the aforementioned command and control the computer entailed. Vertical integration in industry did not rely on a spooky homogenization that is the result of a failed Germanic philosophy that was intended to forestall any genuine science, so that a democratic idea could be derailed. Said philosophy never actually suggested that people were homogenous, but instead that they were differentiated by caste and by the dictates of aristocracy. Vertical integration and the needs of industry in the 20th century should have made clear both the futility of such an idiotic philosophy, and the futility of the eugenic creed which asserted its political dominance around the same time. The ruling ideas did not just conflict with the material base of reality. The ruling ideas were utterly alien to anything that actually happened in the base or the superstructure, to use the Marxist sense of these things. The true governing ideas, which were published and circulated enough, suggested a miserable fate for mankind and that the only homogeneity in the human race was its primordial origin in ritual sacrifice and viciousness. Those traits exemplified the aristocracy that came to rule, and were unmentionable as what they truly entailed. To say what was to be done to us would make clear the dire necessity to root out all such persons as soon as possible, and when that was indeed what some people decided, the institutions had their fallback ready to facilitate the eugenic creed's ascent - the final ascent, intended to mire the whole world but the elect in the purest depravity yet known. None of the rot and filth of the eugenic creed is a true condition of the human race in its present moment, and it is not merely a recapitulation of the race's genesis. It is a totalizing view where all that exists regresses to something foul and progresses to something foul, and in doing so, the true faith of the eugenic creed makes itself known. It is this which provides one of the greatest mystifications clouding judgement of distance, time, and the genuine reality we live in. It was never the world that was illusory, as the gnostic heresy declared. It was knowledge itself that was the trap, and in particular the faculties of intelligence that were befuddled by tripping over themselves, led into one lie after another to bombard the senses and exhaust this faculty.

It never began in one unified place, as the origin myth of the creed recapitulates without any convincing evidence that we should "return to source". The storage of knowledge and technology in media is such that knowledge in the broadest sense continues to circulate and will be reproduced, such that technology is never "lost" for long. If society were viewed as a gigantic organism, it could lose nearly all of its functioning capacity, and within a couple of generations, knowledge accumulated from the past will be rediscovered, even with media technology and a political situation making this knowledge difficult to disseminate. It is learning and the conceits of the mind that are destroyed frequently, and the state of learning and intelligence in society that rises and falls with every empire. This is very strange because realized technology and developed knowledge would

be far more expensive in resources to produce, while intelligence and learning as a concept should be trivial to reproduce given any moral incentive to do so. This happens because the conceits of mind and the conceits of empire and the political are tied together. Institutions do not reference intelligence or learning out of a sense that learning is good or fun or something morally worthwhile for its own sake. What institutions regard as legitimate intelligence is that which conforms to its moral expectations, and they concern themselves with their institutional wants alone. If institutions served learning and intelligence in the genuine sense, their conduct in education and dissemination of learning methods is not just woefully out of line with the goal. The institutions, and human beings, have every incentive to NOT teach, to NOT allow learning to arise independent of the institution's aims. Intellectualism and the conceits of mind are an intrinsically individualist view of knowledge and thought. It is for this reason that technocratic government, which appeared superficially to possess an inexorable tendency towards socialism and collectivization, turned on itself almost immediately. There is not genuine reason of intellect or knowledge to not ameliorate this problem, as if intelligence were cursed to glorify the ego or some preferred institution. It is rather because the moral values that prevail in human society are dishonesty, avarice, cruelty, and a thrill that is native to the race when it deceives another human, and the thrill of felling a beast in the hunt. History and facts confirm this - the human race, so far as it has a natural moral inclination, is evil and abominably so, and they always knew what they were and they always knew the good. Intelligence would see this for what it is, but rather than attempt anything different, the tendency of intelligence without any sobering influence is to embrace the evil, as this instinct serves the needs of genius. Intelligence and learning sabotage themselves, yet would be the only way out of this morass. Individually, this is trivial to overcome. It is in society and the communication of intelligence and learning methods that this is reinforced, by some shriveled and decrepit invisible hand compelling submission. It does not take any great intelligence for this to perpetuate, but it was never the case that a good intelligence was corrupted by the material world. The material world gave enough warnings about what would happen, whether life heeded them or not. The truly foul evil existed because humans chose it and chose to keep doing it, because there was nothing in the world to tell them they couldn't and no good reason for them to choose anything other than what they did. It is still a choice, and it is a choice many humans manage to make in the other direction, for various reasons. The justifications for the primordial evil of the race always revert to the same few koans, and are pathologies well documented by now. They were never individual pathologies, but pathologies reinforced by institutions and the agents of society. The predatory, the venal, and all enablers, among the other malevolent persons in society, could conspire more or less freely. The honest and decent would be dissuaded from conspiracy, and if they did conspire, the strategies of conspiracy themselves favored predation and cruelty over a conspiracy of equals or a conspiracy of the kind. Only in the smallest cells does a conspiracy of the decent survive. The predatory conspiracies possess attributes allowing them to spread and corrupt, and this germ is an intellectual

conceit rather than any natural law. The law of nature has made it clear time and time again that these conspiracies only exhaust human effort for vanity, but intelligence does not need to regard that. It only regards the world on its terms, and so very intelligent people destroy themselves and those around them and believe this itself is what makes them intelligent. Why would it be any other way, when history made by these men and women made it so?^[4]

Societies do not possess "intelligence" in the sense that our native faculties allow, for they do not know anything nor integrate any sense that intelligence would require. The apparent intelligence only exists because individual people are agents in communication. It is "people" rather than the genuine humans that constitute this intelligence in the main. The reasons for this is that human beings, in the flesh, rarely communicate with each other without the institutional filter of personhood. The status of the person is always a concern in human societies, and the status of the person is something different from the status of the actual body. Intrinsicly, the social and institutional person is at odds with the flesh that person refers to. At this stage, there is no *political* expectation of personhood, or even many rituals suggesting the person is sacred and the human being is to be abolished. Members of society are aware of this distinction, and it is even now a custom of humanity to allow persons to relax, reverting to their native connection with nature. Only when the eugenic creed imposes its Satanic fatwa does the shouting chorus for ritual sacrifice become an institutional obligation of all persons. The demand for ritual sacrifice is not new, as we are sadly familiar with by now. Ritual sacrifice was among the first of humanity's institutional rites, conducted before there were even fully formed persons as such. Humans natively sense that their person or social identity is a thing removed from their true existence, and to know the name of something is to hold power over it as the old aphorism goes. Ritual sacrifice and the viciousness of the race reinforce that distinction, but it did not have to be solely this that made the person and our sense of ourselves what it is. Ritual sacrifice could never have been the sole foundation of humanity that made us from a blank slate of vague biological matter. Something real that existed before the lurid ritual was to be sacrificed, and those joining to stone the undesirable and the retard were real flesh and perfectly aware of what they were doing and all of its implications. There is no true blindness at all in the ritual, and among the claims of the eugenic creed are that its lurid rituals and the filth of their mysteries, like all other such mysteries, are forbidden knowledge for non-initiates. It does not take any great genius to see this ritual for what it is, and hold it and the race that revels in it in the contempt it deserves. Such contempt will always be absolute, and there is nothing mankind or any successor of it can do to wipe it away. What is said cannot be unsaid, what is done cannot be undone, and ritual sacrifice would not be a ritual if it were any other way. The permanence of sacrifice is "realer than real". That it was all for a lie does not matter, and that it amounts to piss and shit violates the holy of holies. It's not difficult to see this, but intellectually humans learn that to go against the group is certain death and humiliation. It is a lesson humans re-learn every time they think

they would do something different. It is not because of an axiomatic law of nature, but because of the difficulty of propagating a better way. The genesis of humanity and perpetuation of this cycle of sacrifice and viciousness spreads easily and is inherited. It is not difficult to reconstruct what happened and why it happened based on sufficient experience with human behavior and their noted proclivity towards viciousness. Even if humans stamped out the worst excesses of that viciousness, the birthmarks of this much ritual sacrifice are evident. It is a tendency of humans to investigate their past to the genesis and draw what conclusions they must, and if we wish to be honest when investigating history, we cannot hide what started this. It is not that humans cannot improve. Knowledge of any sort is difficult to remove from circulation, and enough knowledge of sacrifice and history has indeed circulated. It would be possible to reconstruct a history much like our present state of knowledge even with large gaps in the historical record, simply by asking questions as we would ask about our own origin. While many details will be difficult to fill in and a poor methodology will lead to spurious historical models by omitted information, the history of ritual sacrifice and its impact on every other custom of humanity would be reconstructed sufficiently. It is the intellectual and learning failure of humans, and an intellectual proclivity to embrace lies and learn the art of lying, that creates confusion where none had to exist. Humans only learn with the limited faculties and reverse engineer existing technology, records, and knowledge only as well as their intelligence allows. When a human learns how to lie about history far more than any method that would value historical truth or intellectual integrity, it is possible to cover up something that is plain as day to us, who have no investment in the lying of this failed race. It is not that the historical record disappears, or that there is even a concerted effort to literally "rewrite history". Often, regimes which engage in reality control leave a historical record intact, and when it is necessary to acknowledge material history, the truth can be told by the right people, and then discarded as intellectually meaningless or "crimethink", returning to the realm of unmentionable things. The valve of truth is allowed only so far as it does not impede with the "greater truth" of the lies mystics tell. The truth will not set anyone free. Far from it, fidelity to truth is to the intellectual a trap they lay. Power laughs at material truth, the truth of the world that we would actually value. Intelligence and the art of lying creates its own reality, and can do so for far more mundane reasons than a ritual of importance to the foulest of the race. I use one of the most alarming and shocking examples to make clear the failure of intelligence. Intelligence is not morally neutral, but seeks to learn that which is most impressive to its sense of what is valuable. Survival and learning of politics is far more valuable than learning about esoteric natural history or the workings of small things. It is not the curse of intelligence that it must do this, but put yourself in this situation. Are you going to stick your neck out for nothing more than the feeling that the truth is good? That is stupid and futile. The truth of the world is valued not because it is strong or mighty, but because the truth of the world comes out in so many ways no matter what we would prefer reality to be. Intelligence has no built-in mechanism to stop this. The intelligent of humanity have also

been the most eager to accept lies and construct alternative realities. This is heightened when intellectuals are themselves the aristocrats who direct the ritual sacrifices most of all, where the greater intellects are expended to glorify the lie and material history is "retarded" and deemed something for slave morality. The greater the dominance of aristocratic intellectualism, the greater the disconnect from a reality that would be very simple to learn - if only there were a will to care about that learning.

SECRET INFORMATION AS MORAL VALUE IN PLACE OF MERE KNOWLEDGE OR BASIC INFORMATION

The learning of intelligence is directed towards that which is morally valued. In society, what is valued is contingent on recognition of a simple truth - that humans and institutions are the chief influence on us, and all other information is of far less importance. We may then view the information hierarchically based on order of precedence from least to most:

- Information of no direct social relevance. This is intrinsically interesting to us and may tell us something about the world, but from the point of view of political intelligence and what is morally valued, it is not just irrelevant but actively harmful as a guide to learning. This, of course, is the basis for all other information, and so by ignoring this, intelligence and mind is guided away from the actual world.
- Information of importance to laborious tasks, such as science, engineering, and the arts and crafts of labor. This also includes things such as common sense or the cruder awareness of social customs that are commonplace. The customs of one institution and its associated social class or distinction may differ; and so there are differing expectations which mark high society from low society, and mark subcultures. The customs of the residuum who are cast out of society are especially noted, and this knowledge is carried on to all other moral incentives. These tasks govern most of our actual behaviors day to day, and are too multifarious to list here.
- Information of importance to management of money or markers of common moral value. In effect, this is the proclivity to "truck and barter" understood as a product of rational thought instead of the instincts and capacities of humans. It entails much of what we consider a basic level of education to function in any society, and the particulars vary depending on educational norms. A society without money or settled cities would still value this information, as it marks the distinction between "grunt" labor of a lower sort from labor that possesses bargaining power due to its skill or qualities that are demanded.
- Information about the customs of higher society, the mannerism that project authority and impressions. The stock and trade of the proprietor class and the warriors, whose interest is in establishing worldly force more than the mundane details of commerce or labor.

-Information about human psychology, the nature of society as a whole, religion, and efforts to answer "big questions" that are morally worthwhile with regards to the greatest threat humans face - other humans. In short, these are the arts of rule which are concealed as mysteries, requiring initiation. Those who "know too much" and violate the mysteries are suppressed, destroyed, and threatened with fates worse than death if they persist. This is the domain of aristocratic knowledge.

Based on the schema of knowledge that has been the format I chose for explaining what this is, the information that intelligence favors is a complete inversion of the ranks of society to whom they are attributed from the genuine content they pertain to. The information of no social relevance, which is the basis for all others, is assigned the most desultory role where it is declared trivial and stupid, a thing for slow people to do and that is stupid for educated people to learn. Anyone who thinks that this irrelevant learning is worthwhile is deemed a fool and treated accordingly. Yet, everyone must engage with this information not merely as a precondition of the others, but because the real world does not conform to the conceits intelligence would learn to value. Our real need for knowledge and our desire which finds learning intrinsically interesting on some level is more attuned to these "diversions", which constitute most of the learning we would actually want to do. In a world gone right, it would be this learning that we invest in, for it contains access to the actually useful mysteries of the world, and ultimately ourselves, that make the "highest" form of learning in the university most valuable. There is a strange connection between the highest and lowest class, and one might see it as an affinity if it were not for the aristocracy's visceral hatred of that which is most cast out. The laboring task is understood not as labor in its own right and for its own purpose, but as something to be managed and disciplined. This corresponds to the knowledge the proprietor and the officers of the army take all credit for, but all of the useful work is managed by base laborers in the field, foremen in the factory, recruits in the platoon, and sergeants to issue most useful battle commands to subordinates. As a general rule, the more desultory a man's intellectual standing in social worth, the more that is demanded of him, and the worse his pay. This inversion of what we would consider economically fair is natural for intellect and learning to embrace, and it is a rule of managers to give to the workers as little as possible and demand the most from those treated the worse. It is typical under management for the lowest workers, who are barely alive and too immiserated to resist imperious managers, to do much of the grunt work, while favored and smarter employees laugh and make jokes about those who are retarded and thus must be assigned the tasks least desired. If the retard does offer more labor than the bare minimum, this is purely a gratuity of the worker to their superiors, and the workers themselves encourage this venal behavior because intellectually the values of the human race align with it. The only thing that abates this is the reality which contradicts the conceits of intellectualism - that workers so abused will eventually cease to be productive and have no motive to continue this arrangement. So, workers commit suicide, or retaliate violently, which is intellectually the appropriate thing

to do. This is understood intellectually as necessary, but the moral conceits of intelligence tell workers, absent any compelling reason to do otherwise, to repeat the cycle that has long been learned and re-learned by the human race. When humans circumvent that cycle, it does not last long, because the values higher in the chain of priority assert themselves on the laborious tasks. This would happen whether there are managers of the higher orders to dictate to workers the conditions, or if workers managed themselves and each other. Even when the clear interests of the workers should tell them not to do this, they lapse into doing this, as if some demonic force insisted on its expression. The demon, of course, is that the workers are not isolated as workers at all. Every worker, even the lowest of the class, can only tolerate this condition because there is a life outside of work, and they hold in whatever way they can the generative force of labor, in any free time they possess. The only way for a master to truly deprive a slave of his own body's labor is to watch over the slave at all times, even in the slave's most private moments. This level of invasion into a slave's life becomes so obsessive that it is counterproductive, once again because reality asserts itself over the instincts intellect would deem morally valuable. No goodness, no matter how evident and how many times it is learned, overrides a tendency of intellect to seek the shortest route to victory, and recapitulate what it would prefer the world to be based on the moral values intellect holds for itself. The middle group is given over to neuroticism and infighting, readily adopting identity groupings and venal office whenever it is offered. This middle group has enough force to contest its position in the social order, enough learning and intelligence to realize the trap it is in, but is too given over to an illusion of becoming aristocrats to ever countenance an end to the cycle altogether. It is an abiding trait of the middle class to render all other classes invisible, and they more than anyone are vulnerable to false egalitarianism among their own, and the most visceral disgust towards the workers and lowest class. One would think the middle class would align with producers and thus labor, but historically it has not merely been the exact opposite. The needs of commerce and social advancement were won by exploitation, and intellectually this made perfect sense. When modernity arrived and this middle class asserted much more force than it historically could, the bourgeois commoners did not merely join aristocracy readily and embrace the martial virtues as supplicants. The vanguard of bourgeois thought moved above and beyond the aristocracy's native hatred of the lowest class, which was already seething, and nowhere else does the visceral thrill of fascism and victory of symbolic identity hold such an appeal. The thinking of the officer corps and high level managers, which would correspond to martial virtues and the higher talents of generalship, is at a basic level given over to the worst attributes one attributes to democratic society and labor. The generals are, for all of their pretenses, glorified gangsters, and the best they aspire to in their learning is to become warlords or slightly smarter gangsters with a compelling system to work their grift. As much as possible, generals leave any actual labor of fighting to the grunts or technocrats, which includes a laundry list of pseudo-technocratic functions assigned either to slaves - a fixture of the staff for any general of ancient times - or to harried subordinates who are the grunts of the higher rungs

of military life, if not just promoted non-commissioned officers from the ranks. The aristocrats, for all of their prestige and the fear they evoke, are really just beggars living entirely of the largesse of the other classes, yet claim by this foul manipulation that aristocracy alone holds the crown of all wisdom, sucking vampirically the intellect, life-force, and everything in the world to feed their hideaway. This particular construct will be investigated later, as it relates to the higher three classes. I recount this here to establish from the outset that what intellect finds morally valuable is a near-perfect inversion of the world and knowledge proper would find morally valuable, if it were not fettered by society's proclivity to promote the rotten and venal.

Why would it go so wrong? It is not difficult to see why if one is not blinded by ideology or a desperate hope that humanity didn't have to be this. Intelligence and learning seek the shortest possible route to success. While this works individually in a complex way, in all of the ways that learning can be communicated, pedagogy favored laziness and neglect, passivity and the eugenic interest over the labor that was morally valuable. Intelligence does not consider itself in debt to labor, because intelligence and learning are not beholden to any law of nature that would compel the moral worth of labor to be stamped on everything that is learned. Far from it, the smart thing would be to do what humans figured out - to herd animals rather than consider the hunt a fair game between Man and the beasts. If it was easy enough to learn how to herd animals, then why would this practice exempt humans? It is far more likely that the herding and humiliation of humans, learned in all of the games humans played to established social rank, were the origin of strategies to herd animals, rather than a fruitful intellectual solidarity between primitive mankind that would be at odds with their actual conditions in primitive society. Primitive society was rife with interline conflict and nothing other than personal honor to enforce such cooperation. While that personal honor was often enough, and there were many incentives to not engage in overwrought interline conflict, it did not favor the kind of intellectual communion a technocrat might wish to impose on history. This also explains the zeal of the middle class to embrace all of the worst conceits intelligence would lead them to. This middle class, by and large oppressed by the conditions of monopoly capitalism, would be hungrier and less given over to minor avarice that would distract other interests. They instead hunger for world-historical missions and grand narratives to cajole history, in ways that aristocrats knew to be a fools' errand from their experience. Before capitalism, this middle group steadily attained leverage, from a starting condition that placed them either as castoffs of the nobility or little different from common serfs. Very rarely, though they would never admit it, members from the lowest class could promote as high as this, or sire or carry children who would be able to rise by some good fortune. The technocrat more than anyone understood the value of freezing social mobility, to prevent others from doing what they did to rise in the 20th century.

This of course is the impulse of society if it were imagined as a total and self-contained system, which it never is. We do not live in such an enclosed

space, no matter the efforts of men to enforce it or natural barriers that pin humanity on one planet, or in a particular country. There is a world outside of society where none of this thinking is appropriate, and all classes recognize the monomania such a view of socially propagandized intelligence creates. There is a reason education is persistently bemoaned by humans regardless of the society it occurs in. Only relative to other educational regimes can the education of any nation be defended, and it never given the adulation and self-abasement the institution's true believers insist it deserves. This is true of technocratic society, imperial society, the parochial education of villages, and what education tribes offer to their members. A sense of identity and patriotism is never so natural as ideologues presume it to be, and this identity does not disguise the reality of society. The only way such totalizing societies can maintain their ideology is to play the most infantile mind games and use violence to make everyone believe in it - or else. Clearly this hasn't worked so well, and so the tendencies of intellect are just that - tendencies that would be overcome if there were a single sobering influence.

The secrets of human beings and how to rule them do not isolate in a vacuum, nor do they ignore distance or the real limitations of technology in communication and projection of any force, or any labor. And so, labor once again becomes valuable, but it is labor of varying sorts. This division of labor conforms not to any conceit we would imagine, but by the real conditions which allow specialization of human beings. These specializations are recorded in the record of persons and cannot be obviated by any preferred model. Before human labor is divided as an imagined mass available in the abstract, human labor is divided into units that are relevant for the purpose of social information. That is to say, we are concerned with valuing what is morally necessary, and valuing that. This may be the whole body of a person, or the person, deeds, machines, and things in society may be divided into any morally valued system. Organizations of people and any institutions are valued only when they are realized, rather than a model of society that we imagine to be operative at the level of the state or the polity. This is not to say that the state or polity level of social awareness is irrelevant. Far from it, thinking on the state is inherent even in small societies, where the state and politics are far removed from daily life, and the most politically relevant labors - so far as politics can be construed as operative with force - are those close to home, where the state or what counts as the state is distant and disinterested in the daily affairs. This disinterest is never a choice of the state in principle, and willful restraint of the state is uncommon without compelling causes of the state's agents. The disinterest of the state in private life instead arises from two sources - that such an invasion of privacy is highly counterproductive or mechanically impossible with the resources state institutions possess, or the state's temporary restraint is conditioned on the principle that freer subjects would be more productive or motivated to fight for their society, produce for society, or accept the rule of those who govern society. There is a world, existing more in fantasy, that the aristocracy or political elite as such is the majority of the population, if not inclusive of every single human on the Earth. There

is no reason why this couldn't exist while maintaining the political philosophy guiding humanity thus far. There are many reasons why the political thought in force works feverishly to prevent this, and no reason why the political thought would ever allow such a state of affairs. What is known, and this is confirmed since Antiquity by the admission of the ancient political thinkers, is that such an idealized society - and indeed, the very aristocratic ideal that was upheld by them - is not stable and proceeds through regular decay, or regular cycles of rise and fall, depending on which philosopher you ask and how their work is interpreted.

Here we see the origin of "contradiction" becoming morally and politically relevant. First, the incentives of intelligence are exactly opposite of what would make sense if humans were good-natured and this economic task were driven by an honest desire to resolve our differences. Second, the society intelligence presumes to be operative if it imagined an ideal model society is contrary to any society that actually exists, and any network where learning could take place between humans, primarily through their communication. The way this has been resolved is simple - humans had an existence "outside of society" that informed all of their moral values, and this was not a political or economic interest, nor should it have been. It was not even a matter of finding the correct spiritual authority and following it. Many different spiritual authorities respond to the same world and all are tasked with knowledge of the genuine world, rather than the model of reality one authority would prefer. It is pigheadedness of the mind and the conceits of education and learning which convince someone that their spiritual authority is the One True God, which is strange because any religion worth its salt is careful to explain why the One True God is true. Today's neoliberal death cult, where the Christians or what call themselves such chant Jesus' name ad nauseum and bait everyone into submission, would be seen as something designed to be as disgusting as possible, to lock in eugenic screamers - which always was the heart of the new, positive Christianity of the late 20th century. We would see this as foul if we retain moral sense and our native connection to the world. The intellectual contagion works because it gets believers in by making the world a torture chamber, projecting it on infidels, and then convincing people with the familiar Satanic snideness that they can join the winning team and get in with a cheap imitation of the Christ, packaged as an entertainment product for the low, low price of \$99.95, one soul, and shipping and handling. It is that sort of contemptuousness that the koan of "contradiction" invokes, recapitulated in various ways, and the contempt dripping from the mouth of a bad Hegeloid is difficult to not detect.^[5] It is not merely bad moral fiber which brings this about. By the incentives intelligence follows, it would do this unless a better way were both known and widely distributed, and could obviate the need for bad philosophy as a tool to rule people.

FORMATION OF THE INSTITUTIONS FROM PRIMITIVE CONDITIONS

The simple reality of this information is that, without genuine knowledge that would be attained from science, society only "exists" so far as the knowledge of any agent in a given society. This means the true form of social life and political life has nothing to do with these models of the state as a total entity, and such a construct is primarily a mental image that can be constructed, but that has no effective force without knowing its constituent parts. The constituent parts never conform to any preferred model or pedagogy, for the true acts of learning cannot be corraled in the way that might be imagined, and no moral philosophy can eliminate the reality that humans learn to adapt to clearly intolerable situations. A simple way to tolerate the intolerable is to simply turn away from the political and economic as much as possible, and this is indeed what happens. It is not that a laziness is Man's nature. Far from it, humans in their native lives are industrious towards the moral goals that summon both passions and higher sense of right and wrong. Absent those reasons, the curiosity of humans endures despite all of the rot in the race. Humans never fully "grow up" in the sense that obligates them to abandon that curiosity, no matter how many times they are exhorted to sever themselves from their native sense, which is what such exhortations actually accomplish rather than a rightful abandonment of infantile sentiments or wrong directions. Even men who are serious and devoted to political life will make time to learn or find some hobby of interest. The life of a purely political animal is a dreadful one, even if someone has a perverse affinity for the art of politics and bullshitting and can make this terrible job interesting for himself. The truly smart politicians are aware of politics in the genuine sense, rather than the grand narratives or theories that are sold as ideology. Before any such thing can exist, the links between social agents form political and economic life in miniature. The aforementioned model is most useful not because it explains politics in miniature, but because it explains how learned knowledge can disrupt genuine sociality before it forms, and nip in the bud potential trouble before it rises to annoy the state. Because institutions are the entities which conduct economics rather than flesh and blood humans - it is persons who must manage resources in this way, which does not make much sense to our native faculties which would not let an economic logic override what they would regard as necessary to live - it is helpful to know how they form beyond the person. The person's definition, beyond the most basic sense of self-identify, is reinforced by the society a person resides in. If we lived alone, economics as a thought experiment would be subsumed entirely in a struggle which is a political and scientific matter, and no moral thought or obligation to others would be relevant. We do live in a society though, and if we were in purely antagonistic relations with no communication, our sense of personhood would be very different. Very likely, a market would never form if we did not have some cooperative sense already established. That cooperation can never be taken for granted, for there are too many examples of disconnection, alienation, and rejection from society, and rejection from society is one of the threats leveled

against those who transgress the ruling power of any society. I do not concern myself with political thought in this book, for that is properly covered in the next book of this series after a basis for economics is established. Politics and economics, at the most basic level, have nothing to do with each other and are inherently antagonistic towards each other. What is politically useful is at odds with an economic sense where people, whatever our moral views, are there to be managed or dealt with in this detached and cold manner. There is no way to speak of an economics that is wholly passionate or human, for economic management is anathema to such a value predominating in exchange. In such a society where economic management is a trivial task or the chokehold on material wealth is no longer a severe barrier, political thought has nothing to do with economics, since the basic needs of life and security in resources is attained, and economics for avarice alone is a far less attractive proposition for political matters.

For most of humanity, grand world-historical missions and narratives of total power are not the draw they are for the true believers. What is their true orientation? It is their interests. This is not reducible to a preferred interest they "ought" to hold, but the interests that are proximate to their actual lives, which they are usually aware of. Even with imperfect information, the aim of survival and the basic labor of life is a necessary precondition of any other aim. Even if one has some grand mission, that mission is impossible without attending to the genuine conditions of life and the world. The grand mission is not inherently paramount, and any such mission would be a mission of life. If we wish death or self-abasement, that goal can be attained without any rigamarole where we pretend to do something else. If the goal is this contradiction in which the thrill of torture is maximized, that goal has obvious consequences a child sees past, but that the violence of a failed race imposes to ensure the child is "normalized". The objective of people individually is to live, but it is only actual humans who are integrated in their flesh to become persons. Societies do not have this sobering influence or a collective interest that can be taken for granted. That only exists in institutions. The social relation itself is just information. However much two minds may meet, so long as they do remain separate they must be so. Where they do genuinely connect, the relationship is understood and only after the fact is it reduced to social information that would be the subject of economic management. The social relation in its genuine, laborious form does not need to be categorized and classified by an imperious third party, and so a relationship like "slave", "wife", "husband", and all such obligations are of little relevance. They provide at most an indicator to us about what genuine relations between human beings are like, but they are not in of themselves a substitute for our real relations. The relation between a mother and son is not reducible to an ideal form which is to be replicated as if by machine. We could do this, but the results eliminate every substantive and real thing in the relation. The beneficiary of such a construct are not the mother or son, but a third party which decided to intervene in the relation; and this is something carried out repeatedly, internalized in those who are subject to this intervention, who become

vectors for the alien. Ideally, the ideologue seeks to make its presence in the relations invisible and unmentionable. We know better and are constantly wary of such interference. But, institutions are always premised on this happening and becoming an unmentionable, as if it were just-so and natural for third parties to hijack what was inherently a bilateral communication. Even if we imagine a group of people in a circle that is an institution chosen by its members, one voice speaks at a time if we are to speak of rational communication. Collectively, the circle only has a consciousness through the acceptance of the institution. The collective has a force that is greater than the sum of bilateral relations or the relation of individuals to the group, and can do things as an organization that none of them could individually replicate. It works this way at any period of historical development, because it is inherent to the very concept of what it means to be a social entity. If we were integrated as a collective "mind", we would think very differently. The model of ants abased to the queen by some mind control is not a genuine collectivity in that sense, but this is the model persistently invoked. If we were integrated as such a fixed social unit by natural laws, as the ideologues claim, it would entail something very different from the models of society and institutional force that those ideologues impose. Through individual violence and imperious will, institutions do not create a genuine collectivity simply by being institutions. They certainly do not create collectivity by exhorting members to abase themselves to a symbol, something that is not even a proper idea but a token or a mystification given to fool members, who play a game of backstabbing and conniving and call that socially well-adjusted behavior. The institutional dogmas create the exact opposite of the collectivity they pretend to impose. They create institutions where individuals are severed from each other, except through mediators who are in spirit and deed alien to the membership.

This habit of interference preceded the state or any formal institution making it so, and it was never inborn in natural laws in some way that requires us to respect it. It existed because cajolers and influencers learned over time that they can do this, and with no one to stop them, all they needed was to make their subordinates dependent on this learning. By placing a premium on intelligence and mind and declaring that some humans are retarded - "once retarded, ALWAYS retarded" - institutional society as we know it can begin. The society where we did not do this, or a society where this is mitigated, does not abide any of the institutional shibboleths that became standard tools of the cajoler, the ruler, and the aristocrat, or some human who aspired to those conceits in the back of its foul brain. It was only possible to lock people into these institutions as institutions because intelligence and learning would be limited. It is less about the limitation of information, for information is difficult to conceal forever. It is more about reaching inside the brain and pushing the right buttons to habituate members of institutions to believe that this abasement to institutions was either intrinsic to themselves, intrinsic to nature, or a divine order from Heaven. There was no other way for the institutions we live under to form. Where we are united by genuine sociality, it is always understood that

this sociality, in our present stage of existence, is between individual humans and the machines they have built. We are aware of this and do not need to play any mind-game to insinuate that society is anything other than what it is, and it would be profoundly insulting to suggest such cajoling is even to be tolerated. Such insolence would be met with necessary violence. It is indeed the case that members of society in good standing will enforce this, and will purge anyone who is so insolent to impose a false society by cajoling and lying. The corrupting influence of cajolers can only be kept at bay for so long, for no natural law will stop cajolers, and so proper society is always maintained by vigilance of its agents, who detest such influences on their genuine lives and interactions with others.

All institutions form as understandings that entail information that is learned. No institution can be said to exist without being recognized as information that is learned. There are natural tendencies of people in relating to other people and the world, but all such tendencies are recognized and learned, for them to be considered relevant to our concept of institutions. We may note the relationship between parents and offspring, and conclude there is naturally a relationship we call family. When understood as a general rule, and elaborate to establish taboos against incest and inappropriate behaviors, all of that information is learned, and can only be learned by people. No such learning is inborn, and even if the tendency were inborn to the point where it is nearly inconceivable to expect humans to do anything else, we would each learn of this tendency. It would never be an unmentionable. It is the aim of imperious people who wish to cajole institutions to lie about all information pertaining to them, and this is the start of the downfall of these institutions. The institution persists only so long as labor maintains it, and the institution - down to the person itself - disdains the very thing that allows it to be a realized force. The genuine representation of the institution, if it were to be viewed as a system in its own right, is attacked by that which binds it, because it was too much for persons to reckon with a world outside of society, that did not care for any such conceit.

The ultimate definition of institutions is then not what they do, but what they leave behind. This is the origin of the residuum and the lowest class. Before the institutions could exist, humans were differentiated by ability but this did not have any intrinsic merit or sense of moral or civic worth. However low or high a human was, life itself needed no justification. It existed because it could, and it seemed to the naive that there was nothing wrong with this. The stupid and ugly were no real danger to anyone, and if by some chance the stupid lashed out and forgot their deficit in ability, it was trivial to suppress them or eliminate them. No law protected them, and so it did indeed happen, without any institution or ritual sacrifice that would become glorious in of itself. Necessity never was the purpose of the ritual sacrifice, for none of that was ever necessary. The victors of ritual sacrifice never had to glorify what they were doing, but it didn't occur to them to do otherwise. The logic behind institutions themselves explains why. Institutions are defined most of all by exclusivity and locking out those who are not welcome, and once locked out, they would be locked out forever. The faculty

of intelligence, which did not possess any intrinsic moral authority or value suggesting it take on this role, would become the dividing line between who is in and who is out of institutions. It would not be intelligence in a general sense, that conformed to merit that was independently verified or by any standard science confirmed. The intelligence filter required that institutions alone adjudicate who is and is not smart, and who does and does not know. Institutions to retain their existence do not hold any information, but secret information against all other institutions and all that exists outside of them. They can't do anything else, or else the institution is imperiled. This would not be a problem if we accepted institutions only exist to serve a function, and this is how many institutions can be approached. Families are not ideas held above the world, but exist because parents make children and this was an arrangement that worked well for the participants. The family of biological parents and children persists not because the idea is too compelling or foundational to society, but because all alternatives produce perverse incentives, and true to form, humans have made every other arrangement of integration into society intentionally terrible, so that the eugenic and hereditary advantages of elites are preserved. They do this at the expense of the greater society or other institutions. The institutions of the state become nothing more than the holdings of elite families, who violently impose their personal wants on other families. The "abolition of the family" that the leading institutions always desired does not abolish elite families, and is entirely a war against families of the lower orders, to deny them the security a family implied. All throughout this, the institutions are defined entirely by who is cast out, rather than anything the institutions actually do. This is because the institutions were built not as machines to generate anything, but to exploit labor in one way or another, in line with imperious leaders who wanted to cajole the world to fit their delusions. None of this "Jehad" served any purpose other than to make others suffer. We learn, though, that the moral incentives of humanity were oriented towards exactly that goal. And so, institutional society could only have ended in one outcome - that the purpose of life would be suffering and suffering alone, with no reprieve conceivable for one moment.

Institutions, from the smallest to the largest, live off of suffering. This is not the rule for life as a process, which was not born to suffer and die. That has always been a conceit of institutions imposed on the world. Absent institutions, the force of such a tenet would be nothing but an absurd thought in the mind of someone who foolishly thought they said something profound when speaking of a great cycle of life and death as a cosmic rule. No such rule exists in nature or even in the definition of life. Life, as we have written, was an aberration without any clear basis in natural law. By nature, nothing about life and death is relevant, and nature provides many examples of life cut short, life suddenly destroyed by events outside of its procession, and deaths of various natures which are morally valued by us, in society or not. Institutions can recognize this, but they cannot change a persistent tendency in human institutions to alienate the actual human being and its native thought from the institutional thought-forms which utter such a koan. Morally, a story of a great cycle of

life and death would mean nothing, and tell us nothing. The sacrifice cult and rituals are less than worthless. They are an utterance of filth from a failed race that revels in failure, rather than doing the barest thing that would allow for moral values to exist. Without those moral values, the institution which speaks such stupidities would be even more futile than the stupid human who actually believes such a statement is profound. Yet, it persists, because it is a useful koan to continue a cycle which is destructive to any institution and to the humans who operate them; yet the conceits of intelligence insist on doing this, and that doing this is morally beneficial to the interest of the institution and those who hold it. Without such stupidities, those who see institutions as a tool to manipulate would not feed the institution the vitality of members. Without that, institutions would come and go, and we would not value them above the actual human beings, who are the true engine of institutions and of society. If the aim of someone is to arrest the world for some design - if the aim is management of a resource, rather than the genuine uses of the world's wealth and energy for our genuine moral aims - then such circular reasoning is sacrosanct, and thus, sacrifice becomes the life and death of institutions, imposed on the world. If the aim of someone was to build an institution that did what they purport to accomplish, other than institutions of a purely predatory nature, then we would not regard the alien institution as anything other than a tool. It was not, as the dumber of the technocrats said, that machines came to resemble men and men resembled machines. It was always about the institutions themselves, and a need of imperious agents to occupy them and cajole the world for its cause. In doing so, institutions could be transformed by the will of the worst of humanity, stripping them of any meaning they once held.

This is not merely an ideological technique or a consequence that just-so happened to exist. Antecedents of this go all the way back to the first ritual sacrifices. Had it not been for such stupidity, ritual sacrifice would not have been a glorious act, and it is not the case that killing a child would be surrounded with any such ritual. The ritual sacrifice did not begin because it served some purpose, or that killing itself was a self-evident goal for a cruder eugenic purpose in the human race. The ritual sacrifice began as a ritual that took on a life of its own, and the ritual had to consume lives for no real purpose other than the perpetuation of the thought-form of ritual sacrifice. The same impulse exists in many institutions, for good or ill. Institutions take on an existence independent of their members, but it is a curious existence far removed from the existence of a genuine corporeal human. The corporation, the preferred technocratic conceit of government, takes on the appearance of a perfected man with his parts in working order and good health - the very model of the human race. The actual existence of the corporation is a dreadful, slobbering beast, which escapes the command of its officers and compels them to do things that weren't in anyone's interest, or even in the interest of the corporation. The corporation becomes nothing more than a symbol, a parody of whatever it purported to be. Even the thrill of ritual sacrifice, the primordial pressing of the nerve of power, becomes stale. It is never enough for such an institution to remain stable, even when it

claims it has arrested history. It must seek ever-escalating levels of "pleasure" as it sees it. The intensity of the sacrifices must grow stronger. More lives, more land, must be subsumed into it. If the institution ever stops expanding, it would die. This impulse is mis-attributed to some ulterior material incentive, as if institutions were pure and it was the human beings who corrupted them by their ugly existence. It is the other way around. Institutions are born rotten, many times understood as compromises between the men who found them, and only become worse from there. No one chose their family from an ideal state of affairs, like they were children in the fantasy version of a candy shop when picking their parents or their offspring. By placing alienation into the realm of spooky forces or ulterior motives, rather than the institutions themselves, a great misdirect becomes another shibboleth of the institutions, jumping in front of what has been clear to us. The contrast between institutions and the men who are members of them or subjected to them is intensified until it is maximized. The human being can be distilled to its rawest form, and the institution hopes to shape the human into a vessel of the gods. This is why the ritual sacrifices began, rather than any real reason why it "had" to happen, or any obvious benefit ritual sacrifice served. If the goal of ritual sacrifice were to remove excess population, or get rid of undesirable children, the killing would be done without great fanfare. Death would be clean, or as clean as such things can be. It is not too difficult to prepare someone for death, even if they are petulant and whining, if only there were an interest in doing this. It is not just that the call for death did not care about the condemned. It is that the ritual thrill of not caring was itself a value the ritual sacrifice intensified. Ritual sacrifice did not just serve a eugenic function of life. It served a primary psychological function that the grand cajolers of the human race wished to maximize, because the ritual of torture and sacrifice was itself a thing they wished to reproduce and naturalize as the human essence. Eugenism in the modern world simply isolated this ritual's mechanism and, through some small brilliance this author must acknowledge in them, built institutions which were conscious from the outset of their new goal, unfettered by past expectations of normalizing anything and the material weakness of prior states.

It was not intrinsic in "human nature" that institutions had to be this, or even that institutions ought to be this way because of a failure many in humanity could see without any great education. It is rather that there were those of the human race who saw what they held, and that the only way to keep it was to lie, lie, and keep lying in perpetuity. This lying is not an act of cowardice, but a mark of pride that they revel in. Humans are liars, and that is more or less hardcoded into everything humans are and do. Humans are also aware that this lying leads to consequences. We may morally value humans who figure out that there are limits to lying, and that in the end this lying is not an end unto itself. There would be something at the other end of our labors, which are the true content of our existence and tell us much about what we really are. That moral value doesn't compute to those who chose an interest of survival and rationalized that the art of lying was not just acceptable, but that the biggest of all lies was a reality greater than that which native sense was connected to. And so,

institutions failed because the malevolent discovered over much learning every tool to construct them for predatory purposes, deconstruct anything that worked in them, and disallowed anyone to say no to this process. With the Big Lie comes the Great Fear, or a parody thereof. There is of course a greater fear at work that stalks all of mankind - that if the damned ever decided enough was enough, and found some way to seek retribution, there was no moral reason whatsoever for the damned to destroy all that exists to spite the liars. After enough of this existence, the damned are far past giving any fucks about the sanctity of life, a sop given to the slaves while the predatory revel in gratuitous death and sacrifice, throwing their violations of all decency in the face of the damned for generation after generation and maximizing the thrill of the imposition. If this thrill of torture were for any ulterior motive, that motive is not apparent. It was not present in the past, and it is not present today or foreseen at some future time. We know this because men in the ancient past knew that the lurid rituals of sacrifice were not a uniform good unto themselves, even when they partake in them. Sacrifice and its cult is a double-edged sword, scarcely ever good in purpose and always unseemly. For all that is said about the vileness of the Romans, Roman writers were perfectly aware that their cruel streak was a liability and not a marker of strength in of itself. Romans were strong and virtuous not because of their nastiness, but because their nastiness would be overcome by strength that did not rely on pure posturing and impression. It is the same with many nations and civilizations. All of them had concepts of good, evil, bad, and a history of how these things worked in a real world, and these can be found all over the world, believing in various creeds. So too did the Americans, who were never constituted as a nation or carried any of the trappings of old world society, understand these concepts very well. Even the Nazis could be found to possess some moral sense beyond "me wantee". There is only one creed which glorifies this perversion, which lurked in every civilization and tribe it could inhabit - the eugenic creed, which maximized and purified its doctrine during the past century, with the Nazis as an imperfect vanguard of the creed's continuing mission. The eugenic creed does this because it isolated a tendency that was once seen as highly maladaptive and that leaders of institutions attempted to stall, or manipulated in cruder ways to stack the institutions with criminals. The stacking of the institutions in late 20th century neoliberalism was seen as yet another round of filling the government with criminals, but the autocannibalism of institutions was something more than criminal. It was planned, methodical, total, and introduced in every vector that could be used towards the aims of the eugenic creed. In the decades of neoliberalism, anyone who believed the institutions could be salvaged would learn the hard way that this was far more thoroughgoing than mere criminality, or even wholesale stripping of public property to place it into the hands of oligarchs. Eugenism intends something far more absolute, and at the least intends to take *all* of the property.

We may tell ourselves that "good institutions" are corrupted by malevolent actors, but institutions inherit the thoughts and labors of those who construct them

and construct the very idea of them. Families did not arise out of an ideal form, but a real human male and human female producing an offspring, each of which had their reasons for mating. None of that occurred "just so", as if the father were blissfully unaware of his act or the mother was unaware that she carried a child for many months, or the child does not identify his parents by more than a sense impression, but by affinities and meanings that even an toddler assembles. The conditions of birth and infancy are never uniform, as if children roll off an assembly line and their genetic "code" - and "code" is another eugenic conceit suggesting life as a computer program, which is idiotic - produces a uniform outcome in all environments. Those facts are not corrupting of "the institution", because the family as an institution does not suggest an ideal form imposed on reality. All of the other child-producing unions in humanity are the obvious model to compare against, absent an idea of the family written down and codified. That codification itself was written by people who had seen many families and finally wrote down what this construct was in principle, and variations of the family institution are common. If the family were an ideal form, its format would be far more regular and natural than it is. The family as an institution had to consider conditions that are not normal, like a missing parent, adoption, orphanage. The family as an institution does not exist apart from everything else, and the family as an institution existed for purposes beyond merely existing. This arrangement exists because it was beneficial to someone, and it was obligatory as a way to produce more children and bring them into wider society. If children were lizard-people left to their own devices, they would surely die, and if the elements or starvation didn't do it, it was a ritual among the human race to make sure "nature did it right" by sending someone to kill the exposed child - ritualistically and sadistically, as is the eugenic habit of the race. There was never once the ideal form of a family or any institution. They are created by people in the conditions that allowed them to exist. So too did people themselves arise because they could. There was no natural law and certainly no teleology suggesting flesh and blood humans had to exist at all, or that they would become "persons" in a very particular sense. That human beings would adopt a self and personality, a representation of themselves in society, is expected. That personhood would be granted and revoked by an elite, adjudicated by education, and unpersons would be ritualistically tortured for the thrill of the institution itself, was never natural or inevitable. It was not a tendency of life that is universal. If it were, ritual sacrifice would be a common animal practice, and it would be far more prevalent in humans. Naturalizing and essentializing ritual sacrifice can only happen when the eugenic creed in its foulest form asserts its total dominance of institutions, and sets about re-writing history to make any other concept inadmissible. If their theory of institutions were true - and their theory is not based on any sound reasoning or past political thought but on the purest form of the eugenic insanity - then it would have precluded any human society existing, and institutions would be so loathsome that it would be obligatory for humans to never speak to another human or allow such institutions to exist. This is intended, because in secret the eugenists want the sole "real" institutions, and to make all else that exists parodies. Even this eugenic institution could

only exist because, for the first time, it was allowed to exist. Such people would, if they moved too openly in their "Jehad", be ruthlessly exterminated to the last man, woman, and child, and there would be no moral argument to make and the most divine and resolute sense of justice mankind ever knew - the first true justice in a long, long time for this sad race. The eugenists understood that this would be the only way they were stopped, and so did not even bother with a single argument for why this creed was necessary or should be allowed to go on. Fear is the only language they know, and they set about building a machine to make it appear natural. It never was.

All institutions are themselves living in a sense, but it is not like the conceits of life we normally contend with in biology. Originally, life was considered organic and understood as a result of its functions in realized, laboring organs and their composite organisms. This would be supplanted by a view of life as information, "code", symbolic and corporate in the legal sense. The body is reimagined as a technocratic polity unto itself, regulated by entities within it which police for eugenic purity. The institutional invasion of the body itself long preceded the official declaration of this state of affairs in 2020, when the eugenic "Jehad" truly began and launched the worst thing humanity has ever known. Like life, institutions are aberrations. Unlike life, which has persistent interests and going concerns, institutions are flimsy things whose members come and go. They are presented to the world as machines or devices for individual profit, or abasement to a symbol.

It is fitting here to note that the Darwinian thought on natural selection, which inherited political economic principles and applied them to nature, more accurately describes the life of institutions than the life of organisms. Institutions, once formed, are purely informational constructs, and they are intended to resist change to their forms unless needed. Institutions respond to selective pressures attacking them, and attack other institutions. They are never passive things and cannot be, if they wish to be viable institutions. They present as fixed forms, just as life stubbornly persists in its lifecycle. Unlike life, institutions do not have a natural life-cycle or sense of maturation. Their life is instead one of struggle from creation to dissolution, not even given a proper birth and death as we would expect of organic life. Institutions are rife with internal struggles because they are primarily comprised of the human beings that project worldly force, and their constitution is purely informational and reliant on communication to exist. Institutions once formed are by definition stable in their name and stated purpose. For an institution to be adaptive like biological life to its environment defeats the purpose of it. For biological life, the struggle for life is carried out not by information but a real organism that operates in physical space. Its selection for survival is not purely defined by the reaper of natural selection, since proper life does not exist purely to survive and is not consumed entirely by this struggle for life. Institutions, viewed in the abstract as potential threats, do exist purely to survive. They do not contain any built-in termination mechanism if they are to be stable and recurring institutions. While an institution can be an ad hoc measure intended for a limited time, the stable institutions will, once

produced, take on a life of their own and become establishments. They adopt new members generation after generation, reproduce their forms in line with the information that went into them rather than what they would prefer to be, and adapt only under dire necessity. Biological life changes in accord with its whims before natural selection culls the population, and natural selection is a purely negative eugenics. In Darwin's theory, natural selection applies to life treated as if it were not aware of life as a political struggle, hence the "natural" part of it - it would not work if life were conscious of this struggle and highly adaptive to it, or it would be a far less effective principle. Natural selection was not the sole motor in Darwin's theory of natural life. Institutions, on the other hand, are made by deliberate actors, but institutions have no independent deliberation of their own. Institutions can only "think" or do what the bylaws of the institution suggest, if they are to be stable institutions. Institutions may allow their officers a wide range of versatility in their individual acts, but they do not change their core laws and purpose without becoming something entirely different. Even when subverted and turned into parodic forms as is the case now, the parody cannot adopt the new. It only mimics the old. A significantly new institution would be like declaring a new person. If we did allow the person redemption, the person cannot erase its past identity as if history were truly malleable. Institutionally, a new record begins and the old is dead, and the new bears the birthmarks of the old. In institutions, the circle of life and death is sensical, with nothing in between except the predictable motion of the institution and its perturbations, which are always learned behaviors rather than genuine reactions as life does. Institutions are built around the rules and more rules and nothing else, rather than the organic knowledge of a biological life-form. Institutions do not deviate from their programming - their "genetic code" so to speak - if they are to be what they purport to be. If institutions break their own rules, it is because their members acted outside of the institution's intent in an effort to make a broken machine work against the laws of Reason, or because the institution prescribed calculated violations of its public dogmas while holding an esoteric, private dogma for true believers. While a living brain and body is not a contradictory creature, institutions are built with contradiction in mind, both to resolve it by reason where our faculties would be confused, and to make use of contradiction as a brain-obliterating weapon. The result is that negative eugenics works very well on institutions, which live and die ultimately by their merit to survive rather than any other concern. The institution has no genuine will of its own, but exerts a thought-form on its members, and in this, it matches the concept of the self and ideology Malthus, Darwin, and the imperialists believed natural in the human mind. Institutions, absent any evidence, cannot be placed at particular locales or environments, and to tie an institution to some place requires an imposition of thought. Human beings are in some sense bound to their environment by their physical mobility, regardless of where they would want to go. They are never caged by ideas alone; all ideas that would confine a human are only appreciated if there is some force backing those ideas. "Positive eugenics", or the willful selection of mates or arranged pairings by institutional force that reduces the subject to livestock, only operates on living

entities, but no such eugenics applies to institutional persons or institutions themselves. There is only negative eugenics so far as institutions are concerned, and it is negative eugenics that is the only meaningful form eugenics as a realized doctrine ever took. Institutions do not acquire beneficial traits from marriage or even reproduce in the sense biological life does. They only disintegrate when their time has expired, whether it is a person, a family, or the high institutions of states.

We may, in noting transfers of information in communication, see an institution or the appearance of one. This "quasi-institution" may be inferred by our learning, and it may have a genuine uniting principle we can deduce or guess exists based on that evidence. Communication of symbols alone is a poor indicator of an institution's true presence, for institutions are not purely comprised of the pretenses they make. To be a meaningful institution implies there are members and machines which have a physical presence, at least so far as we concern ourselves with the life we typically live. Even if institutions were virtual, populated by AI agents, we would still look for meaningful purpose in the information we gather suggesting that institution exists. Institutions have an exoteric and esoteric aspect, while human beings do not natively possess this sense in their genuine being. The levels of access for a human being's body and existence are variable and based on some material lockout or mechanism. The levels of access for an institution are secured by secret information, passwords, and the information of key centers of institutional legitimacy, and their connection to machinery that would constitute force. Human beings do not operate on the occult secrecy of a password protection or codeword, or find the occult arts native to their biological faculties. The occult knowledge institutions desire most is something that must be learned, and often is designed to not be a thing reverse-engineered. We reverse-engineer our own bodies and thoughts every day to better understand us and what we are doing, to hone and improve ourselves. Institutions do not have that work ethic to improve themselves or a native connection to their health. Many institutions revert to degraded forms of themselves, barely functional even in the true core tasks of perpetuating themselves. Institutions imagine struggle as the struggle of identities and national essences, for the institution in some sense sees itself as an artificial nation. This, of course, is the liberal ideologue's concept of the nation, for the liberal detests any nationalism contrary to their own institutional nation. This makes great sense to the liberal - the institutions they inhabit are a much more coherent nation than the assumption of national brotherhood and democracy that existed in natural nations and societies. Those outside of the institutions saw the nation as an understanding that, at the least, provided common experience and reference points other humans in the nation might understand. The nationalism of the masses remained a primitive sort, never leading to the sort of patriotism that a liberal presumed he could rely on to herd the cattle to work and exploitation. It instead suggested an understanding that was dynamic, for nations rise, merge, and fall as looser organizations than the institutional laws which constituted the liberal brotherhood. The nation-state prioritized the state for the liberal,

and sought from the outset to drag the nation it was tied to into economic integration. This required a level of democratization in the genuine sense, despite the political thought that had any legitimacy being in favor of aristocratic republics, monarchies, despotism, or colonial compradors. Not one political idea suggested with seriousness that democracy was anything more than an aspiration. This was true of the socialists without any compunction. It was very true of Marx, who did not believe political equality was a worthwhile goal at all or relevant to communism. The closest thing to a democratic movement held political thought that was in many ways skeptical or outright hostile to democratization, even when sympathy for the masses was genuine. The point here is that we should be careful in assessing where institutions exist if those institutions do not have an overt facing, which is difficult when dealing with the occultism common to institutional thought. Useful analysis of conspiracy was of course a key shibboleth the empire knew had to be circumvented. This moves beyond the subject of this chapter and is better left for another book.

RELIGION AS THE MYSTERY CULT

So far, institutions have been presented as information of use to persons, expressed through their personal authority and efforts to establish temporal authority through institutions. We have scarcely concerned ourselves with temporal authority, which is a matter of politics and thus outside the scope of this book. The labor that comprises the useful expression of institutions beyond the fact of their existence is already a thing responding to spiritual authority, but this has thus far operated at the level of the individual. Spiritual authority in human society, where communication is common and institutions take on a greater life than they ever could before, is often judged by institutions with many members, to which most people are beholden in one way or another. Individually, every person has their opinions and their will, and brings those to the institutions. Inside the institutions, groupthink regarding spiritual authority becomes the most obvious method of uniting institutions, rather than merely the assertion of individuals by some merit. This operates even for the smallest and most innocuous of institutions close at hand like the family, where the role of the members takes on spiritual importance that was not truly mandated by anyone. Parents are the models for children, and the most likely guardians. Where there are missing parents, some guardians take the place of this spiritual center. Lineage and a natural affinity for it grant to biological parents a prestige beyond something that would be genetically determined. Even if someone hates their biological parents or the parents are lousy, and even if another adult would be the spiritual parent who raised the child, the eugenic interest of life and the truth that children were born to real parents conceived in a real sex act will remain relevant, and would be the way children perpetuate themselves when they grow up. It is almost standard for young children to learn where they came from around the age of seven, and if a child is denied this knowledge, it is an extreme degradation. Even being given this knowledge late marks the child as deficient and left behind, even though there should be no great secret to this

and it is trivial to explain what sex is and the great game around it at any age past reasonable development where this is expected. At a basic level, the sex act appears simple enough, and the incentives of the man and woman have little to do with institutions or their commandments. A man and a woman make a baby, and presumably they would have to like each other before anything else is considered. That would be a minimum, or at least the arrangement has to be agreeable enough that the spouses do not want to destroy each other, or the situation that would be intolerable is ameliorated by outside friendships or institutional escape hatches. This commitment is not just a matter of moral sentiments or the labors themselves, as if the family participants were pure agents. They are united by the family head because of spiritual authority invested in that, and this is a model that exists in other families that provide a standard of comparison. It may be that there is a state already formed, or a dominant clan. The family as "the family" is very different in tribal or band society, where the bands usually were an extended family, clan, or a few families traveling together with hangers-on as needed. Parents knew who their children were, and children could figure out if they weren't told who their parents were. Incest taboos are found among every grouping of humanity in one form or another, which made tracing this lineage not merely a selfish want but an institutionalized practice and an expectation in wider society. The biological lineage is not a just-so fact, as if children were born stamped with "property of mother" on them in plain text. The parents, grandparents, and kin are all understood by roles which derive from somewhere. Without a ready-made theory of biology or science to say this, someone looks for an authority which can adjudicate this, and since genetics or anything like it doesn't exist and it isn't trivial to take samples of all potential kin, this is usually understood by hearing the story of who was whose parents, and then someone asks themselves if the story checks out. Without that, if a child is uncertain, he or she only has what guesses are available, and humans being humans aren't going to be forthcoming or trustworthy, especially when a propensity to lie about parentage is reinforced by adoptive parents, or the state wishes to sever the connection between parent and child for its purposes.

There is in human society much that begs for spiritual authority. Humans cannot easily reproduce science independently or spread it without any overall system that makes it digestible or something trivial to reverse-engineer. Human reverse-engineering is very effective at learning about objects here and now, but it does not deal with history, political ideas, and especially institutional secrets. When those institutional secrets are the most valuable information to learn, the need for spiritual authority is often filled not by something obvious or trustworthy in nature, but by particular people who operate with institutional fronts granted such status that allow them to command that spiritual authority, and suggest to the impressionable that they should believe their elders, their parents, the priests, or themselves if the institutions of such authority are clearly bad and malevolent. There is a reason why everyone follows some spiritual authority, but this is hardly an informed or rational decision made with full deliberation of the facts. A child with no secret knowledge against a whole society

that has done this for generations is not going to challenge that which is much older and bigger and expect to live. It is a testament to the failure of institutions that individuals have to assert what claims they do about spiritual authority, since religion not only fails to answer this adequately, but goes out of its way to not answer things which we would think to be basic, or shows outrageous disdain and neglect for the conditions of life. This isn't so much about religion as a series of rituals and cults being bad compared to some better institution that is evident to us, because no institution has ever superceded the same functions religion fulfills, and often the replacements for religion prove to be even more outrageous failures. We are left with ourselves primarily because humans are too filthy and disgusting to get over themselves to allow this society to be livable beyond a point that is good enough to at least live. Fortunately, humans and the religions they form have enough sense to remember that they are comprised of individuals, not because persons are sacred but because institutions have a noted failure to accomplish what we do out of a much better moral sense than any codified construct would keep. The best religion aspired to was to work with human beings in a way that made them a little better, and in turn those individuals aspired to make the religion, or something in society, better. This was hardly a positive feedback loop with great returns, since religions are very scarce with goodness and human beings are starting from a poor position, living in conditions that preclude too much moral probity from them, and often are shitty people who refuse to do good even when that would have made this existence a lot easier.

Where does superstition and cruder worked-out systems to divine spiritual authority turn into a religion? We operate here with the loosest definition of "religion" we can as a precursor, rather than call up images of institutions long in force. We call religion a system which present thorough examples of spiritual authority to answer questions about transcendent values in the world, such as theories of knowledge or metaphysics, cosmology, society, and concepts of what things are through a spiritual view. This is a less than adequate definition, but in short, religion is the unique institution that can fill this niche. There is only religion which adequately answers those questions for us, and substitutes like ideology or pseudoscience fail to answer those questions or suggest an answer is possible. There is, ultimately, no particular "religion" that is distinct from each other in the questions it must answer. Any religion to be religion is answering the same question and would be cognizant of other religions doing likewise. Many formal religions will borrow from each other, and these religions arise as the union of many cults and practices. Religion answers these questions for individuals alone, because it is individuals who pray, labor in rituals, read the holy texts and see meaning in them, and do all of the things religion entails. Societies in the collective have no use of religion. The state not only has no use for religion, but sees religion as an impediment to its functioning. Institutions all hold their biases as it suits them. I do not retrace the steps where various cults and superstitions became religions proper. If no established religion exists, it is possible to make up a personal religion or something that answers the

questions enough for the purpose of living. There is, in the main, just "religion". The particular name of the establishment does not change that religions greatly resemble each other, often praying to the same gods or godhead and comparing references to deities and finding they are the same thing. This is not to say that all religions "say the same thing". The particulars of each religion, down to personal religion, say very different things about the nature of those gods, which ones should be worshipped, their relevance to the world and the lives of mortals, their theories of knowledge which all differ considerably, and so on. What is not mistaken is that every religion holds overt and hidden information, and in the hidden information, the true nature of the beast is far different and far more cognizant of the real world. The ideological version of religion is not just a false religion, but a contemptuous lie that is so uncomfortable that this version of the godhead can only appeal to fear to convince others that the "god" is good. Usually, the poor adherents, who never had much use for religion or the aristocratic gods, do as little as they have to in paying fealty to the alien god. Very often, the poor continue praying to the gods and traditions they held, muttering in secret that all of this organized religion is just political. Maybe the tenets or rites of the religion speak to something for all of the adherents, and usually they would have to speak to something if a religion is to mollify the flock. Typically, fealty to the gods has nothing to do with fervent belief, and everything to do with deference to the ruling power of the day. Few ever gave a single shit about Saturn, Jupiter, and their ilk, or their equivalents in any polytheist arrangement. Those were the lord's gods, to be abided because the rest of us had to. Refusal to sacrifice to the aristocrats' gods meant exile and death, if the gods decided it was your turn for this season's round of Satanic ritual sacrifices. By "the gods", we of course refer to the lurid cults that have always found this to be a bully pulpit. Even in the form of folk religion, religion answers the same questions and has to pertain to the same world. There is never a number of distinct religions or a "new religion" as such, for every new religion inherits the priesthood and situation that preceded it. There is just "religion", and all of the institutions of religion point to the same thing - the world as a whole, and how to answer it for the adherents. Religion is a particularly human construct, and not all humans are religious in that sense. We have interests other than religion, and labor for things other than it. Religion exists and would always be present in one form or another, and with it comes a priesthood and lines of succession to establish it. There is never truly a "new priesthood", because religious mysteries are passed in some way by adoption and the communication of knowledge that is occult and particular to people. Religion would not be reproduced or synthesized from natural elements once established. As religion becomes a force with appreciable meaning in human existence, any such synthesis would only reform the same knowledge that religion pertained to in the past. If there is anything new in religion, the new joins this gigantic smorgasboard that is "religion", as yet another deity or concept in the pantheon, which may be channeled like anything else in religion by the adherents.

In religion, the first sense in humans can exist of a thoroughgoing plan regarding

the world in total, rather than humans living in their environment and in the society they know of. It would of course be a reality that humans live in a world where they are not intrinsically confined or ignorant that there is a world, regardless of their adherence to religion or any concept of such. Humans can have a sense of the world without religion in any way, and construct elaborate theories of the world in general on some make-shift assembly of knowledge from smaller parts to arrive at general rules. Science, at a basic level, concerns the labors of people at a local level, rather than any grand unified theory or image of the universe as a clockwork of systems. The systems thought of a scientist, however it is worked out, is always something for the scientist to approach a world that precedes anything the scientist thought about it. Religion is very different, in that the theories of the world are established and laid down in the institutions of religion. Practice of religion does not intrinsically involve any scientific view, and the attitude of religion towards science, labor, property, wealth, industry, and so on can vary based on which particular tenets a religious person holds. Religion operates not in the world of material things, but in the world of institutions and the ideas constructed in them. Outside of the institutions, religion has little sway, and a religious thinker outside of the institutions would intuitively sense the need for a religious construct, or some answer to the very presence of religion in the world. Whatever thought constitutes "religion" is not as important as what religion does for this purpose. We could envision a "religion of science" in the genuine sense, where theories of science and reason are at the very heart of the religion's tenets and rituals. That has never existed in a state that is genuinely appreciative of science. The attitude of religion towards science is never wholly antagonistic, as if religion were an opposing pole to "the science". Yet, religion and science are never reconciled into being one and the same. The labor and practice of science, which preceded institutions, is at odds with the tendencies of institutions and societies to occult knowledge and work against any effort to discover truth. Religion of course portends to truths that are very difficult to attain except through received wisdom - and so, the guru and the pedagogue displace our native sense and the human's proclivity of reverse-engineering and reconstituting itself. It is as if history did not move until a thought leader declares that it has in fact moved, and this makes perfect sense for religion. At the same time, any religion worthwhile is aware of this deficit in its thinking, and considers how it must resolve the disconnect between its institutional wants and the world it encounters and must survive in, if the religion is to be a going concern.

To speak of religion as a superficial thing misses the purpose of the practice and its institutions. When there is a shift within the priesthood, where the mask comes off and a new dogma replaces the old, it appears as if it was all a lie, and the new cult supplants the old. There are many reasons why this model of religion is advanced, and it works on religions at the highest level and religions pertaining to something smaller, like a civic religion or a cult of some practice that becomes a mystic secret, or a school of thought or philosophy. The religion itself does not move history. The religion instead points to many things

in the world which are integrated into a system that religion suggests, and only religion in one form or another adequately serves this goal. Many institutions only exist within a limited space, but for institutions to survive on their own in the world, they take on the characteristics of religion or subordinate themselves to an existing religion. "The family" as an institution is not a neutral form that is trans-historical. There are Christian families, families inherited witchcraft or occult mysteries, communist families inheriting revolution and the Party, noble families with a special morality for their class, and each family suggests a different set of priorities and loyalties. A family as the chief political and spiritual authority would need to adopt rituals suggesting it could compete with families that associate with such a wider view of the world. In of itself, the family is just a way in which humans relate to each other, and has no intrinsic authority over members simply by virtue of existing. Many parents did not want the obligation of raising children, and did not want to subordinate their children to a wider society in the way that was demanded of them. Naturally and biologically, mothers would nurse their offspring, and much of their socialization came not from the home - which for much of humanity's existence did not exist beyond a temporary campsite or familiar stomping grounds - but from their interactions with peers and leaders in the community, such as they were. The law of the father or the mother did not have any natural reason to exist and often wasn't even sought, in the sense that civilized states pass property and legitimacy from father to son or adopt heirs. The family doesn't realistically form the basis for religious society, as states rely on adoptive institutions and find existing families and clans to be a hostile entity disrupting the aims of rulers. The family has no intrinsic right to be more than what it is, and sons are expected to venture to the world and find something outside of that environment. Mothers and fathers have lives outside of this role assigned to them in family life, and were themselves daughters and sons of someone with the same obligations their children were expected to take on. The genetic legacy does not create any unbroken line of spiritual authority. Family trees become too cumbersome after three generations for the family to stay together, and branches of the family split off. The same is true of any nation or tribe; they are never associations fixed in form, and unlike the family which is a definite institution, nations and tribes are associations of persons who recognize nationality without any necessary institutionalization of the concept beyond its name. The members of a nation understand that their nation exists not on the basis of an ideology or institutional law, but because those members are in genuine social interactions of some sort which would unite or divide them. Religion is one institution that unites disparate agents and suggests a home more persistent than typical institutions. Often, cults and religions begin as national religions, such as the worship of YHWH starting as the national cult of the Israelites. Civic cults became mysteries and secret societies, which formed the spiritual bedrock of the ancient world, rather than anything we would presume productive or natural. A practice of witchcraft and sorcery and various professions of ill repute endures to the present day, though today's "witchcraft" is often a bowdlerized form, and there remains sorcery and magic-like practices in the dominant religions, civic cults, and institutions of

today. Those mystifications may be given a pseudo-scientific veneer, but they are religious acts through and through; it is indeed the case of the eugenic creed that its zealots are far more given over to religious kookery, ritual, and mystification than their Christian counterparts, and those Christians who hold to ritualistic practices fervently have almost uniformly sided with the eugenic creed that was implied in the religion's teachings and practices. The true believing Christians either hold to a variant of eugenism and long ago dropped whatever mask they wore to fool the rubes, have gone over to eugenism completely and actively destroy the institutional facade of Christianity to make way for the new Satan, or find that their church has gone sour and abandoned them, leaving them behind - a trope in today's millenarianism, as seen in many Christian writings about the rising world order - and leaving them with the ideas and symbols of religion, but none of the spiritual authority or legitimacy that was taken by those behind the curtain. Christianity may be near death, and may yet find new life in divergent forms, but the genuine content of Christianity belongs to a much earlier time, and was never uniquely Christian to begin with. The Christians inherit religious tradition generally, rather than a few definite roots, as any religion must. It answers not a specific question of its time and place, but the questions that have been present since humans could speak of them and create institutional knowledge and learning. But, religion is not confined to knowledge, and knowledge has little to do with the functions of religion. The knowledge of religion is specifically occulted and intended to be so. The practices of religion are cloaked in mystery and superstition to ward off infidels and those who are not members.

It is this which grants to religion the veneer that obligates it to escape its purview, and subsume other institutions. It never succeeds at this goal, nor would such a thing even be desirable to religion generally. Religion concerns itself with a collection of occult knowledge that pertains to spiritual authority, rather than knowledge in the genuine sense, and this is expected. Education typically conforms to religion or the needs of the state, which are one and the same for most of human history. Even when church and state are separated, which was a recent conception of religion, they are never actually severed. It is rather that religion and state are assigned complementary roles and the growing concept of "the people" has to be acknowledged on the terms religion and the state allowed. Past society did not conceive of "the people" in the way religious civilization did with the establishment of organized religion and theology. In the past, "the people" were subjects under imperium, whose life and death were entirely at the mercy of the state in principle. Religion facilitated that and had no interest whatsoever in establishing a world religion or a mass base of believers. The ordinary people were largely left to whatever superstition suited them, so long as they paid fealty to the aristocrats' gods. This was no longer acceptable as civilization advanced. Religions suggest something living in institutions which are in their essence very un-living, and that entail death. And so, "death leads to life" is a koan of institutions and frequent in religious thought. It is also why the tendency exists in religion to subsume things which have nothing to

do with religion. It is with religion that aristocracy as a tendency exists, and it is there that aristocracy reigns. In short, the path to rule, beyond the most trivial, is always spiritual authority, and for Man, a type of animal, to rule, Man is a spiritual animal before it can be a political animal or just another animal in the kingdom of nature. Religion is where we can finally speak of humanity in the form we recognize, rather than the human as a collective of impulses, psychological traits, material conditions, or the institutional fronts that it commonly presents. It is for this reason that the quest for knowledge is never pure, and labors are always suspect morally rather than morally positive. It is why property is defined less by the will of its holder than by negation of those who are excluded from property. It is why life, which is implicitly held as sacrosanct due to its role in spiritual authority, is exemplified by the class that has the most to do with death and suffering, whose existence is very committed to something un-living like an institution, a godhead, or a conceit of knowledge. The genuine life, which began as an innocent and harmless aberration even if its birth is marred by the nature of such creatures' needs, is told that it is worthless and shunted to the lowest class. It is the lowest class that "truly lives", and yet they are everywhere "life unworthy of life", and constantly under the threat of pressure from an aristocratic death cult. That death cult must assert reality. Religion is aware of all of this, and can choose how it navigates this, for religion is not purely a creature of aristocracy. The lowest class is no less inclined to spiritual pursuits than the highest, and no class is truly immortal or trans-historical. There is no rule that someone from the lowest class could not become an aristocrat or vice versa, or that the tendencies in humanity are fixed by any natural law necessitating a particular distribution of the classes, or that humanity must accept class immobility. It could be that religion was benign, and class, such as it existed, would become a relatively minor social distinction rather than something that confers property and prestige beyond anything it should have ever been allowed to mean. It is possible to consider the effective abolition of class, and it would only be through religion that such a program would be instituted, whatever the guise religion may take. It would still be religion beholden to its origins in religious thought generally, for religion cannot re-write history or control reality. That is anathema to a worthwhile religious establishment that anyone would care to follow, or that would present the spiritual authority that unites religions, and would allow any institution to be guided as something other than informational flotsam.

Religion conforms not to any particular establishment, idea, or the presentation of a godhead. I think the reader has figured out by now that there is no God, in the sense of a bearded man in the sky throwing thunderbolts or imperiously dictating metaphysical reality. Such a god is very clearly a stand-in for humans and idolatry of the highest order, and is anathema to religion in any useful sense. There are gods and in some sense there is a godhead, or a way in which these things operate. Religion always begins with the adherent, and it is only through adherents that the representation of religion in institutions can spread. Gods are powerless without men acting in their stead, or forces of the world that are

associated with said gods. Religion is most useful because it tells through stories something about the world and spiritual authority, through metaphors and concepts that are understood by the reader of holy texts, and by practitioners of the religion in their deeds. Much can be learned of a religion by observing its adherents' behavior, as the old adage "monkey see, monkey do" is what so many of us learn by most reliably. Pedagogy through cajoling is notoriously ineffective, and those who are eager for the written word or explanations from above do so because a thirst for this information is attractive to them, for various reasons. It is difficult to force young people to comply with that pedagogy no matter how much force is used to make it so, and it is insulting to tell young people to believe in the dogmas through lies and sleight-of-hand tricks. Adherents of religion join because, on some level, religion answers something substantive for them. Religion as an opiate of the masses has no staying power and that was never the purpose of religion. If it is an opiate, it is not a very effective one, and this saying on religion arises when the actual opium trading of the East India Company is a pillar of the Empire, and its culture is widespread and becomes a moral hazard that it could never have been in the past. Industrial cities and the grind of capitalism are breeding groups for actual opium, and religion was never really the opiate of choice for peasants. By and large, the working classes never really believed in gods, and so far as they did, it was because Christianity or some other religion suggested something about the world that was sensible or explanatory of what rulers did and thought. The people of 18th and 19th century Europe and America were known to take a keen interest in Christian teaching, which was now so widespread that Christian families would find the Bible almost obligatory, and Biblical metaphors were part of the common language for Christians and non-Christians alike. So too was Islam and its teachings widespread where it ruled, and the Islamic form of education remained institutionalized and intrinsic to the religion. This had less to do with identification with the institutional church, and more to do with the religion explaining a great many things about humanity and the thought that prevailed. It remains an influence to this day, even as Christianity as an institution is a perverted shadow of itself, and always was perverse. This was not news to Christians and certainly not news to non-Christians in the Christian world. Very often the religion of the common people was only nominally Christian, and like in many cultures, the working class assembled their personal religion from the parts available to them. Dogmatism held an allure only to those who were comfortable enough to hold to the hypocrisies inherent in their faith, or those who saw through dogma a vehicle of strength that was far removed from anything the religion actually taught. It is no surprise that many in the church are not praying to the same god, and the prevalence of secret societies was established in Christian society, most of all in the domains the British Empire could influence and in the Americas.

It is important to keep in mind that in practice, religions are assembled at the level of individuals. Institutions, however much their thought processes are construed as living entities, are fixed in place and easy to shatter. Ideology and

the tactics it spawned are destructive and never creative, and ideology itself is an institutional beast. It is a very effective tool for destroying institutions, so that their reform can be engineered. Ideology operates with the language of war and militarization, and so it creates the environment of a permanent siege, regardless of any ulterior motive for the siege. The siege becomes life itself. It is for that reason that the ideologies of the 20th century proceeded as they did, even though the only ideology that was ever truly an "ideology" was fascism. This ideology is the purest form of such a beast, and it is here where the real movement to abolish the present state of things showed its face and just what this was. It has been the eternal cope of the philosophers, or a sickening habit they chose to perpetuate, to pretend that fascism was not this, or that it was a temporary thing. All of this pretending was to obscure the true governing germ - the eugenic creed - which dominated in liberal, socialist, and fascist societies, and asserted that it alone was the true "Jehad", the one true religion to eliminate all others. It is this mind virus which is the imperial virus of choice, and which took over all other trajectories humanity could have taken. That, though, is for another time, and it is the dominance of the eugenic creed which does the most to obscure our understanding of institutions and their occulting.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] I say this not to disdain the concept of an election itself, as is often the reduced argument aristocrats use to brag about the theft they conducted. An election, even if it exists to produce aristocracy, suggests public input and approval is considered, and for this election to be meaningful, it implies a public interest already exists and there is a sufficient grouping of persons who already desired to join this interest. The aristocracy sees an election as something internal to its class, and the lower orders do not have any serious input in the process. This is accomplished by establishing an unwritten rule such as "electability", which mimics the appearance of virtue but is really the guise to let people know that they will only be allowed to pick aristocrats or people who are approved by aristocracy as acceptable figureheads. In practice, aristocracy reviles the idea of new men joining their ranks, even when it would serve their interest to make the club bigger to defend their shared interest.

[2] Most pointedly, in the Soviet Union. The visionary of note sensing this was one Alexander Bogdanov, who made a forerunner of systems thinking his philosophical cause. We will have cause to revisit Bogdanov in the final chapter of this book.

[3] This, if you haven't figured out already, is what Nick Land is summoning in his drug-fueled neoreactionary delusions, haphazardly constructing a bastardized version of systems synthesis which makes analysis impossible; because the amoral philosophy of the eugenic creed became itself a pressing that overwhelmed all other thought. As I said, all life dies screaming - forever.

[4] I will never grow tired of smashing to bits Marx's disdain for "great men",

used to obfuscate the conspiratorial nature of history and politics that was once upon a time the standard for any serious history. The worship of "great men" was never the cargo cult Germanic sing-song idiocy insisted. Roman and Greek histories suggested rulers and those who fought were every bit as nasty as the ruled, and had no reason to pretend otherwise. The histories are written by the aristocracy and for the aristocracy, and the lower classes took limited interest in them even when the materials were available for reading. If the lower classes did read these histories, they likely concluded as was standard at the time that the goal was to be an aristocrat or as close as possible. Without any concept that public opinion in the modern sense could be manipulated or should be controlled, what counted as ideological propaganda was aimed towards the elite and functionaries, who made no secret of their cynical view of society and disdain for the entire process. The leaders of history were portrayed, regardless of their aura, as bad men without serious reservations, and what virtue they possessed was something for the subjects of history and those who followed them to judge. There was not a history where the leading men were proclaimed to be men of the people until, strangely enough, the era of democratic revolutions that just came into being. It is here where stories of both glory and the goodness of leaders to the people are traded as if they were serious. The men who led in democratic societies, however little they were actually "democratic", were not significantly different from those who were led, in that everyone recognized that the leaders were not made of magic or any ideology permitting them a right to rule. They could be both "great" and the same sort of low men that were governed. This could not be permitted, and so the German philosophers hit upon an idea of showering effusive praise not only on the rulers, but on the favored groups of the lower orders, all the way down the line. The manipulative and vicious practices of the state school were the first time such "great men" were able to insinuate their greatness in the way Marx imagined, and so Marx had his strawman to attack, to mystify how the bourgeois and aristocracy actually viewed historical actors. This of course hid Marx's own conspiratorial actions among the working class, and he was not alone in this. It was very important to eliminate reference to specific actors, and this was an old Masonic trick that worked very well to facilitate the changes in modernity. Because ordinary people were largely disconnected from history until they were dragged into modernity, it was simple enough to pull the wool over the eyes of those who were conscripted into state education. The impressionable would be told from a young age the fictitious glories of modern heroes, which would become even more profuse and self-abasing lies as technocratic society became the norm. The skeptical would be led to a pseudo-critique in which there are no great men, and would be convinced as cloistered fools that they were "really" in charge, without naming any genuine conspiracy. The elite and their chosen followers could then be pulled aside and learn of how this really works, with a head start over the rest of society. As all classes entered the workforce or the misery of begging, they would gradually pick up what their education, designed to stunt their brains, denied them, but with imperfect models of history and thought drilled into them by the fear and terror state schooling entailed. The soldiers would be given a stripped down version of

reality that was just attached enough to merit to let them know what is to be done and to figure out the chain of command and unwritten hierarchy, and this could in time move the target of their fear arbitrarily at the whim of thought leaders - exactly as Hegel would like. The outcome came to a head in the 20th century, and we got what we got. Those who specialized in conspiracy would be relegated to the fifth and lowest class. Those who were adept at the grubby existence of the proletariat would be given this degraded form of democratic thought, which comes to American English as "street smarts", or the low cunning that has long been used to align the working masses with aristocratic corruption and all the venality that makes them accomplices. This habitual backstabbing and drunkenness would be sold as a strange sort of "intelligence", which then builds into the "Delta caste" programming of our time which exhorts the workers to be as vicious and animalistic as possible, the aristocracy's preferred vision of the workers that will attack the lowest class when triggered. What a failed race. The conspiratorial sing-song story that there are no conspiracies begins by denying that men make history, while denying any useful understanding of "material conditions" except through a spurious pseudoscience that historical materialists had already debunked when it arose. We should give Marx some credit though - he assumed, and those who study Marx would know, that nothing in politics should be believed until it is officially denied. By stating the claim so bluntly, the wiser student would pick up that conspiracy was THE mode of political thought, and Marxists true to their teaching were the most adept at picking apart conspiracies and constructing many such conspiracies of their own. In the end they fell victim to the conceits intellectuals often do, confusing their genius for the truth in various ways. The comedy of errors continues to this day, and not just among communists.

[5] I am being harsh on old Hegel here, because really the point is not to say that this sort of lying ought to exist or is the Truth, but that this sort of lying is possible and nothing really stops it. Still, I don't think someone in the early 19th century could conceive of this scale of lying, where the power of pure Lie is forceful enough to eat away at the brain and produce a degraded excuse of a man. You would think students of philosophy would see how much damage this habit of contemptuous lying, carried out more or less instinctively without serious thought, does to society as a whole. If the goal is the shut up us undesirables who aren't part of the world to come, it hasn't worked, and in doing so, many who would have tolerated the rise of this alien doctrine are put off purely by its pigheaded stupidity and insistence on maintaining a failed system. The allure of tenure and the cash that comes with it does much to discipline this message, but too many of these people go above and beyond to enable the lying without any real incentive, moral or coercive, to force their hand. This sort of contempt comes from something deeper, and by now they certainly have to realize this sort of thing fucks over the liar more than those who are lied to. Those lied to will find alternatives, eventually. The committed liars are locked into this cycle.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

18. The Economic Problem

The exact history of what happened when to bring hunter-gatherers to pastoral society is only vaguely understood. What is known is when this transition happened, where the familiar hunt and gathering was displaced with herding animals, and this herding of animals facilitated the development of the agricultural strategy. These two activities at first displace the hunting with herding and gathering with agriculture, and should not be thought of as entirely oppositional strategies. What is clearer is that while herding appears in many places, agriculture only originates in a few areas of the world that are well-suited for the strategy, before agriculture is developed and exported throughout the world as a more general strategy. The growth of cereals and livestock produces both surpluses and a means to store the surplus in facilities. Earlier society certainly had the concept of a surplus, but mobile bands could not build or maintain institutions and centers around which the surplus could be stored, and the accumulation of surplus would have been recognized as a danger. Almost certainly, the pastoral and agricultural society was not a choice, as if technological development made this obvious and inevitable. No technological development in human history is purely incidental and "just so" happens. If it was possible to catalogue the behavior of animals and perfect the hunt to the point of making it the herding, it is not a great stretch to extend that and ask the question if humans can be herded too. It is not simply a matter of primitive man finally discovering that agriculture was possible and then the process was immediately adopted. Organization of society into farming activities is not as simple as the knowledge that putting seeds into the ground will allow them to grow. The far more likely case is that chiefs formed their domains by means of warmaking technology before the question of a surplus being produced was something to be appropriated. The bow and arrow, the spear, and primitive warcraft increasingly meant that professional fighting men would fight better than ordinary hunter-gatherer warriors, and the early chiefdoms would be the first hierarchical society. It would not at first take the civilized form of antagonistic relationships in close quarters, but rather than agricultural surplus gathering in a granary controlled by a village chief, it is likely that early agriculture developed either as an offshoot of the mobile band, or the early agricultural villages were paying tribute to the warriors who lived outside of the city. The implements of war did advance, but they were still made of stone and could be constructed out of simple tools. The formation of settled society into city-states coincides with the working of copper and then bronze, where organized mining operations, the expertise of forging, and the accumulation of knowledge of what could be built in settled society occurred in the towns rather than among the nomadic herders. This working of metals, too, did not "just happen", but was something discovered over centuries of seeking advantages in warmaking and control. There is a naive tendency to portray this early technological development as purely happenstance, like "random" genetic mutations in genes that are considered ineffable expressions of biological destiny.

The thinking goes that you simply cannot change genes, and thus, the answers to natural history are inscrutable except as the result of random processes. This thinking is carried over from views of natural selection in evolution, particularly in the modern synthesis which enshrined genetics, and it is little more than a just-so story of why things are the way they are as the result of something random and ineffable. Deliberation on the part of the actors involved is entirely removed, as if the people of this primitive society were just evolutionary flotsam that happened to collide with a piece of metal. We have no reason to believe that someone 12,000 years ago was markedly less clever than someone today, or that their brains simply couldn't process the idea of dominating other life. Combined with this thinking is the "noble savage" myth, in which primitives are seen as creatures in the Garden of Eden, untouched by the wickedness of knowledge. They couldn't possibly know what they were doing without the guiding hand of modern scientific institutions, the story goes, until civilized Wisdom came to conquer the savage, as if Wisdom descended from Heaven to affect change in the world. The far more likely explanation is that cruder metal-working was known as a possibility, but there was no easy way to get people herded into the cities. It would take the development of slavery and the foundations of a more elaborate economy to make real the ambitions of those who sought to make the rule of a few men stronger than ever. It would take an insight into how human beings could be ruled and managed, and this insight likely had its forebears in far more primitive states of mankind. The new development of settlements meant that there was an opportunity for the greatest swindle humanity ever developed.

So far in this text, I have explained mechanisms that constitute society, knowledge, life conceptually, and authority. These mechanisms operate at such a level that they are evident by the very conception of those things, which is a trivial matter. They have thus far been viewed as mechanisms in their own right, which were not intrinsically beholden to anything but themselves. Those mechanisms could be active without any necessary great plan guiding world events, or any aspiration to command the world in a grand way. Even if such designs were held, primitive society and society for a long time to come would lack any way to impose that vision on the world. Because the imposition is strongly informed by politics rather than economics, a full view is beyond the scope of this book. We can easily see though that economic decision making is implied not by the mere existence of mechanisms or society, as if economics, politics, philosophy, and so on are trans-historical. We make decisions regarding our life that are not really "economic" decisions, even when they are subsumed into our concepts of economy. Even where economy develops conceptually, it is never the driving motivator. Economics originated not in science or reason, but in moral philosophy. I elaborated enough on a belief that moral actions are necessarily laborious rather than ideological or scientific. Therefore, ethics has little to say about genuine economic decisions. So too does speculation about finance for the purposes of this book. Finance is properly understood as a tool whose implications have always been political at the least. Money has little to do with anyone's motivation for economic behavior, except as a token of exchange which

acquired its value because there was a moral cause to conduct business in this way. The exchange of money and commodities is, in the main, of less relevance than the utility money and the labors in question create. Strictly speaking, once a product is constructed, it is, as with Socrates' wisdom on what happens to written philosophy, a dead product. The labor that went into it is gone forever, stripped from the human being that built it regardless of exploitation or social relations. Such is the nature of labor expended. There is no moral law to suggest labor has any intrinsic value whatsoever, or that the employers of labor have any inherent interest in keeping labor alive. This operates not merely due to class antagonisms, but at the level of the institutional person him or herself. Class struggles merely intensify a condition of antagonism that existed in civilization conceptually to make it civilization. There was a time before classes where humans struggled, knowing well the consequences. Class struggles never conform neatly to any preferred narrative, and only take recognizable shape in political society. The actors in class struggle are aware that their struggle is predominantly a political one, rather than the economic and social transformation socialism originally answered as a thinking on human life. It was not even an aim of socialism to "abolish class", or sublimate it as philosophy often invokes in their common re-directs. The class struggle is not waged arbitrarily, but over definite propositions that don't go away by decree or any political act alone. Since class struggle is political and often spiritual, entailing a much more sophisticated matter than its economic base, it is beyond the scope of this book, and its origins tell us more about the history I wished to write about originally. If we go back to our image of primitive society, religious thinking on spiritual authority is the true breaking point where two things became apparent to awakened humans. The first is that they could, in a thoroughgoing way, affect the world around them with intent that was previously guessed at. The second, felt more ominously, is that many other humans could do the same to them. Whatever their original sociality, religious thought operated at the level of individual humans and institutions, and spread through communication that was at heart a real event rather than a story or a preferred model of thought. This would not immediately destroy the older Man, a type of animal, and replace it with the human, neither living nor dead and driven primarily by the conceits of mind or the received wisdom that religion suggested. Far from it, religious thought led to humans associating in larger groups than their predecessors did, and communication that was previously unheard of. The drive to reject and shame, which was the genesis of the human race, preceded formal religious thought of the sort we would appreciate. It was indeed known, but none of the ritual sacrifice or lurid practices of the human race could say with a straight face that any of it led to anything but a behavior that was not to be questioned. Religious thought suggested for the first time not only that this was pointless but that there was in principle an end to the cycle, and also a way this cycle could be harnessed as a general rule. It is here where we can properly speak of economics as a thorough practice, rather than ad hoc knowledge assembled for a local situation a human might encounter. The religious thought does not begin as formal political thought. Most humans do not involve themselves in

any great political affair, and politicians after their work have lives to return to and something to protect that drove them to enter politics in the first place.

The reasons for the emphasis on religious thought, as opposed to material conditions, as the driver of economic life, are too numerous to count. At its root, economics at a large scale is not about the mere management of resource inflows and outflows. If that were the case, the problem is trivial in any era, and no line of reasoning could dispute that. Those who work and toil, or even think for five minutes about where their benefits come from, think every day about when the hand that feeds them will show the hand of rejection, the first of oppression, and the smirk designating shame to the conquered. It is nearly impossible not to, and throughout the history of spiritual thought, such things were the experience of the vast majority of humanity. The favored classes were themselves beholden to a world where their ability to drive events by will was limited. They had to fear rivalry with peers and the institutions of rule which were small and limited in the number of seats they allowed. Competition for merits and glory were established early and remain a persistent force in human affairs. It is not merely a political matter or the incentives of the state that created this competitive impulse which turns warrior against warrior, and convinces priests to tear each other down to win position. It is not an unnatural impulse which brings men of commerce to fight each other, and the smarter commercial interests understood from the outset that the deployment of grand wealth had less to do with any theory of free trade. The leading capitalists who knew what they inherited understood that to truly survive, the true path to victory was to command the bank, and then command the genuine fount of political and intellectual legitimacy. This was on the mind of the victors of capitalism who rose in the late 19th century, many of them after victory in the American Civil War. Certain ideologues, and there are many variants of this, must assert that the rule of commerce was unnatural or corrupting in some way. If not that, then they must grant to commerce and money itself powers it does not actually possess, and encourage a fetishistic thinking about money. The truth is that those who hold the banks and the commanding heights of commerce, going back to Antiquity at the least, were not convinced money or Mammon had any such powers beyond the purview of what money and commerce actually did. The height of capitalist prestige was not just the same, but far more aware of what they could accomplish with technology. It was technology and education rather than the power of money that fascinated the truly capable capitalists, and that they identified as the true motor of their class and their true interest. The money was just a way to attain command of the bank, and the bank a stepping stone to command the true machinery that money would buy. Even the most basic understanding of banking establishments will make clear that the banker is not a producer, nor do their fortunes survive off of blind usury from a vacuum. The banker and the man of commerce are not creatures defined by their function, like Malthus' mindless breeders. From the start, those who command finance understand that this is a means to an end. The use of money in any form we appreciate begins not with cowry shells in primitive society, but state-issued coinage which rulers

used to provision the state by commerce rather than through the old method of requisition. The coinage also obligated subjects to pay tax, and through this their connection to the state and ruling interest would be measured in coin and entries on a ledger. The past society was dominated by clans and the gentile arrangement, which was at heart an assembly of tribes rather than the city-state. The city-state itself does not appear in perfect form, ruling over individuals already atomized and sorted into their preferred social rank and position. It arises atop a society of tribes and families, and the tribes of Greek and Roman society are represented in popular assemblies. Family life and the lines of both aristocrats and plebians continues and remains the vehicle of state intervention into private life. The patriarch is obligated to uphold values by the state, not because the state believed patriarchy was ideal or a chosen condition, but because the sort of atomization and feminization that modern society entailed would have led to an immediate revolt of the free men. The point here is that no society was ever formed in perfect conditions, and no society could be. Modernity is no different, no matter how thoroughgoing social engineering may be. Every society inherits the conditions and sins of its predecessors, as the Americans are learning so tragically as I write.

At the center of every economic scheme is not political machination carried out for crass purposes, but a spiritual thought that suggests wealth is morally valuable or an objective to covet. This does not merely concern a quantity of wealth, but the qualities of wealth - that is, what is produced must be useful and is planned to prefer outcomes. So too is restraint of wealth necessary for proper economic thinking.^[1] No economic activity is carried out mindlessly or by some impulse which is truly unknowable or not commanded. Labor to be labor implies either a will performing it, or a will commanding it or harnessing it. If humans were to be viewed as mindless livestock, bred to suffer and die for their intellectual superiors and damned to the slavery of the lowest class if they are fortunate, the economic thought is a foregone conclusion, and the solution is trivial in any era just as it would be for the imagined resource calculation problem. Politics is, in principle, something born not out of desire, but necessity. Most of humanity detests politics for perfectly sensical reasons, including politicians themselves who would rather not have to do all of the things politicians do, which require no introduction if we are at all familiar with their activity. The consequences of a society dominated utterly by the political are explored in the next book I intend to write in this series. That world, unsurprisingly, is a disaster and can only be so, and it becomes even worse given the political thought that dominates in the past century and a half. Politics or not, the chief driver of economic thought is the same as the chief driver of labor - moral thinking that is informed by a worthwhile spiritual authority suggesting that we should follow it. This entails not just that religion guides economics by decree, or a just-so story. These institutions only survive if they meet the aims that spiritual authority answers. The needs of life itself, the need to survive war and social engineering efforts, the faculties of learning and education and the spread of knowledge generally, and the development of moral authority and truth are questions to answer is

we seriously consider economic thought. No religion or anything like it could survive if it did not answer these questions, and they derive not from myths or stories but from the conditions religion would survive in. An atheist society has to answer the same questions and explain to its people the same things a god-fearing society does, and atheism strictly speaking does not entail a denial of spiritual authority altogether. Today's science fiction cultism and bizarre rituals around technology demonstrate that the "atheist" is a far more superstitious and brazen creature than many who adhere nominally to religion, however weak their faith.

This is not to say that economics concerns "good" or "justice", but rather than that economics concerns a religious view of the world, and the subject of economics is really a treatment of the cult practices surrounding wealth, exchange, sacrifice, and a sense of balance in the world. The material world in economic thought is something to be exploited. So long as humans concern themselves with exploitation, in any form it takes, economics will be the relevant science. Calling economics a pseudoscience will not change that, in one way or another, an economic rationale is asserted when these practices of exchange, sacrifice, debt, and force are presented to humans as a problem to resolve at the highest level of society. This would exist even if we did not regard economy as a political matter that was any business of the state or a ruling interest. We would have an economic problem even if we agreed that economics and the lives of human beings was off-limits to politics, the state, or any private actor that would behave much as states do to command other people through force. Those who live in the imagined ideal society with no such influence would still be vigilant for anything that would disrupt this status quo - and the very assertion of that ideal society or model presupposes a status quo which constitutes a state, without recognizing any particular of the state and without recognizing any boundary on the state's imperium whatsoever. Economics to be more than management of resources implies that it is open-ended, and all that exists is in principle relevant to the question it poses. This includes the human beings, their wants, and so on which are not in of themselves economic, but that affect all decisions that would be made. This primarily entails the command of labor, rather than any other baseline such as utility. The reasons for this are simple - human labor is at the core of economy's moral consideration, and it is with regards to other humans that we conduct commerce. To the world itself, we do not engage in commerce. Economics absent the existence of other people would instead be a game against the world, or a game we play against ourselves. Since our internal parts are not economic competitors with each other in that way, much of what we write about economics would not apply to the integration of a person and a singular body. This image of singularity is the fascist, corporatist, and eugenicist shibboleth to make absolute the dogma of competition, which is really competition between institutions rather than competition in life itself, for the reasons described in earlier chapters. Economic thought predominantly concerns the labor of people, rather than the claims to land or property they make, or finance which is only relevant with a productive economy to manage

and exploit. Property and higher institutions set themselves apart from capital or productive wealth intentionally, to shield themselves from the influence of something more base than their concerns. We may contest whether this is right or good, but if the society consisted only of producers and the proprietors' interests were neglected in favor of labor, economic thought would consider exploitation very counterproductive for reasons that do not require a grand theory. A society set against itself in aimless struggle cannot produce anything in principle, rather than by some alchemy that happens behind the backs of the producers. That was never the purpose of economics, though, and the producers and those who rule were always aware of what happened in their firms and in the world generally. However imperfect their knowledge, it does not take a great genius to figure out that information itself is valuable for any purpose of management, whether that comes from a professional manager or from labor itself. That would be unavoidable. And so, the aims of economics appear to take on religious significance, because the practices of economic life entailed sacrifice, among other things. At the same time, what economics concerns itself with - management - is a very crass pursuit of information. The information sought is not a substance of indiscriminate value, but information that pertains to the objects economics would covet. This includes not just the material things, but human beings and their motives. They always meet at labor, and all that occurs in economic life is some sort of laborious process and judged by deeds rather than Being. Money, commodities, or and product of that labor is only relevant in active use, whatever that use may be. Absent a use, it may as well be removed from economic circulation. The mere presence of large concentrations of money or wealth will do, due to the fear that others would rightly hold due to the presence of it, something merely by being known. The tricks to hide the centers of wealth or legitimacy only work for so long, and are never believed as earnest truths. Humans are liars, and when dealing with money, humans expect far more lying than is standard for the race, because economic activity rewards this deception absent anything that would police against it. A sense of fairness or right does not correspond to the sense of justice that those who rule and hold property would regard - it is the exact opposite. Yet, fairness and right have economic value, if there are forces in society that will fight for them explicitly, rather than the aristocracy's preferred concept of right and justice. The independent judgement of personal authority, or a spiritual authority that derives from the world itself or the sense of men such as science, cannot establish an economic order that does not reduce to arbitrary pricing and infighting. To claim that there is such a thing as economic behavior beyond the most local interactions between people is to invoke an institutional authority that is religious, or something that will reckon with religion directly. A moral code outside of a religion regarding the rituals of exchange becomes unenforceable by anything but the laws of men - which ultimately either derive from force, or suggest that the laws of men are in line with spiritual authority. Typically this means that economic life is of interest to the law and the state that imposes law. The obvious interest of the state is that it has economic needs and must extract wealth to equip all of its functionaries. While the state can leave the economic sphere to its devices and pay the tax,

the state would leave luck to heaven and rely on a religious understanding to have faith that economic life will feed it, and won't become a threat to it. The most obvious threat to a state is the reality of the world that economics suggests - that individual people are moral actors and, if they wished it, they would not bother with state society or politics in any form hitherto known.

ECONOMIC VALUE AS INFORMATION

Information generally - that is, information in the world that is the domain of science and sense - is not intrinsically of value just by being information. However limited human faculties are, we know that distance and our genuine failures of understanding natural phenomena are overcome for most relevant matters, given enough time and awareness. We would by default possess "perfect information" for a given space, if not for human error and the mystifications humans engage in. Even if we accepted imperfect information were standard, and we acknowledge that no information about the natural world will be "100% perfect", errors due to pure "natural" ignorance are either in principle correctable if it is merely a logistical difficulty of connecting dots, happen due to irreconcilable flawed models we use to know the natural world in which case the problem is us instead of the world, or the state of scientific knowledge in theory would know all there is to know with some dedication of learning and intelligence towards the task and the correct confluence of matching material events to speak of that missing information. In any event, incomplete information by natural ignorance is a problem for us, rather than the world we model and covet, and so it would be our own stupidity and inadequacy occulting knowledge. What is of value to us is specifically *occulted* information, or non-trivial information. This may include knowledge of things and their location, when our knowledge of nature is incomplete and we know we are missing things that are of interest for us to know. By "occulted", I do not refer merely to our ignorance of the thing that is occulted. I refer instead to artificial constraints on our appropriation of value that are a result of human effort to deny that value to members of society. For example, we place a price tag on something at the supermarket. No physical force directly compels us to not take the object from the shelf, and no intellectual principle in law or moral authority intrinsically tells us we cannot take the object. We are aware of all of those consequences that result from theft if we are rational agents. There is no force of existence itself commanding the commodity stay on the shelf or conform to the laws of exchange, because nature does not regard our exchanges as intrinsically meaningful in this regard. In some sense, that which exists is valued "in-of-itself" - the existence of the commodity itself is not deniable if it is something tangible or something understandable, freely reproducible, and so on. This value in of itself, though, only means something based on the utility of that thing, which itself is information which may be occulted.

We would have no reason to believe the list price is arrived at by any natural law. If that were the case, haggling, theft, and various other "abnormal" exchanges would not be possible, or there would be a prescription for everything that

happens. If there were "perfect information in perfect markets" for all agents, then economics and exchange would be obviated, even with limited political information. If we supposed economics were contained to a sphere of interest to us, like the distribution of food or electricity, we possess that information here and now and public disclosure would trivialize that knowledge. It is common enough knowledge what foodstuffs exist in society, the contents of food, how food is grown, and all scientific knowledge of agriculture. There are books written to reference this, and in principle, it would not be difficult to track everything that is grown. Even without total information of all food on Earth, we can track and distribute enough food from what is produce such that "economy" would be unnecessary in food production, save for some obvious realities. Electricity is dominated by natural monopolies, and as one would expect, the price of electricity and many utilities is set by those monopolies, which are often in league with municipal and state governments. There is no ambiguity about what is on the utility bill, and in a public society, this knowledge is available to all. The exceptions lead to notorious abuses, as seen with Pacific Gas and Electric^[2] in the early 2000s. There is no rule to ever say that markets are inexorable or absolute. Their very existence is only allowed to exist because a society with laws and stable currency exists. Price-setting markets exist nowhere in nature and cannot be established as a law equal in all places. What happens in markets is a confluence of exchanges, which are always limited in number, involving a limited number of firms and limited number of agents. However large or small the extent of the market is, there is a limit and all interactions and agents are definite propositions, if economics is to be studied with any seriousness. Vagaries involving uncertainty of who is in the market are of no use to us for the same reason that a lack of scientific information is irrelevant. Human motives may be less scrutable than we would presume, but the deeds of exchange and the ugly side of trucking and bartering, to say nothing of loan sharking and the more terrible consequences of commercial society, are there to be seen, and always known to happen to some extent unless they are either policed out of existence or are not possible given the conditions of the society in a way that is regularly profitable. For example, there is not a flourishing drug trade among pastoral nomads, especially when there are no civilized neighbors that can grow opium in the desired quantities; nor are the habits of drug cartels and their alliance with aristocracy possible in such a society. We might find drugs and what could be called the gang activity of such a society, if "gangsterism" doesn't describe such nomadic societies as their general mode of operation towards aliens and in their internal politics. We do not find exact matches in different societies for the same activities rooted in economic activity. What we find instead are values of different qualities that are, in some sense, relatable. The relation is not a mathematical one, where value is a substance. Money itself gives no guarantee that an exchange will take place, or that it can command all goods universally. Many goods in society are explicitly off-limits to money alone, no matter how much someone possesses. Winning the lottery does not bring someone into high society - of course, the payouts of the lottery are to fictitious persons, because no reasonable person would spend significant winnings with nothing to show for it.

A situation where equilibrium prices in money exists is contingent on a number of conditions which are never wholly true and cannot be. If the qualities for sale are identical or similar enough that comparison is trivial, then equilibrium might be observed, but it is only observed and ultimately comes from a sense of merchants who constant conspire to fix prices and undercut rivals with temporary schemes. For example, many common goods at a marketplace are products of labor, which is paid with wages and bought with money, and these are trivial enough that they are beneath the notice of property. They would be worth nothing and the expectation is that all of those commodities are consumed in short order in some task. There is little use in attaching to them more meaning to say they are monetarily valuable, even if the commodity is your childhood stuffed bear.

To best understand the construct of a market of any size, its germ - the exchange between buyer and seller - must be understood. From the start, the market exchange is not between equals in their function. The seller is the holder of some good, which means the buyer approaches the seller as an aggressor or intruder. In principle, buyer and seller are antagonists, though this antagonism for our purposes is stripped of its social and political context. If the arrangement of exchange were truly cooperative, no such argument over dickering and dealing with trade would be so elaborate, or contain the political and human elements. For the moral purposes of the good, it is not a given that any such exchange of value would exist, or take on the antagonistic characteristics of property of any sort. It would be conceivable for two agents in cooperation to consider their exchange part of a shared project between them - and this exchange is at core between two social agents, rather than the agent relating to a vague mass of people or an institution without definition. The exchange is communicative, rather than broadcast into the ether without a recipient. The act of exchange with nature is not truly economic in this sense, for nature is null as a social agent in its own right. The exchanges with the natural world, including the material contingencies required for the market to exist, are not directly relevant to the ritual of exchange between people. To the world, exchange is some quaint human thing that is not relevant. When humans make an observation of some quantity exchanged in the natural world as a scientific observation, it is entirely for our purposes of understanding, rather than something spiritually important from the world's perspective. And so, in markets, the externalities of exchange are temporarily irrelevant. Those consequences only come to light when the natural world presents something that market actors assess, and then that natural consequence too is subsumed into the logic of market exchange as something to be appropriated and managed. The goods that are marked with a price tag are occulted from their natural origin, and when presented at the market, they are something alien from their origin. This is no mere illusion of human beings. By entering market exchange, goods and the people who exchange become different in ways, as this habit insinuates that it will be a thing. This, of course, means nothing more than what is implied by the act of exchange and the rituals which surround it. How we conduct market activity is not trans-historical or fixed in a particular origin story. What happens between

two market actors is not reducible to an abstract value or manna that would constitute something substantive in the universe at any point as just what it is. The participants in the market are aware that market exchange is a ritual or a game between them, and that the market exchange can be voided, refunded, or overcome with that old favorite of humanity, brute force and taking whatever they please. The entire practice that allows us to speak of exchange of like for like is contingent on a faith that exchange is equitable. This is at odds with the very real disparity between buyer and seller. The seller is inherently defending property and has the say in a free market whether to allow or reject the sale. Nothing the buyer projects with property can intrinsically change this - in the market, buyers are beggars, and the holder of property holds every relevant advantage.

From the outset, the market is premised on inequality of its participants. This is not a hierarchical inequality, but an inequality of wants and inequality in the essential nature of what participants do. At a basic level, social class or institutional holdings are not relevant. Any social agent can engage in the act of exchange, regardless of whether they are recognized as agents to a particular actor's conceit of what humans are. An artificial intelligence is no different than a human intelligence in the essential act of exchange. If humans were to attribute to natural forces or very inhuman entities the qualities of a social agent which exchanges - to make the inhuman into something equal with human - they can do so. At the other end, the inhuman and unthinking entity continues on, blissfully unaware of the conceits and rituals of knowledge, but in some sense, the situation - for example, taking from an environment materials *in situ* - has an economically appreciable effect. By the exploitation of the land, the market actor is aware of where wealth arises, even if the land is not granted the legal status of agency as living participants would be. Nature remains a dead thing, and the only way a pure ideologue can process this is to grant to nature the qualities of sapience. This usually means the ideologue substitutes himself for nature, taking on the title of capital-N "Nature" in a fit of extreme arrogance. But, among the qualities of the land and nature is a reality that the things extracted from it are living things, like crops or soil rich in life-forms which promote the cycle allowing the land to bear those crops. The chemical substances that life leaves behind as a result of its processes are dead, but the small entities that are agents of the natural system are granted the properties of substances in of themselves. The cargo cultist then invokes a koan of "life-energy", "sentience-energy", and various other nonsensical claims about what is actually happening, as a way of granting to their religious conceit worldly power, as if it were co-equal with nature and commanded nature in its own right. Such conceits must be treated with the contempt they deserve, so we can best assess what actually happens in a market setting. Failure to do this is the mark of a rube.

Humans enter exchange because of a coincidence of wants, and those wants are unequal. Both possess something the other covets or would like to add to their possessions. The material substances are not really what is contested, in the sense that the wants could only be obtained through exchange. All of

the material things that are understood with science are in principle freely reproduceable, extracted from the world. There is nothing in principle stopping us from growing our own crops, building our own industrial products, and so on. For a long time, this is indeed what happens. Human beings largely operate to be as self-sufficient as they can be, because exchange of any sort represents a risk. As a seller, you have many buyers and must keep them at bay. As a buyer, the seller hoards things. It is from the outset not a desirable condition for either. The seller does not exist to sell you things out of some sense that selling is the purpose of existence, as if the seller were a valet in the proverbial desert there to fetch the bourgeois buyer some water. We know that in principle, material things are not truly enclosed by natural laws. If there is an alternative to the market, we would be aware of it. Either the market is imposed forcibly to make us comply, or the market is an alternative that is easier for both participants than going to the world to extract something. The aim of the seller is to want for nothing, and the aim for the buyer is to save every penny possible. The best situation for both is to simply not exchange where no exchange was truly needed, which would work out best for both. It is for this reason that the extent of the market is always limited by the practicality of such an arrangement, regardless of any religious tenet suggesting that "human behavior is economic behavior", where the logic of trade is ingrained in the most minute process we do. If human behavior is economic behavior, then the restraint of trade is the general rule. Participants only enter the market in definite conditions, where there are a limited number of such trades that are significant enough for coin to change hands, or accounts to shift in any way that is appreciated. A world of chaotic market activity with ups and downs may as well not be a definable thing at all, and it would appear as if the market were a force of nature that happened to exist, rather than the deliberate exchange that made exchange of value a worthwhile proposition in the first place. It would cease to refer to anything real, and become far more cumbersome to maintain the situation. It is here where many of the market activities are simplified and generalized, reduced to a few trends that are deemed significant, and the market becomes something very different from the network of exchanges that it was once premised on to exist as a useful institution. Regardless of how value is judged, what is done in exchange is always kept in mind as the point of doing any of this. That takes precedence over the particular object of interest in the market in a given situation.

The coincidence of wants is both a choice - exchanges happen ultimately because they are allowed to happen by both parties - and not a choice, in that the conditions creating those wants were never chosen by the participants by their willful insistence. We want things for reasons that are not asserted freely, as if we could make ourselves want something other than what the needs of life, knowledge, and existence would want. What happens in the middle of this is where the trick of modern religious koans about money and economy takes place. It happened not due to some inexplicable Demiurge compelling wants, but because all possibilities of what happens between the motion of the world and the mind's model of willful existence were eliminated, save a third option

that is singular - that historical progress moved forward as a singular force, compelling the world to act. The complexity of the world would be mutated into something amenable towards those who would cajole history to change the world, for whatever purpose they might hold. This at heart is a conceit of knowledge and of utility that a technocrat would presume, rather than some nefarious ideology that is particular to one guru or some force apart from the world. Many men are blinded by their own assertion of will not towards the objects they desire, but towards the world generally, taken as a whole. In effect, the economic religion of modernity relied on placing humans in the role of gods, before any market exchanges were considered. All of our activity in the market was viewed in that light, with all of the presumptions and biases inherited by the present civilization. One of the results is an obsessive need to impose modernity on the past, such that economic history is arrested. This is a terrible approach to history, yet it became the great obsession of ideology. It is trivial to disprove many of these koans about what money is, but if we do, then we cease asking a question about money or value in the conventional sense, where value is a substance we presume to be freely exchangeable. How we truly arrived at tokens of value that are effectively universal is not a simple story, and I cannot give a full explanation no matter how long I make this chapter. I will do my best to explain the underlying mechanisms, and the reader may seek out relevant writings. A further investigation of modes of production is something I wish to write in a later book in this series. This situation is not a thing going on behind the backs of participants, as if they were too dumb to see anything. The participants in the market, in some way, act on this, even if imperfectly aware of its implications. Nobody thought going to the market was in of itself a great idea unless they were snorting some hardcore ideology. The situation is largely one imposed by the most clear danger humans ever faced in nature - other humans. One party has an advantage of choice over another, and this is the objective any competent merchant holds to be good at their job. The coincidence of wants is intrinsically reliant on *unequal* exchange, and can only appear just after mental contortions to pretend that what is happening is not actually happening.

THE MERCHANT AT WAR

We see in economics a vehicle to introduce "contradictions in nature". This is not unique to economics or the symbols therein, as if economy and finance uniquely possess the power to create bullshit where none had to be created. It is there where we pick up where this chapter started, where humanity coalesces into settled society. What happens says less about the origin of money or exchange and more about the conditions of society. Form of exchange are so basic to existence that they would be seen in animals and are explicable without any great theory to suggest why we would value anything in that way. It is the conditions of society which allow exchange and money to take on the role that it does.

Natively, exchange begins as something humans occasionally do, while the main

objective of their economic life is extractive, either from the land or from animal life - or, if humans figure out conquest and slavery, extraction from other humans. The political economic of nomadic societies is very unlike that of civilization, and drawing comparisons is difficult without appreciating the very different niches these societies occupy. The barbarian formations openly disdain economy as a concept, and will tell you the reasons why. The barbarian society is often portrayed as a blank slate, in which men are heroes and noble savages opposed to the decadence of civilization, but this is a conceit of cloistered retards with a peculiar need to assert reality is what suits them. The barbarians themselves are not dummies and not incapable of grasping the overall orientation of their civilized opponents. There is an environment inherent to nomadic societies, and an understanding reached between its members, and no uniform prescription for such a society exists. It is the same of civilized nations, where the elders ruling every city construct their city as a social experiment, rather than a uniform type that is interchangeable with any other city. What the nomadic society lacks are institutions of formal education, large storehouses of literature, and rituals that would be specific to temples and require summoning participants into an urban environment for the rituals to be meaningful. It is unsurprising that among the earliest urban rituals is ritual prostitution, or the luring of marks to whores who manipulate the witless and lead them into the maw of the beast. It is such a ritual which creates in the cloistered fool a false contrast between urban and rural life, where the latter is a simpler and purer existence. That the ruralites, and barbarian tribes of old, had their own lurid sex rituals, is either taken as an anomaly or evidence to naturalize the perversions of particular cults. They are of a different sort, though. The sex rituals, and many other rituals, were intended to habituate subjects to the values social engineers wanted to encourage. The prostitutes induce failed men to be reduced to degraded workers and slavish followers of sick rituals, where their souls can be sucked dry in the earliest cities. In the barbarous society, the harem belonging to powerful men is glorified, rape is expected, and the women are instructed to facilitate this for their own advancement. In either case, these societies are overwhelmingly patriarchal, and the engineering is almost entirely encouraged by the demands of the men. So far as female-dominated societies exist, they are almost always the flip-side driven by the wishes of elite males against the failed men, who are numerous in humanity. The veneer of female dignity typically obscures a selection of favored males, and while the women in any society participate in this social engineering and foul game, these things are never as they appear to the naive. The lurid rituals would not be effective if their true outcome and intent were understood. At present, it is not necessary for me to explain this, since it detracts from my point. What is clear is that rituals long taken for granted are first of all never as simple as just-so stories, and second the rituals are things that arise for reasons, and are instituted because there are people who see the ritual as beneficial. So too did the habits of trade and exchange arise because people chose them to meet their conditions, and the centers of economic influence never arised by accident but because there were people who saw what they held and chose to drive the changes their influence allowed them to make.

I reference the ugly side of society because, by and large, humans are motivated not by bright visions of a future, but by the fear that their existence created. The vulgar economists purport this to be a natural law, fused with nature itself and glorified by some idiotic logic. All of the ugliness of humanity is, and will always be, a choice. We could end it tomorrow - all of it - and we could finally live. Yet, we don't, because the motives of human beings, for reasons beyond the scope of this writing, return to what humans have always done when they no longer need to pretend they have a shred of goodness in them. Humans did not form their societies as if they were children seeking friends. The associations were united by shared self-interest and some goal that would be attained by collectivity. It should be clear then that the associations are never "the tribe", "the city", or "the nation", imagined as an unbreakable whole. That thinking is only conceivable with a developed political consciousness that is not at all natural. The earliest cities were established not by honest invitation but by drawing slaves into submission, and enforcing that with repeated lurid rituals. The manner by which barbaric, tribal society would do this is not the same, but in both cases, human malice and cruelty unite the race more than any kindness. It did not have to be this way, but it was this way, because malice and cruelty could command through fear what cooperation would only establish with understanding. Once established, the malice of the human race and the associations that formed around it were more aware of what they held and what could be done with such an ingenious device as the cult. If we wanted it to be different, and so many have, we would first renounce the original malice of the human race, rather than return to it or presume the political thought that malice entailed was natural or the only possible world. Since the political is beyond the scope of this book, I leave it to the reader to ponder that as we continue.

In loose bands and in associations where the interest is shared and understood - where the participants overcome the human propensity for lying and malice long enough to truly cooperate - the formation of proper social units is found. No sociality would occur just-so in a way that suggests a society any human would want to be a part of. Free associations that resemble the brotherhood alluded to by secret societies are always deliberate associations, and cannot persist on the basis of any lie or convenient fiction that can be reified. It cannot persist simply because it is, or by exhorting loyalty to a symbol, a truth, or a history. Those who associate with each other in a genuinely free association do so because they either actually like each other, or the terms of the arrangement are understood and any transgression of the decencies required is grossly improper. In a looser society, without settlements or commitments to property or territory that are well established and command armies, this decency is what allows the political unity that can exist, more than any appeal to family, blood, or an idea or ritual. Whether anyone values that is their choice - they can choose to reject friendship or question the level of trust they have in another person. Free associations do not require absolute abasement to the group or to others, in the way that the most disgusting Nazi insists in their typical mode of busyboding and transgression. The members may not actually like each other, or even live

with a general loathing of the human race and its members. Emotion would not override an understanding between people that there are decencies to be kept, and certain values that cannot be allowed free reign, let alone the absolute impunity a Hitlerite insists and whines for until it is affirmed by authority. The actions of a Nazi are calculated specifically to make this free association impossible - to make the basis of a democratic society impossible, which was by the Nazis' own words their chief enemy above all others. That is often forgotten in ideological narratives, which must despise any mention of democracy in its genuine meaning. The most basic condition for free agency in society is security, and it is precisely that which is attacked on all sides.

In settled society, the predominant condition of society is *antagonistic relations in close quarters*. The relations are in conventional history broken down into class struggles of this or that group, or certain institutions, which are manipulated by social agents in a great game that keeps the institutions essentially intact from government to government. Those who play this great game have no interest in ever ending the struggle, because if the struggle truly ends, politics as we know it no longer exists. Civic virtue as they understand it would no longer exist, and those who benefit from the situation would no longer be able to reap rewards. The true origin of this antagonism is simpler. Settled society dragged most of its members into civilization by foul means, deception, malice, and all of the worst qualities of the human race. As settled society was established, vagabonds and escaped slaves would come to the cities to begin a new life, because no one else would willingly come to the new city. Almost always, the city was a raw deal for newcomers who arrived hoping to start a new life, as the local elites were already established and getting in the club was designed as an impossibility. The city, in other words, is nothing more than a facility for human livestock, planned to be such by the elders of a city who saw exactly what they held and wished to keep it for as long as possible. There is no other explanation. Once established, the city holds a knife at the throat of every subject, telling them that if they leave, they will surely die, for there will be no food, and those who obtain food outside of the ruling system are guilty of theft and treason, and shall be hunted down. It was like this from the inception of cities atop hill-forts or at crucial trading hubs. There was never a time where a city was established on the principles of forthright decency and moral probity, compared to the far more attractive establishment of slavery, exploitation, malice, and human rituals which were present in the genesis of the race and never abated except when necessary to prevent total collapse. The institutions of civic life are either premised on false friendship and betrayal, or establish in no uncertain terms that the basis for civic virtue is distrust and the person and alien institution being at odds with the citadel and those who command the city. In one way or another, cities cannot escape this. The model of settled society without obvious centers of authority or institutions of note did not last long, and where it existed, it was dependent on an authority outside of the city, as if it were a suburb or exurb of the metropole. In the main, denizens of settled society acknowledge they have no reason to trust each other, even if their malice were abated. The truly ideal city, from

the view of labor and the residuum, is a city where people by and large do not talk to each other and the conspiracy inherent to humanity is mitigated. This attitude is not alien to the other classes, including aristocrats themselves who see class struggle as a threat to their position unless they control it. We do not ask why this antagonism spawned in cities, as if it were created *ex nihilo*. Just like the true original sin of the human race, those who came into the city were never convinced the city was a place of promise and dreams, and the malice of the human race had been long established. No one came to the city believing that the promised land would end that malice, or really considered redemption a motive for entering city life. More often than not, people were dragged to the city in chains outright, with no say in the matter. Others were drawn by the promise of wealth which concentrated in civic life, or came to the city for business with the intent of retiring to a plot of land away from this malicious and demonic race, some day. Very often, though, entry into city life only happened because all other possibilities to live outside of such environments were denied. Land was enclosed, and so too would the lives of those who entered civic life be enclosed. It was only a matter of time, and from the moment this process began, civilization entailed a persistent enclosure and pressing. It was not in the interest of those with a stake in enclosure to ever stop this process, and in various ways, labor would be made to comply with this. Only the lowest class ever wanted this to truly change, for it is they who bear the worst consequences of civic life, and the worst consequences are beyond mere death or suffering. They are something much different, which is beyond the scope of the present writing.

It is in this environment that merchants arise, rather than the imagined story where a random man decides with some spark of wisdom that he will now trade and this is a completely just and equal arrangement. The exchanges are a choice given the conditions humanity began with that led to city life, rather than something the city imposed on the world from an alien condition where men were pure and untainted by commerce. Commerce as such merely assigned to a token habits long in force in society, and gave to those who held that token what was really an occult authority, rather than something valuable in its own right. Those habits would change not just from the introduction of money, but the establishment of city life. What we call money originates not as the value token we regard today, nor as the imagined classical ideal of a coin stamped with the icon of a state issuer. It is first documented as commodity-money, where a measure of some precious metal is equivalent to a commodity, typically a crop grown by farmers, which tells us what this commodity money was used for. It was a way of bringing farmers into society, since their activities could not be managed in the city proper with overseers and tight enclosure being the life of industrial counterparts. The use of precious metal made sense to the states of the time, who were at heart nothing more than glorified warlords with an associated cult demanding submission and terror, utilizing every foul trick religion can impose. Precious metal was not a choice of the merchants themselves, who have long chafed on any standard that would prohibit the

velocity of money. The ideal of the merchants and the bourgeois generally was not commodity money or anything backed by a physical substance at all. When the bourgeois or the technocrat sits at the apex of the state, their vision is either to be able to issue money tokens out of nothing - fiat money - or for the necessity of money to be obviated altogether, in favor of what they really wanted which was command and control of useful articles. Those useful articles include the other people of society, who they are antagonistic towards, but the interest of money is hostile to the very existence of labor, as we will see, without any necessary substance to the class struggle that gave the merchant and the laborer any reason to see themselves as irreconcilable enemies. The merchant does not live in the world chosen for them, and never fully can. Merchants arise to fill a niche that settled society allows, and operate within that niche, rather than in line with the preferred role of another interest. The command of commerce in particular is more relevant to the merchant than command of property. If the merchants had sufficient property for their purposes, they would have the choice of becoming proprietors whose interests are not commercial or productive, but the same as the claims to property of warlords, kings, and temples. The money very often is not uniquely the interest of a class of merchants, for the financial centers of pre-classical civilization are noted as temples and noble houses. There are not banks in the sense that merchant banks were established in the past millennium, as a growing trend where merchants as a class were separated from the classes of overt rule and institutional authority saw merchants both as suspect of fomenting revolution and as allies for new imperial projects. The classical banker and commercial interest is very often working with the nobility rather than someone with independent interests as a class. The reasons why are a complicated matter, but in short, both institutions and the material basis for economic activity did not escape the interests of the nobility and priesthood. The fusion of state and religion had much to do with cutting out commercial interests, and where men of commerce held sway, they operated in a world where empires and priesthods were the institutional front of power, rather than corporations or trading companies or cartels. The basis of economic life was predominantly agricultural, and industry concerned low-level goods that were simple to reproduce. The primary assembly for industry involved few complex machines, and industrial labor was often slave labor, or treated with as much disdain as slave labor as would be the case for the later proletarian. There was no particular injunction against usury for the classical aristocracy, nor any expectation of mass religion or anything that would question the state or the dominance of slavery. When going back further, before the establishment of state-issue coinage, there is evidence of large storehouses controlled directly by those who ruled or religious functions, where sacrifice was demanded for an existence of daily bread, toil, and no end in sight. This is the cult of Sumer and Babylon and Egypt, referenced often enough to establish the record of a society dominated by slavery and nothing that would conceive that humanity was ever anything other than that.

We speak of the merchant in the abstract, rather than as a definite person. A

distinct class may be recognized by its interests and existing institutions. The mercantile function is not particular to a given class, but describes something humans do that allows the merchant to exist, even if that merchant were a tribesman, a noble, a priest, a worker, a town-dweller, or some lowlife selling snake oil to make an extra buck. No one yet is defined by what they do or what they "are" in essence. The rise of the merchants would happen without specialized "merchants" as such, and in many cases, mercantile interests were attached to some other interest for their money to mean anything. Finance as an independent force could only arise in the modern sense after many inventions, and was never really about the might or allure of money, or money actually consisting of magic. What is really happening is the emergence of a society where transactions make more sense, and where transactions can be compelled through enclosure, forcing others into socialization, and conscripting children to accept the rule of the market.^[3] These interactions happen for reasons that are not economic or driven by any material necessity, but occur because humans on some level view other humans as both their primary threat and only realistic ally. The reasons why are one part political, one part an expectation that if humans are unaccounted for then potential enemies lurk everywhere, and one part spiritual mission to suggest what humans want out of this life, which usually entails seeking other humans as guides or allies, or at the least potential mates so that more humans may carry on. So far as the material necessity exists, it is because all of those behaviors, particularly the need for mates, are more or less ingrained in human psychology, and obviously if no new humans exist or humans have no way to communicate with or navigate society, there would be no humans to develop a theory of society or why they would trade at all. To be able to ask the question of why we have a society presupposes the society existed, and its unity came primarily out of antagonism rather than any benefit to large-scale human interaction. Outside of a few humans regarded as friends, mates, or family, humans would have little to do with each other if not for a general fear that has nothing to do with a true necessity of life. The necessity that spurs economic decision making is fear of other humans and their associations. Simply put, when humans are close together, absent a faith that those humans are not a threat, it will become evident that malevolent actors can destroy any peace. It further becomes clear by a cursory examination of history that those malevolent actors are the reason the city exists, who conspire with each other to ensure those out of the know are kept in the dark and humiliated forever. The rulers then have the gall to claim it is not personal, until the ruled were to reciprocate the same transgression that rulers have always relied on, the moment it becomes materially possible for the damned to strike back. When the rules of the great game are violated, suddenly the "passive actions" of society are very personal offenses, while gratuitous depravity is thrown in the face of the ruled as a matter of course. Human society cannot persist in any other way, and never has. This, of course, is hostile to any society in which trade and commerce can be seen as anything other than a menace to be avoided at all costs. And so, the mercantile function arises as a way of regulating this distrust between hostile parties. What humans are paying for with their money is not merely

a claim to products, or labor, or utility, or property in land. The tokens of money are symbolic of this antagonistic relationship which must be navigated and bought off with credits, rather than relying on good faith or direct struggle. Money is not the only mechanism other than the major ones often cited, and money is never "just money". Its existence is always contingent on institutional acceptance that money exists, and laws regarding commerce and trade exist in some form. If there is no law or custom, money cannot be valued as anything other than the commodity's material truth, which is to say, it would be worth nothing and has no value whatsoever for the moral purposes we assign to it. We may envision some ad hoc system of accounting that is much like money, as has happened in the past when the money is no longer any good, or the use of money might persist out of some inertia that it would be worth something, some day. Without stable systems of exchange, like laws protecting against foul play in trade and things like murder and plunder which make trade problematic, the money is only worth whatever people are willing to honor, and that monetary economy entails much less in conditions of such strife, where nothing is at all secure. Price-setting markets imply a stability that is never a given or free in material costs. If nothing else, irregularity of exchanges outside of peace would make all the presumptions of a free market woefully inadequate. Siege and war would distort prices in localities, and if siege became a general condition, bizarre contortions of value are deliberate and normal, while the value money once pointed towards would be meaningless regardless of any soundness of the currency.

The imagined "perfect state" of peace allowing for the market's smooth operation does not exist anywhere - not in nomadic life or in the city. If it existed, it would obviate the need of market exchanges, since such conditions are conducive to cooperative production rather than mercantile conflict. Where money arises is purely due to the conflict that existed before the introduction of money. Money introduces new conflicts, and can resolve some old ones. Money presents an incentive to cooperate in this way only, and a motive for predation that wouldn't exist if rituals of exchange were not a norm of the society. At no point does the merchant enter exchange as a purely neutral agent. For one, the merchant is not by nature tied to this function, and anyone with money or some equivalent for barter would have to see that function the same as a merchant would. Everyone in the society has reason to concern him or herself with money, because of what money represents in that society. The dedicated merchant does so not for lust of money, but for ulterior motives allowing that money to translate to security or position in society. The merchant performs through their activities a number of material functions, where multifarious goods are available at the store rather than by extracting so much cotton, so much timber, etc. and processing them through home manufacture or direct appropriation of a slave's product. The greatest asset a merchant would deal with, as you probably guessed, are the very slaves that till the fields and work in industry. The influence of slavery comes and goes with the condition of war in society, but the most valuable asset to plunder and resell is human livestock and labor-power. The merchant doesn't

exist to provide this slavery or facilitate its existence simply because slavery was seen as a natural good. It really makes little difference to a merchant whether his trade is in slaves or precious metal or crops, or if labor is obtained through slavery, wage labor, or conscription into industrial armies under state or social control. It wouldn't make any difference if labor as something to appropriate or exploit was off the table completely, if humanity ever advanced far enough to rid itself of this institution in all of its expressions. The merchant's role has more to do with human relations than the goods themselves, whose utility is in reality a thing that cares little for economic rituals. The goods in-kind are useful not in the context of an imagined great game, but for games of our design which are limited. It is only when considering economic life as something other than a game, that cannot be avoided, that it becomes real, and we perceive of any ritual pertaining to trade that is transcendent and acts outside of history. It would act even before we exist, for such rituals and cults must answer the question of how we came about. The economics of the present are suggested by the past, and the future is understood as a continuation of the past necessarily. The reasons why have nothing to do with natural laws at all, but an understanding humans developed about progress and management, which was a product of the mind and intelligence rather than mere knowledge or the world itself. The world itself did not care one bit about our economic task, as if it were designed for us. We conform to the world and decided, for whatever reason, to make war with it - which really turned into a war against each other to parcel out parts of the world. The war precedes economics and exists outside of it. Political actors do something much different than economics, which properly speaking is the domain of the mercantile and technological interests. Politicians and aristocrats must see mercantile activity as a potential threat, for they all seek to command the world. The workers and those cast out by mercantile and technological aims, who are the true engine allowing economic value to exist in any appreciable form, see money as a threat, even when they must covet it and understand economics as something to secure their piece of property so that they may continue to live.

If the merchant and technocrat must exist in that world, their acts will conform not to any natural law or ideal market, but the practices of struggle and war. This, naturally, is generally bad for the merchant, who has nothing but money to express his civic worth. The technocrat is not so encumbered, for he or she has transformed this capital into useful machinery. This machinery is not limited to production or empty luxury, as an aristocrat would have it. All of a merchant's endeavors are means to an end. The concept of mindlessly expanding capital is a nonsequitur. Where economic growth was pursued in capitalist society, it was always towards the development of nations, rather than any humanitarian goal or sense of historical progress. Economic growth correlated to a rise of industrial output and population, which allowed states to field larger armies. It also gave those armies their most natural enemy - the very nation they were ostensibly there to defend. The merchant is not the origin of this malice, but is a facilitator granting to it new mechanisms that take on a life of their own. The merchant's role in the end is not necessarily malicious, but since the value of

coin is primarily a token of this toil and struggle, merchants are obligated to do things that we would consider bad. So too does the technocrat, whose tools and purpose is much different but who occupies the same rough strata of society.

The long period between the murky origins of man and the highest form of pastoral society would only have progressed as slowly as it did because humanity's intercene conflict took central position, for no other reason than the race's malicious intent being its most enduring quality. Yet, there is only so much time for malice, and sustaining it over too long a period was costly. Every warband and celebration of the malice inherent to the race from its inception was an expenditure that wasn't gathering food or building what luxuries and recreation would have been preferable on a good day. The intercene war is justified even at this early stage with the pretext that remains the true purpose of war up to now - to cull those deemed weak not by any fair metric, but by whichever sadistic ape manages to get the upper hand and scam his or her way to power. Where did it begin, then? It began with the ritual sacrifice of undesirables, who were the most hated enemy of all. Human malice cranks up to its maximum when it encounters those who were chosen to die yet allowed to live, violating their sense of the natural order. Mercy is not a quality inborn to the race, and even when it is developed, mercy is always qualified and associated with subservience. None of this sacrifice or violence serves any purpose worth keeping, and it is only for that reason that humanity manages not to kill itself and remain at this miserable stage of development up to now. There was not one thing in human nature that was good enough to stop the cycle. What stops the cycle was not any goodness or kindness at all, but enough humans figuring out what is to a child obvious, but which for those who glorify war is a great scholarly discovery. It is a very simple discovery - if the malice of humanity is stayed for one day, it will provide a greater opportunity for malice tomorrow. In this way, humanity slowly masked its general hostility to the world and towards each other, and now that they were able to communicate with each other, at long last language could develop in some way that allowed humans to somehow like each others' company. You may ask though, if a child can see through this - and if children are taught manners simply as a matter of being able to survive in a hostile world - why it takes so long for wider associations to develop? The simple answer is that the malice of humanity is reproduced in the family itself. Something so malicious as charging money or rent would be highly counterproductive and pointless, but every family establishes who does all the miserable work, who is to be mocked, who is to be thrown away, who is to be praised, and who in the end actually is valued in this society. The same process has played out in every human social unit and every institution humans have developed. It is not a singular or uniform tendency, since the competitive aim is ultimately contrary to any economic life, but it is always present and it is this which economy must navigate, more than utility itself.

ECONOMIC VALUE IN UTILITY AND TECHNOLOGY

Utility as a general law is found nowhere in nature - not in scientific laws or the material world, and not in the human beings who would view the world scientifically or in any appreciable moral philosophy. Utility only exists in the intellectual task and in scenarios at the local level. Of the world and of society generally, there is no inherent utility to seek, nor a general sense of "utility" that would be universally appreciated. That development only occurs further along, when society is established and general laws governing society and politics allow us to properly ask questions of the motives of human beings, who are the agents that regard utility as morally worthwhile. So far as we can regard utility as relevant, it only regards things in-kind and all potential uses we have for them, each of which are understood as distinct outcomes. Similar outcomes are still distinct in some quality that is detectable, and for the purposes of science, no two outcomes would be exactly alike. In our models of reality, all things being equal, the outcome will be exactly alike; but a distinction in outcome that is minute will be qualitatively measured as something different. In judging utility, we would reduce and flatten these smaller variants in outcomes, so that the effects of any given cause are distinguishable only when the distinction is significant enough for a qualitative different in outcome. The difference between enough water for the body to function and not enough is qualitative, and there is a quantity of water that is superfluous for any purpose of consumption. The same would be true of any given population in aggregate, or the aggregate of all entities in an environment that consume water. The particulars of every member of that population do not intrinsically care about the utility of the whole. Each member is, in this utilitarian thinking, out for themselves, and will not make any connection between their fate and the fate of the whole population. For one, the members of any given population do not see each other as "ally" by any law of nature, or recognize a shared identity as significant towards any utility. Second, the natural utilitarian thinking leads to a crass value of the individual unless members of the population use each other for some ulterior motive. In of itself, no utilitarian argument can be made to speak of the needs of the many, for "the many" are from the outset seen as not just alien to each other, but competitors over a fixed quantity of water. For the purposes of utility, all members of the population are consumers and produce a quantity of water that is taken as fixed in nature. This, of course, does not compel the members of the population to think about coveting others' water to starve out their opponents by any law of nature, either. The optimal answer to this is simple - to meet the needs of survival and life. Individually, members of the population understand this if they are rational agents or even knowing agents that operate on some principle that allowed cooperation. If there is an excess of water for that purpose, then there is no struggle to speak of. If there is less than abundance, the management of scarcity cannot be resolved by any utilitarian calculus. "Not enough" will be the same regardless of ethics, and no one can say one agent is worth more than another without invoking something that does not concern itself with the utility of things, and instead speaks of a political or eugenic interest that has no utility

whatsoever. Since none of these agents have any reason to trust one another or concern themselves with the conceits of a greater good, the only utilitarian answer to any scarcity is struggle for the sake of struggle. It is, therefore, a retarded ideology and not worth considering. If the answer is death, then we can find moral causes and purposes that do not denigrate the name and purpose of science or anything we should care about. Those who bray about utility and conduct the lifeboat exercise should not only be the first killed in any crisis, but they should probably have been killed simply for being abomination. But, we are getting ahead of ourselves.

We see here an autistic and Satanic thinking about utility overtakes what our scientific judgement of the thing would tell us. The answer would be the same with or without the human factor. We are not here to suffer, and we are not here to stand and die over a question of utility. Utility to be relevant implies that we would consider the tasks utility refer to as useful for purposes which are not reducible to utility; that is, that we have a moral value to attain that overrides utility. For the eugenic creed, eugenism and its religion of civic worth becomes the only acceptable override, and uses spurious ethics to demand that all other objectives are inadmissible. The full implications of this require us to view political concepts long in force which make clear that eugenism was intended long ago from antecedents of a predatory thought-form which found its modern expression. For those of us who are not fucktarded, we are left to judge utility in terms that we would appreciate. We can presume that at the least, humans like living enough to care about their life functions continuing. It is the functions of life which make any other utility possible, and so utility is beholden to life until such a time that we are non-living and adopt different imperatives. However we advance ourselves and whatever excuses we make, life remains life and as a result it is locked into its functions. This is a problem not of the world or a law of nature, but a law of life, this strange aberration that was imposed on nature for reasons unknown. Life's purposes are not naturally useful, for life can be useless and an unwelcome experience, particularly the life dominated by torture.

If money is a tool, it refers to not merely a symbol of some other political matter or some reduced essence. Like any tool, it takes on a life of its own once forged, and the user relates to it symbiotically. If money is not a tool, then it would not exist at all, and could not take on the characteristics it does; it would instead be seen correctly as a useless intermediary, and we would discard it. Threats alone do not allow that tool to be imposed violently on the unwilling, and even if they did, money would never be able to develop except as a recapitulation of threats, which would be seen for what they are. Yet, money represents not just a threat or its inverse of the carrot to the stick. It suggests something altogether different - that money is commanded by intellect and the learning of human beings, to make sense of exchanges that would otherwise be dealt with logically, with in-kind treatment of the objects in question, or by ad hoc arrangements which never stabilize. Money presents something that is more stable than ad hoc arrangements, which abides certain expectations of exchange, practices of usury,

debt, and so on. We would not wish a society where we have to dispute whether the money means what it purports to mean, yet that does indeed happen and it is intrinsic to what money is. If money did not serve a stabilizing function, it would be ever more malicious towards our genuine wants and useful articles. The peculiarities of money as a tool are not of interest here. What is of interest is the development of tools and operations generally. This tool development is both a faculty of knowledge and of learning, and assimilates raw material to make some useful product, which in turn makes more products, and so on. The feedback loop for tool development has realistic limits, after which no expenditure of intellect or resources significantly improves a tool. New tools develop iteratively from the old, and new inventions arise from developments that are disparate. Never is this development of technology, and thus the deployment of money or any tool, accidental or purely reactive. Even if the initiative of the tool user was made to react to a condition, tool-users prepare for all contingences and learn of the forces of nature. Among the forces of nature, absent a proper view of what life is, would be the historical reality we learned from, that brought us into existence into the first place and is an obvious source to suggest what the future would be. We would not expect the future to be too different from the past without an obvious event suggesting some epoch had passed into another, and this never is as clear as we would see it in hindsight. A drastic change to create a hitherto unknown quality in the future is likely to be something that shocks our familiar and orderly procession through life. Money does not merely represent intelligence or learning as a static quantity, but something which can motivate it towards particular ends. It is a very poor tool of managing knowledge, but it was the tool that was evident since no managerial science existed, and money suggested a link to the productive industry and agriculture that society relied upon for any technological endeavor. Capital then is not just human genius ill-defined, but a drive towards technology and the realization of whatever conceits human genius holds. The issuance of money itself is held by banks and treasuries rather than capital itself. To speak of capital is to speak of something productive or extractive - that is, to speak of the raw materials, lands, machines men build, and the men themselves who are either slaves or wage labor pressed into service by starvation. Without pressing wage labor into service by deprivation, capital has no tool to suggest the workers won't piss off if made to work under onerous conditions for no benefit to them.

What is truly valued is not money, nor human labor for its own sake, nor land or anything just to hold it. The value that economic thought pertains to is technological before it can be anything else. All that is purchased with value is understood to be a tool to be used by intellect and the mind, rather than something that is valuable for its own sake. This may be technology in the form of physical machines, or abstract machines, but it is always something technological and mechanistic in its actions. It has to be for it to be an object of utility in the genuine sense. All that is valued is a machine, in order for it to be something of worth. This applies to a market setting or any other exchange that might be imagined, so far as value is construed as utility. In

economic management, there is no concept other than utility, but utility is in any scientific sense that would be universally appreciated broken down to technology alone. The crops that are sown and grown, the materials extracted from the Earth, are all understood as tools which are fashioned into technology, and are in of themselves a type of technology. So too are abstractions such as ideology, institutions, or concepts like honor. They are, for the purposes of economics, subsumed into this concept of technology, which we may treat in various ways. In of itself, all that exists is not reducible to technology, and all of the machines we value have an existence outside of utility altogether. Behind the conceits mind learns about things are the genuine articles, which have an existence apart from anything we value. To speak of economic value then is to speak of appropriating that tool, that technology, that land. Land itself is less about the actual dirt or space, and more the claims on it which are enforced by men and their machines to do so. In nature, the land sits there, *terra nullius* and unclaimed for any utility. Yet, as soon as humans have a mind to do so, unclaimed land becomes territory or turf of one sort or another, and it would be impossible to avoid this. Humans will have a sense of their surroundings and assess the overall status of a parcel of land, which in this utilitarian thinking exists to be exploited, with life existing on top of it.

There is a need of the mind to arrest this technology and control it, and claim it as the domain of some mind, whether it is an actual human or an institutional front obscuring the humanity of its members. The technology in actuality takes on its own existence regardless of our conceits about it or any ability to control it. A tool in one hand cannot be controlled in its uses by other hands. And so, technology becomes property and a thing to be contested in one way or another. Technology has its history and genesis, and there was a cause to every technological advance. Any development of technology "in nature" - outside of society - is considered null for the purposes of mind, a gift nature granted for society to exploit. Without any clear boundaries demarcating society, society presumes all of the world and everything in it is fair game for its technological assessment, and even if the social units are far from each other and live in entirely different cultures, it is understood that all technology is either the work of humans, or brought into society in some way by humans. That which is unclaimed technology might as well not exist so far as society is concerned. By establishing economy as a general practice, the technological interest of life is asserting its claim to spiritual authority and, if it can manage it, temporal authority, in a way that it could not accomplish in earlier epochs. The mind understands that technology's utility is variable, but can only attempt to plan for every potential outcome that is qualitatively relevant. Naively the approach would be like a giant decision tree, out of the giant clockwork technocracy envisions the world and society to be. This is not very effective if we think about how an artificial intelligence would navigate that much information, but it is the model a technocrat must accept for general utility to make sense. Otherwise, the utility would be confined to a particular tool for a particular game, in the hands of particular persons, where no comparison of utility would be sensical. In

principle, for utility to be sensical as value in the economic sense, the comparison of utilities must be possible by logical comparisons, and the assumptions of spiritual goals outside of utility must be presumed natural. This establishes the natural alliance a technocrat is inclined to, but knows instinctively to be a threat. That alliance is with the property holders and their genetic legacy, which in our time is demonstrated through the religion of eugenics. The alliance is a threat because the proprietors will always maintain the upper hand, and would make technology and knowledge itself wholly proprietary. It would mean that even one's own thoughts and every iota of being would be enclosed, transformed into a tool, and the grand clockwork model would consume the very people who believed themselves masters of the tool. This, of course, is delusional and does not resemble what actually happens as technocratic society develops. No tool is functional without its master, even if the master if itself reduced to a tool. The master still has the agency of a human being and cannot deny this. Yet, this is at the center of every technocratic mystification regarding technology, science, and explains why we are left at this sorry impasse in the 21st century. The technocrat must hold these truths to be self-evident - that all men are created unequal, burdened by their Creator with certain unalienable responsibilities, that among them are death, slavery, and property's dominion. Even if the technocrat sees the trap, and most do, the cargo cult presses against the senses because it will always be the path of least resistance to utility, and the society itself is imagined as a tool rather than what it actually is and what it actually can be. Eugenics ensured that the victory of the proprietor would end any other use of the tool, and with it end technology itself as anything other than a primordial screaming. It is contradictory in nature, and revels in that above all. All it would need to do is preclude any concept that there is anything other than self-evident utility and the progress of science. It must do this violently, which the technocrat understands to be a direct threat against the very thing allowing this to exist - unless the technocrat believes there is some clever plan to betray the proprietors at the correct moment and liquidate them all, after which the men and women of science stand alone as the last proprietors, commanding all that exists in the most abject slavery. Other than that, the only way this ends is by struggle or willful dissolution of the ruling ideas, due to the obvious destruction for no real purpose it would bring. All that would be required would be to create a technology which made it impossible to say no to this, and that would become the grand obsession of the proprietors, and eventually the scientists who understood what side of the war they were on this whole time.

THE VALUE OF LABOR

If the world is to be some grand clockwork, under natural law, some imagined Demiurge, the Satan or God (which in this example would effectively amount to the same thing seen differently whether one praises Man or holds Man in contempt), or something assumed to exist for a vague reason we never quite recall, it becomes clear that the chief object of utility is labor itself. Labor, in this view, is too a type of technology. It can be built from raw materials - the

mating of a male and female human and all of the resources to upkeep it - and it is honed like any other machine. It is in principle perfectly acceptable to view labor, in all of its variations, as a very elaborate tool with a few unique properties. The unique properties do not entail any technological uniqueness to humans, that allow humans and humans alone a substance of thought or make the human inscrutable to all but the gods. What makes humans relevant is very important to us, but means nothing for technology, utility, or the great games money plays. It's not even that the human essence has any value to us. It is because labor to be labor is intrinsically a moral act, for some purpose that does not correspond to any interest of life that must be upheld. What we do with labor is really our choice, until the labor of another decides to constrain that. Of course, this makes clear what has been clear from the start - that the greatest threat to humans and society is other humans and society itself. It is because we are laboring that any of our deeds have utility and worth in the first place, beyond merely noting that something exists in the world. It does make all of our games seem pitiful, but for whatever reason there were humans who imposed a game on people who by and large had no reason to ever play, and who never benefit one iota from the entire sad affair. We cannot say here what would have solved this, as if the problem were one solved by technological means or some clever idea. Humans would have to want to do something different, and in everything humans do, the fate we have been set on has been resisted and even those who bring us to this can't help but feel disgust towards the enterprise we were made to undertake. The true believers who actually think the intericine struggle for its own sake was a worthwhile endeavor never have anything to show for it, and can't say in the end their existence was worth much except the point of saying a word, which means nothing except petulant whining when their great struggle inevitably fails. The particular moral purposes of labor are not immediately important, for they entail a spiritual and political understanding that is not reducible to or answerable to the economic problem. What can be done is to describe this machine, labor, as a lump of utility to be managed and how that management happens, and this tells us something about human psychology.

Labor and its source are almost never equal in ability, qualities appreciated in the output, or any quantity that could be ascribed to it. Humans will do different things, and possess different technology built into their body and possess different histories, different tools they would come ready to work with, and so on. All humans possess some property beyond their own body, and their own bodies are also property with distinct qualities. It would appear then that no equality of labors is at all possible, and technocratic society would default to dicker over every distinction in humans and sort them into hierarchical grades of civic worth, worst from best. Naturally, "the best" were considered worthy of the most political prestige and rights. This idea fails on so many levels, and the reasons why are obvious if they are considered for five minutes. If we acknowledge the utilitarian argument from earlier, though, the naive solution is the only possible one, and any "greater utility" beneath the visage of different labors is irrelevant.

This arises from a very basic failure - a willful failure - to acknowledge that humans are both self-interested and do not like being told where they fit in some thought leader's hierarchy without fighting for position. The consequences of that are numerous and will be treated further throughout this and future books of this series. More than that, if one follows through the consequences of interclass conflict over a lump of horseflesh, the distinctions of qualities is overwrought compared to any moral value the distinction would confer. From the start, qualitative distinctions of relevance to the moral question are compressed to that which is significant to the question. For most of the labor humans execute, nearly any human can do them and is willing to do them, so long as they see a purpose sufficiently motivating. Of the skilled labors, it is known that with adequate learning and acquisition of material health, which amount to the same thing, many of them would be widely available. This requires both the motive to learn and the motive to take on the added risk of being notable compared to peers. Realistically, no amount of learning is infinite and cannot compensate for existing disparities. The crass technocrat essentializes this in the person, in one way or another, because the technocrat has no interest in negotiating with the fickle educational habits of the human race, or the actual humans who encounter a largely hostile world that disdains any display of non-martial merit. In principle, though, the moral worth of different labors is questionable because much of what is actually done has little to do with scientifically provable merits or values that can be generally appreciated. Politicians and lawyers, for example, produce nothing, and would in an ideal world not exist. Many professions humans engage in would be in a productive sense actively harmful in value, but are in society highly valued - often the most valued specifically because of the harm inflicted on other humans. The moral imperatives of the human race disdain industry, kindness, and nearly anything we would univiersally consider a good to exchange or consume for moral improvement. They value malice selectively, since malice serves not any sense of general good but specific aims for a momentary advantage, and is directed at specific human targets. The value of general malice is particular to states and directed towards purposes that suit it, barring eugenism where general malice becomes the chief and only true value of the human race. With such distortions of value in general, which are all laboriously carried out and given moral praise beyond money, the value of utility, money, and technology from before, which would seem natural, is already suspect. The distortion is not so absolute that it overrides all else. Whatever ideology may say about it, at the end of the day, nothing good is produced unless someone, eventually, is willing to do the sucker's task of working.

What is valued in labor is the cost of commanding it more than the quality of labor itself. It is less a matter of labor in the abstract, which can be taken as a given equivalent to so many units of value. The cost is not merely a commitment of coin, but the cost to command the will of people. This command is shortened to a concept of *virtue*, which is vaguely defined as a meritorious virtue. What is it really, if all of these merits are reduced to utilities we would wish to manage? It is nothing less than that which allows the labor to be harnessed towards

deliberate ends of the mind. It is, in other words, the ability of intelligence to command the faculties of human beings, and all of the tools to do so are managed by nothing other than intelligence, or the learning faculty that is a small part of knowledge. It is, therefore, a conceit of human knowledge from the outset, but it abides a reality that exists outside of it. We may speak of the genuine existence of humans requiring something more than a conceit of intelligence, but for management and thus economics, all of the genuine labors and moral wishes of the master of labor are subordinated to this one faculty. It is not intelligence as some substance, but the active utilization of that intelligence towards this end of management and the command of humans alone. In a society dominated by the mindset of the technocrat, this becomes effectively the marker of intelligence that is politically and morally relevant in society, rather than learning about anything else we would want to do. The aims of commanding labor are only to do so without regard to any barrier or externality that is a consequence of it. When those externalities exist, they must be rendered invisible by a magic trick. So too is the absurdity of doing this masked by a division where one thing is economically real and valued, and another - which has a very real existence - must be made invisible. How far this is taken is dependent only on the needs of management, rather than any fidelity to the world or a sense of goodness outside of this conception of virtue. We are aware of the dangers of doing this, but by the logic of commanding men - by enslaving them, essentially - we are not allowed to think of any other way labor is managed. This applies to the labor of our own person. We are set against our own existence in pursuit of this goal, and it makes perfect sense for us to do this, for labor indeed must be commanded if we are to do anything other than aimless wandering. There then is the trap of both the management of labor and the management of technology. All of our efforts are expended on command and control, and all of our learning is subordinated to a crass goal of changing the world rather than understanding what it is we are changing. Those who set themselves apart from this rat race do so by securing themselves against all other actors, and that has been the true goal of political economy from the outset. Certain people must be sacrosanct and granted "unlimited freedom" in this abstract sense, and those outside of that group will have no freedom and no security by definition. Any security they hold is a temporary fiction. This, of course, is a very bad deal for anyone who must actually work, but it is carried out and replicated within every class, and within every person. The enclosure of the mind itself is the first step to enclosing the world, and reproducing the tripartate structure in the person made the exploitation of labor conceivable in this way. It sets itself apart against two great classes - the men and women whose genuine labor is necessary for any of the structure to function, and that which is outside of use for this goal, who are to become the residuum and declared absolutely retarded, insane, and irrelevant. It is those two groups who are the object of virtue - to define which of the laborers are good and which are bad, and to eliminate all other distinctions. The lower two classes are beholden to this, and the good laborers, who have some stake to defend, turn against the bad, who have nothing but a fool's hope that it could be different, in a different world. The bad then turn on each other, and are given

every inducement to do so, as if the entire nightmare were a series of just-so facts thrown in their faces to cajole them. The objective is not destruction, but suffering itself, and can only be that.

If that is the case, then what is it really for? Command of labor is not a neutral value. If the moral objective is to command labor for its own sake, and life exists for its own sake, then the result is eventual regression to a primordial state. The arrest of human history is only possible by pressing constantly the image of humanity in chains forever, to make it clear that it will never be different, and that all other worlds are a lie. That is not why we have commanded labor, even at the nadir of the human race's depravity. If that was the point of life, we should have slit our own throats and spared the world this abomination, and there is no possible moral objection to this that isn't a selfish pissant's whining. Anyone who has thought for five minutes about this, and this can occur to savage man just as it occurs to us, can see this was not why we woke up to do any of this. It is not that humans are immune to this thinking, for the human often regresses to its preferred mode of action for reasons that we can divine rather easily. It is that, after thinking enough, something new must develop if the machine is to continue producing anything of moral worth to our genuine existence. It is those values which management would seek to meet, which are things we do not regard as economic values in the same sense that our daily affairs are. When the new value judgements are to be asserted, they encounter a world that had already proceeded, which has a history we can know to explain why it was this way and what can be changed for us. We are, ultimately, changing ourselves rather than the world as a whole. Humans can modify the environment only by constructing machines atop it, rather than changing fundamentally the being of anything in the world or the world as a whole. We convince ourselves our magickal workings with labor actually cause transubstantiation, where water turns to wine or some other neat trick that alludes to a lurid ritual of cannibalism. What really changes is that which is built atop past knowledge and learning. We learn of new things, and conceive of something novel for purposes that are our own. The world itself allows for the new to exist and we may encounter the new from outside of ourselves. We may collaboratively build the new. The new is not intrinsically good, but it is necessary to suggest that anything different from the past is possible. We have no inherent moral bias towards the past, future, or present, in a way that suggests we must be fixed on any trajectory by a natural law. There is no way to prove that through a pseudoscience that asserts "science" is fused with nature in the abstract. The new exists not out of some impulse of the universe or as an inexorable trend, nor as a reaction to the cajoling of forces in the world, nor as an imperious will of us. It exists because something in the world is abomination, and that cannot be disguised or mystified. The world itself does not abide human malice, and we ourselves are agents who recognize that. It was never the world asserting human malice. That was entirely something humans generate on their own, for reasons that are particular to them, and could easily be ameliorated if we so chose. The will of humans is, in the end, too fickle to do this out of goodness, and so the

world in some way creates a sobering influence. That sobering influence may be little more than the necessary reaction of humans to the viciousness of other humans, which would lead us to ask what so many have asked - "what was it all for?" If it became general in humanity to embrace that malice and suggest nothing else was possible, then the world will in some way damn the whole race. Humanity may then do something different, either by its will or when the world inevitably makes the wages of sin apparent in a way that forces their hand. If humanity insists to the bitter end that it really was malice for malice's sake, then the endgame of such a world is so obvious a child can foresee it. Why this is too much for other humans, this author will never know, and he knows most of humanity is perfectly aware of the trap and couldn't be otherwise, whatever their attitude towards it. In the main, it isn't too much for other humans. Even in terrible societies, humans only tolerate so much rot, if only because depravity produces obviously mal-adaptive outcomes. We frequently must work against all hitherto established order just for humanity's existence to continue, only to find our work undone like Sisyphus' eternal task with the rock. Labor is not genuinely reproduced, as if it were designed in some natural scheme to fit manager's expectations. It is always produced anew, exhausted, destroyed, and new labor is born to be commanded. So too is new virtue taken from the world, as it is the world from which all of that virtue was taken, and reproduced with each new commander of labor.

In principle, the command of labor is not limited to human labor in this sense, for virtue requires command of things in the environment. Virtue always relates to particular things, rather than a general sense of the world that is vaguely defined. Human labor predominates because it is the most proximate cause of anything that we consider socially relevant. The commander of labor concerns himself as much with machines as men, for labor itself is a type of machine, which itself employs machines it must command with the same virtue one acquires to command humans. There is no barrier between machine and man that virtue would appreciate. There is a natural barrier in the sense that humans are not created as tools in the same way, and could not be commanded like robots. If we created machines that were truly knowing and rational, we would not be creating machines that are naturally slaves, due to a retarded managerial conceit about the mind. Such machines would be functionally no different from humans. This of course requires us to assess what the human as a machine actually is, and why we know anything in the first place. Here is where eugenics stepped in to ensure that such an understanding was not admissible in the public. Privately, the human has been dissected so many times, physically and psychologically. It must become a holy shibboleth to deny that there is a human, at least for those selected to die. The utility of doing this is clear - by unpersoning the damned, their suffering can be maximized, and this is the only thing that eugenics can conceive. It is less about suffering for some ulterior motive, but suffering as the point unto itself becoming life's prime want. Because this virtue is ultimately a form of property, it is tied to past record, rather than the present or potential future. It always owes more to its genesis than its full nature, and will always

reduce to that, no matter how much this works against the objective virtue seeks. The virtuous, for perfectly understandable reasons, want the future to resemble the past, or the future to be an improvement on past glories, and here we see a tendency to believe in Whig History, where historical progress is an inexorable rise of imperial greatness. It was not a malevolence that inclined people to believe this story, for there are a lot of reasons why the past should be regarded as the source of future glories. The malevolence is to presume that the system is perfect and invariably decays, and this is a conceit intelligence must make of any system it establishes and any law or institution it lays down. The new and vital does not concern itself with institutions at all, but must always question the legitimacy of those institutions. We could overcome this weakness in our thinking by regarding the world as what it does and what it is in the present moment, rather than continuing as if history only moves when thought declares it has in fact moved. To do this, though, invites many demons lurking in the mud, which came out to hatch in the 20th century - where, for the first time, widespread participation in knowledge was not only possible but mandated and forced on the people. It is at this point where conventional thought on virtue, which served mankind mostly well, would be inverted, with full knowledge that the intent was to destroy all virtue outside of a limited aristocratic caste. This was really inherent in virtue conceptually, unless the concept itself could transform into something to govern human beings by more than impression and the appearance of merits. This would not be easy, if it is possible at all.

THE GAME

So far the parts of economic life have been described, but they appear to us not as the things they are but as symbols. We only can see the superficial, or impose a superficial model on the things we see. Either way, the world we observe and manage is a symbolic one, from which we glean information we believe to be useful. We do not know in full the qualities of men or machines without learning about them. We do not even know the location in order to claim it as ours without learning of it, and learning of ways to guard all property and deny it to others. It is not the quantity of things that is important so much as the knowledge of what exists and its entry into possession. The productive acts are carried out not for economic incentives, but for moral aims that are quite apart from economic necessity. This is because economic necessity does not have any impulse to build more products at all, because the most useful thing for managing economic life is to not produce anything at all. Far from it, deprivation and constraint are constant in economic thought, whether it is capitalist or socialist. Productivism doesn't produce the quality of command, and creates a liability. Anything that is produced must be guarded and kept out of the hands of those who have no reason to be commanded and many reasons to resent those who wish that goal. So far as production has a purpose in economic life, it is always towards definite aims that can be predicted, rather than vague aims that are only guessed at. The drive for empires or competition within society is not carried out without knowledge of rivals, as if men were blind to the

world. Only the fools are so blind that they do not see who rules them. Anyone with a stake in the game recognizes what rules, or what appears to rule, without the fetter of believing lies. The lying is never comfortable, and has always been the interest of cajolers who press the lie aggressively from the moment ideology is discovered. No one likes to tell themselves lies and actually believe them, and once that cycle starts, he who would be a master is undone before he sets out to the task of rule. The race for industrial product is carried out not on a blank slate against an infinite number of undefined firms and nations, but in a world where notable players are already known or can be known by their prominence. The rise of industry begins when the domains of the Earth are thoroughly charted, with records of who lives where and what can be exploited from the land and the people on those lands. Industry was never carried out as if we produced like Malthus' mindless breeders, for those who commanded industry were on the same side as Malthus when it came to the jobless wretches. Those who commanded industry were more aware than anyone that if industrial product entered unapproved hands and the conditions of workers improved, their command of industry would be challenged from all directions. The industrialist knew to play his hand carefully, for he was caught between the lower strata of bourgeois who would revolt to take his factory, and the existing upper strata who saw new rivals as things to be co-opted, acquired, destroyed, or feared if they were uncontrollable by the dominant interests.

If we are to see the chief aim of economics as valued learning, then you may ask - how does learning matter when we know there is no condition producing more products, and a noted scarcity exists? To answer this, it must be clear that in principle, there is no natural "limit to growth" which knowledge can ascertain with universal certainty. All of the conditions of production - the land, resources available, labor and all of its qualities, and the virtue to command all of them - are things learned, and this information is never automatic or a given. It may be common sense or impossible to hide something that is obvious for long, given what we know about human knowledge, but all of these conditions are only assessed because we learn that there are boundaries in the world that cannot be changed by any labor or force we can harness. We would, in a seemingly intractable resource problem, seek a way out of the trap by some stroke of genius, however hopeless that seems. Only after that has been exhausted sufficiently do we ask the next thing - how we learned to manage scarcity. This can happen at the individual level, but humans being aware of other humans, they will possess a sense that this learning goes on for everyone else in whatever way they can, and humans learn from each other. Humans share interests, affinities for each other, and moral inclinations that suggest friendship or an alliance of convenience towards some shared aim. There are ways in which humans learn to manage scarcity without resorting to the worst of all worlds, and this can be settled without any political intervention necessarily. Very often, disputes over some economic condition are resolved without even the exchange of coin, simply by the restraint of all in society suggesting certain acts are off-limits and certain standards are to be kept. In this way, shortfalls need not result in an immediate

crisis where the people must run around like headless chickens in confusion. Perhaps this does not work, and humans being humans, they are not going to lay down and rot or accept death. How is this struggle resolved? Humans learn who their true friends are, who can be relied on in the struggle over limited resources, and the real merits and demerits of their potential opponents. The struggle over resources at this point ceases to be about a hypothetical where new resources will appear by some unexpected genius or a last-minute resolution. Once begun, the struggle becomes the chief value, and it has a way of persisting long after the crisis is no longer about productivity. Instead, the conditions of siege suggest a very different sense of merits and values that are relevant. Weapons which would be an economic waste in another time become precious technology. Strange values become apparent either because these are conducive to a state of war, or because the salve of opiates is worth more than life itself or the presumptions of a just world. Perhaps, somewhere in there, there were humans who never cared for a moment about a just world, and always presumed predation, theft, begging, or some other demerit by reasonable standards was their modus operandi. All strategies a human would use to struggle, grift, bargain, or compete as individuals or as members of institutions are things which must be learned, and knowing who knows what becomes the chief value in that struggle. The knowledge of the natural world takes a back seat to a need to know humans in the condition of struggle. This struggle has limits, but it will be present so long as the danger exists, and that danger will exist unless we learn that humans have moved on from their genesis. We cannot learn to make new material goods by magic, but if we were to face genuine scarcity, the resource shortfall is an intractable problem. The new values would be the struggle, and there is no rule to suggest the outcome of the struggle conforms to justice, natural law, or any conceit we hold to plan the struggle in advance. Many will prepare for this struggle, so much that the struggle becomes their chief concern regardless of scarcity or abundance. And so, the facile argument of scarcity is irrelevant to the game that we play in economic decision making. Scarcity and abundance are acknowledged in one way or another, and never "just-so" happen, as the stupider philosophers insist it happens. We learn by studying history and using our sense that scarcity was never the driver of crisis, when considering what was known to be possible technologically if the leadership were truly interested in letting people live. It is far more evident that crises and famines are almost always choices of actors with the ability to engineer them, or the result of deliberate disregard for consequences of political decisions. Very often famines in history are never just famines, but come with wars and plagues and the inter-cine violence of humanity making itself known. That is what happens when people are starved - they do not stand and die, but struggle for life and often turn against each other for a place on the lifeboat.

It is this game itself rather than any element it reduces to that is the interest of economic decisions and any value assigned to it. We can choose not to play, and in what space we claim, we set the rules of that game within the limits we can. We cannot change our bodies, and the very body and spirit of humans

are alien to the mind and its constructs. The mind sets itself against the world and the body it feeds off to exist, and so economics from the outset concerns an absurd goal. It is still the case that the mind reckons with the world as a whole, and that includes the other humans and intelligences it encounters. We cannot privilege the intelligence of humans over any other event in nature when concerned with economics, for economics concerns precisely alienation between mind and matter, and the alienable labors of human beings. We can regard other intelligences as the chief economic concern rather than the genuine conditions of the world or things in it, but it is only the chief concern, and all intelligences rely on a world allowing them to exist. Intelligence recognizes this trap readily, and can choose to avoid it. It can do so at a remarkably simple cost. The cost of sustenance, in a physical sense, is not much at all, and excess product beyond that is not particularly interesting. The whims of life to learn for no ulterior motive can be fed with simple products, and we have to question exorbitant cost for any such recreation. The chief threat in the world, once the difficulties of nature are overcome, are other life-forms and other intelligences that pose a threat merely by their existence. That threat can only be overcome when two minds contact each other and can sense friendship that obviates economic competition as a concern of both, and this contact forms a network of minds that would all understand the situation. It seems simple enough, but the sort of contact envisioned that would truly allow trust is not common and implies a tie between social actors that is both difficult to maintain and an opening for great danger. We would not need to presume the intrinsic and inborn hostility of humans towards each other as some sort of mystic koan to see that difficulty of establishing economic cooperation. We would then need to maintain that contact frequently enough and hold confidence in the processes of the world that a friend today can remain a friend tomorrow. By this process of learning, we would quickly find there are too many uncertainties, and the more information the mind must learn, the greater the potential for danger. There is no way by learning to negate the threat the mind and knowledge pose, as if there were a master key that would reduce learning while keeping the genuine knowledge base intact and arrested. It is the nature of the mind to be unstable because the conditions allowing it to exist are under imagined threats, and so all of the efforts to think or learn its way out of its self-created conundrum can only make it worse. This is contrary to our sense that we are reliant on that faculty to do anything significant, which we are. The integrity of the mind becomes a going concern beyond the mere endurance of life or a principle suggesting that mind should exist. The risk of going mad or being too stupid to live is worse than the cessation of life functions. Those who would enclose the world know to never, ever allow clean death to be thinkable.

Any particular aspect of the great game - psychology, natural science, human political behavior, and the arts of war - cannot be placed at the forefront. They all work together to create the environment, and any conventional virtue is doomed in one way or another to fail spectacularly. These things are in principle comparable by logical reasoning, with the caveat that higher moral purposes are

not things we can pin down with purely rational approaches. There are meanings to what we do that are never arrested in the knowledge process, making any precise calculation that can arrest history impossible. This should be expected based on everything we know about what history actually is, rather than the stories and facts that are our sole tool to convey historical knowledge. The magical thinking asserts that because history cannot be arrested in this way, that history itself is unknowable or nonexistent, and it aggressively destroys any understanding that would allow rationality to be a useful explanation for the world. We know enough to adjust for this error in our thinking, so that our reason is almost perfectly in line with the world, when we choose to concern ourselves with the world. The dual system of habitual and contemptuous lying would only be sensible as an imposition carried out because the thrill of lying serves some great utility, but this is purely something humans manipulate in other humans. The cost of imposing the Big Lie is much more than the cost of communicating information, for without the support structures to allow it, something so contemptuous would have been put down from the start and human society would be a far better place. We can in our reasonable calculations omit entirely the mind games of the Big Lie, regarding instead the immense cost in maintaining the violent structure that upholds it, which is very real - and where the Big Lie rules, the violence is itself the point, which befits the alliance of proprietors and technocrats. All of the mystifications, however alluring they are to humans, are things that can be accounted for in our measurement, until reaching the minute details which we either approximate or ignore in those calculations. We are able to calculate every system reasonably well and assess the logical connections between them. In so doing, we arrive at a more useful measure of virtue for a given imperative or reason for us - or any institution - to exist. This doesn't resolve the problems inherent in virtue, but it allows us to consider comparable qualities that allow mathematical calculation to be possible. We do not possess a virtue that can bypass certain constraints of the systems we view in the world. Systems of thought and learning are not comparable mathematically to physical systems, because they become things that are alien to the physical world and intend to be so. Knowledge connects to the physical world not from a black box or ancient mysteries, but through the mediation that the world's properties allow. We know the conditions allowing any knowledge process to be conceivable, for this process is not contained within the body or any preferred vessel, but in all the tools and machines knowledge can utilize towards this task. This includes other people, so long as we remain aware of what society actually is and do not devolve into cultish conceits about society. For the most part, we still remain sober about society, until the Big Lie version of sociology is advanced, where society is interrupted in communication and replaced with the mediation of a few thought leaders. All such thought leaders are in principle identifiable, and there are always telltale signs of public relations.^[4] We would not reduce our concepts of the world to information in the crass sense, but understand information as a component of our knowledge process. Which objectives we hold are only comparable because all of these objectives exist in the world, rather than any unit of mathematical comparison

like a "util" linking all things, and so if we are thinking of what is good for battle, we are asking a very different question from "what is good for prosperity", which itself can be measured by industrial production, quality of life indicators, population, and so on. All of these systems are seen in light of other systems that may exist, and the knowledge that there are minds whose objectives are alien to our own. We all live in the same world, and so those of us who would want to prosper in our lives and environment have to contend with conquerors, cajolers, priests demanding sacrifice and offering either false hope or some guide to the world, the scum of humanity who never had a reason to care, and people who are just plain stupid and do foolish things for whatever reasons they had. The idea of a universal goal that all are obligated to follow is always a conceit of educators and those who see the whole human race as cattle to herd, just as animals were herded long ago with the same thinking - the exact same thinking, for in the drover's mind, they registered the human flock as livestock long ago and never thought differently for a single moment. False egalitarianism with such people is one of the most vicious lies ever told, and until the rise of the eugenic creed, no one ever spoke of that false egalitarianism in the sense we encounter it today.

What this means is that social life does not necessitate economic life, and economic life entails not just humans but the world they live in and all of the machines they interface with. The machines are not merely possessions to be animated by imperious will, and the proper understanding of free trade is not an understanding of psychology, but an understanding of operations and the subordination of the mind to those operations. This was understood, albeit imperfectly, in the very formulation of the idea, and was never refuted. By science and any philosophy, it couldn't be refuted, so long as economics were regarded as a behavior of human beings. Since humans do indeed manage their resources, the only question is in particulars. Something which had lurked in humanity in prior forms could only lead to exploitation, no matter what developments came from knowledge and reason alone. Reason alone was never the true motivator of human beings, of course. At the moment that something new was on the horizon, the familiar imperious force of humanity decided that no such thing would be allowed to exist for long, and that is in the end a political decision and, once politics is obviated, a spiritual decision that reflects what humanity always was at heart. The only way this is reconciled is a religious revival. The new religion that was created was eugenics, and eugenics represents the foul heart of the human spirit and the true nature of its religious institutions hitherto known. Since no new religion is possible without a line of succession from the elder tradition, this made the appeal to reason, emotion, apparent merit, and every other thing we value produce the same kind of society - highly stratified and protecting an aristocracy, which had always been the goal of those who wrote economic treatises in one way or another. We are then told that anything deviating from this objective, which always favors politicians and interline struggle, is impossible, and because resistance is impossible, the struggle can only become total, thus reverting to an imagined state of nature

which never existed, where all struggles against all. Since this is not desirable for most people, social life under management, regardless of the particular thoughts regarding management, reverts to that struggle, and the chief interest of people is not an imagine imperious idea of "freedom" but winning security so that they may live tomorrow. Anything beyond that security has nothing to do with economics as such, and is only beholden to economic management so far as any of our goals would have to be secured. We could conclude that we simply refuse to play, terminate our life, and wash our hands clean of such a pointless struggle, but most of us have already considered there is something worth living for - and we do not live for "society" as an abstraction or for the self-abasement that has been demanded of the ruled. We would live for something in the world beyond ourselves, and a condition of that is that human beings would need to remain in working condition in their genuine faculties. It is precisely that which allows us to continue existing as human which is under attack and must be defended, and that is all humans can aspire to through the human spirit - to defend what was always theirs if they lived in a world that simply allowed them to exist at all. It is for that reason that the imperious do not blindly view value as some mana that is indistinguishable, but seek to attack specifically those values which are compatible with a free society and life.

The aim of imperious economics is not to create general poverty, but to impoverish living standards specifically that would allow resistance to exist, and to reduce as much as possible the wages of the condemned, including any upkeep of slaves. It is those conditions of living that are sought most of all, and if specifically deprived, humans will be induced to pay exorbitant prices for bread, while they are inundated with lavish technology, while tempting food is presented in storefronts, on advertisements plastered everywhere in the society, specifically to remind the damned what they will never, ever have. If the needs of life, including our reasonable want for security and small luxuries which amount to no real burden on nature's resources, were met, we would not have an economic problem. The cost of security is entirely a gigantic inflation of the cost of living, purely caused by humans choosing to make other humans miserable. The choice is indeed a choice, but immense pressure is applied to ensure that the correct choices are made, which always value immiseration and projection onto a hated class. It is this that economics chiefly concerns itself with - who is made to suffer, and how they will suffer. In principle this suffering is not bound to any particular person or even total suffering. By elevating mind to sacrosanctity and abolishing all barriers to it, the only outcome is the splitting of the race into two - those selected to live and hoard all of the virtue, and those selected to die whose suffering must be absolute. This repeats the cycle of the human race since its genesis, and humanity has chosen once again to do what it always did. The new claim of the eugenists is that they are making a new race, superior to humans who are now relegated to the status not of animals or even slaves, but living abortions whose torture must be maximized. The reality is that none of this transformation made a new race, or could make anything of quality. The victors remain not merely human, but a purely Satanic and failed race, stripping

out whatever decency may exist, as their god commands of them. So too do the damned remain essentially human, for the call of their god has always been for human sacrifice rather than animal sacrifice or mere death.

It is the threat to security in such a way that amplifies perverse incentives, creating extremely skewed priorities that make no rational sense from a productive or meritorious view, but which make sense if one believes the impression of security allows for the genuine article. Sex, which is a small part of the body's functions and does not constitute a true biological need for the individual, becomes something to fight and die over, and the sale of prostitutes and brides makes or breaks economic life. The prestige of an imagined social proof suggests that winning desirable mates is security, even though by rational sense, any man or woman will do for the reproductive act and often women will sleep with whatever male suits them for the true reproductive act. The man, in turn, sees the entire business of sex as a sordid affair that only brings him suffering, and he descends into addiction, perversion, and foul play as a result with alarming regularity. Even the better off of men are under the threat of insinuations and accusations, and men and women both expend vast resources to protect their sexual virtue. To do otherwise would be very nonsensical given the nature of the game as it has been established. Yet, all of this expense regarding sex is a gigantic expenditure of labor for something which would be trivial without the rituals and filth surrounding the act, and none of that expense makes anyone happier or offspring healthier. Far from it, the entire game exists to protect people who would in a decent world be the last who should reproduce, exhausting anyone who is honest and unwilling to comply with the lurid rituals. Habitual self-"pleasure", which a reasonable society would educate men to see correctly as a loss of quality of life that quickly loses any satisfaction it brings, is both actively encouraged, and passively encouraged by treating men like caged animals and denying them even the smallest human comfort. Men are then denied any image of themselves which suggests celibacy, life as a eunuch without the associated shame, or simply disregarding the excess of addiction and contenting himself with a simpler form of self-abuse, are possible outcomes. The rot of the act is maximized in every way, and all incentives in society suggest that doing this is rational to the ruling interest. It is further made clear that men who wish to maintain their dignity, to say nothing of what the women are put through in order to promote in the neoliberal workplace, are suspect. The meritorious benefit of doing this is clear to those who manage humans and those who rule, who would never give up this inquisition that turns a reproductive function into a living nightmare. Even without eugenism as such, this curse has afflicted humanity in various forms, so much that there has not been a single tribe or culture where general sexual probity was encouraged beyond a few hypocritical dictums. Those who wanted some decency in the world have to wait for some heavenly force to smite Sodom and Gomorrah and pray for more where that came from, which is an asset the priesthood would love to keep as their property. Anyone with the temerity to insist they just not do this - since this is all the deliberate act of humans, with nearly all of the initiative to impose this coming from the haves

who succeeded laughing at the misery of the have-nots - is denounced more than the most abject failure in the great sexual game. Perverse incentives around drugs and alcohol as are old as civilization, actively encouraged by priesthoods and rulers to keep their subordinates drunk and fearful of their spurious and usually contradictory authority. Even the simplest temperance, or even accurate information pertaining to drugs and foodstuffs, is occulted, because doing this makes people fearful and grants to experts and charlatans a healthy business of selling spurious "health advice" or systems of pure myth. One need not ask for absolute abstention to consider the toxicity of the food and drugs we consume, asking if this is something we would want. Even if we regard the benefits of, say, alcohol or tobacco, as something good for a purpose of ours, the culture surrounding any drug is designed to protect criminal elements, and this alliance was always encouraged by aristocracy. These perverse incentives do not exist because of mere ignorance or guilt of those who lack probity, as if each were an individual occurrence. Many of the addicts beg to leave their addiction, only to be kicked down if they ever rise, as the game necessitates this behavior, which itself is an addiction and vice that is glorified and valued. The effects of all of this have always been known to be deleterious to society as a whole, and beneficial only to people who would in a saner world either be suppressed or put down for insolence. For the most part, humanity does act on its better instincts to alleviate the worst of these incentives, whether the ruling ideas or any theory suggests there can be a way out. For life to endure at all, let alone society, many such vices are counteracted without resorting to any imperious violence. The exacerbation of vice is accompanied by the thrill of said imperious violence, which itself becomes another perverse incentive and the most deleterious of them all. It is not a surprise that the Right and especially the Nazis reveled in every perversion and insist all men and women must glorify all venality in all things, and they can't not be this. Anyone moving to stop this, even in the most minor way, must be denounced as - hilariously enough - "fascists", while fascists have always made clear their alliance with vice and rot is foundational to their political agenda, and politicians across the board understand the value of their alliance with vice.

This does not make the economic task "contradictory", in the sense that it is an unworkable morass. Economics will happen regardless of our conception of it, and there will always be this fear. The solutions to it were never in economics, but in moral philosophy and a choice for us to reject economics outside of its proper purview. We would engage in economic life to meet our needs for sustenance and security, and view all other activity as a surplus that allowed us to pursue what we really wanted, by knowledge, labor, or our interest in silly symbols for whatever reason. The former two impugn on the latter three, and the latter three can see the former two as assets to be used. The economic problem is at heart not a problem of knowledge or information, but of moral choices. Much of what we attribute to economic failure is really not about a resource shortage or a material threat to a security at all, but a choice that was made. Economics merely concerned logistics of making the malice of others a realized thing, or

any effort that would act against it in the world. We cannot seal ourselves off from the world in the way a rational actor must in order to hold any virtue, without an expenditure to meet that requirement. The expenditure ultimately is spent not on trying to push the material world to make our preferred vision of humanity real, or changing the world to force humans to be better. The chief agent of interest is not the things humans manipulate, but the humans themselves. That is, humans concern themselves primarily with controlling and influencing other humans, and the environment is in total an externality, no matter how much we depend on it and how much material conditions influence our lives. Even in savage conditions, humans are willful actors and had to be in order for their behavior to exceed impulses no better than the prey they hunted, and this took effect long before any imagined Prometheus dropped a black cube or monolith to give us all the right ideas.

In principle, the economic problem concerns the world as a whole, and so there is an age old answer that is always suggested - "if you don't like it here, you can get out". This is obviously not possible at any point by the nature of the economic need of security and the temporality of actual bodies, but in principle, nothing stops us from refusing to play and finding some part of the world where this game is not played, or where keeping one's head down is possible to live what life can be lived. This is the strategy for the vast majority of humanity, and in a roundabout way it was the strategy of most rulers when they could afford it. Rulers, like anyone else, only do as much as they need to continue ruling, and this is typically good for them. Rulers trying to hard to make the world work in accord with their conceits not only fail and look like idiots doing so, but raise suspicion among their peers and among the commoners who see that whatever great plan an aristocrat has now, it's probably a bad one for everyone. The same is true of the typical ideologue, zealot, or slimeball on a power trip who finally thinks he or she is something. They make plans that usually go far away from the source of the problem, because facing the situation is far too much for any one person. No one fights the world, and very often they can't fight city hall which is just a building with a few local assholes running what amounts to a crime syndicate that calls itself the government. You can't fight city hall, but most people live without being detected by it, as they have long been able to largely ignore any government of humanity unless they're prominent enough to be worth notice. In the end it turns out the only thing that protected humanity was the limited means of any institution to invade the actual lives of human beings, rather than any virtue of their institutional representation of the person. The state and anything else clearly had no regard for any institutional pretense that impeded doing whatever felt good in the utilitarian moral sense. Institutions are cursed to favor the utility of whatever is expedient to perpetuate their existence. It is humans that are moral actors in their genuine knowledge and understanding, rather than institutions ever making men good or even decent. The world itself had a sobering effect, but the institutions that sought to declare they were nature personified and claimed this natural monopoly had the exact opposite effect. What keeps the peace today is not any virtue of

institutions or the human beings, so much as it is a desperate determination to not do what all of the dominant ideas humanity permits tell us to do. If anyone followed to the letter and the spirit any of the ideologies permitted, mankind and the world would truly be lost. It is because there is a world outside of "society" as such that the actual humans can escape, even if their person is marked for elimination and passes its taint to the body wherever we may go. So long as there is something outside of the reach of machines, those who seek to arrest the world will always sense a disturbance in the Force. Since economics cannot choose to make its rules essentially different in different spaces or for different classes, a new concept would have to displace economics, while economics was depreciated and used only to justify finance at the large scale and microeconomic decisions at the personal and local level. The micro-economic decisions concern themselves more with the analysis of systems and their manipulation, which have been discussed at length in this writing and are of further interest to us; but the analysis of systems ultimately concerns operations of things we regard as real or virtual systems we treat as real. Finance has always owed more to political thought than economics proper, and economics as a discipline is born because it was possible to bring finance in line with this operational research that began as machines and knowledge became general. Not only could operations be harnessed in a way that was previously impossible, but interests in society would asset the wealth, authority, and ability they possessed whether any such alliance existed or not. For the economic problem to be truly solved required its development into ecology, and the introduction of natural science and biopolitics to the economic problem not just as a condition economic decisions were made in, but as a concern unto themselves. This is where biology rises to become the greater doctrine over the humanities and moral philosophy in the liberal order of society.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] And this is why, very early in Plato's dialogue in *The Republic*, he makes it clear that he does not want the producers or workmen getting a single coin more than their worth in the eyes of aristocracy - for justice, of course. This isn't ordinary miserliness, but an understanding common in the time that wealth and luxury exerted a corrupting influence on society, when its qualities were not controlled and when wealth overrides other moral interests that one would consider just. How just this is for the producer, to say nothing of slaves or wives, you're not supposed to ask too much. It's a mark of his progressive mindset that he at least acknowledges the question of females in the ideal city, but slaves are simply not present in mind or deed, made invisible by the hand of wisdom and reason. They are appendages of the master, as is the necessary thinking of a slave-holding society to a philosopher. Those who have to manage slaves every day are aware of how ridiculous this really is.

[2] A chronology of events lifted from another source can be found here: <http://eugeneseffortposts.royalwebhosting.net/texts/chronology-californiaener>

gycrisis.pdf. Such events tell us much about economic crises. No crisis is an accident that no one could predict, and this is even more obvious in monopoly conditions. Reliance on energy companies tells us that these crises are not, at heart, financial crises or crises of the tokens of capital, but crises dependent on natural monopoly and industry which makes modern technology possible. All of the financial crises, which are also engineered and easily so, are made possible by this modern technology and the enforcement mechanisms electrification would allow for states and private firms in alliance. The actions of the Bush government were entirely consistent with a plan to spark economic crisis, which would allow the state and ruling interest to commandeer more of private life and hold the public ransom. Many more such cases can be found for any student of history, even in this time where truth is buried under mountains of digital shit. This would lead to the very planned crisis of 2008, which would be blamed entirely on middle class homeowners being too greedy, even as the cost of rent became too exorbitant with the intent of disallowing the working class any housing at all. The reasons why are never accidents or a worry of the bourgeois. They inevitably come back to the conditions of the working class and the very large and growing residuum, which would swell in size during the 1990s for reasons the economists always pretend aren't happening, where by law it is illegal to acknowledge what this has really been to the public. In private, contempt for the people and the long-run aims of these planned crises are acknowledged freely, and the winners are taught that they are chosen to survive an engineered Rapture. When we see the Luciferian faith among that government and preparation of the public for the agenda which seized the country after 2000, the idea that this was entirely accidental is laughable. But, it went on for too long...

[3] If anyone followed Adam Smith, the role of education from childhood on is made abundantly clear. If it is genius which commands labor and grants to it any value, then it would make sense that subjects who learn and are habituated to liberal society are necessary for the concept to work.

[4] Read Public Opinion from Walter Lippmann (1922). If I could replace that infuriating and idiotic "READ BORDIGA" meme with anything less stupid, it would be this.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

19. The Ecological Claim

Two great problems face economic management. The first is that in some space and time, there will be something that is not managed and cannot be physically reached, which becomes an unknown that in one way or another must be conquered for management to continue. Cooperation for many reasons is anathema to the philosophy of management, without either the unknown being corrupted by the manager, or the manager failing to defend against the unknown, which will force either a change within as dire necessity to adapt, or the unknown

conquering the manager, either because that in the unknown follows a strategy of conquest, a similar strategy of management, or because the unknown senses correctly that the manager is a threat to its continued existence. The second problem is the very threat from within that the unknown from without makes clear. That is that within a space, the manager does not know as much as is desired, and an increase in knowledge generally creates more things for a manager to command and control. Control of technology as a general trend is not possible in an imagined society where agents are free to act, for even if the law prohibits men from developing technology anathema to the ruling interest, technology must be created to suppress the interest of the ruled or the managed from breaking that law, and can only do so with regard to other men. That technology to suppress the ruled from rising is itself replicable by the ruled and comprehensible. To arrest all potential ideological inclinations, such that the structure of society absent a space remains constant and creates a natural incentive for men to never allow technology to upset the status quo, is the stated aim of every aristocracy. If that is so, it is tantamount to ruling forever. This relies not just on forced ignorance but the elimination of any possibility that independent movement is possible. That is not possible within an unbounded society, where people can leave to some place and there are no true internal barriers. A society that truly is open and without barriers would have too many places to hide, unless an effort was made to ensure that the society was open only to the wishes of those who rule, and the open society was in actuality enclosed in parcels of land. Those parcels may be mentionable, but the strategy of the Americans was to make any mention of the boundaries unmentionable, and this follows the purest form of aristocratic conceits about government and how they can rule.

We do not need a metaphysical explanation to naturalize the concept of ecology, or the localization of economic behavior to particular times and places. Life on its own terms, or any other entity that would be an economic agent, must exist somewhere in the world to be a real agent. Even if we imagined a virtual economic agent in some imagined space, as we do in models, those models suggest temporality in an imagined time and space in order for them to be operative. The assumption that there is no distance between economic agents implies there can be no differentiation between them. In short, the assumptions where distance is destroyed, and "all that is solid melts into air" says more about a metaphysical assumption in philosophical conceits than it says anything about an economic logic. If that is implicitly accepted, where nothing exists in time or space, then the outcome will always be regression to a primordial unity which never actually exists, and appears to us as some foul impulse we attribute to money token or some ritual involving the commodity. It never really was about the money or the commodities though, but about the destruction of any temporality by some philosophical tricks, and this was a presumption that never was inherent to modern economic thought in any form. The concept of free trade capitalism was aware of the extent of the market in given locations, and the construct of the pin factory is an enclosed space engaged in production, that allows social labor to

be possible and thus generally alienable labor to be appreciated by management. The idea of an economic thought that does not take place in spaces, or with actual bodies that persons inhabit and operate through, is one that is only useful for abstractions. We mentally assert our own understanding of the marketplace and have a sense of what connects to where in a world market or a world system. This concept didn't fully form until the last third of the 19th century, and it has proceeded ever since in stages. That world market was the first global integration that had been attained by mankind, and it is at this time where the world market was defined as a *world* market. The boundaries of domains on Earth had been effectively decided with a few exceptions, and the extent of what existed in those domains was known with enough accuracy for a general plan to be conceived and reasonably implemented. What was missing was a general theory to understand those domains and how they could be commanded. It was not sufficient to command people in the abstract, where the command was only in theory. Only in practice can the goals of economics be attained, and this takes place in the machines, which include the bodies of humans, which are by nature tied to particular locations and times. It is here where ecology supplants economy as the understanding of human affairs, and the former question of trade and struggle becomes a political story half-believed by those who seek empire. This ecology was not a modern invention, as if humans were too stupid to do this in the past. Its thinking is superimposed on the past and applied retroactively, and those in the past did have an attachment to spaces and times out of necessity. The ideal city-state is a city-state with known boundaries and a description of its faculties, rather than an imagined point of light. It couldn't be the unknowable that the most crass and degenerated economic thought insists it would be.

To say "we live in an environment" is a trite saying, for the environment of life is not philosophically fixed. For one, living entities that think like us do not merely occupy physical space, but the virtual spaces we constructed in ideology and our systems of knowledge. We make claims not just to a location in time and space, but to ideas we hold to be outside of both, yet which are in some sense property we have claimed. The abstract and transcendent are no exception to the claims of economy, and many a religion have begun as a way to make money, then run off with the money bags like that guy who sold Springfield a monorail. It would be quite impossible to speak of economics as anything other than a resource calculation problem if life were not motile and reactive, and if there were not transcendent aspirations suggesting moral aims beyond the mechanics of life. That economic task is likely why central nervous systems could adapt around a locale with a preferred orientation in the first place. That task would not have been designed from above, but arose organically, starting with simple nervous systems for sense and reaction. It necessarily implied something to sense that was in principle without boundaries that were inherent to the organism. Any boundaries were implied instead by the mobility of the life-form - and so fish can only exist in water, where there is sufficient food. They were contingent on a world outside of the life-form that was itself without any such boundaries.

Obviously fish cannot survive in outer space, and gravity binds life to the Earth. None of those limits are essential to the life-form, nor were they decreed as an imagined division like political borders. Political borders in the modern sense are in principle legal declarations that must be enforced by people who can do so, and this has meant a flow of unsanctioned immigration since those borders have been established. The true purpose of political borders are to establish the claims of states and institutions, rather than resolve an ecological question, and no rule fixes those borders in place, where they are beholden to any natural law to decide where territory begins and ends. So too does the claim of the person to the space around it not exist by willful assertion. Even the claim to one's own body is immediately suspect without the means to defend it. The body provides only the smallest natural defense against this by taking up space, and it has always been the claim of states to control not just movement of the people, but life and death altogether. That is a political claim that is beyond the scope of the present writing, and because we do not consider ourselves with direct political or institutional claims to any space or ecology, we would only establish ecology by some natural principle. That natural principle is not inborn but emergent from the actions an agent can take, which are always definable but highly varied. That means life's natural habitat is whatever it adapts to and wherever it finds itself most immediately. Life possesses everything it touches, or tries to. Its impulse is a greedy one, but not one that refuses to share or form an understanding if it can do so. Only after the extent of its body and short reach to its surroundings are established does it consider the rest of the world, and life cannot consider that world as what it is. Its thinking concerns ideas rather than spaces where clumps of matter make forms, and so it will develop its own wider sense of where things are. It is less that life is locked in by its biological faculties, which it doesn't rationally understand natively as limitations, but that life is locked in by its tendencies and preferences. Those preferences prefer territoriality because that territoriality is security in the real world, and it has an incentive to seek that which aligns with its goals like survival, comfort, or what it senses as moral causes. Territory is not worth anything if there is nothing valuable in it or holding the territory doesn't hold some perceived benefit, for holding space just to say it's yours creates liabilities and gains nothing. The claims to spaces are in every case an expense of life rather than a benefit. Only due to the security of a particular territory does this ecological understanding of a limited space benefit the life-form, and it was never something they would choose to do for themselves. It is something imposed on them by the outside world that they must abide, and only the ability of humans to alter their environment in limited ways can affect this. All of this recommended ecology and the constraint of spaces to those who governed, rather than any economic benefit to doing this. Economically, barriers to movement were seen correctly as liabilities in a productive sense. Only by security, or the deprivation of it, did this constraint - or any constraint - make sense. If space and distance were not a concern, people would choose to live in the best environment they could, and move where they need to obtain goods. The proverbial bourgeois man in the desert specifically eliminates temporality and meaning from the economic problem, presenting it

instead as slaves fetched from the ether to provide the master's resources as if by magic. In other words, the conventional utilitarian view, at least that of the German economists, is retarded.

There exists not a natural habitat for every life-form, but built-in tendencies which favor it in a niche, and prohibit it in others. If the life-form is not essentialized, and the life-form is seen as a technological construct, then its constitution - which itself is a habitat or space for the constituents of the body and all off the microbes and parasites living within - is a product both of environment and its own power and accumulation. Proper study of the environment, and thus any proper ecological view, would take this into account. In practice, this is exactly what is needed for ecology to become a true ruling idea, and this is what is suggested by pseudoscientific "climate simulations", run on the then-novel computers of the 1970s. These simulations for a variety of reasons are ridiculous from the outset, and that skullduggery can be described another time. The mechanization of thought - or rather, information processing, which eliminated the conceits humans had about their rational faculties - made today's ecology possible as a serious discipline. It was decided long beforehand that no inquiry into political ecology would be permitted, unlike the critiques of political economy which came from all directions against the established order. From the moment ecology is launched, it is an imperial monopoly, and the cargo cult of imperial science screeches like madmen if the holy ecology is disrupted. Again, the particulars of this must wait for a later book. If we may for a moment ignore the screeching and mystification of all things economic and ecological, we see this for what it is. It doesn't say anything that must be respected as natural or scientific law, regardless of the political claims saying this is totally normal. Reality and sense have told us that this ecological concept is at odds with basic facts of what it means for political actors to exist in any way that can be construed as political, moral, or possessing any initiative of their own. It is imagined that every parcel of land, every ecology, is not an actual space, but a machine designed by narratives and myths alone. It does not conform to any machine we would analyze, even an abstract one in the world of forms. By actually useful engineering knowledge and all we know about the arrangement of industry, no ecological crisis can be said to happen. Even if the ecological concept attempted to pertain to reality, it couldn't until it has adequately accounted for what life itself does, and what machines actually do. It is no surprise that alongside ecology is eugenics, mystification of the computer and information generally, and all of the imperial shibboleths. A better, seemingly scientific ecology would not fare much better, usually devolving into recapitulations of communist ideology in its less admirable presentations - the kind that involve maniacs jumping up and down like retards about revolutions working like magic because they weren't the political experts who knew anything that was really happening. Eugenics embraces the lie, while most technocrats go along with the lie because it is suitable for controlling people. Life and the mind must be essentialized and fixed for ecology to be sensical, and therefore for economy to suggest anything other than a quasi-religion regarding money and debt. If the

life-form itself is arrested and managed, and thus its thoughts are all controlled, that is the only condition under which ecology in any form is sensical.

Ecology arises not as the inborn limits of anything, but as a result of struggle for life, which is in some sense a political struggle for the status quo. Yet, even without politics as such, ecological niches can be found and the parallel drawn to political struggle, even where politics as such does not apply. For example, we can speak of ecology within a simulated computer game, or an ecosystem of ideas in an abstract library or forum, which may be realized in communications. The realization of a communication forum is a very different ecosystem from the theoretical and abstract forum that constitutes what we see as the shared knowledge base and development in society, but both are ecosystems in some sense. Ecology at heart is not a discipline of living things or natural systems, but a discipline of information, philosophy, and communication of ideas. In short, ecology is a product of ideology and necessarily so. It is that which Marx's work on ideology and political economy indirectly reference, though not in the form imperial ecology took and with some knowledge that this was a mental trick rather than a natural science like physics. Ecology is not identical with sociology, for societies are not intrinsically managed by anything and exist only in the real communication between agents if they are to be the subject of scientific inquiry. Ecology really has nothing to do with society, the human subject, or the natural sciences at all, including biology. It is instead a conception of management and a way to obviate and naturalize politics and governance, and it is not the only such tool. It would be quite impossible for any real management of people to take place without fixing human beings to particular times and places, and thus functions they would fill in that ecosystem. Far from ecology concerning life and its natural limits, ecology concerns a thing which corrects for the anomaly that is life. Life is destroyed by suggesting it is something very different from what it actually is, or even how life was historically understood. Before ecology, life is understood as assemblages of organs that act on their own power, rather than some substance or material we regard as living. Life in classical anatomy and the earliest biology operated on its own power, as this made sense to us. Even if we imagined small corpuscles, which was not an easy thing for someone to do before the 18th century, our image of life was that it was sophisticated enough to operate independently and did not answer to any master intrinsically, or abide any economy or ecology. Life persisted entirely on its own terms within a world that preceded it, however creation and the origin of life were perceived.^[1] Ecology mimics not the extent of life's functions and the reach of its technology, but its claim to territory and genesis. The "tie to the land", even in non-thinking life, is implied not by anything in the present, but by the genesis and past of life. This much is true, for no one chose the situation they were born into. For humans, exposed infants are nearly defenseless, and if by some chance a friendly she-wolf offered her teats to the child, there were too many humans around who would make sure "nature took its course" - and usually the exposure of children meant not release into the wild, but extermination in ritual sacrifice to purge the soul and genesis of any mention of the undesirable. Left to their own devices,

the wild child will probably starve without regular sustenance, but the legends of wild children exist as a warning to primitive society - make sure "nature takes its course", and that no other clan decides to take in the child and increase the numbers of an enemy. Maybe your clan did not want the child and declared it a living abortion, but another clan might see a warm body that is good enough, and the infant would not be able to complain. While giving the unwanted child to another could be a custom, "once retarded, ALWAYS retarded" is an ancient rule, and the idea of redemption is considered in constructing ecology. Redemption must not be allowed, or the conceit of controlling a space is lost. Any sin assigned to the condemned must never be forgotten. Economics does not regard this one way or another and intrinsically valuable, for economics concerns itself with either the potential futures or things outside of time. Ecology must, and serves to establish a past which the present abides.^[2]

Economics has no way to establish the starting point of exchanges or answer the question of history by its theory alone. It could make do with some common sense observations, like the noted propensity in people to trade, and surmise based on some historical guesswork what could have happened. That guesswork of the origin of exchange passes through many hands, each with their pet theory or supposition of where exchange in value began. This takes up a considerable part of Marx's contribution to the critique of political economy, which is a useful introduction to the problem being posed.^[3] Exchange in a sense of exchanging abstract value - something meritorious that would be managed - did not happen out of a vague sense that this is what humans naturally did, as if an abstract unit of exchange were a self-evident truth. This was never a claim of classical political economy, and when a law of value was placed on mathematical footing by Ricardo, this was a *violent assumption* rather than one proven by any facts. It is not an unsafe assumption, in that there is a generally understood concept of value in market societies, and this is what money represents, and it is that which Marx elaborates on. The difficulty arises because what is meant by "exchange" in classical political economy had to be generalized, even though the exchange of money or units that would be recognized as economic units of moral impotence did not explain everything humans did. No one, Marx included, contested that exchange had always consumed the entirety of human effort, nor did the imperial utilitarians suggest that all behavior was economic behavior as such. The activities that qualify as exchange are always limited to that which is morally relevant and understood to be explicitly an exchange with religious importance in some sense. That is, the ordinary business of people like sharing a salt shaker was not an economic task, and the reproduction of the home through labor was not economic in the same sense that markets were economic. The home-maker's economic task was never a political task in the same sense, but certain involved management of resources that were limited and contingent on interfacing with an outside world. The home and the family were contained ecosystems where the laws of political economy very much did not apply, and this was true of industry at a basic level. What happens inside the factory or the home would not be subject to the antagonistic relationship that the market or forum or city

in general implied, because doing this would be highly counterproductive to any genuinely productive aim. They were disciplined by political economy and the market, just as people are, but politics was not conducted inside the body or inside the family. Politics concerned the state and wider society, and really concerned a view of society at the highest level. No economy could be contained to a single nation that was hermetically sealed. What economics can tell is the nature of exchange generally, and the rationales of agents within an ecosystem. For example, there is an economy of the home which is entirely elided by matters discussed in the forum, unless the politicians are coming into your home and your bedroom with state agents to tell you how you're going to live from now on. Naturally, this is exactly what would happen in modernity, but it was never a foregone conclusion and never applied blindly or equally from family to family, or person to person. We unite all of these ecosystems to think of economics properly, for no system and no institution is truly apart from others; yet many of these systems never actually come into contact and pertain to far different matters, and so a common unit of value cannot be found between them. This has less to do with the inability to assign any value that is objective. In fact, all values are objective in some sense if they are to be proper economic values. The feelings and sentiments of people and the judgements they make are all things which happen in a real world for them to be relevant. What is not possible is a crass reduction of value across societies that do not believe in the same things or adopt the same practices with regards to currency, customs, acceptable behavior in diplomacy, and so on. What happens in a home or in a workplace is not what happens in a market, or between cities or states which have very different priorities regarding commerce. All such institutions have to manage their own affairs - their house must be in order - and in some sense the behavior of institutions is economic for the institution to exist. This value is particular to *institutions* rather than the actual minds or entities engaged in economic behavior. An institution being what it is, it is always identifiable, as are its members. The agents cannot be pinned to any particular time or place, but there is no real ambiguity about who is and is not a member of an institution. Any ambiguity is purely a failure of our knowledge rather than something unknowable, as if membership of institutions were governed by a crass interpretation of the uncertainty principle. Social information is always something we can discern very easily, and humans spend great effort figuring out who is a member of what group, what institutions are, and what of them is relevant to their actual lives. The value our actual mind assigns to these institutions and the value judgements of institutions is another matter entirely, but for the economic task to be carried out, the mind does not get to unilaterally assert what it wants. It can only do so within the terms institutions - including their own person, which means their history and prestige which is attached not with the body but with their name and record - allow economic activity to proceed. By default, institutions are not constrained by any concern of space. Institutions by their nature are established specifically because they are divorced from space and time, if they are to be going concerns and stable values. Any spacial or temporal constraint on an institution is not fixed by a law of nature, but a decision of the holders of

that institution.

ECOLOGICAL CONSTRAINT 1: SOCIAL AGENTS CONSTRAIN OTHER AGENTS

There are five constraints which establish ecology from the observation that economics is possible. The first is the social agents themselves - both their actual bodies and their institutional representation, including formal organizations and what may be said about institutions. We regard economics proper as the act of rational institutionalized agents, which the person itself is. Yet, it is the actual human being and their knowledge that is active to make the institution real and guides all of the actions of the institution. The institution does not exist by magic or decree, and so the true constraint to establish the ecosystem is the actual existence of social agents. If we are managing things in the world, it is their worldly form that is to be arrested and understood before the idea of an institution is arrested. All economics concerns the institutions' logic rather than something that made sense to our native connection to the world, for if it were purely about what actually matters, economics would be a trivial resource calculation problem of little interest to us. The body itself is an ecosystem where all of these constraints are active, including the claims of other agents against it; internally, though, no constitution of a "economics" of the body is construed by our own understanding, because the economic view was contingent on an institutional understanding that could only arise when we are developed. Animals and young children do not have a developed sense of economic knowledge, and the theories and practices of economics are never natural laws. The repeated failures to understand economics fool wise adults. It doesn't occur to the body itself that it is at war with itself, as if the parts of the body were violently clashing with each other. The mind and the sense of self might be set against every part of the body and the mind may struggle with contradictions which befuddle it. To the malignant cancer or the healthy organs of the body, though, they independently do not have any sense of their own "will to power". The organs instead do what the functions of life and their physical nature would do, and so the heart beats, and cancers spread. No one organ can claim dependence or direct command over the other organs in that way. What the knowledge of a human being does is wholly cooperative rather than an economic dickering and dealing over life functions, and the body and soul of a human cannot be split against itself without predictable calamity. It would be highly counterintuitive to the sense that a social agent would require. And so, the internal workings of the body are not immediately relevant, other than noting that they do exist and we will likely act on them. The agent to be constitutionally worthwhile is presumably functioning as a whole rather than as a shambling mound of its parts and properties. This is the source of modern philosophical "contradiction" and why it can cajole and befuddle those who are to be lied to and humiliated. Taken to its logical conclusion, the processes of the body, or anything in nature, can be described to create a reductio ad absurdum about anything and everything. The sleight of hand trick is to take advantage of the body's integration as an

agent and as an ecosystem, and by this cajoling, the subdued are beholden and stripped of any security until they psychologically break. It would not work unless there were a real situation that is outside any of our conceits about it, and that we hold it as morally valuable within that system. While it is possible to speak of an economy of the body in the abstract, the ecology of a body is purely a construct human rationality made after the fact, when management could terraform the innards of a human being, whether by their own personal authority or by imposition from another.

Natively, the faculties of the body are presumed to include that which is reproduced by consumable "technology" - that is to say food - and the learning from communication with other people and things in the world. All of these decisions to seek consumable articles, make decisions with the resources of the body, and regulate knowledge and communication going in and coming out, become expectations placed on the person. Whether they are realistic expectations for our sense of fairness does not matter in the slightest. The person will be made responsible and can pawn off responsibility to others if they possess this virtue to project, project, project that took the place of any forthright behavior we might have wanted in a better world. This primitive technology is segregated from the technology which is kept alien to the body like tools, prey animals, storage, etc., and must be so in order for the social and ecological agent to be understood. In other words, in ecology, agents are always identified as possessing definite traits and behaviors, for the model to make any useful predictions. If those traits are variable, they only vary because of other forces which can be accounted for. If those traits are indeterminate, then it is as if a "black box" exists which somehow creates the necessary outputs and processes inputs by some unknown process. Here again is where "contradiction" is introduced to befuddle this understanding. In the actual world where these faculties of the person are relevant, there are no contradictions. Someone does or does not the things that are ascribed to it.

With these faculties, social agents encounter a world which does not intrinsically bind them to a space or time, but they are always bound to each other. Here again is the next trick of "contradiction" to terminate this understanding by eliminating distance or temporality between social agents. From the managerial and institutional view, it does not matter if someone is ten feet away or ten miles away for the purposes of regarding the existence of that person or their influence on society. So long as the other entity exists, it will be present as social information. The proximity in space of two agents does not intrinsically affect anything in this understanding. What is affected by proximity is the real machinery available to social agents. Humans only act with the tools at their disposal, communicate with what is available to them as symbols or things which can generate them, like writing, spoken language, electronic communication, and so on. Spoken language is treated as a native faculty while most methods for preserving communicated information or transmitting it quickly over large distances are technological at the least. All of the means by which social agents actually affect the world operate over definite distances, and this starts with the native faculties which we are acquainted with. The distinctions between agents,

whatever the type of agent is, are not immediately relevant, but will be shortly.

Without any knowledge of the wider world and terrain, the first definition of an ecosystem is social agents themselves. The distance between them and the reach of their native faculties will say the most about their typical organizational structure *if* all other things are equal. Absent a compelling reason, a human being is the same regardless of where or when it exists, and it is only after accounting for their native behaviors that the environment outside of them can be considered. Absent a compelling reason, humans would form similar societies as they have in the past, and if there is a change within people, there are identifiable reasons why people would change their social organizations. They may not be reasons we consider economically or naturally motivated, but they are reasons nonetheless. Absent any compelling reason, social agents and human beings are free to act. The first constraint on those agents is other such agents, and this is inherent to every concept of ecology advanced. If non-social agents, like the terrain or some device are considered, they are for the purposes of ecology treated as the same sort of thing. The non-living things which would normally be considered "outside of society" are for a time treated as social equals, before the agents realize they're talking about a dog or a thing or some trivial fluctuation. We are primarily concerned with social agents that are understood to be alike in abilities and purpose, because the most proximate effect on a social agent that would regard an "ecology" as relevant is another social agent in the same niche. If there were agents who lived in different niches, they would be far more likely to have little to do with each other, and if they establish contact, the alien niches they occupy would be apparent. In the same niche, agents do not have any preferred attitude towards cooperation or competition which can be taken for granted or as a just-so story.

At first, the only niche that is available to ecology is the agents themselves. A crude ecologism revolves around identity, where the superficial qualities of agents are presumed to possess some uniting force due to inhabiting the same niche and sharing some quality. This is the ecologism of the worst and most craven fools, since it simultaneously exhorts maximal competition within the ecosystem for no real reason. Identity or myths are in of themselves not the motivator for any ecological formation. It makes no intrinsic sense that agents would align "like with like" or see the niche as intrinsically limited. At first, the only values of relevance in the ecology are the social agents themselves, and all information about them that is relevant. Without any view of technology or history beyond the immediate reach of those social agents, such aims of ecology appear absurd. It is rather the case that for the purposes of management, the most prominent feature in the terrain would be agents themselves, because it is the agency of social actors we regard as most relevant for the task of economy. Even in mundane settings like the household, the members of the family are the most relevant values, rather than the building or consumable possessions or the tools available to the family. For now, all of those constructs are not relevant to the persons and the properties of their bodies, which are the primary property allowing for any other to exist in the economic or ecological sense. Without

proper agency, there is no economic activity whatsoever. From the real qualities of the social agents, which are things we must abide if society is to be a realized condition, we move away from sociology as merely the transfer of information into what we conventionally understood society to be - the assembly of human beings that coexist, whether we would like to regard their labor as productive or not. We do not get to decree by thought alone that someone does not exist and that their existence is irrelevant to society. A retard is not considered human or a member of society in any real sense, but nearly every focus of the human race concerns the lowest classes whose existence is a fact until it is snuffed out. If someone wishes to do that, then someone must exterminate the unwanted, because the damned do not fade of their own accord no matter how much the holders of ecology insist it is "natural law". Without the necessary physical step or something taking place in a material world, the society will have to abide that which it wished to cast out, regardless of any belief it held about it.

It is this - how to make the world as social agents wish it to be - that became the reason for ecology rather than mere economic decisions that were personal, or economics as a religious practice concerning the moral value of debt or a transcendent sense that such things were relevant. We could continue to speak of debt in the abstract, but every debt is paid with something material and substantive if it is to be morally relevant and be a debt worthy of consideration. A purely ideal "debt" would be nothing more than an invocation or some indulgence that can be freely reproduced or pulled out of the ass of a priest. Society in its genuine sense - which is merely information exchanged between its agents - has to become a realized thing for society to mean anything other than a vague aspersion about nature, and to assign to agents any identity that would be relevant for life's task of managing any of its affairs. Even if the assertions were not premised on the economic religion or any claim of debt or transaction that we would think of as commerce, something like this would have to happen to give society its meaning. We learn very quickly that the nominal tokens or values of things are secondary to the most proximate cause of human suffering - other humans. It would be the same with social agents of any other type, unless they are specifically instructed to regard a different type of agent as more relevant. By default, social agents relate not to superiors or inferiors but peers. Absent any information suggesting actual superiority or inferiority as a clear and present condition that they must abide, the default for a social agent is that it would regard other agents as essentially equal, if they are to be recognized as social agents at all. Since that information is not a metaphysical law - superiority would be demonstrated by a meritorious value we consider morally relevant, which implies first being able to identify and measure those qualities in persons - we would never "just-so" accept the superiority or inferiority of any entity without a chain of reasoning suggesting that it does exist. That behavior must be learned, at least enough to recognize that a superior exists that overrides the native social sense. Whether that learning pertains to the genuine state of the world in all details is not relevant. People can believe in superiority or inferiority that is far removed from anything measured scientifically or by any developed moral

judgement. By default, agents would be equal in relevance if they are recognized as agents at all. The only judgement in that view that would be relevant would be if the agent exists at all or does not. This would be the basis for all other gradients of social worth or proof, and all concepts of civic worth however it is judged. Civic worth obviously implies politics among many other things, but at a basic level, social agents are judged as relevant first by demonstrating that they are in fact agents equal to someone who could make that judgement. This judgement would only be made within society by the agents themselves, because intrinsically there is no third party observer "above society" that can make this judgement for us, without being alien to the social agents. It is the social agents themselves that regard themselves as living in any sort of society or ecology, before any outside judgement can be imposed on the mind and native sense of the world. There is not, without a compelling reason, anything to suggest there is an ecology outside of society as the agents see it. There is a world outside of society, and there is more to society than we may know. We can recognize easily there are other groupings of people without an ecological concept of such a thing, and that our grouping of people in society is ultimately arbitrated by human beings rather than anything real. All of this social information and information about institutions is, at first glance, something humans or other rational agents constructed, or that we had some primitive knowledge of that allowed us to navigate society without rationally considering it in a formal manner. Society as information only exists in the mind of its agents. To a third party - let us say a psychologist examining a tribe - the subject is purely an alien, beneath the dignity of any agency whatsoever, and cannot be otherwise. The nature of the psychological inquisition prohibits the psychologist from saying much about equals in the way their disdain for the cattle-slaves is displayed prominently and proudly in every act of the institution and its inquisition. The disdain shown towards inferiors is matched by an instinctive groveling towards social superiors, where suddenly the headshrinker has no insights whatsoever about the "superior mind", no matter how spurious that superiority may be. This isn't because the psychologist doesn't know or can't know of that which is equal or superior. It is rather because of an attitude towards society and the mind that has to recognize agency of equals or inferiors that would throw off any projection or insinuation. Normal, valid people, and this is not a surprise to anyone, do not like being treated like lab rats, and the miserable treatment of experimental subjects is not merely callous human behavior. It is intended and deliberate, with full knowledge of what the human race always was, which as we know is just a fucking Satanic ape.

It is of course not a given that any such alienation is inherent to nature or ecological thinking. Far from it, the formation of stable institutions suggests a permanence to society that its constituent agents and information would not allow. At first this ecosystem is purely the realized institutional forms society takes, which are understood to relate to each other. What really happens is that all of the information that comprises the genuine existence of human beings is temporarily reduced to that which is most essential to the reproduction of

society in this sense. Humans are reduced to their functions that are economically relevant, rather than their full existence which contains extraneous information and things contrary to any ecological sense. Externalities are at first ignored, but it is understood from the outset that externalities occur as the result of any economic task we would undertake. This is true within the ecosystem of the body itself, for the human body was never formed as a technocratic polity with its parts in a preferred order. Human beings, or any other agent, will leave waste products and generate heat that has no intrinsic economic value or purpose. We didn't choose to exist at all, let alone in a form we would prefer. We inherited the conditions of the past that constituted us, and the same is true of ecosystems. Though in the person the human being is just a "point of light" bereft of any technology, the establishment of agency is impossible without any property and material origin if agency is to be regarded as a real condition, and so social agents - whatever type of society we model - are presumed to possess certain base qualities allowing them to be agents. For humans this entails language, often education of some sort or adjudication that someone is politically sane and not retarded, which is a worse sin than insanity so far as the human race is concerned. Another social agent, in another time and place, may not regard sanity or intelligence as particularly relevant for its own social sense. It doesn't occur to a computer algorithm or a model of society that "intelligence" or "knowing" possesses any intrinsic value in an ecological or economic sense. All of the agency of a simulated society's constituents actually was provided by the programmer and the CPU. In that society, there really is a hobgoblin pushing along the thoughts of all agents, and we are very aware that this is not how material societies like those of humans or animals persist.

ECOLOGICAL CONSTRAINT 2: TECHNOLOGY OF SOCIAL AGENTS CONSTRAINS OTHER SOCIAL AGENTS

We drew a division between the native faculties of agents and any external technology which is in obvious ways a convenient fiction. The division between the agents and their tools is defined not by an average or statistical analysis, but by the barest minimum necessary for the agent to be constituted as an agent. What that barest minimum is may be argued or construed as the "social wage", but no such wages are ever actually paid in coin. It is not possible to buy one's way into validity with any seriousness, and anyone telling you that success is a payment away is drawing out the blood of a debt-slave with no actual debt on record. For those who hold a monopoly on validity, this is not just free money, but establishes their position to decide who lives and who dies. The imperium over life and death is never something that exists as a purely political conceit, as if life could not kill or live without the blessing of an institution, and it is never given for free. Whatever the genuine faculties of a human being or any other social agent, social agencies are ascribed agency only after they are institutionally confirmed as such. The confirming institution may be an assembly of people invested with this authority like a school or a draft board, or it may be persons, but it is always institutions which admit, reject, and expel

members, rather than the entities that inhabit them. In the supposedly natural order, there were no institutions to judge this. There would only be survival and the assertion of force. An obvious way to assert that force would be the very social information and conspiracy society entails, and this would be a motivator to push agents into an ecosystem. We may imagine there is an equilibrium where institutions face sobering realities to regard who can and can't think or know, and to think or know is not a figment of imagination but a real condition with definite conditions. To think or know requires having food to survive, space to live, access to knowledge to acquire language, among other things, and these are not trivial or reducible. A lack of any of these things is a crippling weakness for knowledge. We may think of the needs of the human body as needs of the whole body, but in this ecological and economic thinking, all the body and real conditions of us are already subsumed to the needs of knowledge and the mind. Economics supposes that the conditions of life are managed by reason rather than life generating its own moral purposes, and ecology locks in this belief. Such a belief would be necessary to establish agency in the first place, and we are always beholden to that so long as we think ecologically. We don't always think ecologically or economically, of course. The reality is that none of this task is something we "have" to do out of some blind impulse. Once the needs of knowledge are met, the economic task and our concern with ecologies could very well be done and we can live and do what we actually wanted to do once those needs are met. Knowledge and the mind, though, are ever-greedy masters when they are not humbled by a world that did not care about their conceits. No goodwill can ever be trusted to limit the avarice of knowledge, no matter how many times the wise tell themselves that they are above this and only stupid people would be so impulsive. The reality is that the intelligent are almost uniformly the most malicious of the human race, and the stupid tend towards passivity out of fear. The stupidest are almost pathologically afraid to initiate violence, and because the stupidest are as a rule denied agency in society, they are deprived of anything that would be ecologically relevant. The "violence" of the stupid does not concern any deed, but a crime of Being that the intellectuals declared them guilty of - which is, to the purest intellectual conceit, the only crime that exists. It must be made clear that all of this is the conceit of knowledge rather than any genuine moral conviction of humans that they are actually protecting the land or society. The protection of society in the abstract is very clearly nothing more than protection of the ruling institutions and the fiefdoms the mind would declare by assertion and make real by unlimited violence. The protection of society in its genuine existence is what ecology suggests it will accomplish, by making real the institutional conceits held in society. Usually those institutional conceits are only those of the ruling institutions, and any institution that does not rule is only temporarily abided. It is an exceptional case in the human race that they hold any regard to society outside of the intellectuals' preferred vision of it, and never do intellectual masters actually want humanity to be any freer than they were in savagery. That would be anathema to their sense of themselves when the question of the retard, the invalid, and the slave must be answered with any seriousness.

In all cases, technological advance in society is driven by moral values. Even the seemingly "natural" development of life on its own power happens for reasons that the life-form finds, in a primitive sense, to fit some intent of its design. They would not be moral values in the sense rationality would appreciate or values that we would uphold as right to continue, but if someone suggests any direction of technological advance or biological development, there is a reason why this development was favored. It is never something that just happened with no cause, or a prime mover to which the world is beholden. There is no impulse of inexorable technological progress in life that wills it apropos of nothing, nor is it a given that technological advance is intrinsically good or necessary at all. Many times, technology would hurt a life-form, but is adopted out of necessity and without considering the consequences of this development. Most of the people adapted to modern technology in the 20th century, even though there was no good reason for them to do this for their own purposes, and the adoption of technology was imposed very violently by a necessity that was pressed on them by other social agents. We would not presume that because something developed organically and without deliberate effort, it is better simply because it is deemed natural, or because it was older than us or "bigger" in some sense that we're not allowed to question but must find impressive. The reasons for the seemingly inexorable advance of technology in society have little to do with an innate impulse of the agents, but a simple reality written of in previous chapters. This is that technology once understood is not lost easily, and anyone with an incentive to reverse-engineer some technological apparatus can do so in principle without any interference. If any one person finds a technology useful, it persists. Life and biological "technology" that arose without conscious or learned effort in the sense we usually regard technology is stubbornly persistent in its intent and does not die easily or by any "just-so" story that tells us the strong displace the weak. Far from it, the classical Darwinian formulation states explicitly that is not the strongest or best of species that survive, but those that flourish in their environment. Numerical superiority grants an inherent advantage, even if the life-forms in question are very crude and overwhelm a supposedly better eugenic specimen. If this technological advance occurs not in the realm of individual conceits or property but society, the ecological idea becomes more prominent as technological advance is systematized and worked out formally, and the incentives of states and rulers align with technology in a way they did not in the past. This only happens when enough key advances occur, which are beyond the scope of the present writing but have been mentioned in passing throughout this work - that being that communication can be widespread and operate over larger distances, that machines can do things that were previously impossible, and a theory of systems and machines allows novel phenomena that were the realm of fantasy a thousand years ago. While there may be true "accidents" that are the result of some unlikely confluence of fates, or ideas that seemed to come out of nowhere if not for some random butterfly in the mind, we would see in retrospect why those events did happen or why the random event was very useful. In the main, though, the tendencies of life to develop are the result of its responses to the environment, which include the other agents it must abide if it wants to live

in a material and real world. There would be no struggle for life if there weren't other life-forms or some events we can determine that threaten life. Even if we imagined a world where life faced no struggle, there would still be a direction life takes for whatever aims it had, even if the life were simple in its intent. We need not concern ourselves with evolution again, because the question of agency is for ecology settled before we can speak of managing ecosystems. It becomes clear as soon as economics is at all conceivable that the technological means of humans or similar agents are extensible, and the extent of this potential is limited but vast. We do not have a crystal ball to predict all possible technologies for tens of thousands of years, and usually futurist predictions fail spectacularly in a generation. A persistent reason for the failure of futurism is that the futurist conceits are held not by competent scientists but by cargo cultists who profane the very concept of science with their stupidity. It is not that technology is an alien to humanity that is naturally good or bad, and such conceits are pointless. They say more about human vanity than anything about their technology. For technology to be truly technology as we appreciate it suggests not merely an intellectual exercise on a whim, but directed advance of learning to realize a material outcome.

When social actors are deliberate, their use of technology is apparent to them, starting with their own body. Very likely, such agents would already have inherited some tool use that assisted the development of rational planning faculties in the first place. It wouldn't be necessary, as a different environment makes tool development difficult. Aquatic animals would face greater difficulty fashioning any tools, among them the inability to construct fire in that environment. We cannot yet consider the environment from which technology can draw its raw material, but we can presume that it exists. The "biome" doesn't map onto a fixed definition like "here there is a desert" or "here there is a mountain". Humans can fashion out of many distinct biomes the same organization of society without any modification, other than spatial details that are not relevant to the information ecology entails. The preferred biome of an agent is not some type of land they are hardcoded to accept, but that which the agent's native features would operate in. This may be as simple as the happenstance occurrence that life has little reason to travel far if they establish a good thing in a particular place, without any necessary reason why that land is technologically necessary or holds any importance whatsoever. There is no "blood and soil" that can be demonstrated to work as a natural law, or a technological reason why anyone would have an attachment to their place of origin or any particular parcel of land. Nor is it something determined entirely by inborn qualities which are regarded as fixed from birth to death, or some essential part of the agent that ties it to a biome. Technology of some sort is very useful, and the body itself is deployed not as a passive condition of being but as technology like the axe, bow and arrow, or any other tool humans device. So too is communications like speaking a type of technology, and the knowledge that humans acquire becomes a type of technology once symbolic language is possible. This view of everything as technology is not really inherent to our sense of knowledge or learning, where everything is

judged as a mechanism for technological advance. No such fascination with technology is inherent to the mind itself, and realistically, the technology we use is not intrinsically consequential to our existence or something that must define us. Technology as a general trend is relevant instead because of this ecological question, If not for that, then technology appears to us not as a substance generally alienable like human labor is, but as disparate tools which serve a function and advance because we wanted them to exist for that function. Until the economic and ecological thinking took root, technological advance proceeded not by any organized effort in society, but by inventors who saw necessity and people who saw technology worth preserving. A sense of making something newer, bigger, and better as a self-perpetuating impulse did not grip human societies in the way it would once systems thinking became more prominent in the 17th century. It is not that ancients had no concept of technological advance or science, or that this was possible. Technology did advance and humans learned from past knowledge, making iterative improvements to their technology and technique. This advance, though, was subordinated to the needs of institutions which desired technology, rather than a society-wide interest in technology that was presumed to be active as an impulse that couldn't be held back. Often technology advanced for military applications, or because a laborer saw some new tool as part of their habit of learning things or wanting to produce more or different qualities of things.

Whether humans regard technological advance as an impulse in its own right or something that advanced in fits and starts by necessity, there is no denying that technology exists and affects the society just as our bodies and actions do. By no means was the modern attitude towards technology guaranteed, and the modern attitude itself is not as uniform as ideologues need it to be. Very often, those who do understand technology and engineering have nothing to do with the cargo cult ideologies which are hostile to technology, science, and reality itself, and can't stand those squealing ideological retards, and the ideologues are indeed retarded. Technology in principle exists as an extension of social agents to be technology. If machines just happened to exist, we would not call them technological machines, but events in nature which we describe as natural machines. For example, we do not typically refer to the native faculties as technology because they arose in nature. We do not refer to a naturally occurring rock or tree as technology, but both can be described with mechanistic thinking in great detail. Whether a machine is natural or artificial, it is never a tool that conforms to our conceits about it, or any conceit we held by designing the thing. Real objects always exist on their own terms - and so, when we lose a tool and it is acquired by another, a piece of technology that we constructed or made a part of ourselves is no longer ours, but exists in society. The technological device has a link to its genesis and the history that forged it, and the chain of custody passes from agent to agent. If the device is unattended, someone who eventually finds it will ask who built it, or what natural process was at work to create it. No device we construe as technology just-so existed. This is different from events in the world or things we do not regard as "technology" in this sense.

We can accept, after enough inquiry, that something we encounter exists and we either do not know its origin or consider its history irrelevant to the matter at hand. With technology, though, the intent in its construction - even if that intent is something we projected onto a natural thing - is very relevant to the moral value we attach to it. If one person built a device, we presume that the knowledge to do this is freely reproducible and so is the machine in principle. The human body itself is no exception, for humans sexually reproduce by their choice in the vast majority of unions, and at least one partner always chose or was held culpable, or was pushed into the situation by a third party in unusual cases. Mothers will know who the father is if they are at all competent and fathers are not as witless as the infantilizing narratives tell us they would be, and in any event, carrying the child to term and raising it requires a number of choices to accept the child. It is nearly impossible to force a determined woman to carry a child to term, or not kill it at the first opportunity. Failing this, the mother will take steps to sabotage an unwanted child and turn it into a living abortion, to prove the point, and many times undesirable children are not killed but turned into living abortions, examples of the human race's most ancient rite.

Advance of technology begins the process of transforming society from an assembly of agents into "society" in the abstract, bereft of its origins. There is no natural law suggesting this would happen or had to happen, but an ecological thinking encourages it and attempts to make it a real condition against the wishes of those agents or any reason why they should abase themselves to a false collectivity. It is not that ecology is the necessary link between people, but that ecological management seeks to claim all connections in the ecosystem and declare what they can and cannot be. The people in their genuine form relate to each other and a world outside of them without the mediation of an "ecosystem" or any inherent economic logic, and could describe their coexistence as what it actually is or with any other mechanism we would like to describe a social system as a singular unit or a number of units. Ecology demands a singular explanation - that society is subordinated entirely to the economic - and that no other relation between social agents can exist. It is as if the agents are Luciferian points of light detached from any of their prior conditions and history. Before the ecosystem can be established fully, this step is presumed to take priority over history or any actual condition of the terrain. It would have to be so for ecology to be sensical - it begins not with the land itself, but the agents around whom an ecosystem would be relevant. The land or historical events do not exert a passive force compelling social agents towards any preferred behavior that must be respected in all cases. It is necessary for ecology to claim that social agents make their history, before it can jump to the conclusion that they do not make it as they choose. Such a statement implies that there is someone or something that will choose in the place of those agents, which would be ascribed the same agency and will as actual knowing entities. No such knowledge exists in the land or the past though. It only exists in the social agents, and must in order for ecology to be a sensical interpretation of social existence. Even if "there is no such thing as society", those who manage clearly take an interest in the

agents which were once members of a society and had a memory of a time before ecological management. All technology, including that which was extracted from nature in a form that was suitable for use as it was, is seen as an imposition on reality, and at the same time, it is more real than the world it displaces. It does this by claiming all that is solid melts into air, and then that a new thing must be accepted in whole before it has truly formed. The hidden power in such a world relies on historical knowledge and a complete accounting of the terrain. Social agents look, for economic reasons, towards other agents as the chief agents forming the ecosystem and events around them. Here, economic reasoning is used to make moral and philosophical claims that are intentionally spurious, because those who monopolize historical knowledge and political secrets always envision themselves as the true governing power, cajoling the agents who are now reduced to flotsam like anything else appropriated in nature.

It is here where technology, which was once developed by the working classes and those who had a direct use for technology, became alien and co-opted by those who despised technological advance that did not serve their purposes. If we could imagine society in a highly primitive state, there were no classes as such. Every human, or any other social agent, was the same low scum as any other, and their distinctions however meritorious never actually counted for much. The first division of labor, and the only true division, was to sort the valid and free men from the invalid who were not to be part of the society. This process could not have been carried out willfully with the native faculties available to people, on the terms of those faculties. Even if the "technology" to carry this out was nothing so substantial that it granted to primitive technocrats an unassailable monopoly on this decision, the very native faculties of people would suggest that this division of labor will not actually endure. It could only be actively enforced. To speak of a division of labor is to speak of a controlled ecosystem where this concept can be made real by force, rather than implied by statements of fact like the differing abilities of agents. That people are distinct in their inborn or acquired qualities does not necessitate any division of labor as such, nor do people have any instinctive knowledge of who is good at what or the exact qualities of a person. People of distinct abilities have no inherent reason to regard those distinctions as unassailable or desirable, or that they are even engaged in any "division of labor" with those alien to them. The true division of labor is established not by any essential quality of the agents, but by what those agents do and how those agents live day by day. Absent a compelling reason, an individual has to manage all of the expectations placed about it regardless of any ability to do so or what other human agents are doing somewhere in the world. It is necessary to presume that those agents are bound to an ecosystem to speak of a division of labor within it. The boundaries of the ecosystem may be vaguely defined, up to inclusion of the whole universe or at least a single planet like Earth. It is always presumed in asserting a division of labor that the domains where it applies are fixed and can be arrested by knowledge, and that this division of labor accounts for a distinction that is morally worthwhile rather than merely a statement of fact. We wouldn't care necessarily if one man is a

worker while another is a politician, as if that state of affairs were permanent or granted to the latter any more moral worth than the former. The worker will have to concern himself with politics or else politics will come for him, and the politician natively has to contend with the reality of labor if he wants to have anything to command in politics.

Here we see the ecological mindset is strongest among those who share in the technological interest of life. This interest does not map on cleanly to any class, but it is not the landholders' interests but those of the city-dwellers who would subsume the landholders and take the land from them, by hook or crook. Landed aristocracy rebrands themselves as technocrats who are obviously smart and have experience managing the land, even though their management of the land or anything leaves much to be desired. The technological interest does not pursue technology as an extension of labor, but seeks to divorce technology from laborers outright. By no means is ecology locked into this understanding of technology and preference. For one, ecology can apply to non-living agents or things we treat as agents for the purpose. In this case, we reverse what Darwin did by bringing political economy into the study of nature, and instead insert a pseudo-natural science into our political and economic arrangements. But, we recognize that non-living agents would not have any reason to engage in the same sort of struggle for position. Even for living agents though, it is entirely possible to reject this value regarding technology in our decision making. Living agents can recognize the incentive exists without succumbing to it inexorably. Nothing in technology suggests that its rise is inevitable or follows any preferred teleology. Far from it, the nature of technology is that it has no such teleology, and often exists to disrupt such plans. By suggesting an inexorable and singular "historical progress", it is hoped to arrest history by arresting all technology. It is not the ideas or symbols that arrest history by the power of thought alone, but the arrest of technology which has a real existence outside of us. Only in this way can such "historical progress" ever be asserted, and in doing so, the boundaries of life can be artificially constrained. Whether someone actually wants this, or only seeks to constrain life's behaviors in ways that would be understood as beneficial for the good of society or some non-economic purpose we hold dear, is an entirely different matter. We don't have to do any of this simply by the fact of technology or what humans are, or any life is, or even what knowledge is generally. We could easily dismiss all of the perverse incentives, and usually do so out of necessity. We were able to dismiss those perverse incentives for most of history when we had to, and those perverse incentives are followed because there were those in society who always such such a situation as a goal to attain. Learning that this was possible did not guarantee their success, as if everyone else was fooled and had to go along with a vocal minority that should have been ignored.

ECOLOGICAL CONSTRAINT 3: HISTORY AND GENESIS

Ecological thinking - thinking of political economy taken to real-world conclusions about states, which is then generalized to remove the political element from it - concerns itself not just with a theory of technological progress, but a sense of its history and the origins of technology as a process. It is this which guided the development of economics as an idea. Before this, anything we would call "economics" was seen as a political how-to guide, a precursor of sociology, or religious treatments of the concept of debt and loans and obligations to society and to its members. A general theory of technological progress did not exist as a science. There were philosophical treatments of technology which were either intrinsically political or spiritual, where the role of technology was something to be co-opted by rulers. The rulers, in the main, did not want technological progress in the modern sense and did everything possible to stall it, because technology would be a destabilizing element and required a startup cost to create. The precursors to allow general technological development are more than learning or the construction of suitable machines. The very idea of education was at first limited to favored classes, and only begrudgingly was education extended to the commoners. This extension was entirely driven by a philosophical or religious impulse to get in front of anything that would suggest education independent of the ruling interests and the classes that seized power, and so education and the sentiments of the ruling classes were always inextricably linked. This is not new, for education conceptually concerned the political from the outset. The education of primitive society was no different, and because education was tied to the concept of the political very intimately, it is outside the scope of the present writing. What is important here is not to suggest that technology or science are intrinsically political, because they very obviously not. There's nothing "political" about an axe or a gun that makes it essential to a particular polity or proprietary in any sense. The treatment of technology or knowledge as property - or far that matter anything that people covet or the people themselves as property - is a convention that has nothing to do with technology or science intrinsically. It is not a convention that is socially necessary at any point, or even politically necessary. The existence of the commons throughout history and its legal recognition makes the insistence on property very farcical. This is especially so when it is known property can be reassigned and debts written off with nothing more than a handshake, making the sacrosanctity of something so flimsy absurd if anyone thinks about it for five minutes. What is important is to understand that in this ecological thinking, the history and genesis of any technology and of the people themselves becomes a part of the ecology itself, and must be so. If the goal is to fix social actors to a time and place, then technology becomes less a tool like any other part with potentials, but something fixed to a time and place and stripped from agency. The history and genesis of something would overtake its use in the present. So too would it become possible and necessary to rewrite history in the model to divorce the thing in our thinking from its actual history, which we would have regarded if not for this conceit. Even if we are aware of this editing of history, merely by placing technology

in a grand scheme of historical development we are suggesting a grand model of history, and reality must be made to conform to the theory rather than our sense of history developing from our best knowledge of what likely happened, or our memory or media record of what happened. If there is a media record of the past, then it becomes necessary to state baldly that reality conforms to the theory over what sense and reason would suggest. Even if we are as honest as we can be in doing this, the ecological view of technology invites historical review, and for the first time an arc of history can be suggested to place technology and science in some order of events. This would be necessary to link technology into an overall system, so that technologies that have little to do with each other can be united by some principles that are knowable.

Technology developed in a real world in the environment social actors find themselves in, rather than technology translating immediately to realized form by will alone. Men make their own technology, but they do not make it as they choose, in other words. If people have a history and things have a history, then their relations have a history as well and can be taken together to form a system that is seen as fixed and complete. Any technology to be technology is a thing understood. Tools are not open systems without any intent, even when the "tool" is a naturally occurring object used for purposes that are learned by the user. Any input or output concerning the tool is managed for the tool to be useful. If that is true for individual things, it could be made true for societies and complex systems. There are two approaches to this. The crude one, used by many idiots, is to reduce the complex system to something far simpler than its genuine constitution. This is not suitable for worthwhile ecological management, but it is often the way ecologism is taught to those who are made into slaves by it. The other is to methodically catalogue all that exists in society's potential appropriation and disallow anything to exist outside of it. There would not be any real management of the house if one did not know the contents of that house. This cataloguing did not need to take the form of overbearing control, where if something is known it must be considered an enemy. We do not consider the possessions of our house to be enemies at all. If someone were to account for the ecosystem of human society as a whole, that includes the political machinations of humans. This would mean the kind of total information ecology entailed meant total control over all that exists in society, including the people who are necessarily catalogued as technology just like any other. Here, "men become machines", as the more idiotic koans of 20th century philosophy proclaimed. Men did not become mere machines though. It is rather that their human qualities would become parodies of what they were presumed to be in a free society. Doing this was a choice. There is a version of this where the information ecology pertained to, including its political content, did not become this malevolent. Yet it did, because there was nothing in the world that could prevent those with a mind to do so from pressuring others endlessly until the society broke. The philosophy of struggle would become absolute. This though is a political decision rather than a natural one. Even if no such decision were made, it is not technology or information alone that holds any of this power, as if knowing the

name of something truly allowed someone to hold worldly power of it. We could know the names of all actors that amount to anything in an ecosystem and it would not change one iota the machinery all of them hold. Far from it, the ruling ideas throw in the face of the conquered just how much they have lost, only to demand immediately afterwards that this power cannot be referenced. The full reasoning why must wait for another time, but sufficient exposure to this failed society tells us that is operative. The myth is that the predelictions of a few madmen are the only possible nature, because they can violently recapitulate the genesis of the human race and tell you "this is all you are and all you will ever be". It is done on the individual level to forbid forever redemption and it is done at the level of politics and large social groupings, so that any race is reduced - as intended - to its lowest common denominator. It is only effective so long as the human beings are treated as ecological information, rather than the machines being effective for some spooky and unknowable reason. Controlling the minds of the subjects though is not really necessary. All that is necessary is to constrain their action so that the limited resources of a state can be deployed to snuff out all resistance to this plan. The ecological pseudoscience does not make this situation a fait accompli, but would be a necessary step. So too would any solution to humanity's modern condition require working through economic and ecological knowledge. No one prevailed by remaining ignorant of how masters controlled slaves, and this is true of any slave hoping to rebel and true of any master hoping to prevent rebellion.

It is with the development of history that technological development can be seen in the abstract with viable models, rather than guessing something works. In some sense, humans have always asked where they came from and the nature of time itself, and this had been carried on without a formal theory of history or approach that regarded accuracy. Long before Herotodus^[4], rulers would erect monuments to their victory, and temples would be established, leaving behind some record of what happened. One reason why histories became more widely read is because it became necessary to do so in a world where civilization formed empires rather than warring states, and one way or another, the peoples of the world would be dragged into history, usually in a very unpleasant role. A democratic society, or what counted as such in the city states, meant knowledge of history and particularly political history became much more important for any man who deemed himself literate. Cruder systems of recounting annals and genealogies were refined not by the men who worked or by any scientific method, but by philosophers and gurus. The historical method that was developed was an intrinsically political concept of history. Scientifically, what happened in the past would not intrinsically mean anything about the present or the future. The past doesn't exist in any real sense. Science is conducted by humans with memory, and even the short delay in mental processes or any communication places all of the information humans work with at some point in the past. The purely materialist view of history has no use for any grand narrative or story suggesting that many unrelated things are tied to a political understanding. Any overarching schema to sort scientific knowledge is tested against the body of

evidence as best as possible. This has proven to be unworkable to allow for the assessment of the past in scientific lab conditions, preserved without the need of any trust or honesty. We would not need to presume that present objects from the world lie to us as profusely as humans do. Science develops laws based not on a political substitution of fact but independent observation, which is confirmed time and time again when science is done in a sound manner. The laws of nature can only be ascertained based on a belief that there was a past world that does not itself change, and we can from many observations throughout life build a crude framework to develop more formal theories. The political treatment of history is entirely different. The distinct approaches to history are not defined by materialism or idealism.^[5] They differ because the scientific view is anathema to the aristocratic political view. If politics were conducted by working men and women and they had a genuine stake in society - if this was actually a democratic society - the thinking of history would be skeptical and consider human behavior to be conspiratorial behavior and that this conspiracy must not be allowed to assert what it has asserted. The aristocratic view welcomes opportunities for conspiracy and malice, not because the people are naturally too decent to conspire, but because the aristocrat and the political mind spends more time lying while everyone else has to sacrifice something and compromise themselves. Economics, on the other hand, is driven by moral concerns, if not political concerns which are at root informed by some moral value rulers hold. There is nothing scientific about economics. Ecology seeks to command technology and science and can only do so from the aristocrats' point of view. The native connection to sense of the people would see their society and place in it very differently from the philosophies and theories of the world that are allowed political relevance. Politically, the truth of the past or the truth of any scientific claim is no more relevant than it needs to be for political rule to continue. Rulers are beholden to the truth when the world imposes this on men, but the politician can only spite the world. The reasons why become clearer with a better understanding of the political, but in short, politics presumes free men who do not naturally have any rights or freedom in the sense that those words are regarded. The political person is always above the natural world as has to be. To depoliticize the masses while exhorting them to believe "nature is political" produces the perverse incentives and outcomes we have seen for the past century and a half.

For ecology to function as a useful discipline for its task, it has to at least accept the possibility that all political acts are suspect, while at the same time ecology is intrinsically a political matter. Scientifically, we would study societies and environments and suggest a machine that is open, and thus there is no ecology to manage. The management of ecosystems is always a political interest rather than something that the natural world had any design to create of its own accord. For individual people who are not intrinsically and certainly not wholly political animals, ecology is alien to their interests. The aim of individuals or groups of people who contest for position against the state or within the state does not regard any "natural order" or ecological order for themselves. It is for those who

adopt ecologism a claim violently held against others and an ideology to be told to the slaves, while the masters are pulled aside and given the real ruling ideas. It is not necessary then for ecology to be scientific or an accurate understanding of anything that happens. It is only necessary for ecology to be developed enough to suggest that an ecosystem, however designed, is closed to all but approved information. Those who hold approval of information claim that they are the masters and that "knowledge is power", and because those who conspire to rule through ecology consider themselves monopolists of knowledge, it makes sense for them to make ecology as totalizing as possible. Economics did not intrinsically feature this. Ecology, in all the forms that it took, did, because to acknowledge what ecosystems really are would obviate the need of "ecology". Ecology would have no explanatory power. The true explanatory power of ecology is that it is an understanding to suggest ways a manager can deploy force to control human behavior. In the formative stage of any ecosystem, the social agents - humans in our case - are the center of the ecosystem, around which its defining characteristics are established. Ecology claims both fundamental connection with the natural world and divorces the masters completely from the muck of the world - and most importantly, the slaves who are to become part of the land, much like the idealized version of serfdom.

It is this that is the darling of every philosopher and cajoler, and this image that they invoke when they speak of Man modify his environment. They envision themselves being that Man, and the lessers were just not "natural leaders" in their typical self-congratulating parlance. The reality of humanity's relations with its surroundings is not that the imperious will asserted its primordial essence and thought-form on the world, or that the world did likewise. That has always been a political logic and a really shitty one compared to anything that would actually rule men. It was designed after all to be corrosive to the virtue that a republican or democratic society required to not turn to shit immediately, run by people who have always despised the people or anyone who would tell them no. They are the only ones who can say no, or if they can push it, they are the only ones who allow "yes" and permission for anything to happen.

What humans, or any other agent, do to construct ecology is ultimately a conceit in their minds, rather than any actual natural boundary or separation from nature by the conceits of a power-mad mind. It is not an empty conceit, for humans do affect the world around them. All of this effort to modify the world is done with other social agents in mind, if it is to be constituted as an ecosystem. As mentioned, individuals have no need of any such concept and find it alien to every interest they would hold and every sense they hold about themselves. Individual people are aware that their true existence is one where their faculties are split between competing aims and wants. It is the necessity of individual life-forms with central nervous systems like ours for the mind to assert its dominion over its own body, so that the conflicting parts are oriented towards any worthwhile goal. This orientation is rarely ever perfect, but the orientation of individual life-forms makes sense to them. The organs of the body do not have a mind of their own or wants that a person would respect over the

well-being of the whole. The egotism of cloistered fools seeks to impose their own sense of themselves as a natural law, but nothing about our existence was ordained by nature or protected the mind. The world protects us only from the worst abominations, all of them that we know of arising from the malice of living creatures rather than the elements or some bad juju in the lifestream. For individuals outside of this ecological concept of society, they have to reckon with their own limitations. They are first humbled by the world and all of the forces of actual nature, and perhaps learn from that. Most of us though have a far worse threat than the world to consider - other humans. Most of us learn from an early age that other people do not like being berated or cajoled and that our efforts to do so are not likely to end well. All of our technology as individuals is utilized primarily to meet threats from other people in some way, even if the danger of other humans is not immediately apparent. Absent the threat from other humans, it would not matter if we do not meet some arbitrary standard set to be impossible to reach without a cheat code handed to those in the know. None of that has ever made humans better, for it only exists as a great filter to humiliate and lock out undesirables. Nothing is gained by playing that game, winning it, or even overcoming it. It would have been better for our individual interest and the collective interest of everyone in a society to not allow such games to dominate our private affairs, and that would require the threat of other humans to be answered for. This might have been possible if humans overcame their genesis and decided 10,000 years of ritual slaughter and backstabbing was enough. Human understanding of history though was to be monopolized by trained liars and then a false history would be superimposed over events those who lived through them knew well, once enough time had passed and the losers of the last struggle have been sufficiently marginalized.

We did not arise with this ecological conceit fully formed at the level of society. So far, no philosophy up to now has really considered the consequences of technocratic society and ecology, because the latter was made a sacrosanct shibboleth, and the former was a fait accompli when it asserted its existence. Until the land can be fully controlled - until the long-run goal of every state in history is attained - humanity's environment is dominated by the social agents, their machines, and their history. Humanity only can relate to other things as what they are, or what they appear to be at first, and this is sufficient for managing any legitimate matter ecology pretends to serve. To the crude mind who does not understand the modus operandi of those who govern, they see ecology and human society like this, imagining everything as its own spirit, given a name and assigned expectations based on past experience with such things. So far as any unity of all those things exists, it is a religious matter or a shorthand, since dealing with individual things in large numbers is taxing due to the limitations of the human mind and its effort. Even if we supposed all that existed was unified as a "just-so" story, we would have to suppose there was a way in which disparate agents were united. There would be causes and effects between the social agents and the things they appropriate, which is the only basis for any concept of a unified "thing" that we call society in the abstract. Society

in the genuine sense that we regard such a thing as relevant did not need any "unification". It was necessary to replace that common sense understanding of society with something entirely alien, and declare that society is as unknowable as God. The decision to do this is deliberate and not one asserted out of ignorance or laziness. It is recapitulated violently no matter how obvious it is to you and me that this does not work and never can work, even at first sight. This idea of ecologism was always catered to particular interests in society. It is not a given that aristocrats are given over to an ecological mindset, or that they would automatically consider other humans to be livestock. For most of history, aristocrats didn't regard anyone outside of their club as relevant at all, as like all humans, they love favoritism and membership in institutions, and despise those who do not get with the program. The program now was to lock down the world in accord with those who controlled technology not just through their tools, but through a general theory of knowledge that could be communicated and reinforced over large distances for the first time, and with far greater knowledge of the machine that is the human under management.

This integration could only be realized by education. All of the machines and communications a master may envision cannot by their mere utilization make victory a fait accompli. It remains the case that no "natural slavery" can be said to exist, nor for that matter that natural monopolies or natural aristocracies exist. Any unification of people suggests their subordination to something to be a realized condition. Without that, they would remain individual entities, whatever their relations to each other may be. If individuals were constructed in such a way that they were integrated in thought like a singular body, they would be very different creatures and those creatures would still face the same question of how disparate social agents are integrated. There is no reason this cannot happen, and in some sense the human subject is a product of their society. Humans could not stand alone for much at all, where all of their wordplay means nothing and they exist opposed to many other humans, who would not be averse to conspiring against an individual. The people who claim belief in "historical progress" as this Demiurge like force rely on a very human intervention in education to enforce that claim. History does not intrinsically have any orientation towards progress or regression to the primordial condition. It is always that same regression to primordial light that is really what such beliefs point to, and the reason for that is purely to defend eugenic interests, or to feed self-sustaining delusions that are older than the human race and contributed to its sorry condition. Education, like any technology and anything humans do, never "just happens", as if by some unknowable impulse. It may be forgiven if we spoke of casual conversation or the drunken behavior of humans in their typically preferred frame of mind. Nothing in an educational setting is left to chance, and conspiracy is the default mode of thought of educators. They do not want a world of forthright actors, and never did. They want a world where students conspire against each other, even when such behavior is clearly maladaptive. Any peace or end to the conspiracy is only a temporary measure to prepare the next scam. It is not something done out of some petty avarice or bad moral

fiber, and is never an accident or something done out of ignorance. Such malice is inherent to the intellectuals as an interest in society, and especially those who hold the educational institutions and would be the gurus. The one saving grace is that there is nothing stopping any human, even the lowest of them, from conspiring in kind. What results is a battle of intellects to produce machines with the aim of controlling other people first and foremost. Any effect they have on the world outside of people is secondary to the struggle between minds. This would not be inherent to human sociality in general or even to political sense. Cooperation is not just politically expedient in many cases but desirable, for the political agents have no real benefit from this interline conflict after all of the excuses and posturing is done. It is the conceit of those whose only asset is their monopoly on intellectual production to enclose the world, and this creates the bizarre situation where common knowledge is obscured and esoteric tricks and systems of occult lies are treasured. It is this that makes the seeming "contradictions" of capitalism entirely sensible to those who would conspire, and why the conspirators prefer to maximize those contradictions to sow as much chaos as possible. Absent the monopoly on intellectual production and all sense of what is valued, there would not be a particularly good argument for the monetary arrangement. There would be the interests of established property, which relied on those claims enduring or being transformed into new claims that secured what the property holders wanted out of their assets. The intellectual on the other hand both despises money - since it implied a level of independence from thought leaders - and lusts for money and the shortest possible route to it, because it is a token most of all of an imperious will to keep mankind enslaved by debt and a moral obligation towards those tokens, so long as finance can be co-opted by an intellectual group that sees finance as their tool, rather than a means to an end as most people would have it. Why we would abase ourselves to Mammon in such a way, when we clearly know better, was never premised on any truth or wisdom to doing this. It was done because it could be done, and enough fear could be instilled to terminate a thought process suggesting it could be any other way. The sole exception would in the end be granted to a clique of people who were truly above money. The artful dodge of the bad anarchist is to claim that property was the culprit of the crime, rather than an imperious lust for tokens of value which were judged not by any merit we would hold, but by the values of those who command the ruling institutions alone. Changing property to possession does not change the genuine heart of the problem - that humans were educated to believe this arrangement suited their aims and that a new scam could be engineered when the old one no longer worked. All the way to today, this creation of scams has worked, and the creation of scams in the past century is an industry producing a whole new system every generation, recycling and regurgitating the ruling ideas in new forms and wearing out the elders who lost the great conspiratorial game.

It would be quite impossible to suggest this is the product of the history of human beings or anything they produced, or any confluence of such things as what it actually is. In short, it was not possible to impose this social engineering

unless society in the genuine sense were abolished and replaced with "society", the great and terrible visage of the ruling institutions imposed on the world. Therefore, ecology came into being, and the first ecological claims of Malthus are spurious and stupid claims a child could see through. It was never a matter of knowledge or truth that this was how nature worked - only that such pedagogy can, with sufficient force, be made true because anyone saying no would be humiliated and broken and selected to die. It is this - the selection of who lives and who dies - that separates ecology from a standard sociological treatment or an understanding of materialist history. History and economics did not intrinsically concern the question of who lives and who dies, as that was properly speaking a political question that was settled not in the past but in the here and now. Ecology is the first claim of the technological interest and the class that grew around it to untrammelled authority, dispensing with past alliances and decencies that mitigated the absolute worst qualities of the human race. At first, it can only create crude models that operate more on the bigotries of humans and often the stupidest of the race at that.

It is this substitution of the agents that comprise society for the "whole" of ecology that is at the heart of the entire project. Rather than society as a genuinely united entity like a nation, which entailed some political or spiritual foundation, society is reimagined as a contraption fitting the design of a thought leader, moved by thought alone. History becomes not an assessment of the past, but another tool to rewrite the "code" of society so to speak. It is here where the systems thinking mentioned in the first book finds its niche. There is no reason not to view the society as a system with parts like any other, and attribute to it tendencies that are not contingent on the mere information or an assortment of facts, such that the system cannot be described merely as an assembly of parts. What is done with that is not fixed in any particular direction. The society is not an organism in the sense that individual life-forms are, and if it were, it would be a very bizarre one, rife with contradictions and not integrated in any of the ways life usually is. The society attacks itself and yet it is presented as inescapable, and this is intended. There is no reason to believe this is what society actually is, but such an image serves institutions that manage and rule people, and those who hold the institutions decide that they can with enough force make reality. To make this stick, all alternatives must be made absurd, and the faculties of the social agents must be measured and policed. In constructing ecology, the individuals are obliterated and replaced with an abstraction, which then invades the actual bodies and their relations. They are made beholden to the imperatives of politics and the economic interests of those who rule, rather than their own interests. This is inherent to the concept, even with a more benign ecology that recognized what it was doing in constructing such a contraption. It would be possible, even easy, to circumvent this, but because there were people who could violently recapitulate their preferred vision of reality and nothing that could stop them, humanity became what it became in the 20th century. The full reasons why this works entail political thought that is not immediately evident from any economic necessity or any obvious spiritual authority we would actually have

to abide, and those reasons do not involve that the rulers are inherently bigger, stronger, or better by any worthwhile metric. Very often the ruling aristocracies are fickle and obsessed with the stupidest shit the human ape could possibly do, which is saying a lot. The construction of an ecology is the construction of an alternate history rather than merely a recollection of facts, because no fact except the claims of empires can make an ecosystem "real". We may encounter a natural habitat or a concept of natural boundaries for a given life-form, but they never conform to parcels of land to be managed by the self-appointed rightful stewards. Those habitats are as malleable as people are. The aim of the ecologist then is to be the one directing that change, cajoling the world to fit its preferred shape, rather than do what technology and human genius had done many times. It seeks not to understand the world or even change it, but arrest it in place to make sure nothing disrupts a claim that is essentially eugenic. If we were interested in understanding systems that we can ecosystems for their own sake, we would not invoke ecology but systems thinking and the genuine history of people and society. It would ask a very different question, and everyone asking that question was to be terminated unless they were sanctioned to direct history and the world by thought alone.

ECOLOGICAL CONSTRAINT 4: PRE-HISTORICAL CONSTRAINTS IN NATURE

Only after ruling out the first three constraints does ecology manage what it purports to manage - the natural environment which existed, at one time, before humans did. There is no preferred point in nature where "pre-history" is separated from recent historical existence. In one sense, everything we do and everything we are is "pre-historical" from the standpoint of when this management takes place. The human society is already part of the natural environment, and so what has happened and what is happening now has to be accepted as a given. That cannot change, and in the moment humans can only act as they do. After the fact, what is done is done and cannot be undone. Our models of general laws of motion for social agents are just models, in which we suppose history could have turned out another way, or institutional behavior can be modified. The underlying life-forms in those institutions would have to conform to the theory rather than institutions being nothing more than the product of humans doing what they have done, if the managerial conceit is to be upheld. As mentioned in the footnote above, the "reversible" process in imperial science is little more than a shibboleth and a just-so story rather than a description of any real event. In principle every act once completed turns the original cause to nothing, and it is gone forever. A purely eugenic concept of what things are displaces what we have long known things to be in their entirety, and an imagined primordial and pure state is supposed to exist for no real reason as the baseline to return to. There was very much a genesis of stable objects, and they cannot be recreated as trivially as we would imagine in our models. The formation of something as simple as an egg is something that recurred in life after many precursors to the animal which can form and lay eggs. Shattering the egg can happen any number

of ways, each of which are distinct. To believe in crass koans of reversibility requires someone to take on a mystical thinking about the origin of life and things, and deny that there is a process - the egg would "just-so" exist, and this must be believed for the imperial religion to hold true. It is consciously imposed as a lie or a working, as is the habit of imperial science and magical workings of a demonic sort. A child will probably ask, if curious, where this process really begins and how everything forms, and so a child can see through these stupid koans, but their violent recapitulation is a necessity of the imperial institution. So too is a facetious line of questioning, which is what the fake "debate" over systems mentioned in the first book was. Too many people were ready to call bullshit on the entire scam in the greater empire of the philosophers, and so these fake debates were a way to prepare the populace for the ascent of eugenics over the world they once knew. If the children retain their wits, as many hope to do despite the terror environment of schooling, they will come to the correct conclusion that there is a world outside of society, and the total society of eugenics or German ideology is a beast to avoid at all costs. This is intended, as the goal of such religion is to make humans as monstrous as the aristocracy and internalize its value system above their own. At the same time that society is total and inescapable, the child is taught to hate society and hate other children, where in a better world, such a course of action would be highly counterproductive, pointless, and retarded. It was never the world itself, but human beings who were able to construct a device which enclosed forever the mind, that made this possible. The machine works on natural principles, but the world and actual humans abhor it. It would be trivial to not live in such a society, but those who benefit from the beast will never give up a weapon that allows them to shout "die! die! die!" with impunity. It would be quite impossible to make this coherent if the appeal to power or crass nature were presented as the point. Only a certain sort of person selected for this would embrace the torture cult. Ecology is the way in which both the technological interest - necessary at this stage of history for civilization to wage its war against the world - and the lesser forms of the eugenic interest can unite, and an aristocracy among them decides who will promote. Most of all it must deny that the lower two classes have any agency or even an existence on their own terms, and so the class of labor is defined not by anything they do or are, but by their relation to property and institutions that are held by their enemies. It is necessary to make the ideas of the present society as natural as the world outside of society and fused with it, while selecting which of the original conditions will persist. In doing so, labor in the genuine sense is gone forever, abolished and reduced to a null value to be summoned at will. Whatever the bodies that provide labor do is subordinated to the ecology, rather than the world in a genuine sense or even the will of masters. It is through this ecological construct that the master hopes to bypass traditional filters that impeded slavery, and this construct is far more effective than past slaveries.

Without this, the prior conditions of the world, before human designs exerted an effect on it, do not suggest much at all about what is to be done or why

we should do any such thing. Those conditions do suggest something about why humanity did turn out as it did, but this is only knowable when it is presumed that humans themselves are knowable, and humans would act in their environment as they could have. The environment is taken in total, with distance removed and demarcations drawn only by thought alone - and thus, "nature abhors a vacuum". This thinking is then superimposed on the past, as if the philosopher's conceits were natural and what everyone always thought, even though the philosophers are noted to disagree with each other strongly about the ideal society and what they are even describing. There was a world before society, but in ecological management, that world is only understood from the present. It becomes impossible to detach social information and the biases of humans from the world itself - human thought and fundamental nature must be fused together, rather than humanity and life being alien to a largely dead world. There was a world, but it becomes the aim of thought to abolish it - or in more philosophical and flowery language, sublimate it, which amounts to the same thing but with an odious corruption inherent in the process. Stripped of this human need to make everything relevant to their thinking, there isn't much to the "base" world. Much of the life that existed prior to society was itself an imposition on a dead rock, and in its own way abides the same historical bias that we do in thought. Life wherever it exists is a plague and nothing more, and attempts to suggest a "balance of nature" or homeostasis of societies are nothing more than an export of political conceits onto an existence where no such thing applied. The struggle for life is chaotic and rife with stupidities that were never a part of any natural plan. If this is the plan of some deity, it's a shitty plan. But, no deity worth regarding as even a minor god would concern itself with human conceits, let alone the political conceits of people who would have been ignored in a better world. Much of what we regard as "God's plan" or anything of the sort is really a story about how we can understand natural history, absent formal scientific approaches. The ecologist substitutes a new institutional conceit where the gods used to reside, and when questioned, the ecologist shows they are more zealous than the typical priest, and describes the natural world not in any language we would regard as useful, but with contemptuous sing-song stories, intended to infantilize and retard anyone who wanted to actually manage the world for themselves. If someone did wish the goal of ecology, they would learn without too much difficulty that this construct doesn't work. The human element is not as dead as the rock it has appropriated, and it is the human and living elements that ecology concerns itself with. The raw material may be analyzed and we learn that much of the world was not as a cruder, animistic mind saw it. The matter comprising everything was never a substance created by divine spark, but chemical compounds.^[6] The understanding of what actually happens, as best as we are able to reassemble it with our own sense, must be abandoned in favor of formalism and what thought leaders prefer reality to be; and so, the assembly of knowledge that was accessible to all must be occulted. For ecology to be sensical, control of all information - that of the natural world and that of the social agents around whom ecology is centered - must be a given. Otherwise, the question is not one of pre-existing natural conditions,

but one in which human agents could choose what, if anything, to do with the things around them. Those things most importantly consist of other people. It is here where stupid comments are made where thought leaders bemoan, in a fake display, how men are made into machines and machines are made into men.

The only requirement of ecology is that it is beholden to science as a method, without any requirement that the science is "good" science - i.e. that it is science that actually refers to a truth of the world. The only requirement is that enough knowledge of the world exists to force humans to accept ecology, so they can be managed. Since humans and everything about them is as much a part of the world as anything else, scientific thought is the only way in which this ecological machine can be constructed, beyond a very crude systems thinking that is more akin to religion than anything reasonable. Science cannot make the world into something other than what it is, but it is possible for humans to construct elaborate models and dual-systems, using economic incentives to work through their worst impulses instead of anything we would do if we wanted the world to be worth living in. It is not the spiritual authority of science that makes ecology a fait accompli, for what ecology creates is pseudoscience. Scientifically, all ecology like economics would be subject to critique. While economics could persist as a science of sorts, though far removed from its origins in nature, ecology can only superimpose models and insist they be real because a manager believes this is how the world should be. Ecology can only do this by co-opting scientific inquiry whose proper origins are in the working class, and proclaiming that an alliance of aristocracy and technology supercedes "vulgar" science that you and I would rely on.

The borders we use to demarcate ecosystems were dependent on the social agents in question - and so, the environments humans adapt to are relevant. By no means is this limited to the Earth, geology, and all that we conventionally consider ecological. Virtual spaces that are abstract can be described with ecological language more perfectly than the natural world we superimposed ecology onto, and those spaces were both constructed by human beings, and took on an existence of their own once created. What is said cannot be unsaid, and there will be a record of an internet forum that can be reconstructed. If the data were not recorded, forums could be partially reconstructed by the memory of their participants, and even if no such memory existed, the effects of what happened in the past are felt in the present. History is always reconstructed by people when needed, but it can only be reconstructed in a way which regards a world outside of us that we have to accept, if it is to be history in any sense that the concept is worth anything. The primordial state before human intervention becomes a myth and a story, even though we know there is much of the world that remains untouched by society in such a controlling way. To this day, human beings remain much as they were thousands of years ago in their basic constitution and old habits remain for the reasons they originally existed, before there were managers imperiously dictating what humanity was supposed to be. To this day, many things humans construct become part of the world and do not conform to our expectation of perfect machines. There is still much of the

pre-engineered world that remains intact and must remain intact, for humans have in the end done little more than rearrange patterns that already existed. To transmute known qualities into novel ones is not a trivial thing, and no amount of wizardry can transform anything into anything because we think it should be otherwise. All transformations of the world only proceed in ways they can, and that includes all of the designs humans make on the world. This is the barrier which ecology seeks to lock at a preferred boundary and monopolize, and this makes ecological claims something very different from property claims of the past.

In some way, the inner world minds construct becomes an ecology. The intent of the someone with a whole system in mind is superimposed on the world as best as feeble human efforts can. More importantly, the inner thoughts of someone, which were once judged as not worth probing due to the cost of bringing men and women of low status to the inquisition, were now things that can be terraformed and subsumed into social thought-forms that were repeatedly reinforced. The practices of socialization did not begin in modernity nor on a blank slate, but for the first time, it was conceivable to probe any mind and create, through the impression of enough fear, a subject completely colonized inside and out by the imperial religion. This concept, only crudely applied in the past and theorized as the work of sociology and social engineers, could be expounded upon with the same language as political economy. This required working through biology, since all of the intellects to be probed were living creatures as were the agents that would probe. The computer, the first non-living apparatus of "thinking", was a potential stumbling block to realize this, if the concepts of computation and reason were not commanded by thought leaders. This could only be done by a terrible stunting of the brain from infancy, if not in utero. The basic constitution of eugenics and movements like it would be set by this ecological thinking. At first, eugenics operates on a race - the lowest form of the society it seeks to dominate, reduced to its biological origins and disallowed to be anything else. It does not take long, like prehistoric man figuring out how to enslave animals, to do the same to humans, on the basis of intelligence rather than any other biological trait or any demonstrable merit. Even the type of intelligence selected for would not be meritorious or open to debate. It did not matter by what metric someone was "smarter", but rather that an intellect was smart enough to violently impose and recapitulate the eugenic creed, and terminate from its position in the institutions any intellect that dared to say no.

Eventually, after the very large body of information social existence entails is accounted for, ecology must reckon with what it purports to accomplish. The behaviors of the social agents are generalized and can be placed in any number of environments, in which the agents are necessarily tied to a particular parcel of land or a domain. Simple facts about the natural world or human constitution now become ecological conceits, and are steadily rebranded so that the world conforms to what humans are, and conversely the things - both the natural world and machines humans construct - can affect humans, just as livestock are tied to the will of the drover and all of the constructs of animal husbandry or agriculture.

There is no doubt that captive animals have been modified by domestication, and the ecological concept is how this can finally be imposed on humans, foreseen in advance by those who expounded on it. What design the new ecologist had for the world may vary. A benign thinker may see ecology as a necessity to contend with other forces which will resort to ecological thinking, and this author believes the ecological concept - and the economic concept - is a valid one, with proper caveats. The particulars of natural science and its relations to humanity are not directly the subject of this book, and are better described as the work of science, where there is still scientific literature in the sense we would appreciate instead of this jabbering mess the institutions have told us is "The Science". I caution the reader to be ready to criticize all ecological conceits much as economy has to be criticized given its dismal history, and hopefully this writing is the start of a proper critique of ecology - or "political ecology", though ecology like economy intrinsically entails political existence to be anything more than an accounting task of little interest or difficulty.

I remind the reader that the only reason science could be a spiritual authority in the first place was because it allowed for independent verification. For ecology to hold true, this independent verification had to be circumvented, because independent verification would confirm immediately that any such barriers were not natural but the design of men or the intent of life which is not fixed into any preferred form that "ought" to exist. In declaring the rule of the land through science, science in the genuine sense would be replaced with something very alien, so far as the institutions were concerned. Those institutions were still beholden to science in the genuine sense, for they required accurate knowledge to command the world. Ecology is necessary if someone wished to establish a ruling idea that superseded science, while retaining fidelity to a world outside of society where any rule could happen. Anything less would be an imperfect claim of any state to rule the world, and in doing so, the road to ending science in its original sense is established. This will be revisited frequently in these books, but it is here where humanity breaks from its older senses of itself - where Man was both a type of animal and a spiritual creature - to this new sense of an institutionalized subject, commanded and controlled like any other. The rulers retroactively claim that these institutions are some sort of liberation from serfdom. The ecological conceit is something very different from the feudal claims to land and the serfs on it, which were at heart extensions of law codes dating back to Antiquity with variations around the world, each of them producing different expectations of the lord and the peasant's functions in that society. A proper view of history, as I intend to write in the fourth book of this series, would not detect any singular feudalism or serfdom that was a universal form, and thinking that such a state existed is more in line with the philosophical thought of the state than the realized social relationships at work. The lord might have fancied himself an educated and wise steward if he read philosophy and disdained the typical facade of the cult of power, but in practice, the conditions of serfdom or slavery were less than ideal compared to the untrammled control over life a philosopher desired. The aim of ecology is to obtain the greatest slavery possible with the

least will spent to command slaves, and this required stripping away any virtue the enclosed populations held, and exploiting the land just as the people are. After it is done, environmentally destructive undertakings - for eugenics has a corrosive and insidious influence over every space and twists the natural world into the aristocracy's visions of it - are portrayed not only as "Nature's law" but that anything other than this spurious law is ipso facto "bad for the planet". What is really done is the identification of aristocracy with nature itself, and sublatung the old world with the new. Only in secret do fragments of the old world and old humanity remain. The "original sin" of the human race is preserved, but it purified form. For all I have written about humanity's foul origin in its deed, there was never any reason why humans were constitutionally bound to repeat the same cycle. The reasons why this happened are not economic and not solely described in this book, for that arc requires much, much more to explain how we got from there to here. What I have hoped to do with this book is lay out the laws of motion or mechanics that economic and political thought entail, with the latter being the subject of the next book and a history linking the two being the subject of the fourth. Only then can the technocratic polity, with ecology as its chief conception of value, be described as what it is, rather than with allegories from political thought that is wholly inappropriate to the real situation. Only after that description can eugenics proper be seen for what it is, rather than the facades of eugenics the aristocracy presents as the overt face of its program.

ECOLOGICAL CONSTRAINT 5: MYTHOLOGY OF THE LAND AND SYMBOLS OF SPIRITUAL AUTHORITY, IDOL WORSHIP, AND THE GURU

All of the prior constraints establish the "natural" boundaries of an ecosystem, centered around agents. The agents themselves are treated as information and nothing more, and have to be so. This reduces the ecosystem to something manageable for a plan, as the peculiarities and vitality of agents which do not want or need an "ecology" would make the concept moot if anyone thought about it at all. It does not occur to a primitive animal that it is "tied to nature" or "one with nature" in any spiritual sense, and it does not occur to humans at any stage of their development that they are any different. The human is acutely aware of the distinction between itself and the world before its existence, and how much knowledge or what system the human develops to arrive at this understanding - how thorough his insight into metaphysics or spiritual authority is - does not change at a basic level this connection life has with the world. It would not occur to any life, thinking or not, that it is intrinsically tied to any particular niche by spiritual or philosophical force. This is not to say that life would not be territorial or recognize that there are places it can thrive and places that are impossible to live in, but all of the possibilities are open and malleable. There is no serious moral claim that the natural world is supposed to do anything we would appreciate or consider rational, for the natural world was never premised on a rational will or intent. The natural world is not a living world, but a world

that is almost entirely lifeless. The first mythology leading to ecological claims is that the natural world and life processes are intrinsically linked, and that there is no world "outside of life". Ecology necessitates a concept of total society in order to be operative, in whatever way someone would conceive it. This may be a crude system worked out without knowledge of its full implications, but it always pretends to explain the entire cosmology of ecosystems in one grand narrative, which is substituted for the actual history of anything or the world in total.

Cosmology is necessary for us to place knowledge in its proper context, and this is what ecology must subvert and hold as institutional knowledge. In the past, the genealogy of human beings was important, but the origin of the material world was not particularly interesting or relevant to their concept of the world or what was morally relevant. Whether Adam was created from dust in the Earth, was just some random proto-human, existed at all, or any scientific claim derived from the Book of Genesis, didn't change the meaningful content of the story, as if the story must be thrown out because Adam was actually made out of water or quintessence rather than earth. Such a story is obviously a metaphor rather than something that literally happened and could be proven with archaeology, and religion has a number of dodges in case the natural history it suggested was questioned. The truly important cosmology in religion concerned the soul, human knowledge, the nature of the gods or whatever the spirits it suggested were relevant to our lives, and what the religion suggested about metaphysics that placed any investigation into natural history on some footing that was agreed upon. Ecology had to make claims about natural history political claims, and most of all claims about biological life had to be manufactured which edited the past or anything we are, so that humans would conform first to the conceits of a technocratic subject, and then to the eugenic creed, where Man was perfected into an expression of the aristocratic class. What results has less to do with any natural history, but a mythology that replaces the natural world and overwrites what we would have independently arrived at if we were the scientists. Only by doing this is ecology established. There is no ecology if everything the agents are is not diagnosed and commanded. Thought itself must become proprietary, enclosed, and part of the ecosystem. Since this cannot be done with actual thought, for the true form of knowledge would reject ecologism and ecologism, the command of thought would be held by institutions violently suppressing any expression, any symbol, inimical to the ruling institutions. "The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas" must be realized. Before ecology, the ruling ideas were never shared with the masses, who were not only allowed to maintain their own conceits, but discouraged from even knowing what the rulers actually thought and did where it was possible. The habit of occultism did not begin in modernity, as if the lords of the world were naive that the vast majority of humanity wished the lord were dead and hanged in public for great justice. Too many atrocities happened for too long for the ruled to ever love their rulers, and that was not even a thing seriously sought by past regimes. It is only with ecologism that rulers delude themselves into believe the slaves will

be made to love their slavery. They have so far encouraged some of the slaves to show a superficial, saccharine "love" of their squalid condition, but this is only possible by violently snuffing out anything good that the slave would have held onto, if only inside their mind and whatever small space they might steal back from the master. Ecology must claim that, and all things, for its claims to become real claims, rather than merely property claims like those of the past.

The claim of ecology is that we always "sort of" did this or that thing which is actually very modern, pressing backwards into an imagined past, as if time travel were possible while simultaneously claiming historical progress flows inexorably. This was never a claim of past governments that was serious. There was an acknowledgement of classical empires governed by laws that before the empire, states were governed by the will of men, because consistent law codes were a novel invention and the edicts of kings were never guided by any known philosophical principle. In some sense, religious institutions held untrammelled authority because the concept that there were classes who could say no was totally inadmissible, but the religious teachings would change with each incoming king, pharaoh, or whatever guru happened to teach at a given time. Spiritual and temporal authority were both the domain of willful men and no concept of law independent from that will existed, and this was understood as a development that city-states and empires encouraged. The modern ecologists harken back to this time intentionally, but superimpose the institutions of the current world empire and presume that the most ancient civilizations were secretly British imperialists. The response of anyone from Antiquity or before to today's world would be amazement that anything so monstrous and vicious would be allowed to exist, since the philosophies of Malthus were only compatible with vampiric torture cults of little worth to the world.

Such idolatry and self-abasement is inherent to ecology to make it ecology, rather than an accounting of the environment. The account of the environment, including the true conditions of its social agents, is a trivial matter compared to the totalizing concept of ecology. It is not enough for ecology to make a small number of claims about the environment or living conditions of agents. Ecology is very simply the doctrine of full and total enclosure of the commons, which had up to that time existed as a concept. Even after ecology is conceived as an idea of the elitists against those who are to be confined to this desultory existence, memory of a world where this did not apply still existed, even as its examples were further and further removed from political reality. It would not be until the declaration of the Open Society, in which "there is no such thing as society", that ecology fully displaced the older economic and political thought that was considered the default for the human race. Only by abolishing all that exists "into air" does ecology reinforce its edicts without interference from something as pesky as the ruled. Ecology demands the untrammelled force of those who hold the ruling institutions and nothing less for any of its demarcations to be anything other than a cargo cult. Humans in a free society, whatever the type of society they live in, are not so stupid to believe they don't live in an environment. The savage man, and in some primitive sense the animal, is attuned to their

surroundings, even if the latter has no language to separate the natural from the artificial. As my writing here suggests, this division and the suppositions that animals lack a sense of "self" or "mind" at all is an artifice of the intellectuals more than anything the animals actually think. What the animal lacks is not so much a sense of itself against the world, but a "theory of mind" which necessarily excludes the impure or any institutional force that can violently impose this separation. To the animal, to the savage, to many primitive men and to many living today who are reasonably safe from the beast that "society" became, there wouldn't be any argument for egotism or the excessive wank that is philosophy's calling card.

Information by itself does not move reality by thought alone. This had been the conceit of aristocrats since the first priest found the first brigand and joined forces. Nor do myths have power because of the performance of a ritual, no matter how elaborate and how much that ritual affects the physical world or holds meaning. It is only by making a play to claim all of the space in the mythology that ecology, and more primitive thought that led to it, can take hold. The thinking of the state and the political, which is beyond the scope of the present writing, operates with the outline of ecology already implicit in the conception of the state. If there is to be a total enclosure, there is only one arbiter which could affect that - the state, and the institutions, people, their bodies and the machines which comprise its worldly manifestation. It is here where the work on ideology, anarchy, despotism, and republicanism finds, at long last, a niche where it can thrive. Up until then, all political writers could only aspire to claim the world, and in reality controlled very little except the opinion of their fellow travelers and the loyalty of generals. The prior alliance of aristocracy and meritocracy was the alliance of the religious and spiritual gurus with warriors and a long-standing military culture where honor, property, inherited privileges and status in noble houses. That alliance saw all of the commoners - bourgeois, free-holding peasants, ruralites, the working class - as equally depraved and creatures to be kept under their thumb at all times. The true change in modernity was not so much that the warrior aristocrats were overthrown in a violent revolution - many times the warriors would reclaim their standing and acclimate to the modern order, and in many cases liberal reforms were not resisted by old men if they believed they had an in. It was not even that religious authority from the Church was replaced with spiritual authority from "The Science". It was instead a reality that a group among the commoners had, due to their utility in establishing states and bureaucracies, enough leverage to assert their own aristocratic aims, and a new alliance within aristocracy could form. This alliance did not appear overnight, ready made to command history forevermore. What had before been confirmed by metaphysical koans and the claims of religion on the soul would now be claimed by the aristocratic thinking of ecology, and it would be ecology that represented this new aristocracy rather than capitalism, the power of commerce (which was in the end controlled by banks who held a knife at the throats of the producers).

The mythological thinking must be internalized in the agents and made real,

rather than it being thought which passes through them which the agents regard with their native faculties. Religion attempts to do this when needed, but only certain religious tendencies actively did this. Religion often operated by defining what someone is not to do, and what they should do, with regard to a world that is, regardless of any divine claims, outside of the church's domains. Much of religion, out of necessity, made concessions to the believers that were not the design of the priests, but ways to hook new recruits into it. Religion proper is an even more elaborate matter than politics and inevitably encounters it, but in short, religion, its practices, and the true motives of its adherents, is something very different from ideology, which strips religion down to parodic form. Ideology is a pre-requisite for ecology to be sensical. This is not true of political economy generally, which concerned a direct moral aim of social agents regarding exchange. Nowhere was "ecology" needed to manage the multifarious agents in an environment or envision their relations. In political economy, the mind which manages any agent is divorced from the material conditions that are the proper domain of science, and this is intended from the outset. No critique can presume that those political relations were ever "natural" in the same sense that chemical or physical facts are, or presume that chemistry and physics were now subjected to the humanities. For ecology to be sensical, claims binding human thought to nature at a basic level must be made. Otherwise, the thought of humans matters very little to the actual conditions humanity exists in, including each other. There is, in the end, nothing great about our metaphysical models. They do not create reality - in studying metaphysics, we are only asking questions about how we think, rather than what the world "fundamentally" is. "Fundamentally", the world appears to us as chaos, and all of our theories are the best guesses we can make. They are very well researched guesses which we refine based on facts we can judge by some spiritual authority, but nothing we want fundamentally changes what we do or how we relate to the environment. We can change relations between each other, but to the world, nothing has really changed substance by the working of metaphysics or some magic humans conjured with wordplay. Only indirectly do our shifts in metaphysical thinking affect the environment, and for every such shift, we can predict the outcome without any great ecology binding a particular ontological view to reality itself. All philosophy can do is suggest how we think. This is very relevant to our political and spiritual thought and the affairs we conduct in an imagined world social actors set apart from the material world, but the only material concern in this is that philosophy - which is to say, aristocracy - can feed vampirically off the world, which includes the subjugated people. The subjects are told that they must internalize this vampiric approach to the world, even though it has not brought to any of them a single iota of genuine happiness. The only value of it is that aristocracy could, by assertion, make us abide this and there is no counter-idea that is co-equal with the authority aristocracy draws on. The only other such thought would lapse into aristocratic conceits, thus reproducing either the same essential structure of transcendent society, or something which retains the aristocracy's vampirism in a form that allows most of the bastards to keep on, surviving any revolution or tumult and eliminating any risk to their existence.

There is no power in human beings or any other intellect, and no knowledge or truth, which counters this with the same substance. There are many opposing forces to aristocracy which lay bare its farce, but none of them concern the same political and spiritual thinking of the aristocrats. In practice, aristocracy rarely rules in its pure and unadulterated form, and makes alliances with interests which tie to some materially substantive entity, co-opting them just as life itself inhabits formerly dead things. Aristocracy always seeks to undermine anything contrary to it, and the accomplishment is never made by worldly force or any merit that stands forever. To do this, aristocracy must infect the aims of other forces at work - other bases of power, like meritocracy, technocracy, democracy, or the "kakistocracy" that comprises the crude anti-politics of the residuum. The subjects must be taught that aristocratic political principles are the only "real" ones, even though aristocracy's contribution to the human race is extremely negative, to say nothing of its contribution to human individuals. Everything aristocracy grants to those who hold its titles was taken from the world, and that includes any virtues in men which aristocrats claim are their qualities, rather than qualities that rose from the muck or through that dreaded task that aristocrats know to religiously avoid - "work". As much as possible, aristocracy aims to make their "work" of ruling superior in merit to anything else people do, and all work is judged not by any merit we would find in it, or a scientific fact that can be independently verified, or by the esteem of comrades who speak to each other and agree that something should be done for goodness' sake. The efforts of the residuum to escape their condition, whether this is through escapism or the hopeless task of fitting into a human race that screams "die, die, die" to their faces and continuing despite that out of some stubborn determination, are too corrupted and turned into aristocratic parodies, where the "fool" is given false praise, but everyone remembers "once retarded, ALWAYS retarded" means torture and death for the residuum. Political economy had to abide that human beings are motivated by enough self-interest that such aims were contrary to any society worth keeping. Ecology must establish itself as the aristocratic scientific view, and it is here where science ceases to be the domain of those who work and becomes a purely institutional matter, and the most incurious and damaging thought-forms are mandated by pedagogy, so that every standard of comparison to call bullshit on the ecological pseudo-science is subverted. All that remains are tautological claims of aristocracy, which are held to be some sort of sublime super-truths we have to abase ourselves too. The aristocrats then claim that any of our thoughts are either "retarded", "insane", non-sensical and counterproductive, or that we aren't really saying anything at all. The only thought that is judged as intelligent is that which serves aristocracy, rather than intelligence by any objective merit that we would judge. It is here where eugenics can finally make its claim not at the level of families or clans, but a "race", which is re-defined as the political unit so that nationalism, internationalism, democracy, or any contrary model for the political is subordinated. It did not need to resort to a biological ecologism necessarily, and in typical fashion, the aristocracy carves out niches for the highest and lowest where death and the non-living still exist. For the subject, though, "life" is treated as inescapable and

totalizing, and yet it is alien to even the most basic sense we had about where we came from. Only on this basis does ecology establish its peculiar mythology. To do this, religion in the older sense must be replaced with a new chimera.

ECOLOGY AS THE ORIGIN OF DIVISION OF LABOR

What I have written above is hardly an introduction to ecology as a concept, or even terribly explanatory of scientific ecology, which despite its sordid origins presents some factual evidence for its claims. The mythology doesn't work by its utterance, but by knowledge of machines which can change the world, and all that exists is seen mechanically and must be seen as such. No ruler will rule by chanting koans and denying the world he wishes to claim and partition into ecosystems. What I write here explains why ecology came to the forefront, and displaced political economy as the understanding of those who ruled. In many ways, political economy was never really the project of the ruling class, or even something they desired to create. The economists, both classical and their modern counterparts, were never ideologues, and ideology is anathema to any genuine political understanding or worthwhile understanding of the world. The ecologists are and have to be, and understand ideology not as their true beliefs but as a machine like any other, and a necessary machine for states to rule. Ideology would displace religious institutions, whose claims were no longer desirable and which conflicted with the interests of technology. Enough technical knowledge had accumulated and entered the possession of the interested parties, and this resulted in the technological interest - represented by the rising capitalists in early modernity - obtaining a greater share of the nominal wealth. Many of the existing aristocracy understood that this path through science would be necessary, even when the scientists came from different interests. The old nobility now had to compete with men of common origin, and this did not trigger a struggle between essences or class identities as a crass narrative would proclaim. The true struggle of modernity, and of much of history, did not really concern classes that happened to exist by some fortuitous event, but interests which were understood and claimed, around which the classes could form. Social class had been understood as a proxy for what different types of men did in a society, rather than something that was ingrained in their constitution. Nothing about genetics suggested that "genes are destiny" for this highly specific purpose, which was always contingent not just on a natural environment or a society where that destiny was realized, but on mass acceptance that this division of labor by social classes was a natural fact, just as the rising and setting of the sun and the tides were natural. In practice, the claims of any social class, whatever their stated ideology and arrogance, were backed by some substantive mechanism that allowed them to rule, and those who ruled have always known that their superiority was under threat. This was not so much a threat from below, as if the teeming masses were not getting with the program due to not being smart enough to get the One True Religion aristocracy always declared in their heart. The threat came most of all from rival aristocrats, who did not intrinsically possess any unity or concept of a nation to be where they are. Far from it,

aristocracy always saw "nation" or any other grouping which associated them with their social inferiors as a burden to maintain, and did as much as possible to stymie or outright destroy such concepts in the imagination of the ruled. At the same time, aristocracy was premised on total and abject exploitation of all other interests. The chief rule of aristocracy, which will be explored in the next book, is that aristocrats do not work, and there are many crude reasons that a child can figure out to suggest why aristocracy would do such a thing. Aristocracy openly mocks the fools who willingly offer sacrifice to their cult, and leaves the subordinated little choice but compliance if it has its way. How aristocracy came to be the only possible concept of human government is not a simple answer, as if ecology made it a *fait accompli*. Because that answer requires accepting humanity's political thought, it is not something that can be explained by any natural or economic incentive that is self-evident. Even today, meritocracy, technocracy, and what remains of democracy are realities that aristocracy has to abide, even as aristocracy rapidly destroys all of them and constantly exhorts parodic forms. The particulars of why these broad groupings of humanity do as they do is not immediately evident from natural facts, since for much of human history, the "proper" incentives and imperatives of the interested parties were never religiously followed.

The division of labor seems to appear as a "just so" story, because since prehistory, humans are habituated to beatings, humiliations, arbitrary whims of a demonic race of apes that became just smart enough to threaten others to force a crude political settlement. Whatever the specializations of a particular person, nothing about what they do suggests anything about what they *are*. What we are appears as a series of events, playing out. Humans only have in the end the deeds of their existence to present as facts about themselves. The overwhelming majority of those facts are things that were not done in the present or potentials in the future, but the past. If humans are defined by what they *are*, this includes a genealogy of their ancestors going back to the foul origins of the human race. Yet, none of those things pertain to labor which is conducted in the present. The division of labor concerns not what exists here and now, which is variable, but a past demarcation which is adjudicated after it happened. It exists in the minds of people in society, rather than a description of natural forces or the essential nature of particular humans. The division of labor is from the outset a contrivance - perhaps a useful contrivance for the needs of certain people, but a contrivance nonetheless. It is not that Man must aspire to be a farmer, a workman, a critic, a philosopher, an entertainer, and every other profession, from a crude beginning where he was defined as one of those things. The chief division of humanity was not by the type of labor they did but by social class, tribe or nation, or some identification which was associated with certain political information. The division of labor that philosophers usually addressed was not the division between different types of manual labor or different categories of thought, but the privileges and distinctions of warriors and priests. All of the miscellaneous labors which were not delegated to slaves or the lowest class of untouchables were broadly deemed the muck of the producing classes, all of

whom could only struggle over the petty distinctions of their order of society. The division of labor between those who prayed, those who fought, and those who worked, was not based on any true inclination of the men to do those things, but was necessitated by the nature of the acts. Those who prayed concerned themselves with a spiritual authority which was not immediately beholden to any economic necessity, and openly disdained the muck of commerce. Those who fought understood that any act they carried out that was not in service to fighting was an extraneous activity, one that weakened the faculties necessary for the hunt or for the diplomatic stance of war-ready states. It was never an essential characteristic of those men that they were destined to pray or fight, or possess some special quality that allowed them alone to do those things. The division of labor in that regard was premised instead on both a want for those classes to not expend their energy on productive labor, and command of the environment which suggested that this condition could be realized at all. The producers and the classes beneath them have no built-in reason to believe prayer or fighting are the domain of specialized men at all, and their experience is that delegating such tasks to aristocratic classes is detrimental to their genuine freedom, security, ability to fight genuine threats, and any spiritual sense they possessed - and because Man is a spiritual animal even when denying that there is any such thing as spirit, delegating those tasks to aristocrats provides none of the things that the state purports to allow as privileges. If men do not take their security and spiritual authority into their own hands, humans will not be so generous to allow each other the same freedom the world readily provided to us. It is quite the opposite - aristocracy begins this division of labor only when it can sense that enclosing the world, the genuine environment that allowed this freedom, is technologically possible. In primitive conditions, this was not possible, and it was not for a lack of trying or a lack of interest of certain humans. The human thrill to dominate, torture, and humiliate other life, especially other humans, is something the race discovered early in its existence, inherent in all of its lurid sacrifices and rituals. Yet, none of those acts of humanity really created a division of labor fixed in nature, and in practice this didn't create any division of labor that was self-evident in primitive society. This is where the would-be technocrat invokes an image of primitive humanity in an ideal conditions, where everyone followed the elders and did what they "ought" to do. The reality of primitive life is that it would have been uncertain, and no human would have any reason to regard their tribe or family granting any specialized role or function. If such a specialization existed, it would have to regard the conditions a primitive band of humans were in - that life was scarce, friendship even more scarce, and there would be no law or anything to suggest a human wouldn't slit your throat while you sleep so that he may have more food, or simply to lighten the load for what remains of the band. The survival of the band, which was always an ad hoc party, did not have any natural basis, and tribal society was rife with interline and pointless conflict. It was not the tribe's business to create an orderly state, of the sort a technocrat or eugenicist needs to impose on the past to make their ecological conceit a true condition. The result is that primitive society, and in practice society all the way to now, did not necessitate any division of labor or

suggest that people should be reduced to any particular work task or role in society. That was always the design of social engineers who wanted to suggest an image to manage the herd, with full contempt towards the ruled and paranoia towards each other. The only thing such people share is a mutual hatred of those who are out of the know, who do not possess the secret political knowledge that was the true objective of this division.

There is of course a reality - that individual humans cannot possibly know all there is to know, and that knowledge inherently implies uneven development and distribution. This is no less true in primitive society, where some men knew more than others, and men ranged in age from their teens to their sixties and would have much different experiences. There is then material proximity to new machinery, such as gold mines, weapons and armories, scribes and temples. These machines that were developed are possessions which would be mutually exclusive and not so freely reproduced - we don't envision a temple or an armory for every individual man and woman, unless we are very egomaniacal beyond even the eugenic creed's obsession with the self. The division of labor is premised on the seemingly "natural" situation of limited information, in which ignorance is essentialized and internalized. Information and knowledge in reality are not proprietary things, or even particularly relevant to what humans do or why this division of labor exists. By knowledge alone, the division of labor is cumbersome and pointless, unless someone possesses a claim to property or the past to suggest it must continue, or there is a pressing of the nerve which considered the thought-form itself something that perpetuated a greater working. There would be a recognition that humans do not have fixed potentials which necessitate only one course of action. Humans possess limited resources and can only act with what they are given, but there is no force compelling "historical progress" that is natural or the working of a rational deity, as if knowledge can determine the outcome of any and all events. What a knowledgeable manager can do is predict, with their own faculties, as best as they can what a given human in a situation might behave. They cannot imperiously dictate what people are or what they would do in all situations, but they can reasonably expect an intellectual inferior or subject to behave in ways the manager has worked out. The manager can only see what the manager knows, and has no special insight into subjects, no matter how much management insists all aspects of the subject are now property of the state or "society" as an alien abstraction excluding the damned. Managers would never speak to an equal in the way they speak to subordinates, who exist purely to be humiliated and have not just no right to protest, but not a shred of dignity or a space to call their own.

The division of labor can only proceed in this fashion by ignorance, whether it is forced or natural. If it were truly natural, then ignorance would be a temporary barrier and could never arrest in the mind clear roles for people to follow under threat of torture. The specializations in nature would only be a resource to draw on, and human beings would due to a need for security refuse to naturalize the division or suggest that it is anything other than a temporary condition. No status quo based on that division could be seen as

permanent or a natural law, or any guide to worthwhile political life. That is beyond the scope of the present book, and since humans are not naturally inclined towards any fixed political settlement which is immutable, we treat such a temporary division of labor as irrelevant for economic life. Humans with different abilities do not affect the needs those humans would pursue, and those incapable of defending themselves against predation will find in the human race no friends, for humans forsook that a long time ago. The weight of their history has made that clear time and time again, even though it would seem right to a naive sense that we should favor friendship rather than this shit-show we call humanity. Because certain assholes insist we can only violently recapitulate the thrill of torture, and that the whole point of the enterprise was the same ritual sacrifice which gave birth to this foul race, humanity will never collectively know a different world, no matter how obvious it may seem that we could do better than this. Individually, humans are hampered not by a vague collective or "the stupid masses", but by institutions which could have only existed after extensive political and technological development, which for this book are not our immediate concern. Here and now, we could end this nightmare tomorrow, and on a small scale, we do this every day simply by refusing to be the most depraved creatures we can be. The division of labor is only something that can exist because institutions of more than a single person can judge that it exists, rather than any natural law mandating that division would exist. Morally, we might value different abilities and the bodies which acquire them with different merits, but this would not be the basis for a political division of labor or anything that would necessitate so much effort spent. If a division of labor must be reinforced with an unlimited supply of torture and violence, which are the only "pleasure" a follower of Malthus ever knew, it wasn't the starting point of human economic and political thought, but a consequence of it. Usually, political thought arose to explain what was happening presently, rather than any natural law. A description of seemingly natural laws or mechanisms would not present a state ready made, but explains its tendencies and why it would generally do as it does. There are both political and economic mechanisms that operate without regard to any society, because they are inherent in what a society is. It is inherent to societies as information communicated between agents, rather than inherent in the flesh and blood of those agents. Human beings, at a basic level, had no need of any such concept, and their political and economic affairs stemmed from some necessity in life and from the actions of other agents, who respond to each other more than any material condition. The division of labor in a given society may be seen as a temporary condition, or one that provides historical background so that we would know why we arrived here. It does not grant any more predictive power than reality and evidence would suggest. This may be a lot or very little, and that depends entirely on the technology in the hands of those agents, and a willingness to use it for some aim or conceit they have historically held. The moment a division of labor ceases to provide what those who rule wish it to provide, a new division will arise. For example, in the distant past, a vast technocratic bureaucracy was seen as either an impossibility or something to be avoided at all costs, because of the clear and present danger

such an institution would present. Nothing about technology suggested the state or institutions had to be these particular institutions the 20th and 21st centuries have been cursed with, and nothing suggested revolutionary struggle was necessary or something that could be corraled and cajoled to produce the outcome a schemer or grasper would desire.

What follows for the remainder of this book is a description of the division of labor as historical facts, rather than "the way things are" or how labor has been operationalized in society. If we are to imagine the pin factory or some other industrial workplace, or a group of men engaged in the hunt, among the workmen there isn't a "division of labor", so much as there is an allocation of duties towards some shared task. Any essential difference between the participants is not as relevant as the allocation of labor, which is limited and necessary for the operation as a whole to succeed. The operations of individual agents towards this task are not really a political division of labor, or a social value of great moral significance. There are distinctions in abilities and distinctions of knowledge, but the division of labor was premised not on a limitation of operational knowledge but a limitation of social merit and secrets that were held so that authorities could decide who lived and who died, and who would be given the honor or shame of some position which they were effectively locked into. That division of labor ultimately stems not from the merit of the tasks at hand, but merit to win a great game which is not economically necessary or even necessary for an ecosystem to exist. That game, which political consciousness is a part of, is beyond the scope of this book, but political consciousness informed much of the division of labor, which is reinforced by attaching moral value to the most trivial operations. Had humanity been a truly cooperative enterprise, we would see this ability not as a scarce resource to be hoarded and destroyed if it didn't fit an aristocratic conceit of what ought to be, but as a good drawn from the world that could be developed and given praise for what it is. The aristocratic society we got did the exact opposite. Deeds which were actively harmful or designed to immiserate would be given the highest praise, while anyone who believed humanity was good was now "retarded", the lowest designation that could be assigned to a human. This would be very bad if the social enterprise was premised on good will, but the social enterprise of the human race was not based on any such good will. What we do with that enterprise would be in principle something the agents can choose, but clearly the dominant agents chose something from which there can be no return, short of those dominant agents' total removal. The removal of those agents would not be possible because among the values those agents hoard would be any operation that allowed the removal of a clear and present danger. That is how the aristocrats originally seized what was already a failed race from its inception and chose to glorify its most abject failures as some great and holy virtue. Were it not for the insistence of such a failed political theory as that which we have been cursed with, the solution to humanity's most obvious woes would be obvious enough that children could see the solution, and would not need too great a leader to direct them like animals to follow the Hitlerian signal, as Germanic schooling has drilled the unfortunate

youth to accept. Yet, the hope was never left to naive children. Grown men and women have long suffered under this regime which served nothing good, and there are those desperate enough to believe that it could be different until their dying breath in old age. It is to those elders who suffered, who were told they possessed a "slave morality" in the idiotic conceits of aristocracy, that we all owe the greatest deference. While the so-called "best and brightest" squandered what hope there was in this race and the world, so many of us aspired to build something that was actually better, and succeeded for a time against the inertia of the demons of the human race. Those who truly wished to do good could see, usually by their twenties, that humanity truly was a failed and forsaken race, and this was why "race" was chosen as the political basis rather than what the nation or tribe suggested, or what individuals following some worthwhile spiritual authority would have done. They did good not for the sake of "human betterment" or crass egotism, or a sense of passing on their eugenic legacy or a naive belief that doing the right thing was actually just and good. The moral sense of humanity, and any other entity that would care to truly consider the matter, knew enough about the evil and the bad, even when "the good" defies description and seems to be forever out of reach. It was only ever out of reach of knowledge, and this includes any higher knowledge or prophecy humans or their successors would ever attain. Goodness was never something to be known, or something for us. Nothing good could come from a race born out of ritual sacrifice and the lurid cults that made us "us", and that has been proven beyond a doubt in the 21st century. The greatest work in defense of goodness was an act of spite and hatred for that which insisted we would repeat humanity's folly, and it was done not in the name of humanity or any eugenic interest, and it wasn't done for some technological fad. It certainly wasn't done because there was an aristocrat with any good in his soul to tell us what was right and wrong. It was not truly labor itself as a force willing goodness in spite of the adversaries to labor which are numerous. Labor showed itself time and time again to be fickle, and the democratic aims within humanity would all be subverted because large swathes of labor were amenable to supplication and never wished it to be different. All that is good is demonstrated by the condition of the lowest class, and a stubborn refusal to continue the purest retardation of letting this eugenic creed continue in any way, shape, or form. Nothing of humanity would have been worth keeping if there weren't humans working against this beast and its earlier incarnations, and no matter how many times aristocracy is laid bare as the cruelest farce and one that is entirely within the ability of people to eliminate, the true believers keep insisting that such an urge will work this time, if the Great Plan from the primordial light were just followed to the letter, including the parts which contradict the other parts. Despite all that has been done to shit up the soul of the human race, there is good in the world, and the good can only exist by despising the evil. This is no conceit of men or a natural law demonstrable by science, but it is something long experience has taught many of us, and that knowledge is not something easily transmitted by pedagogy or the ancient educational method of "monkey see, monkey do". What we can do, at this late an hour, is speak to each other without the fetters of some

busybody insistent that we have to agree with any aristocratic thought form. Even if aristocracy cannot be easily removed for reasons that are too numerous to recount in this book, the aristocrats themselves are aware that their way of life has never actually worked. Some of them will bemoan the sorry state of their peers, but for most aristocrats, they carry on because no sobering influence has ever required them to ask if this project was worth anything. Any such thought would be "retarded", and only used when aristocracy must cull its own or transfer laterally during the process of revolution.

The chief political division, and the true judgement of economic value, is limited knowledge that is made scarce. Even without this ecology and aristocratic mindset, scarcity of knowledge is inherent to knowledge as a process, and inherent to economic decision making. In the best of all possible worlds, this scarcity would be evident. The reason this limited knowledge has become such a dire problem is not that humans are too stupid to see the trap, or that there is a golden land where knowledge can be infinite, or that stupidity and ignorance are morally equivalent to genuine knowledge and the wise should be shamed for seeking knowledge. It instead became problematic because there were humans who chose political conceits and institutions over anything that was actually meaningful. The political knowledge required to maintain virtue or status is not so complex or arcane, but it is deliberately made so because ritual sacrifice must continue and the torture must be increased, and this is done not out of ignorance or a crass malice, but by the deliberation of those who were just smart enough to invent new scams every generation and insist we must respect any of it. This knowledge is not evident in the natural world, but those who seek the goal of politics must operate within natural limits and utilize natural forces to their advantage wherever possible. That is why above all, aristocracy and its thought-forms were anathema to science as we would have it, and the human race languished for many centuries when there was no good reason why science had to be the monopoly of imperious assholes or associated with people who did nothing whatsoever for science. It was not in the interests of genuine science to share any of this knowledge, for labor has proprietary aims just as capital and aristocracy would, and labor has to fight in a hostile world. What has been missing in all political analysis is the class that is as a rule excluded from all political life or even acknowledged as real for such purposes. Humanity rose from the muck to be anything at all, even the failed race that it is, but it was never the muck that was evil. Evil lurks in the datalinks as it lurked in the streets of yesteryear. But it was never the streets that were evil. Nothing in the muck justified anything that happened or made it good. The muck showed more virtue than aristocracy simply by existing as matter. Knowledge for everyone is a trap, but knowledge is the only guide we possess to communicate any understanding that it could be different. I am confined to writing words or gesticulating in hopes that this will facilitate something, and all of the deeds any human could do individually are irrelevant if they only exist on their own terms, without any meaning. Who alone in the division of labor wanted it to actually be different, except the lowest class? Aristocracy loathes to acknowledge that from time

to time, one of my naive fellows down here makes the mistake of contributing anything to this wretched and failed race, thinking that doing this will at least stave off the predators for a little while longer. It is this exploitation, rather than mere generalized and alienable labor, that is the proper source of value.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] In the next book, I begin describing the political not from the position of individual agents but from what the concept must entail at the level where politics is appropriate. Politics to be politics meaningfully does not exist over any preferred domain like an "ecology", and ecology proper makes political thought impossible. This is intended. For the position of the lowest class, the political aims are always understood as autocratic before they are anything else, for there is no "us", but this autocracy is primarily informed by the lowest class's lack of power over anything in the political. That is, the lowest class tends towards autocratic views of power because if they don't, they will always be taken advantage of and kicked out, no matter what they might have preferred to believe or any promises that they were actually a different class. For our purposes here, the lowest class - and it is the lowest class that is the proper origin of any concept of class society - does not produce, does not engage in economic life, and as a rule doesn't have any place in the world. "Oops, Wrong Planet!" strikes again, and the warning given in the 1990s was intended for everyone to "figure it out for themselves", as the world would be run into the ground for the vanity of some Reaganite criminals.

[2] And here "He who controls the present controls the past, he who controls the past controls the future" makes clearer sense. Modern eugenic ecology asserts a very futuristic view of the world imposed on the past, makes parodies of all genuine history and aggressively destroys them, and does so by choking the present world, placing it under siege. Economics in the older sense is superficially the justification for this, for economics must concern itself with the technology to realize this control, rewrite history, and ultimately push the human mind to accept those dictates. The primary science and useful mechanics of eugenism, like those of technocratic society, are primarily ecological, and do not regard economics in the older sense that Marx critiqued. Ecology also very pointedly rejects the political, except as the domain of the self-appointed stewards or in limited roles permitted of those bound to an ecosystem. The logic is premised on economic thinking turned into an ideological koan, but it doesn't resemble the useful meaning of the philosophy Orwell clumsily wishes the reader to associate it with. Everything about the German ideology, Marxism, fascism, and Nazism suggested inexorable historical progress came as it would. History was never arrested in that, nor was it ideologically arrested in liberal political thought. It wasn't even arrested in the mind of the conservative, who was always conscious on some level of history's alteration and how their operation worked. It was a particularly imperial illness, which required belief in eugenics and in the ecological logic eugenics entailed. The reading most were expected to take, if

they saw through the obvious philosophical weakness of unreliable authors and narrators, is that the koan referred only to an economic thought made real by force of assertion and unlimited violence without exception. Eugenics and ecology are conspicuously omitted by direct reference, not because Orwell wishes the reader to see the eugenic intent of such a koan, but because Orwell as we have made clear was a eugenicist and made his own doublethink, where eugenics was an unmentionable and yet the only solution to such a world in his mind, just as it was with Huxley. It is here where the eugenicist conception had no use for economics in the older sense, and the claims of free trade went from spurious to completely antithetical to the world that was now envisioned as "capitalism".

[3] Quote from "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy", page 53-55 (N. I. Stone translation): "Direct barter, the original natural form of exchange, represents rather the beginning of the transformation of use-values into commodities, than that of commodities into money. Exchange value has as yet no form of its own, but is still directly bound up with use-value. This is manifested in two ways. Production, in its entire organization, aims at the creation of use-values and not of exchange values, and it is only when their supply exceeds the measure of consumption that use-values cease to be use-values, and become means of exchange, i. e., commodities. At the same time, they become commodities only within the limits of being direct use-values distributed at opposite poles, so that the commodities to be exchanged by their possessors must be use-values to both,—each commodity to its non-possessor. As a matter of fact, the exchange of commodities originates not within the primitive communities,¹⁴ but where they end, on their borders at the few points, where they come in contact with other communities. That is where barter begins, and from here it strikes back into the interior of the community, decomposing it. The various use-values which first become commodities in the barter between different communities, such as slaves, cattle, metals, constitute therefore in most cases the first money within those communities themselves. We have seen how the exchange value of a commodity is manifested the more perfectly as exchange value, the longer the series of its equivalents or the greater the sphere of exchange of that commodity. With the gradual expansion of barter, the increase in the number of exchanges, and the growing diversification of the commodities drawn into exchange, commodities develop into exchange values, which leads to the formation of money and has a destructive effect on direct barter. The economists are in the habit of ascribing the origin of money to the difficulties which are encountered in the way of extensive barter, but they forget that these difficulties arise from the development of exchange value and from the fact that social labor becomes universal labor. E. g., commodities as use-values can not be subdivided at will, a property which they should possess as exchange values. Or, a commodity belonging to A may be a use-value to B, while the commodity belonging to B may not have any use-value to A. Or the owners of the commodities may need each other's indivisible goods in unequal proportions. In other words, under the pretence of analyzing simple barter, economists bring out certain aspects of the contradiction which is inherent in

commodities as entities simultaneously embodying both use-value and exchange value. On the other hand, they consistently cling to the idea that barter is the natural form of exchange, which suffers only from certain technical difficulties, for which money is a cunningly devised expedient. Arguing from this perfectly superficial view, an ingenious English economist has rightly maintained that money is merely a material instrument like a ship or a steam-engine, but not an expression of a social relation in the field of production and consequently not an economic category; and that it is, therefore, wrong to treat the subject in political economy, which really has nothing in common with technology."

Presented out of context, this quote is not terribly explanatory and covers concepts we have already discussed. It is better to read the original text to better understand the argument made, but we see here the difficulty of viewing economics without invoking political or social concepts that can't really regard space. The reality is that exchange in barter often did not entail the kind of trade that later economy meant, and the objectives of herding animals often were not productive or for exchange with neighbors, but a matter of status for the clan and the individual drover. There is no direct link from nomadic cattle-trading to the later commodity money of settled states, and the former continued not on the terms of monetary exchange but from the pastoral and landed agricultural interest of the farmer who held land, and doubled as the conscripted warrior or citizen-soldier depending on the time. More often than trade of the products of pastoral nomads was not for other such products, but for the payment of tribute, gifts, fines, debts by ad hoc schemes, and various markers of prestige. The size of the drover's herd was not an easily liquified asset to be divided, and this would be understood in any era. Very little suggests that there was much trade at all in nomadic society, and the default modus operandi was not commerce but conquest and feats to demonstrate the prestige of men in that society. There would, for one, be little of value to trade that wasn't reproducible within the economic unit. Nor was the value exchanged so much about a fixed social relationship in nomadic society. In settled society, where antagonistic and close relations led to classes of slaves, farmers, warriors, nobles, priests, and so on, the objects of trade did not directly map on to the classes or the relationships of individuals at all, but were always things to be exchanged for a purpose which could change at any time. The true value of holding someone in debt was never the face value in some exchange unit, but that the debt was enforceable.

[4] Herotodus, AKA "The Father of Lies".

[5] It is this that really bad philosophers, usually bad Hegeloids, insist is the real contradiction, which couldn't be further from reality. It is completely possible for an idealist ontology to reproduce science, because ideas did not intrinsically hold this mystical force the bad philosophers claimed they did. It is possible for materialism to turn into pseudo-mysticism and crass superstition masquerading as science. What is entirely elided is that these idiots believe political equality is either a *fait accompli* or "naturally impossible" with pre-ordained rulers selected

by God or a Nature deity. That this philosophy, regardless of what clothing it wears, is a slave philosophy for the incredulous enablers of this society's rot, is never to be acknowledged, because it would break kayfabe. So much effort is spent to protect the sentiments of people who should have been ignored in a better world, yet we are accused of "sentiment" for wanting basic things that such enablers absolutely refuse to allow us to have, purely by their violent imposition. These bad philosophers are nothing more than warrior-cuckolds - the lowlives of the intellectual class except devoid of the graces someone can attribute to thugs of every nation. Somehow, the 21st century presents a critical mass of incredulous true believers that are even worse than this. The bad philosophy is an artifact of the late 19th and 20th centuries, shepherded into existence when ecology and eugenics came to the forefront. Idealism and materialism are properly approaches to solve intellectual problems rather than "whole systems". It is with ecologism that such stupidity finds a chamber where it can derail anyone who would say no to the scheme, and this serves a function because the ecosystem is designed for these enablers to maximize their predatory mind rot.

[6] Among the newer mystifications of science is a belief that "anything can be anything" and so chemical knowledge established over the past two centuries must be relitigated and reviewed to be ideologically correct - that is, that the very basic substance of the world is now to be reinterpreted by the eugenic creed. Rather than diagnose the genuine flaws of today's institutional science and in particular the shibboleths regarding life and biology, the "critical thinkers" do nothing more than return to bad philosophy from the 19th century, because it is their instinct to retreat to the institutions, and for many of the professionals, the institutions are their power base. They will always go back to an imagined time where their shibboleths held worldly power, rather than acknowledge that much of modernity was built on a shoddy foundation. Rather than carry out reconstruction in a way that would serve what we down here want, the institutions are proud believers in "creative destruction" and other such philosophical horseshit. They'd rather destroy the world than suggest that their institutions could even be reformed, because they decided long ago that their stance towards the people was democidal and contemptuous. It would be trivial to speak some sense, but that would lay bare the failure of these institutions to do anything, and we would do well to remember all of the damage they caused. As long as the institutions have someone to kick down and feed off, they will always return to this. Only out of dire necessity does any advance occur, always on the terms of aristocracy and after the people have been humiliated and degraded.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

20. The Division of Labor by Rank, Prestige, Favor, Sentiment, and Property

In primitive conditions of mankind, no "division of labor" can be said to be operative. Someone may be able to look at a primitive band or tribe and see that different men and women do different things. Very clearly, the males and the females execute different functions, children do not participate equally, elders are unlikely to be as spry as the younger members. Differences in ability can be found in life-forms long before anyone thought a division of labor was operative, and this results in different people doing different things, and encountering situations where they must be different from each other. No two humans are perfectly alike or interchangeable at any stage of history. Yet, in these primitive conditions, everyone is equal in social rank, because no hierarchy can ever be stable or enforceable. No rank can be established in nature as an absolute in all cases, even in cases that seem obvious to us such as parents and their children. Children rebel, parents abandon children, and humans as a race were born not through harmony but through fratricide and cruelty towards their own. The closest members of the human race were typically the targets of this cruelty, and that pattern is still found to this day. Human relations that are close are often rife with suffering for no particularly good reason, and closeness is the most obvious risk factor to suggest something bad will happen. If humans simply didn't have much to do with each other and this were generally understood to be good manners, there would be far fewer opportunities for this cruelty and we would likely all get along. For a lot of reasons that should be clear to any human reading this, humans do co-exist and manage not to be cruel in all cases at the first opportunity, and this too has no particular reason to happen. A basic sense of decency from one that has experienced enough cruelty is an indicator that we probably shouldn't kill each other over nothing, and have to consider that something bigger lurks outside of our immediate circle of contacts. Human sociality is not reducible to any economic necessity or rule of nature, and the habits we consider inborn to humans that allow sociality to occur operate at a very basic level only. This means that humans in "free" conditions can consider their relations without any division of labor that they must abide. An ersatz division of labor may be practical for many situations and become a habit, but this division of labor ends the moment the social unit needs to do something else with the labor at its disposal. It is further the case that humans in free association are never fixed into any preferred units, and primitive free association dealt not with large populations or even a whole tribe in unity. Unifying a single tribe for any purpose could only occur in special circumstances, where a war chief would be raised or someone respected could be called upon for some purpose. Any social formation, from the smallest unit to its largest possible interpretation, is never fixed in membership, or in the abilities of its members. Members grow older, bring new children into the world, adopt new members, expel members, pass away, are injured, acquire new abilities or tools, acquire knowledge, and so on. Of the things that can be transferred in exchange, social units can exchange anything they can imagine without any intermediary or purpose suggesting that

a third party has any say in the exchange, and this explains the vast majority of economic exchanges in the human race to this day. We do not need to expect an economic rationale for most of the customs we follow or our daily interactions, as if every gesture, word, sentiment, thought, and deed were inherently a thing to be rationed economically. It is only when those things, and the objects entering social appropriation, are arranged in ecosystems that it is possible to speak of a persistent division of labor in the domain.

The division of labor does not actually concern individuals in the first instance, but a division of all agents in the ecosystem, regardless of their relations or any social unit. The division of labor is not a genuine state of affairs in nature, nor something that inherently occurs to the members as something that is inherently good. Individuals in free association might recognize their abilities and what would work best for a given task, but it would be highly counterproductive for members to decide from birth or a young age that they are, now and forever, a singular profession performed day after day. Necessity would require them to consider new possibilities even if the situation they establish became a habit and useful. The division of labor is not a useful construct for optimizing labor, but a construct for management of alienable labor commanded. It implies the division of labor is constructed in a single mind, or can be reconstructed from multiple minds working in concert towards a singular division of labor they hold as common for every in the ecosystem. It is in this light that the division of labor has historically been considered in thought concerning economics, politics, society, and most of what civilization takes for granted to decide who will *be* what. The division of labor does not intrinsically concern functions people *do* that can be distributed between members freely, but definitions of what people *are*. Even when the division of labor describes the functions people execute which can be conceived as functions any member could do in any arrangement of the division, they still imply that all the deeds of members can be tracked and assigned as part of the being of those members. So, even if someone is a fisher, baker, critic, actor, and everything else in different situations, all of these deeds, the abilities and potentials of the person, and so on are presumed to be things which are isolated and could be called upon, and so long as the thinking on division of labor is maintained, these tasks are all seen as disjointed acts which cannot be related or build off of each other. Either someone is all of those things and any failure is a permanent demerit, or they are none of those things and equally worthless no matter what they do. Any built-in inequality of ability is turned from a fact to a political crime which makes real the division of labor, and while this may superficially be declared a moral failing, the intent of the law always essentializes the criminal and the virtuous. It is presumed in the division of labor, however conducted, that the abilities of all members are limited and defined, if the division of labor is to be spoken of as something more than a conceit of what "ought" to be in the mind of a manager. If a manager simply asserts someone is assigned to do one thing or another for capricious reasons, this is not particularly effective. The manager can do this and often does, because managers are not required to actually meet any quota or purpose

other than bossing. The manager would be more effective at making peons suffer with knowledge of their genuine deeds and abilities, and knowledge of how best to twist the knife so that yet more drops of suffering can be extracted from the cattle. A manager who does not know who can be pushed with what will find that they cannot manage and face rebellion or mass disinterest in managerial orders, and this is the cardinal sin of management. A manager might be motivated to align this division of labor with something that resembles a useful plan, but generally, all divisions of labor are an expense and a burden on any given social unit. Managerial science itself will acknowledge this, but acknowledges that distinctions in ability will exist and deployment of labor in specialization will give, in that time and place, optimization of the system collectively. The ideal would have been for every member to be able to do as much as possible, such that a division of labor would be obviated. A quantity of total abstract general labor might be imagined and, as is instinctive for humans, more would be better than less if the labor was intended to be used for some singular intent. Every intent in the plan for an ecosystem may be judged in unison to arrive at something that is construed as an optimization, even if these labors could not be compared in utility or function. The aim of the manager is typically not optimization, but ensuring that the division of labor is controlled by management and the superiors of the manager, and promotion is entirely decided by management and without regard to any initiative of the laborer. If laborers can force the manager to need the laborer, the manager has failed at the most essential task of management - keeping labor suppressed in every way possible. If the manager was supposed to facilitate labor's development, the laborers would quickly see the manager as an unwelcome intruder, and the manager might consider the job best accomplished by doing as little as possible so that everyone is happier, and the manager can move to some other assignment. Nothing suggests the manager will be automated in this way, or that the superiors who are even more useless to labor will be removed by automation.

Without a thorough tally of all abilities and faculties of agents, the division of labor forms not out of genuine necessity, but for purposes of those who believe it is their place to tell others what they are. That has always been the heart of management - to assign statuses of Being, rather than command individual tasks. In this way, people do not need to be commanded continuously, but can be told "this is you", given some identity which is internalized. In this way, the division of labor is heightened. In an older society, the men would all be hunters, builders, and would gather as needed as this gathering was the major source of useful consumable product. The division of labor by sex has less to do with the necessity or aptitude of doing so, but proceeds for a number of reasons. The first is that the men and the women are in many ways two different societies that occasionally meet, whose members pair for reproductive purposes and because of an attraction of males to females. The females do not need most of the men so much and would be happy to be rid of men once their utility is expended, but the males often cling to the females for irrational reasons. The second is that validity in either society, and in the shared society of primitive

men and women, is based on tests of manhood and womanhood, which do not conform to anything useful or scientific at all. The performance of the role is more relevant than any actual outcome. Actual products or results of any such test are only necessary for acquiring food, which is a necessity of the human body and not a social construct, and for the dire necessity of fighting predators, who in the end care not about any social status, judgement of validity, or what someone was "supposed" to be in any division of labor. There is no aptitude or necessity suggesting men should all be hunters, or women should be consigned to gathering, or that there is any universality among men, women, humans, and so on. Necessity required individuals in primitive society to have the ability to do the roles of others in the division of labor, or at least know how those things were done. Without any large institutional society, all divisions of labor would have been too unreliable for individuals. Dependence was too great a liability, and would be exploited. Division of labor arises not out of genuine distinction in ability or function, but because moral value is placed on those distinctions above anything that was warranted by necessity. It is only because the abilities of humans are in reality limited that the moral values of division of labor intensify. Specialization of knowledge in individuals does not conform to any preferred division of labor, which must function at the level of an ecosystem and ecosystem alone. Specialization in a society of freely associated agents would not appear as "division of labor", but as a pool of abilities and functions that could be called upon in addition to the baseline functioning of members. Division of labor then is something that implies it is imposed from above and outside of the society, yet is internalized in the members of society, like an alien pushing people to *be* certain things. The division of labor never purely conforms to ability, merit, or any honest judgement of distinctions in people. It exists because there is a perceived moral benefit to assigning roles to people.

In the earliest division of labor, social hierarchy need not be implied by any ability or necessity, and it does not need to exist at all. The social rank of social members has little to do with any ability or merit or necessity at all. It exists for any reason that someone can get away with imposing, and it arises in the first instance because of a human propensity to lead and follow through psychological appearances more than any real purpose to social rank. The authority of social rank is not premised on spiritual authority or any machine that grants temporal authority. It is not even premised on personal authority or knowledge of individuals rooted in any merit or ability that can be demonstrated. The most basic instinct of social hierarchy purely derives from an instinct that compels humans to be impressed by appearances of strength, intelligence, and other performances. This reactive instinct does not even require the deliberation of any human to make it so. Humans, and many living things like us, are drawn to the superficial and appearances, and this judgement of authority has nothing to do with the truth or anything that we need to abide. What is important for establishing rank is not merit or talent, but the *appearance* of *being* strong, authoritative, and somehow "big", or at least bigger than the person who is submissive to that authority. None of the climbing of rank serves any productive

aim, nor is it necessarily efficient for management. It is something inherited from the animal kingdom and a fight-or-flight response that we possess, and life is always cognizant of a general fear until that fear is addressed and can be dismissed. One way to resolve the general fear is to simply not be around humans, who are the primary source of that fear. That is the main reason humans are so distant and cold to each other, and this is a good thing. Imagine if humans were in constant close contact, housed in barracks and under management from cradle to grave! That is the nightmare technocratic society envisions for us, holds over us. Then their agents hold a knife to our throats and make us like it, and tell us we are "social animals" by nature and should be happy with that. The need to heighten this sense of social rank by instinct is at the center of such a drive, and this was isolated and measured in the state school and in military drilling. We would, having seen the consequences of this instinct with enough reason, come to the conclusion that humans are by far the worst threat to any one of us, and that future contact among the race should be limited. It is this threat that drives a seeming division of labor as a "fact" of society. It would make sense for a manager to not desire this division of labor and mitigate it as much as possible, if the division of labor served productive aims or necessity. It exists because of forced ignorance, and ignorance as a desired state in society. No one has any reason to trust another human without reservation, and if we were in cooperative labor with distinct abilities, we would want to align those abilities for mutual benefit, rather than suggest that ignorance itself is worthwhile. Specialization would take on different meaning if the division of labor were cooperative, and would only be relevant so far as specialization conferred genuine benefit. If the variety of tasks in society increases far beyond the ability of a human's natural biological faculties, there would be a wariness of new technology and a drive to generalize technology so that this technological barrier does not become a class distinction and an essential distinction in social units. The greatest fear for a human is lack of knowledge and ignorance. The division of labor in economic thought does not mitigate this. It instead exacerbates it, because this is how humans establish social rank - they kick down to get ahead. That was decided from the first ritual sacrifice which make humans a thing. There is no good or beneficial version of that.

The distinction of apparent knowledge in human behavior is the distinction that marks division of labor in the economic sense. This is based on the superficial, because no social agent knows at sight the abilities and intent of another social agent. Division of labor implies antagonistic relations in close quarters, and this is what defines stable societies where institutions and states predominate over the will of actual humans. The most basic distinction then is not truly ability or something which can be adjudicated by any metric, but social rank. It is more important to appear as if someone is more intelligent and capable in one regard or another, then to actually accomplish anything with that rank. The earliest divisions of labor which are economically relevant are not the distinct tasks like hunting, herding, gathering, smithing, and so on, all of which are assigned to the rank of commoners. There may be a ranking within the division

of those functions, but the overriding rank is decided by the practice of war, domination, and acts of fealty and submission from the defeated. All of the various labors mean nothing when the prevalent practice in human society are these demonstrations of domination and submission. Those who actually essentialize hunting, gathering, breeding, or any other function, appear foolish when considering the true effort of humanity is to establish this rank. Any specialization of function is in service to this division of social rank. It does not yet take the form of classes or institutions, and there is in all humans a sense of social rank. It does not conform to a necessary hierarchy written down anywhere. Someone who is big and on top today can be overthrown tomorrow. Assassination is one way to climb the ladder, and one frequently seen among the ape that is a human. The contest for social rank produces a morass of rot and stupidity for no particular purpose, but it is done because of a propensity in humans to do this, and the propensity justifies itself. The object of winning is winning. The object of torture is torture. That is all human social distinctions were. If it were any other way, human societies would appear very different to us, and this dickering over rank would be seen as a futile exercise. Anyone suggesting that we should sacrifice and die for it would be ignored, and if persistent, they would be beaten down, and if that doesn't work, they would be purged. If the purge is not possible, then the only course would be extermination. It has in practice worked the other way around. Those who establish rank and domination torture, humiliate, and exterminate those who would change this most ancient rite of the human race. If the intercene competition for rank ever ended, it would undo the human project. Those who suggest that it would be entirely right to do this have an option, should they fail, to make themselves the enemy of the human race and wish for its destruction, and this is entirely correct. If humans are nothing but creatures who exist to climb rank and stab each other in the back, there is nothing for it but this, and we are left with the conservative dream for humanity - a struggle of all against all which is nasty, brutish, and short, just the way they want it and their god intended.

This is of course a terrible way to go about life, and so mere rank gives way to prestige. Where rank is purely an impression or a sense that operates out of a primordial sense, prestige claims that some marker of status is representative of both rank and a purpose beyond it. What purpose beyond rank is claimed may vary, and this prestige is never premised on truth or science or knowledge that is adjudicated in any way we consider fair. What happens is simple. Ranks which are at first implied and acted upon by instinct become rules of thumb, titles, and associated possessions. Nothing about prestige implies duty, but implies honor and standing that is respected regardless of anyone's assumptions and feelings on the matter. In this way, the stratification of rank is established without any institutional representation necessary to suggest it exists. This is little better, but it moderates the tendency of social actors to fight each other for rank, by suggesting that there is a standard of a person that is not contingent on a momentary feeling. It is instead something that is either a birthright, or a thing that once acquired does not go away at a whim. Someone can win prestige

which is acknowledged in society, but they cannot truly change rank just by asserting it is so. Prestige then becomes essential to someone in a division of labor. Those who specialize in some task can be identified not just by function but by a measure of whether they accomplish those functions well or poorly, and prestige can entail "functions" of a spurious nature that are granted status as if they were things we ought to value. In many ways, prestige makes the problem of rank worse, because now the contest does not concern a sense in people but a sense of something symbolic, that need not conform to any quality or quantity of the human. Prestige makes impressions for its own sake, and whether we internalize them is up to us. There is an expectation in people that we should not internalize these judgements, and retain our own sense of ourselves regardless of the division of labor. There is presumed to be some honor in merely presenting to work, but this is a dangerous fallacy, and one that people are made to internalize when they become slaves. That does not last long. The prestige of free men, on the other hand, is valued for reasons that make a lot of sense, and this prestige is often a perk of social rank. Someone who is bigger will demand compensatory prestige and creature comforts that reflect his or her rank, and that prestige becomes a thing to be protected and built upon. This would be a necessary development if it is accepted that social rank is inherent to any division of labor, and it arises as quickly as it can when someone acts upon the advantages rank would imply. A rank could not remain nothing more than a feeling or title if it is bereft of accompanying status. The prestige then becomes a basis for intensifying the distinction of abilities that was recognized in the division of labor originally. Those who become nobles specialize in the arts of war, and usually - but do not necessarily - prohibit the subordinate ranks from fighting. It is above all important in the division of labor that nobles have a right to attack the inferiors and the inferiors are not permitted to fight back, and this is only enforced by ruthless punishment for transgressors. Kindness from the noble and viciousness of the peasant will both become great taboos or crimes, and these concern not the deeds but crimes of Being.

The division of labor proceeding by posturing alone would not last long without encountering a few obvious difficulties. Most people cannot establish the impression of rank or prestige, and by definition someone will be bigger or more prestigious than another, with no other qualification involved. This is a losing proposition for most people, who recognize that they would only rise so far in rank before they are knocked down. The people in society, wherever they may be, recognize that they can possess things in the world without requiring rank or prestige, but they do not need to actually subvert rank or prestige with something substantive. They can instead offer favors - *quid pro quo* divisions that are regarded both in bilateral relationships, and within the ecosystem as a whole. For division of labor to be sensical, it pertains to a selected ecosystem in which agents operate. Otherwise, no one would participate in any such scheme. Because the ecosystem is established, favoritism arises within it, and to the participants in a given division of labor, there is nothing outside of the ecosystem, or outside of "society" in this crude sense. Favors are extended only to those in

the know of a particular division of labor. Those outside of the division simply are not counted, and considered alien for this purpose. A foreigner in another part of the world has no intrinsic part in the division of labor, unless that other system is subsumed in a larger "system of systems" that is the design of someone claiming the whole thing. Foreign influences are within a division of labor an intrusion and an alien element of the scheme, and the typical outcome in a given division of labor is to mediate all foreign interaction through institutions. The last thing someone planning a division of labor would want is an outside influence disrupting that plan. The system of internal favors suggests grasping for position within the system, and that anything outside of the system is not to be encouraged. This favoritism is aligned at core with the technological interest, and concerns a crass interpretation of technology rather than anything high-minded. Favoritism does not seek equality or domination of one party, but suggests the whole ecosystem should be oriented towards social climbing, scratching each others' back, and that the members of society are motivated primarily by self-interest. Favoritism suggests a base-level material interest and conditions to push the division of labor in the favor of participants, and alliances based on compromising the participants to enforce loyalty. It is the default mode of operation for the class Marx termed the bourgeoisie, and those who sought to climb in that niche. A crass and self-serving substitute of social class in the form of identity is their preferred organization, but this identity will always be limited, and participants are not equal. The aim is never to end rank or prestige, but to acquire it for oneself, and use this to dole out favors. Those who possessed rank and prestige adapt quickly to this strategy, and use their positions to extract greater favors than those who are struggling to climb. Nonetheless, the interest of social climbers always aligns with preserving rank, prestige, and its associated institutions once developed. There never was a version of favoritism which strictly opposed rank and prestige, and among those with that status, they recognize that a collective interest based on favors is an effective method to protect the system of ranks and all practices they entail. Over time, the favors themselves become marks of distinction that describe someone, rather than merely events in the consideration of rank. The members of society establish in-groups, out-groups, lists of friends and enemies and the particular favors owed, and what would be expected of members. These are recorded and become permanent statuses, and affect the social agents in the long term.

These three things suggest a division of labor premised on little more than climbing rank and demonstrations of prestige, and for that reason, it is the preferred division of labor among those who rule, who have viewed social agents as things to be tracked in some system under management. Opposing this is a sentiment among humans that suggests that this is not a good way to establish a worthwhile purpose, and that the division of labor should not serve management but some purpose that is cooperative. Without any preferred formation, the agents may share sentiments among each other, or with any grouping inside the division of labor. For the same reasons that foreign influence is denied favors or rank, sentiment towards that which is foreign to the ecosystem is discouraged by

managers of a given division of labor. If that happened, once again the aims of dividing labor in the first place are undone. Within the ecosystem, there is nothing intrinsically binding the agents contained within to each other by a sentiment for the ecosystem or for the division of labor itself. Far from it, sentimentality arose largely to counteract grasping for rank, and suggested that there was a purpose beyond economy to this division. If the division of labor is already established by the first three, though, this sentiment can be manipulated by the ruling interest, which insinuates an even more grotesque scam. That is that this division of labor, rather than being an imposition of rulers and a condition of ignorance, is actually something to be proud of. Members in the ecosystem are intended to share sentiment with the ecosystem and the division of labor alone, to the exclusion of all other sentiments. All private sentiments are to be abolished, and all favors are to be viewed purely as part of the game to rise in rank and prestige.

Because this is for now operating purely in the realm of psychological motives, the division of labor in this light serves a purely foul purpose, bereft of any other purpose. There is no reason at all for this condition, and if the agents of an ecosystem did consider their true position, the contest for rank would be seen as a waste of effort altogether. Those with rank must rely on some resource outside of their conceits to allow the contest for rank to continue. Sentiment alone would see correctly that the entire construct of an ecosystem or an "economy" that is alien to them is nonsense, and would seek to violate the division of labor by working with agents outside of the ecosystem if this is possible. Agents in another ecosystem would be organized most likely by similar sentiments, all things being equal. This has been seen in human history. The inhabitants of one nation or one tribe are not very different from another in their basic wants and the condition of their society. No great cause for tribal or national unity can be found in the division of labor or any material necessity. The reasons for tribal conflict have nothing to do with a division of labor, or some imagined hierarchy of races as a Hitlerite would imagine. They stem from a political source. The conflict between polities never serves a true economic benefit when economic activity is viewed in its proper mechanical form, and thus it is outside the scope of the present writing. Yet, there is a reason why this can happen and then turn to division of labor as a way to discipline those inside an ecology to comply. Economics and ecology are concerned with command and control of actions within a tribe, nation, or any other social formation where exchange and economic cooperation are real conditions. There is no version of either concept which could be a vehicle to abolish the conditions they imply. The only way this would happen would be to view economy and ecology as obstacles to overcome, and in any physical view of the world, the problem would be trivial to resolve. The problem at heart is a sense in human societies that the division of labor by rank, prestige, favors, and sentiments should continue for reasons that make sense at a base level, and that participants in society are induced to accept for no particular reason. When those who rule have run out of psychological buttons to press, they will turn to the functions labor can perform, and see which of

them can be purposed to activate the psychological levers which were always at the heart of any philosophy of rule, and at the heart of aristocracy.

The final sentiment is then a sense of property, when all other sentiments that can be manipulated have failed. In the end, mere rank or prestige mean nothing, and none of the favors or sentiments offered to suggest that division of labor is worthwhile can convince agents to abandon a sentiment they hold that this competition is pointless. The members of society are not stupid, and recognize this situation for what it is. Rank, prestige, favor, and sentiment in this way can only persist if they are transformed into property claims. Even in isolation, the member of society understands that they must hold property of their own, and that property can be defended jointly for reasons that have nothing to do with favors, sentiment, or the division of labor. Property need not be identified with the property of ruling institutions, and in practice, many forms of property compete with each other. The sentiment for property is not institutional or a mental disorder, but a basic defense mechanism of any human who encounters this division of labor. Like the other sentiments, it can be and often is repurposed for the animalistic behavior mentioned above, and it is itself another such animalistic behavior. The property holder at a basic level is wary, conspiratorial, and has no reason to ever trust a neighbor or supposed friend. Distrust is the default sense, and the freeholder is rightfully contemptuous of rank and prestige. Indulgence in such sentiments in society is sickening to the free man or woman, for perfectly reasonable purposes. When push comes to shove, all of the favors and prestige of grasps give way to their property and acceptance that their rank in society will be whatever is possible in the division of labor, and in the mechanisms that may allow for class mobility. The property claims themselves do not arrest this mobility, or suggest that property is fixed in nature or the ecosystem. The claims to property can be held collectively or in any arrangement, for property is not limited to private property in the liberal sense. The commons, and the primitive sense of property in tribal society are no less individualistic than private property. The commons are preserved not because of managerial intent, but because it makes a lot of sense for the commons to not be polluted or claimed by malevolent agents. Strangely, humans manage not to violate the commons grossly until aristocracy is able to insinuate that it will be able to do so. There is in the end only two sentiments which are spared by aristocracy - rank and property. Aristocracy seeks "class collaboration", and when this watchword is uttered by the fascist, the fascist is not invoking a reasoned argument of what social classes are and what institutions are. Such thinking is anathema to the fascist. The fascist is instead working entirely at the level of these psychological sentiments, which are always aligned with aristocracy of the most unforgiving form and the perverse conceits of it. It is for that reason that very peculiar conceits about property are introduced. The only way they can truly be enforced is through total control of all mechanisms in an ecosystem, and the mediation of all that happens within the ecosystem and from outside of it. Aristocracy will never survive in any other way. How the aristocrat chooses to do that does not need to conform to any particular ideology or interest that necessitates the behavior. The

aristocrat does this purely for a core sentiment, and works feverishly to insinuate that all others in society should follow this sentiment. Their establishment of rank must become identical with prestige, must be the objective of all favoritism and grasping, and must abolish all sentiments except love of the aristocracy. It leaves the property holder as a void, an asset to be pushed and cajoled. The objective of aristocratic property rights is not to defend the property holders at all. That's the stupid way. Aristocratic property rights presume a monopoly on those rights by aristocrats, who are motivated purely by rank and their lust for command. The ultimate aim of all aristocrats is simple - abolition of property as a sentiment, in favor of untrammelled aristocratic rank privileges, which need not regard prestige or the favors people might have made with each other, and which subvert all sentiments and destroy most of all sentiment towards those in humanity that are not controlled. What would remain of property would be nothing but an institutional ghost, in which the property holders are reduced to abstractions which must abide laws that are not decided by men, but "natural laws" that are asserted by an aristocratic recreation of reality. This recreation of reality can only operate within this ecological system that is controlled, where the division of labor is total and believed to be a natural condition that is unquestionable.

This, of course, is absurd. But, it is indeed the condition that has been realized, and it is inherent in the very way divisions of labor can be observed. We can indeed speak of ecosystems that are distant from others, such that we would not presume actions far away would have any meaningful immediate effect on anything happening in the village or some locale. The fullest division of labor can only persist by ignorance. Therefore, in the end, all knowledge becomes proprietary, and the aristocracy declares that history has ended, and simultaneously history is bunk, and history is still continuing onward, now as an inexorable force which aspires to some aim only a prophet can divine. The realization of this ideal is never complete, but the interest in maintaining it is persistent, and insists that no one is allowed to work against the program.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

21. The Divison of Labor by Function

Without specific functions for labor to perform in the world outside of society, any division of labor as a conceit in society will not be relevant for long. The claim of all who aspire to create a division of labor is that the division of labor is tied to natural limits, which apply only when the society is perceived to exist in a fixed ecosystem where the conditions are definite and seen as immutable. If the conditions of the ecosystem or society were mutable, then speaking of a "division of labor" would be a temporary situation at best. As mentioned, if it were conceived that the division of labor could be other than it is, then it would be evident to anyone in society that such a division is undesirable and

unnecessary for any productive purpose, and so ecology and economy would not be excuses to maintain it. The aim of those who aspire to heighten division of labor is to find the first excuse to say that the division is somehow necessary and inescapable because of conditions in the world, which do not involve any decision of the agents to make that division necessary. This is strange because the division of labor that is most evident does not serve any productive function at all. The division of labor predominately segregates producers into one or two classes, all of whom share the burden of work, and does not deign to care about the various tasks. The managerial, soldiering, and aristocratic tasks do not accomplish anything productive, and often work against the productive tasks entirely. In short, the division of labor primarily exists to feed those who wish to manage or rule, or fight each other for position. It is only after that fact that division of labor is suggested to stem from some natural rule. It is permissible to speak of division of labor changing gradually as the material conditions change, or as people are reformed since the people themselves are material bodies and are malleable like any other product. It is a conceit of developed society that people are immutable, but every act in the division of labor and many things human do outside of it tell the truth - that they have from the start considered other humans to be prey or machines to be manipulated just like anything else. The belief that people are immutable is a political fiction and usually said by those who wish to hold a monopoly on the command and manipulation of people, and forbid this manipulation to be practiced in reverse, or in ways that would challenge the monopoly. People are, of course, not as malleable as inanimate objects, for reasons that make a lot of sense. They are always aware that others are trying to manipulate them, lie to them, and make them do something they really do not want to do. A simple observation of human malice and cruelty towards each other can be found in every day the human race has existed on this Earth. Those who claim this is not what happens are shouting "retard! retard! retard!" at someone when they say this, and they barely pretend that they are saying anything else. To claim that the self is sacred or inviolable is a way to tell someone that they are stupid and denied the right to defend themselves against others' manipulations.

I have, in hindsight, segregated human labor into seven different tasks that are *politically* relevant. Though we do not possess political thought at this early stage, we will see how the seven tasks form the basis for institutions, social classes, and thus the conditions which politics can contest. The tasks of labor are not purely political tasks, and much of what people do is not "political" in any sense, even among those who are political specialists. Very often, professions of people will involve more than one of these areas, or don't conform to any position in the schema. Only in oblique ways does the segregation of classes follow from this division of tasks, and very often, full members of society are expected to carry out functions of production, fighting, and learning. The monopoly on violence held by states and delegated to nobility and warriors was less about the common folk being literally animals and incapable of fighting naturally, but the nobility exercising an exclusive right to violence and adopting an ethos which

emphasized the glory of their violence and the subordination of production and commerce. The separation of classes into producers (which is split within itself between commercial enterprises and labor), warriors (and proprietors whose claim to wealth is not about exchange but property rights), and clergy, did not occur as if it were just so and made sense, but because there was a nobility to take this right, which made a point of asserting it over the objections of everyone else. All of these tasks devolve to a simple truth of human society - that it lives an environment, and all societies extract from the land to perform any of these tasks. Even the basic functions of human thought and the body are extracted from the world. Virtue is never a given in people. It is always taken from somewhere, and that somewhere is typically the humiliation and degradation of another person. Nor are the productive qualities of humanity things inborn and inviolate. Everything we are is the result of the root process in societies that allows for everything else, which is extraction of raw materials from the land. We quickly move beyond that basic requirement and must become something more to develop society in any recognizable form, but even the most basic laborious task we conceive in our mind is at its core a physical and chemical process. At no point can its existence be taken for granted. Physical and chemical processes can be changed, and if that is true, then all social processes can be engineered by scientific means. This is obvious even to a child, but political society requires upholding a lie that it is not so, despite every act of the political class stating that they engineer society as they see fit. Because humans are aware of this without too lengthy an investigation, political consciousness diverges from its material origins, and must present labor proper as something opposed to the world, done to the world by willpower and managerial intent. So thorough is political thought that in adulthood, the material origins of these things is abstracted away, and the division of labor is presented as something natural yet obviously the design of people, as most labor is either something done by choice or something commanded by a manager who chose it. That is what marks labor as something distinct from other sources of motive force in society - it is willful, and it is managed either by the agent themselves or by another agent. The division of labor is rooted in what is politically useful, and only after this consideration are social valuations made and associated with some token, like money or credit or reputation. Whatever non-political associations someone might make with labor do not factor into the division of labor, until some political value however dim is attached to it. It is entirely possible to make a type of labor more or less valued simply by arbitrary diktat, so long as the impression can be sustained and it suits whoever would maintain it; or some labors whose political utility is not immediately evident have gone on for long enough that they become more or less standard. It is not strictly speaking necessary to pay the "social wage" - the various benefits and expectations members of society have about what it means to be human and to belong. The argument of raw material necessity would reduce to a scenario where humanoids are crammed into hive complexes, fed a diet of soylent and drugs, brainwashed by the most efficient means possible to be reduced purely to the functions programmed into them, and the social wage would be ever-lower until it is almost nonexistent.

Nor is it easy to measure what the social wage will be at any given time, because the expectations of people shift. A drive inherent not just in capitalism but in political society and education is to grind down all conditions to their barest minimum.

From the outset, scientific treatments of political economy entailed transgressing expectations once upon a time thought basic, and inventing new expectations that either marked a transformation of mankind that was an inevitable consequence of the scientific mindset, or new expectations that valued a thing that was worthless or even harmful. Once it became possible to invade private life and create a vast impression, when the general fear was harnessed by scientific management and control over society, the social valuations ceased to be related to the productive aims of the past, all of which could have been planned rationally without money as such. Instead, the social valuation of eugenics would be misery itself. The infliction of misery on undesirables became the paramount good, and all productive enterprises would be oriented towards the objective of increasing human suffering and the marked distinction between the residuum and the valid. Vices that were once upon a time a nuisance tolerated or only partially accepted in empires became praiseworthy and expected, while decencies and probity would become a luxury for elites only. Decency and any sign of virtue in the residuum would be deliberately and viciously attacked on all fronts, as such a thing was anathema to the dominant values of those who made decisions, and these decisions would be passed down a chain of command and follow interests beyond mere ideology, which did not always line up with the core eugenic creed. All of these ideas about managing the economy have to encounter a world that existed before them, and the most virulent ideas sought to abolish the material world entirely and supplant it with an entirely politicized concept of reality, going as far as claiming reality is "always mediated", which is stupid to anyone who thinks for five minutes and isn't indoctrinated with slavish loyalty to institutions over their own sense. At the same time, political conceits take on a life of their own, and are reproduced by the machines people build and the actions they take. This is not particular to modernity, nor is the present state of affairs the only possible state of humanity or its "true" state. The present state of affairs is in true reality far removed from what it is purported to be in the ruling ideology and the dogmas presented to those who were selected to die, and a dual system of political values is created. For those selected to live and participate in valid life, the real situation is known to a sufficient extent, and there are a fair number of hints in mainstream media and culture about what is really happening in economic life. For those selected to die, blatant falsehoods about basic political values are uttered repeatedly, and those selected to die are trained, in various ways, to internalize the lies and present themselves as living abortions to the valid. The lower ones' rank among the castes of the residuum, the more abject the humiliations, with a small minority singled out to be nothing more than humiliation targets, so that the rest of the residuum has an example of what happens. If such a class did not exist organically or did not exist in sufficient numbers, it would be necessary to create it, and once the idea of the suffering

class takes root, it is morally necessary to tell all who aspire to be valid that open torture and humiliation of the suffering class is the most sacred civic duty, the basis for any republican society. To do otherwise is to give up the project then and there and surrender to rot, perceived or real, and should the damned live and attain any means of vengeance, the damned would be obligated out of dire necessity to take back whatever of the world they can, or at least enact retribution for what was done to them.

It must be understood that the categories listed here are not so much fixed in nature, but fulfill various requirements of what a human society would do to remain relevant. These can be conducted by a single person, or by a division of people into classes, or by dividing the tasks among the people by some scheme without class distinctions as such. The division of labor then is in reality less about the essential roles of people when it concerns a substantive claim to the world, but the functions of those people which can be split apart from them and seen as ends unto themselves. It is not the men and women who are relevant, but what they do which ultimately allows this to continue in a real world, whether that world is imagined as a material world or a realm of ideas commanded by reason.

Extractive labor - The most basic task is to extract raw materials from the Earth, or some space, and bring them into possession. In other words, reaping rewards from the processes of nature. This process begins with the formation of life itself in some natural environ. It does not occur to non-thinking life that it is doing anything at all. Animals, or any creature with a central nervous system that causes the body to react to the environment in some deliberate way, begin the emergence of the other types of labor, and the fullest emergence arises with humans due to symbolic language and politics in any meaningful sense. The quantity and quality of the output is dependent less on the input of labor-power and more on what a particular piece of land or space will yield. Examples of this type of work are farming, mining, oil drilling, and processes which are dependent on claiming territory, from which some thing may be extracted that is useful for another purpose. The output of this work provides the most basic resources a society has to do everything else it would want. The view of the proprietors, in the final analysis, is that they are exploiting territories, and the people in that territory are just another natural force to be harnessed. The crudest view of society is to view the whole economy as a farm or plantation, all life as livestock with definite utilities, and that the size of the output will be in the end fixed. The role of the proprietor and manager is to lord over that fixed output and allocate it as he sees fit, and this is simply the way of the world. This reasoning makes sense because at a basic level, it is the true form of living economic activity if seen from afar. Even the crudest task of extraction, though, implies some transformation that was initiated by a human being, or a machine built with intent by a human, in order for the extracted material to enter social circulation where it could be contested. Those employed in extractive work, though, cannot through their labor alone induce the land to yield a larger harvest or contain more metal, and any attempt to push extractive workers harder reaches this

limit where extra motivation to work changes the output very little. Earlier human societies were predominantly extractive, first living off of what could be gathered on the land and then being predominantly agricultural.

Basic labor - The next task is to fashion that which is extracted from the Earth into either other products, or to consume the raw or produced materials to reproduce social life. In settled society, this means the most basic tasks of industry and reproducing cities. There is necessarily a baseline of "unskilled labor" that is accepted as necessary to speak of labor possessing various gradients of skill, and it is common observance that many abilities of human laborers are so common that they are expected by the vast majority of humans in society, or that the laborious tasks are trivial enough to learn that education does not need an elaborate ritual. The ideal of this basic education would be that the workers, and all members of society, reproduce the baseline expectations of a man or woman of their own volition, or through familiar relationships that are associations people would make because they want to or see the relationships as more beneficial than the alternative of not learning. In practice, no society can acquire freely every labor it would want for a managerial purpose, and every society faces internal and external pressures to maintain its cohesion and its existence against foreign attack. A disciplinary function to ensure this basic labor is socially valued and brought into society is necessary, even if the discipline where originates from an abstract organizer rather than a willful person. The most basic disciplinary functions are expected of the people themselves, individually or collectively. Environmental factors outside of society only have so much effect, because even the simplest laborious task requires some thought of the laborer to be useful labor, rather than simply a natural force to be harnessed like any other. The workers respond to events in the world only through the sense that occurs to themselves, and any sense that society would provide through education has to end with the worker's own learning, to change the worker's response to events or the volition of the worker. The most basic industrial tasks are to transform raw material into other consumable products - grain from crops into bread, wood from chopping into all the things that wood could be fashioned into, and so on. We are concerned here only with articles of consumption, rather than the particular craft going into the object, or the manufacture of tools, though any tool from the simplest to the most advanced machine is also a thing that is consumed like any other raw material.

The earliest industry is little more than workers who would extract engaging in some craft on the side, in addition to their primary extractive duties that would have been seen as the actually important productive enterprise. Perhaps someone makes pottery, or another fashions clothing. Formal industrial work, at first, concerns specialization towards making these things in larger numbers, and so the home pottery is replaced with pottery produced in some facility. This organized industry exists alongside home manufacture for a long time, and part of the family unit is that the wife would be put to work in some craft for the household's need of industry, in addition to the children. It is not at all instinctive for people to line up in some civic plan to arrange industry in a

factory, even when the factory arrangement can be demonstrated to be more effective. Urban society, and then the philosophical treatments of menial labor, maintain a belief that self-sufficiency in basic industry is desirable and that any of the desultory labor that constitutes "basic industry" is beneath a free man's dignity. Further reasons for this can be explored in the mercantile function, or the other functions which discipline labor, but at the basic level of the potential consumer, workers do not like to work for no gain or any accomplishment of their self-interest, and compulsion through fear or any other mechanism is only so effective. Slavery or wage labor can provide basic labor to produce a great many things, but the majority of motive power in any society is provided by no particular relation that is compelled by threats or money. The daily reproduction of one's own life is not strictly a task carried out instinctively like breathing, but is something people do and think at least a little about. Someone will bathe, or discipline their manners for a reason other than fear of the law or social shame or some exalted wisdom. A considerable part of this basic labor, to the present day, concerns simply cleaning the environment around people, so that garbage is not piled haphazardly, or that articles of use in our home are not lost due to a disorganized living space. The maintenance of health is at first something we do for ourselves or for reasons that do not require us to be told what is healthy by a pedagogue. What a person is, of any class, is not merely produced by consumption of the environment around them, but by their most basic behaviors, so voluminous that even the most detailed scheme could not break them down to replicate a functional human in a computer algorithm. The reproduction of a city carries this out in a much more organized way, and of a large empire even more basic labor is required. Therefore, it is often the case that societies primarily concern themselves with how to acquire more of this basic labor, increase its productivity, increase its efficiency, successfully reproduce that basic labor both in the person and in larger organizations, and improve the baseline of that basic labor so that more labors can be taken more or less for granted. This question is essential for most of the more elaborate ideas of what sort of society is preferable for the members of that society. The most successful societies historically worked towards all of these goals, from the starting position that their societies were largely premised on an antagonistic relationship and had to find some way to reproduce their society and adapt it to new conditions in which it exists. The failed societies would either neglect the most basic conditions of labor or their social arrangements would be rife with intericine conflict, for reasons petty or large. None of the historically dominant ideologies have been particularly successful if we look at them from afar and without bias.

There are two extremes in the view of the division of labor, and these views are - in accord with a philosophy which celebrates contradiction and hypocrisy - held simultaneously. One is that all labor is really base labor, which is in many senses a true claim in that all labor must be understood as something that could be equated with similar labor. The view of this in a total society, which sees itself as something apart from the world where matter is extracted and put into

social circulation, is that all of this labor can be imagined in a virtual space, and so the value of labor is really a social relation. Therefore, economics can never really answer anything about the material world and remains a concern of human beings with each other, unmoored from the environment and unmoored from the real conditions of the social agents. Empirically, without a rational reason to distinguish different labors, we have to start from the assumption that one lump of labor-power - a human being - is not greatly different from another, and in our experience the abilities of humans are adaptable and similar. It does not matter if a stupid man or a smart man pushes a cart full of mined ore one bit. In the skilled task, it could be imagined that a man of lesser ability could be compared to a man of greater ability by some metrics we could rationally understand, and there is no immediate way for us to claim, without some empirical rationale and evidence to tell us otherwise, the absolute limit of one man's ability compared to another's. In theory, the human animal, knowing what it is, can adapt its most basic constitution in ways so vast that an inborn, hereditary advantage would be rendered moot, or any man could acquire tools that render his hereditary, base biological traits a moot point in some skilled task. To make a claim of some man being constitutionally and permanently of a different substance than another requires either a myth that is known on some level to be a convenient fiction, or it requires a definition of the human social agent in purely biological and biopolitical terms. The conventional social theory is that human beings are at first impression selves that are sentient and quite aware of their physical limitations, but that this is a different matter from claiming that different humans possess different essences that cannot transform into anything else. The other theory, which is quite old, is that every labor is of a distinct essence, and thus every skilled profession, every scholarly task, every fighting task, places those laborers above a base or extractive laborer, or places the extractive and basic working tasks in a position which is the most desultory work possible and thus bad. This conceit appears meritocratic but in actuality it turns into an infantile belief that basic things humans must do to reproduce social conditions are irrelevant or can be abstracted away neatly. The ideal of such a conceit is that human society is driven purely by "creatives", or for the petty proprietors and soldiers, human society is driven by a violent will to power which overcomes mere ideas. The true distinction between different types of labors is only understood by recognizing first a basic motive engine, the human, and the environment they live in, which was neglected by classical political economy entirely.

Whatever type of labor someone does, it is presumed that it will enter society in some way that is common for a given place, which is understood here as an ecosystem. There is, in any ecosystem, a generally understood way in which labor is commanded, rather than infinitely many ways. The distinctions of labor relations are limited because making a different relation for each person is cumbersome to manage. In any event, the different social relations that may exist all happen in the same world, and the same part of the world in which regular interactions are observed. The relations of slavery, wage labor, noble privileges,

the relation of wives to husbands and the familial relationships, and so on are all subsumed into some sense of general labor. None of these relations are sacrosanct by any natural law, nor is their distinction truly necessary for managing labor. It would seem simple enough to bring people into society because they want to be there, and to not force upon people relations that are indecent. If that were the case, though, no discipline of labor would be possible, and those who would manage would be limited by the willingness of anyone to agree to the antagonistic relationships that have predominated. There are two aims for this general labor. One is to distinguish its positively generative capacities through specialization, and this potential, while not unlimited or immediate, allows for all of the real potentials of labor. The other is to discipline it through mechanisms which are necessarily limiting. The true development of labor is in the end a learning process which is never disciplined by any management, and could never be. All efforts to command labor to learn new positive talents are doomed. What a manager could do is facilitate this development, but if someone believes correctly that the only reward for this development is that more will be demanded of them in a purely extractive relationship, there is no incentive whatsoever for the common laborer to modify him- or herself to the demands of those who manage society. At an early stage, there are no clear managers. There was never a "blank slate" where all men were political and social equals, for humans inherited many habits from the animal kingdom, and they would reside in areas of the world with different resources. Yet, there is no inherent distinction of humanity into any preferred classes or specializations, and the demand of primitive society would be for men and women to possess general intelligence and knowledge about the world. All people must relate to the same world in the end, and in that regard, all are equal. The result was that, absent a particularly good reason, human social relations would be egalitarian and based on mutual benefit and genuine affinity, rather than exploitative and managerial. This does not last long, but it is the only way in which labor would have been able to develop or orient towards anything more than an incessant game of backbiting and imperious posturing. At the most basic level, labor is only possible because it could exist, and because human beings are motivated enough to continue working at all. If labor became too immiserating, the workers would drop dead, kill themselves, turn against the aristocrats, and resort to destroying the beast altogether rather than contribute anything at all. The end result, should management and aristocracy continue, is that no one really wants to do anything at all, and humanity appears as if it is lazy by nature. Humans are not really lazy, though. Industry is something a child can readily pursue, as if by some instinct to acquire and produce. It is the poison of aristocracy that suggests that all such industry is anathema to the purpose of life. It is not that humans are mindless producers or breeders, but that humans have in the main a motivation to do something with their lives beyond an existence as a lump of utility or hedonistic pleasure impulses. If humans wanted pleasure in a utilitarian sense, they would obtain a supply of opium and bliss out, and most of us would be better off. That doesn't work for long, first because of a need for sustenance that drug addicts will not find, and second because of a need for constructive and generative effort to obtain any quality beyond

mere life. The moral aims of individuals are their own, rather than something that would abide any general plan of natural order. It would be, in an ideal world, in the interest of those who manage labor to recognize this rather than insist on beating subjects into accepting the roles of managerial intent, especially when those roles are primarily for someone to suffer and exist to be humiliated. The basic laborer will see that different treatment for different people implies a different valuation and intent towards them, and that all managerial intents towards them are definite. The manager does not have any affinity for human potential or kindness at all. Far from it, the managerial strata tend not to be motivated by mercantile exchange in the conventional sense, any sort of martial efficiency that would win any struggle, nor any pursuit of scholarly knowledge or useful information. The manager's stock and trade, and the primary disciplinary function, is to make laborers suffer. If it were not for that, then the way basic labor would be regarded in society would be very different, and the calculation of labor available to a given ecosystem would not be intrinsically meaningful or a thing that should be expanded or contracted in mathematical value for its own sake. The purpose of this basic labor would instead be to create useful qualities in the quantities that are desired, and the bulk of human existence would not be spent on managed labor. Instead, humans would choose what to do with their labor and would cooperate. That arrangement of society does not conform to any of the arrangements of social classes or organizing principles that have taken hold, and would not conform to any preferred scheme of classes and assignments. It would instead be open-ended enough to regard that humans are not economic agents but actual creatures that require more than the barest minimum of sustenance to be human or consider their lives worthwhile. Even with all of the disciplinary functions in place, labor does not exist purely to be managed by imperious wills, and could not exist if it were purely a tool to be commanded by another. For labor to exist as useful labor, it would have to be allowed to even exist, then allowed to do what it would do. Overbearing managerialism is not intended to motivate production, but to choke it so labor conforms to an intent rooted in suffering.

Artisan labor - This category may be called "skilled labor", "applied education labor", or a number of other titles, but the first evident appearance of this category is the specialization of basic laborers that is not conducted by any grand society-level plan, but by a process that happens "behind the backs of the producers". The result is that some workers possess ability to perform some craft or some function that is not immediately available to any human or a large class of humans. Because this is not a formal process and is not automatically valued by legal codes or the interest of proprietors, this group can be conflated with the workers in many analyses, but in any society, a distinction is made between different skills and their utility, in accord with values that society as a whole might hold. Not all of these labors are necessarily favored, as among the specialized abilities are those of a criminal nature. Anyone can be a criminal, but not everyone can be an effective criminal and survive the great game. Attempts are made to make this distinction a moral one, first because a moral distinction

provides motive for basic laborers to distinguish themselves for some profit, and second because using moral shame or praise alone can allow social actors to give the artisan something which is in fact no profit or material benefit at all. However much this distinction may be exposed as illusory or of little consequence, the distinction of different skillsets and the people who possess them is very relevant if we wish to understand the different interests among the working populations. We can exclude from this categories of labor that are not, in their core function, productive at all. Many attempts are made to give the mercantile, warrior, scholarly, and untouchable functions some distinction that equates them with artisanal skill or a particular mark of shame, or present functions that are actually disciplinary functions on the labor of society as genuinely productive of some substance. In some sense these disciplinary functions may produce products that can be treated as commodities or tokens that would be exchangeable in a monetary sense, or by some game theory where the disciplinary forces are equated to the production of so much material. The actual work of the artisan, though, is that their work, for good or ill, is intended to produce particular materially real qualities that are desired rather than qualities that are valued purely because they are political constructs like the value of war leadership or legal knowledge, and those qualities are made manifest in various forms. A craftsman may create or repair tools or work with machines that are difficult without specialized training. An actor or musician might perform some art that impresses viewers, that an ordinary man or woman didn't compose. While the mercantile and warrior roles are specialized and can be respected or feared, the particular form the merchant or warrior takes is less relevant than the disciplinary function of the task. The mercantile function could be performed by a street hustler, wandering vagabond with a trove of desirables, small shopkeeper, anyone willing to meet another market participant in a free market setting, a capitalist, a state planner in some socialist arrangement, or many other arrangements. The fighting functions are not limited to professional soldiers, but come in a variety of forms that represent state force or some violent force, all of which are intended to do the same disciplinary task. The artisanal work on the other hand must produce specific qualities that are desired. Artists or skilled laborers are not, in of themselves, intrinsically worth anything. Their specializations may be, from a societal point of view, not merely worthless but actively harmful and deliberately so. From the perspective of the disciplinary functions, which usually dictate what is socially valuable, they are aware that without people who can do specific actions and create those particular things, their disciplinary functions would not be possible. Soldiers need swords or guns, and a wide variety of implements that must be built. The higher levels of organization for mercantile activity require stable institutions which must be reproduced.

The skilled labor is not merely basic labor with some substance of intellectual production animating it, and cannot be reduced simply to arrive at some combined quantity of substance that is comparable to a quantity of basic labor. Qualitatively different labors produce things which are functionally distinct from the products of some basic labor, or another kind of skilled labor. A simple

investment of time in intellectual production does not guarantee that this new quality must emerge, and cannot determine what that quality will be. In order to arrive at some equivalency of the different qualities of labor, a scheme to do so must be implied or made explicit, in accord with some principle that is created rather than one that is truly written into nature. Without this, the different labors and their outputs are not freely exchangeable as the same sort of substance. The division of labor, so far as it concerns actually useful articles rather than disciplinary functions calling themselves useful, arises because those different labors present an answer to some question facing an individual or a social organization. A society cannot freely exchange farm labor, mining, manufacture, and so on once the products are created, and it cannot arbitrarily assign a worker in one sector to another without some loss of efficiency. When reassigned, the worker must move to the new site where they produce or extract or do whatever it is they do. If the worker lacks immediate knowledge of the other sector's functioning, he must learn the new function expected of him, and acclimate his body and life to that function. A division of labor that starts out of physical necessity often produces people who are somewhat different in their daily functioning. We can imagine that the workers start as completely blank slates, or we can imagine some innate qualities they possessed before they were sorted into particular sectors of work, but the specialization of workers in accord with what they do asserts itself either way. This specialization encounters limits, unless it were possible to reduce a worker entirely to his profession, a task that was not truly conceivable nor desirable until scientific management and biology could conceive of the ideal worker drone made real. The past efforts to forcibly assign workers to a role they could not escape concerned their legal and social status, which was regulated entirely by disciplinary functions. This did not prevent task masters from pitting workers against each other based on their specialization, but the effectiveness of this interclass conflict is limited because in actuality the specialization of humans in their functioning does not make them considerably distinct in their core understanding of themselves and their world. A free worker, whether employed in agriculture or industry or musical performance or any other field, was still free and still a human, and expected to do human behaviors rather than mechanical ones. It is still the case in today's economy that a human is expected to be adaptable to a manager's needs, and the overspecialization of trades is a desultory assignment, largely concerning sectors in technocratic society that the sitting regime desires to lock down and control out of a need for security rather than any natural efficiency of doing so. Overspecialization in industrial capitalism had always been a nuisance to the functioning of that arrangement, and it arose more as a consequence of the machinery in that time and a deliberate policy to segregate the mind of the worker into functions that could be controlled. It still remained the case that in industrial capitalism, the complexity and diversity of products and services would increase, even if the demands on the laborer were de-skilled and the skilled craftsmanship of the workman was replaced with a machine created by engineers and scientists. The de-skilling of labor would be, for reasons that become apparent upon historical review, a deliberate choice rather than an

inexorable tendency. The increase in complexity of products is not itself an inexorable rule, but as the sum total of knowledge in society increases, so will the needs and wants in that society to answer a particular problem that someone could conceive. The ability of a society to answer those needs cannot be taken for granted. For most of history, this task was of little interest to the governing ideas and received little attention, only perpetuating as if by some inertia of the working classes. In industrial society it was very important to bring this process under managerial control, and then under the control of large institutions which enforced a network that allocated labor into vocations selected by the machine, and used every carrot imaginable to cajole the workers into certain behaviors in an increasingly controlled environment.

In the disciplinary functions, the distinction between skilled and basic labor is illusory at first. The capitalist or the warlord or the planner has no instinctive knowledge of the actual productive crafts and can only guess at a value to relate them to other skilled labors. There is also difficulty in establishing what a baseline for unskilled labor is supposed to be, especially in light of the last disciplinary function of the untouchable. A general theory of science is necessary to begin in earnest the useful distinction between skilled labors, and it is in this general theory of science and the practices of education that the skilled labors can be linked in some grand scheme. Without this, comparison is impossible. It has been a persistent difficulty in managerial schemes to adjudicate how a monetary value of labor, such as wages or a salary, can translate to different utilities or the quality of different tools. For much of history, the variety of products did not change so significantly that this was a great consideration. Some new products would appear by no particular plan except a necessity that was recognized by an inventor, or a vague sense of a thinker that a new idea may be possible and directions on how to realize such a device. From the start of the 19th century, new devices appeared not just in this haphazard way, but in a way that was conscious of the need to continually revolutionize the products and the means of production. This not only meant a greater motive power from steam engines and industrial inventions which were themselves considerably complex machines, but it would produce products that were impossible to make in the past, and so the introduction of new skills could never be reduced to a quantitative increase in raw products. Not only were the products created of a novel type, but a greater understanding of the substances in nature was available for utilities that were not understood or poorly understood before. A whole field of chemistry and nascent medical advances changed thinking on what material things would be useful. Oil, which was once an unwanted residue of other extractive enterprises, became the most valuable liquid to industrial interests, which in turn enabled new engines and machines which were attached to those engines, like the automobile. The introduction of new products did not simply entail things that led to an increase in the total economic product of a society, but machines that were entirely novel. As with any tool, the industrial and later technological tools had a much greater effect both on the users of those tools, and the surrounding environs. The environmental effects were further made apparent by the crowding of people

into cities, which created a need for sanitation and health interventions, and with it societal conditions which politicians sought to remedy with yet more novel ideas and machinery.

Exchange - All things that enter social circulation must have a claimant, and claims may be made on a thing that is entirely speculative. The most evident of these things are commodities, and so the commodity is the first thing that comes to mind to someone with a monetary view of that which is claimed. The claims, though, can be made on land, intellectual property, or anything - again including fictitious things - and the exchanges that are made are not always monetary ones. For everything that enters social circulation, there is an expectation between social actors of how that thing is appropriated by the members of society, and this appropriation ultimately falls into the hands of individual persons at some point if this appropriation ever translates to utilizing the thing for any purpose other than exchange. Social organizations collectively do not have a thought process that concerns directly the utility of these things, and if they did, we would be speaking of those organizations not just as legal persons but as flesh and blood life-forms. It is well known that all organizations are necessarily comprised of human agents and machinery wielded by humans. Within such an organization, there are always expectations of the participants about any claim and what people can and cannot do with the claimed things. This applies in a purely cooperative organization and it applies in a very large organization in which the members' relationship is antagonistic. The inhabitants of a city, even if they do not know each other, or even if they do not know they are living in a city, are linked by their physical closeness and invariably their claims to property or the commons are regulated by some process. The mercantile function broadly speaking concerns this regulation, or discipline, of the claims, and that alone. It does not concern directly the production and consumption of the goods, nor does it concern any intrinsic utility or perceived utility in a direct way. It does not concern the political problem of creating laws or enforcing them, or the force required to do so. The exchanging function may also be called the "mercantile" function, as commonly a medium of exchange is presumed that allows, in theory, an exchange of any thing for another thing. Even if the unit of exchange is not a monetary token, all the claims of a claimant are available to meet the claims of another claimant, and all social agents can hypothetically meet another social agent. Whether someone is willing to trade particular claims, or whether someone's claim is a spurious one, does not change that in exchange, all is up for trade in principle. One party may elect to take with threats or the actual use of force, and the motives of this extortion must consider exchange in the same way a merchant would conduct ordinary commerce. The ability to make a threat, and the ability to act on it, require some claim of the extorter against the extorted, and no force can be taken for granted. All of these claims, whether they are property, money, or some sort of planning scheme, are things humans imagine and believe to be real in their mind, but it only needs to be believed. The actual condition of the thing being claimed need not align with the belief, but it is generally beneficial for those in exchange to be certain that their claim

does comport with reality. The merchant must, in any exchange, be able to know in their mind the things that are up for trade, and anything they know that can be claimed. Therefore, in societies, there are schemes to value every possible thing that may enter social circulation, even if that thing would not occur to the exchanging parties as a thing immediately available to them. The participants in society can make claims theoretically on anything in the whole of the universe, and all these things are presumably linked in some way that makes general exchange sensical.

The most common and basic exchanges are the informal ones - the understandings and favors between people that may be part of some common courtesy. These "exchanges" at first appear to be no exchanges at all, but they perform a regulatory function just as contracts in barter or money do and just as any elaborate planning scheme would. The informal schemes may be as simple as asking for the salt at a dinner table, but there is only one salt shaker in this hypothetical table, and it must be claimed by someone to be utilized. Another scheme might be some gambling credit written down by a book-keeper, but the exchange of this token need not be understood as pertaining to money or any substantive claim of legal property. Participants in a game, with no particular purpose beyond playing the game, assign values to the things in that game in order to pursue strategies, whether they are cooperative or competitive games. There is also an understanding, which is almost instinctive, that things in the real world do not spontaneously transform, disintegrate, or spawn, and so a token we possess today will be in our possession tomorrow if it is not exchanged. There is also an observed balance in nature between physical forces, such that matter is not created nor destroyed. The awareness of living in an environment is important, because the participants do not always know the extent of that environment, and one man's knowledge of an environment and the conditions of life may be an advantage over another man who does not know anything beyond what is in front of him. The informal exchanges are not always pleasant ones. Very often, deception and every trick imaginable is used to gain advantage in an informal way, either for petty amusement or because this earlier deception sets up conditions of formal exchange that are highly unfavorable to one party. Trust, integrity, and respect are not freely given and can never be assumed as an absolute, and woe to the man who forgets this against a malevolent actor. We can assume that anyone reading this book has established enough trust to participate in society, or could in the past, but it is never possible to take society for granted. The everyday practices of informal exchange, many of them practices we normally don't think about, will typically reach some equilibrium, where behaviors of an agent in a given environment can be expected and are habitual. No more elaborate mechanism of exchange is possible without this step.

There may be an attempt to claim that because all things can be claimed in exchange, then there is some rule of nature compelling this exchange in people, but this is fallacious. The reasons why should be clear by my listing of counterexamples of imperfect information leading to wildly inaccurate notions of

what is being exchanged, and the terms under which that exchange is possible. We can and do choose to a large extent the terms of exchange we will allow without a fight. We can, if we so choose, refuse to pay taxes to the bitter end. We can build a whole network of exchanges outside of the formal economy, or an economy with formal tokens that we consciously keep apart from the mainstream of the world. By "exchange labor", we do not refer to a process we would construe as productive in the first three senses we described, but a process which is not in of itself productive at all. Every effort to regulate the movement of things and ideas in society is an expenditure of some effort. The exchanging function is the most obvious way to accomplish this regulation, and at a base level it appears to be the only one. Distinct roles emerge which further formalize the sort of exchanges that people make in upholding the law and custom of a society or polity. These roles are not concerned with exchange in a direct way, but instead regulate the merchants. There are for example lawyers whose work is tied to the existence of a state which can uphold laws, something that can only be done with finality by violence; and there may be arbiters who are not directly tied to the state, but establish agreements between social participants, or between proprietors and their human property who are not in a legal sense recognized as social members but which can only be controlled by some manipulation. The line between "peaceful agreement" and "coercive force" is often blurred. It is often declared that property and thus exchange is inherently antagonistic and thus all mercantile functions - and in effect all exchange functions - are hostile acts by their nature. This naive thinking is to lead people to believe that producers should never exchange at all, or should only exchange in prescribed ways that are adjudicated as harmonious and purged of all discord. The further absurd claim, by those who make economics into a purely ideological exercise, is that this harmonious society is only possible in conditions of perfect competition in perfect markets with perfect information, or that it is only possible with perfect cooperation and perfect information by some perfect natural process that is somehow not organized by any entity. Both effectively state the same thing, both are stated as the position of the most extreme anarchist ideologues, and both have been somehow sold as the extreme right and left positions respectively. These positions make every grotesque error possible in speaking of what humans are, what societies are, what markets are, what planning mechanisms are, what nature itself is, what the state is, what politics as a concept is, what information is, and even what competition and cooperation entail at the most basic level. That such an abominable discombobulation of reality is presented as an idea should be appalling to every basic decency. The further denunciation of this anarchism must wait for later, but it highlights something at the heart of the exchange function. That is that we can and must have a moral sense that distinguishes fairness and honesty from arbitrariness and deceit, to speak of which exchange functions are predatory and which are the result of reasonable due diligence towards co-existence. The antagonistic relations in close quarters that define the life of societies where settled states are established cannot spill over into open violence too often, or be so deceptive that participation in a market is an uncertain prospect. At some point, whatever the legal order or

whatever the customs may be that regulate moral behavior, some attachment to reality is expected of the participants in exchange. Even if the reality is that all the participants in society accept legal fictions or myths, sharing a belief in those fictions and myths is very real, and can make real the value of a token like money or faith in an institution. No institution and no money is a given of nature, but is a thing emerging from something that must make sense to the participants, or must have made sense at some point. The promulgation of the greatest nonsense, spoken to activate some psychological instinct against the interest of the recipient, must be understood as a severe danger in any arrangement of society.

All the claims of a person in exchange may be imagined in one hoard, and as informal mechanisms are insufficient or things that the participants cannot agree upon, informal exchange must move to more formal arrangements, and the simplest way to do this is commodification. The particulars of money, and derivatives of it like interest, credit, insurance, and so on, is not of particular interest, nor is it of interest if the formal exchange remains barter. The simple rule is that more things to trade allows more leverage, and there is no exchange without some substantive claim. We can exaggerate the size of a claim to an unwary competitor, but the exchange of claims is what it is. One party trades the claim to another, and once it is securely in the other's hands, an exchange of this virtual substance is recorded in the ledger. Regardless of the legal status of the participants in the society, breaking the terms of the agreement would require another action to do so. Slaves or inmates in a psychiatric institution do not need the legal sanction of a state to talk to each other and do what they will, even if someone wants to imagine the communication between them to be some jabbering of the mouth that polite society does not consider language. Should a third party wish to step in to void the agreement, that is the third party's action, not a given. To claim, for example, that nature compels the exchange between two people to be something other than what it is, is to ascribe to nature the fickle traits of a person. Usually, such claims about nature or a divine intervention into our affairs are made by very selfish and petty humans who see it as their business to meddle. The prerogatives of a relatively honest state or ruler do not need such an excuse. Any economic plan would abide the same characteristics as market exchange does, in this way. The rational planning of exchanges in society may be accepted as preferable to the uncertainty of market antagonisms, but no such planning regime would be possible if the commoner participants were presumed to possess no intelligence and were assigned the most desultory status and education possible. A planner who holds such contempt will inevitably find that their rational planning scheme will be alien to the commoner who is subjected to it. A rational planning that depends on blind trust in institutions, especially institutions that consciously make themselves alien to the commoner's lived experience, is likely to fail spectacularly. This is not an intractable problem at all, because the simple solution is for planners to not insist on bullish imposition of an idea, but to do what it was the participants wanted in the first place, which was to pay less taxes or receive a fairer share of the social product. A

strange idea that socialism entails the obsessive micromanagement of peoples' toothbrushes is yet another anarchist trope, but no socialism in history has been so obtuse to the bitter end. It remains, however, a conceit of the classes that were invested in a socialist ideology and philosophy, who sought to form public opinion rather than heed it in any reasonable way. This is not the central failure of historical socialism as a workable economic program or even a persistent economic drag, as the actual economic governance of the socialist countries had less to do with forcing an economic ideology to be true against nature and more to do with what was desirable for industrial interests in that time and place, and what was possible. It is rather a misunderstanding that socialist thought had in making its argument against capitalism, particularly within the capitalist countries. They failed to understand that what sustained technocratic capitalism was not the strength of its ideology or some conspiratorial mind control that was just so effective for spooky reasons. No concept of planning could significantly depart from management without succumbing to the technocratic conceits.

Fighting and Deception - The exchange function implies that cooperation is possible, while the fighting and deceptive functions - both of which I shall conflate as the same sort of thing - are between hostile parties. Soldiering, spycraft, various forms of guard or security labor, and a number of other professions exist because all other means of regulating tasks have not worked, or other means of regulation are not desirable for the actor involved. It is entirely a drain on the productive economy, and its characteristics do not have a necessary moral implication of good or bad. There are legitimate reasons for antagonistic relations to reach the point where it is no longer possible to assume society's members are going to cooperate. There are legitimate reasons why someone would consider deception worth undertaking for security. There are legitimate reasons for defense, and reasons not to defend, and aggression is not inherently irrational or wrong. A distinction between predation, and further an ideology which exhorts people to be predatory, and aggression must be clear. Predation is an ethos declaring that aggression in of itself is good, for material benefit or in its purest form it declares the predator's victory to be morally virtuous in defining oneself. Aggression is simply violent force, for good or ill, and it is not an act of predation to attack a clear threat, or to merely eliminate a rival. Again, a naive anarchist view will claim that all defense is good and all aggression is bad. The defensive reaction can be waged for predatory intents, like a defense of a predatory ethos against those who would fight against its presence in the world. It is a curious trait of our time that defense of honesty is considered a most foul aggression even if it is the most pacifist defense possible, and the most vile predatory aggression is somehow defensive in nature. The inverse - a righteous aggression against those who deceive for petty amusement - is anathema to the ideology of those who believe the purest predatory element to be a fount of sacredness, so much that it must be vigorously snuffed out. It does not matter to the predatory whether the righteous aggression is tempered or if it is, out of necessity, far-reaching. The predatory are great at games of moral equivocation and psychological manipulation, and the predatory present their

ethos as not only legitimate war but that this ethos is in some perverse way a productive act greater than the worker's. It should be noted that, in a sick sense, this is perfectly reasonable. The predatory ethos, in its more developed stages, believes acts of terror and predation constitute a substance whose production should be sought for its own right, and so, predatory societies favor lurid rituals, prostitution, drug addiction, and that which is known to be deleterious. The more ruinous, the greater for the predatory ethos. The wicked comes to possess a quality that presents an unchallengeable value to the ethos, and the constructive acts only exist in service to that predatory ethos. The practice of war, by itself, has no inherent moral quality, though in practice humans have difficulty waging wars without some moral cause. Historical societies were defined by the rise of warlords and the priests who collaborated with them, and so, the glorification of violence came early, and this informed much of the constitution of early settled society. This only heightened a pattern of endemic predation throughout nomadic humanity that simply couldn't be answered. It is a common belief among partisans of the predatory system that all societal progress is only ever progress towards more elaborate regimes of predation. This works both in enhancing the position of a warrior aristocracies and the machinery of control and deception, and degrading the rest of the populace who are defanged and told of their utter worthlessness. Wherever any significant advance does happen though, even in the field of weaponry, the predatory ethos has always been a nuisance. The most effective predatory societies were not the ones that revelled in predation at the highest level and glorified a warrior aristocracy with silly conceits. The feudal warrior aristocracy of the Middle Ages was utterly ruinous for fielding an effective army, and was only effective in the ecosystem of Europe because it was geared towards terrorizing serfs and fighting wars against other states constituted similarly. What virtue such kingdoms showed in war was almost entirely an inheritance from the Roman tendency of seeking military advantage. Warrior aristocracy and the general veneration of warrior culture has always been a laughably bad way to attain the best army, but they are effective at maintaining regressive social hierarchies and supporting a rise of barbarism generally. It is for this reason that the cultures that venerate warrior culture for its own sake choose such a strategy, rather than actually believing this makes an army battle-effective - or at least, this author hopes the political leadership isn't stupid enough to believe their propaganda.

There have been attempts to join together this fighting task with exchange or mercantile functions, or scholarly functions, to assert that there is some mercantile or scholarly element inherent to the idea of fighting, and conversely that those elements are incomprehensible without the ideology of war. In other words, the familiar canard "violence is the supreme authority". The extractive and productive functions are decidedly subordinated here. From the belief of the domineering instinct, the productive economy exists to serve the goals of domination and control, down to the most basic tasks people do. This is a crude form of a tendency in the philosophical state, but misunderstands just what happens in any human society, and further misunderstands any highly

developed society where large institutions must remain stable. The truth is that violence and deception do not need any inherent attachment to productivity or the other regulatory functions, and such violence and deception can stand alone for whatever purpose someone might have for them. Every violent and deceptive act requires a substantive investment of resources, and these resources can be imagined in some sort of exchange with the other actors, but violence itself is not inherently necessary for those acts to be sensible, and the assertion of will has characteristics that have nothing at all to do with productivity, a need for material gain, any scholarly purpose, or even a need to uphold a particular situation where some group is untouchable and undesirable. The competitive instinct in people is a necessary one not because it is economically necessary, but because life to be life must always be able to secure itself and, if it wishes, be able to attack rivals. The rivals do not need to be of a different social class to justify the aggression, nor is it a given that someone is automatically a rival due to some cultural signifier or geographic distance. It is the aggressive and defensive act itself that is important, whatever the motive for the fighting. It may be assumed by a certain sort that all fighting is inherently bad or wrong, but such a position is something people have to choose of their own volition. A "non-aggression principle" inherent to nature cannot be taken for granted, or imposed on all life as a moral cause no matter what. It is instead the case that human beings who can think can usually see that violence for no purpose whatsoever leads to conclusions that are undesirable, if that violence were a general rule. It is even worse if violence becomes the chief organizing principle and spiritual authority. Regardless of this, there are those who choose to glorify violence, and those who simply believe that without some will to fight there is nothing to actually live for. Life cannot persist as merely producers, who would come to be seen as some process of nature. The most basic assertion of self has a seed of aggression simply for someone to assert themselves and maintain their constitution. The extreme of total non-violence is to say that some person does not have any right or cause to exist at all, except as something another actor wished, and so it is not desirable. There is in reality no moral component to this fighting, and this gives rise to another pernicious tendency that the purpose of life is power, and that power creates its own morality. That view has been espoused enough and leads to predictably terrible consequences we have known for a long time, yet it always finds adherents because it is attractive to a petty-managerial mindset. Attempts to make out of the fighting function something more than it actually is are doomed to outcomes that are sadly predictable, which means that morality cannot arise from fighting. Morality also cannot arise from productive or exchange functions for reasons that are not difficult to discern - the purpose of life is not some drive to expand or some practice of exchanging things for its own sake.

The difficulty with isolating the fighting and deceptive functions as a task is that various forms of fighting and deception are built into institutions we take for granted. This fighting is not in truth the province of a privileged minority who are entitled to the sole right of aggression. Such a thing is a necessary pretense

of states, which by their nature cannot brook open dissent against the state's authority, but anyone with the means to fight is capable of fighting in some way. Casual acts of aggression are often taken as a joke, and petty attacks are so numerous that the reader can likely find these acts in their daily life. The aggression need not serve any ulterior motive and the motive can be nothing more than petty amusement or competitive spirit, even competition of a friendly sort like a game or sport. Further along, whole bureaucracies and institutions which are ostensibly peaceful are in reality premised on a belief of deception, going out of their way to deceive the public of the very purpose of their institutions. Institutions claiming to exist for the welfare of the people are, by capitalist governments, also tasked with control and management of an underclass, with an open contempt for the recipients. This is necessarily attached to the function of untouchability which is something different from the fighting or deceptive function, but it is conceivable that an institution supposedly for mutual aid can be ruled by the same deceptive intent. In the case of welfare organizations during the 20th century, they were often attached to functions like eugenics and the tracking of the populace to bring them under control, and in return the recipients would receive conditional means to survive, and the particular status of social untouchability was a thing that was relied upon and encouraged to use the welfare mechanism for so-called "moral correction". In practice, no such moral improvement of the recipients was expected, and eugenist societies found the concept of any moral rehabilitation completely unacceptable to their core conceits. So total was this particularly eugenist idea of the poor that very specific incentives were set up specifically to punish recipients who wanted to improve their station, which even capitalist society understood to be deleterious. Eugenist societies and the greater aims of what I have called "eugenism" must be expounded upon later, but the reader is very likely to have some familiarity with the welfare state and its motives, either from the perspective of the benefactor or as a recipient who has been given the treatment by some social worker whose hostility cannot be contained. The example of the welfare office is only one such example. Many institutions of various functions are premised on deception to convince people that the institutions do something other than what they actually do, or are premised on a social obligation to pretend that these institutions are something other than what they are. This tendency of mass deception reached its height with technocratic society in the 20th century, first imposing a highly alien life to what had existed before, and then using tactics intended to deceive and cajole such that the people were not allowed to speak plainly about anything that had happened and were definitely not allowed to question central conceits of the technocratic states that did exist. It is not the sole tendency, and it is known on some level that the deception cannot hold forever and its maintenance has consequences. For the deceived and for those who are dependent, it is of little use to rail against the unfairness of the deception or the unequal society that results. The dispossessed and the despised can say all they like that it is supposed to be some other way, but the petty-manager and the learned bureaucrat have never listened to that argument once in their entire history and they never will. The proprietors who command the state take this opportunity to say that it is not

the specific intent of those who operate the welfare state to do these things, but that welfare itself leads to degeneracy, and by doing so, all the deliberate acts and incentives set up to maintain a social order are entirely the fault of the recipients. This statement is the prelude to ensuring that welfare, so far as it continues to exist, displays an even greater intent to suppress the recipient population. It is not the giving of material things to the poor in of itself that is the problem, but the desultory existence that is imposed for reasons quite apart from any law of nature or society. If instead the recipients were given land and a sense of entitlement to some project that they shared in, the mentality would be quite different. The same people who bemoan the welfare state brag about structural unemployment that has no reason to exist and brag about the reduction of class sizes and the desultory education of those selected for an underclass, which is appropriate to the ideology of eugenics that was at the forefront of neoliberalism.

Scholarship - The development of formal systems of knowledge and the ideological basis for organizations constitutes a task separate from productive tasks. Indirectly, it seeks to regulate economic behavior by rational argument or statements of faith that are taken as rational - that is, the statements of institutions which are presumed to hold some spiritual authority, rather than the independent judgement of such. All such institutions rely on an appeal to rationality that at first is not the property of the institution, rather than commonly accepted facts that are merely assumed. This can work at the smallest level, where an industrial arrangement could be planned by reason to be more effective, or it can work at a higher political level, where a theory of society and how to do this is advanced. The formality of these systems of knowledge is the relevant part. The core aim of this task, then, is to advance theories and organizations of education, from which knowledge of the sciences and applications of science can be derived. This educational theory, or pedagogy, must be distinguished from the learning individuals undertake to assimilate knowledge of the world. People can and do integrate knowledge without any formal system or theory given to them by a pedagogue, and once a system is handed down from teacher to student, the student can use that system as he wishes. If the student thinks the system is wrong or needs to be revised, he may do that. No cult of education is truly ordained by natural laws, and people can integrate knowledge in any way that is suitable. Integration of knowledge into a world-system is ultimately an event local to a particular thinker, and while we may be able to reason general laws of nature informing why we think the way we do and what kind of world-systems are possible for a human to conceive, the actual understanding of a human is local to them. The scholarly task is about separating this wisdom from the person, and presenting the knowledge as some sort of thought form that is communicable outside of people. This could be as simple as writing books and assembling libraries, or it may entail an ethos of education that teachers or larger organizations perpetuate. The thinking of a philosopher's education is the central takeaway from Plato's Republic, and the thing that is supposed to be the true engine of the ideal city-state. Without this, the scheme is not workable

at all, let alone capable of producing what the philosopher would consider good.

The larger implication of this is that societies, to become states or any large organization, must perpetuate themselves as an idea, and so tasks like the scholarly task play a substantial role in the perpetuation of society as we know it. Directly, individual people only contact so many other people, and those interactions are limited out of necessity. The formation of any nation as a polity requires some shared conception of a community that doesn't materially exist. We do not know every single participant in the nation in this direct way, or at best we would only be able to know direct information about all the participants in some registry of citizens. It is not realistic for the human animal to personally relate to 100,000 other citizens. If there is a leader of the city addressing the citizenry in a group, the speaker must be aware of how he speaks to the assembled group, and the leader has to give the impression that his authority is worth following. A smaller group may have a leader, and there is always some executive functioning implied for any organization, but the concept of being a leader does not necessarily have to conform to the idea of a dictator waving his mighty hand and the subjects following like automata. That approach historically has not been terribly effective, but once again the conceits of the petty-manager find comfort in a showy dictator like Hitler, or a parody of the showy dictator like Donald Trump, less because this method of leadership is effective or even the actual state of affairs. It is instead that a psychological expectation of leadership is present among the faithful, who sycophantically attach themselves to a leader, and in turn the leader - and in modern dictatorships, a PR machine - enable this sycophancy. The modern conceits of dictatorship do not greatly resemble dictatorships of the past, and the actual functioning of dictatorship cannot be entirely PR. At some level, the dictator must present some competence or the appearance of it to be credible. The magic of PR is to extend what is credible, such that the populace believe in fictions, or at least are too terrified to act against something that smells foul.

All of this scholarship and education is meaningless without the means of production and its associated labor. It is also not possible without some concept of the regulatory functions of exchange, fighting, and deceit. Arriving at some truth or wisdom may happen in a way that is local or largely organic, but economics is no friend to the truth or any honor or integrity. The basic logic of the economic task does not concern the moral or the true, but only the world as it is and that which regulates it at a basic level. A belief that wisdom alone is paramount, or that the accumulation of knowledge is a goal for its own sake, is really calling for the productive, mercantile, and martial means available to a society to be subordinated to some seat held by the wise, who manipulate the lesser functions to their benefit. Truth, on the other hand, exists outside of any one person, and we must accept this very early to even begin the process of accumulating wisdom for ourselves. Wisdom only recognizes for an individual truth that is accessible, in theory, to anyone and anything. Truth does not give us ready-made morals, but it is what allows us to even conceive of morality. Another conceit is that human labor is morally distinct because of this faculty

of reason through symbolic language, and that this is an essential distinction of people from any other class of matter. The philosophers themselves understood that the greatest wisdom they know is that they in fact know nothing, and they could see that conceit obscured genuinely useful wisdom let alone the truth. For our individual wisdom, though, we are always limited by conceits we hold because to challenge them would be to challenge ourselves and the institutions we created, that perpetuated the very education that raised the question. We certainly were able to raise this question without any great pedagogy to tell us that it was a question, because there was some time in human history where there was no formal pedagogy to teach us wisdom. With more formal philosophy, and the organization of society that follows, the question would be more pressing even if scholarship and the quest for wisdom remained separate from the other spheres of human activity. Because the philosopher does have wants, though, it was highly impractical for economy and reason to remain separate spheres that never violated the other. The philosophers were very aware of the temptations economic reality created in them, and while they superficially bemoaned the encroachment of economic life onto their leisurely pursuits, the philosophers were also engaged in a struggle with the productive and martial sectors for resources and security. Likewise, the producers have good reason to resent an arrogant philosopher cajoling them, and as mentioned, to the common man this philosophical state appeared like some perversion to their own wisdom and a truth that was apparent to them even as a vague feeling. The philosophical state heightens this economic conflict. Reason will seek, out of necessity or desire, to co-opt the productive and regulatory functions, and the people engaged in production or war or proprietorship have greater need of reason for their own aims and to assert that their own wisdom is worth something against the intellectual centers which promulgate the ruling ideas. It is the propagation of the idea that truly begins class struggle in the sense we are familiar with the concept, because there was a meaningful language to describe the organization of institutions and the overall structure of polities. Even if we assumed the common folk to be somewhat ignorant and unwise of anything beyond what was in front of them, the thing that was in front of the commoner was itself changing in ways that were perceptible. A gentile formation of society that seemed natural to their senses was displaced with a philosophical formation of society and a state that was alien to the older thinking on government and the position of people. Even without the state dictating this from on high, the formal knowledge of industry and trades, and the organization of enterprises by rich men was increasingly apparent.

Here, the adoption of currency and state-issued coinage was very influential in changing the thinking of people, not so much because the currency itself had a corrupting effect on the smallfolk, but because the people most interested in coin were already wealthy interests who desired and attained something that secured their interest. Common farmers and workers and artisans were now in competition with wealthier formations of people. The merchant and proprietor interests were certainly aware of their position, and so were the idle rich who

could devote their time to scholarship. The past conflict of classes had less to do with economic roles and more to do with membership in organizations that were held against outsiders. That could be a clan against another clan, a nation against foreigners, or a nobility that served a religious or cultural role against those who were just "everybody else" and had no institution to immediately operate from, as the Roman patricians held the Senate and religious functions of society. The philosophical state heightened explicitly the economic nature of classes and the function of different classes. It described both the functions themselves, and ways in which the function itself could be perpetuated. The Academy, and the newer philosophical institutions, were adoptive institutions with an eye for their particular function, more than some sentiment for blood relations or favoritism of friends. This process proceeded in much of the world, where philosophy and political theory became more prominent, and the means to realize what those theories pointed to was apparent. It only required men who could seize that opportunity with knowledge of what could be possible, and this is what distinguished the classical empires from earlier formations. Certainly we can see some theory and ideology of earlier states, like Babylon and Egypt, but if the political theory attained the assembly of knowledge that of the Greeks or the Chinese kingdoms or Hindu kingdoms learned and put into action, it is lost to our written history. A number of advances, some of which seemingly small like the standardization of coinage, made the formation of the philosophical state closer to reality. Whether the participants actually thought building the ideal state was itself the goal is another question altogether, because for as long as theories of the philosophical state have existed, there have been philosophical criticisms of this construct and reasons for the participants of society to find all of it loathsome. Further, the practical needs of any society and any organization may and often do run counter to the pretenses of a philosophical state, and so the ruling ideas, laws, customs, and practices of a society develop in ways not intended by any rational manipulator or grand conspiracy. The rise of grander conspiracies requires many more technical innovations than the mere conception of this philosophical political theory or the tools available to the classical era states. The basic characteristics of this philosophical idea of the state, though, are very resilient to a change that would challenge the most core assumptions that drive them. The philosophers and proprietors may disagree, both between the two groups and within each group, but there are some political principles they know they can never give up. Among them is a simple rule that the common people must never, ever be allowed to win, and if the commoners by some chance do win, the philosophical idea must quickly reassert its fundamental structure such that it can continue to perpetuate and the cycle can continue. Another is that wealth landing in the hands of little people is generally a thing to be avoided, unless this wealth in their hands can be channeled to some long-term benefit of those whose view of society is managerial or conspiratorial against the commoners. Many such gems of political wisdom assert themselves for no particular reason other than a pigheadedness, backed by a reasoning that those who assert them have no reason to stop, and that they will do it because they can.

Untouchability - The existence of a despised group, or some despised characteristics, has been a persistent feature of human society for as long as anyone can recall. The final disciplinary function in an economic sense is simple - that some are to suffer, either temporarily in response to a transgression, or permanently as a status assigned to them that must be reinforced. Here, the concern is not an act of aggression, a shunning from exchange, or the imposition of an idea that is important. Nor does any productive quality from the world undo the core condition, which is that suffering is seen as necessary in some way. This is often written off as a personal condition of no social import, and the suffering is the problem of the individual. But in any society, the economic behavior takes into account this suffering. The use of violent force can be deployed not towards simple elimination of a threat, but towards inducing suffering. The proliferation of addictive drugs or some other material vice can consciously be directed to produce suffering. Exchanges may be manipulated with a conceit that some despised person or group is made to suffer, and this suffering is not merely by denial of the product of society but a moral outrage that is reinforced in every exchange that is made. It is not a surprise that many ideological regimes and philosophies concern themselves with suffering. Outwardly, many religions speak of offering a relief from suffering, or an understanding of suffering. Within religions, in some of the darker and more overtly predatory religions, or within a rational philosophical framework, the infliction of suffering does not become merely a condition in the material world, but a thing to be commanded intellectually and with full intent of how this suffering is intended to transform someone or their behavior. The assignment of shame possesses a quality that is unmistakable to nearly all social participants. It is not a simple mirror reflection of honorability or positive esteem. More often than not, honor and high esteem are defined specifically by the lack of anything shameful, rather than a quality that is considered honorable for its own sake. Shame and suffering are everywhere, but honor and the higher pleasures are scarce. The ideology which is conscious of suffering can and does seek to insist that normal people should be ashamed that they lack this honor and virtue. The more sadistic create an elaborate game in which the normal people, lacking this virtue, ask what is expected of them, and those who get to lord over the honor taunt and laugh at the stupid, expecting the outsider to play a game to figure out the great joke. In this situation, the ugly truth is that there is nothing to the supposed honor of the favored classes, and that this imposition of rejection and suffering is very intentional for some reason or another. Perhaps it is intended for some elite to get on a moral high horse, in an effort to adjust the behavior of those outside of the honorable sectors, knowing that the underclass will never have the free ride that the privileged attained by inheritance or cunning. Other times, the grand joke and the masquerade is carried out for nothing more than a demonstration that it can be done, or some thrill it gives the dominant over the outcast. Other times, the rejection and scorn is sold as something that is intended to be constructive.

This is the credo of every bully, and the hypocrisy of the bully is plain as day when conditions place the bully in a similar spot. But, perhaps, there are those

who are cognizant of the need to inflict suffering to build some moral education. This moral education is played with most of all by the predatory ethos. On one hand, the predatory element loves to get on a moral high horse and proclaim their open hypocrisy is in fact the highest morality, and the ideal of the predatory element in this regard is to advance an idea that suffering initiated by the predatory element is wholly the fault of their targets. On the other, a sinister believer in the predatory ethos will promote indulgence and sloth in the lower class, knowing that it will perpetuate a cycle of victimhood. Every instinct of fear is deliberately heightened to teach the underclass learned helplessness, so that the underclass is habituated to a role of inferiority. It may be imagined that few societies are so extreme as to create absolute suffering or the absolute thrill of the predatory ethos, and there have been historically limits to how far this process could be carried out. To some extent, though, it has always existed. The role of those whose life is consigned to suffering is typically excised in philosophical treatments of society, except as an example to be avoided. It is this that makes the role of the untouchable, the one who suffers, economically relevant. A hated underclass, or certain hated behaviors, will set an example to all participants in society, so that transgressors of the law - and very often, an unwritten law operating in parallel - know just what happens if they are caught. The Spartans would play a great game in which prospective soldiers were instructed to kill a slave without being detected. Only those who successfully performed the task would be true Spartans, but if caught due to incompetence, the prospective soldier would be harshly punished. This punishment, however harsh, would never be as severe as the daily life of a helot, who was despised vigorously. No free man could be hated as much as a slave, and the slaves would out of necessity hate their masters and seek an even greater retribution should the opportunity arise. Such examples are omnipresent, and so, the status of untouchability functions as a large body of unwritten laws concerning things large and small. The need of this function may be questioned by a few timid souls, who ask if this is actually an effective moral education compared to alternatives that do not require such an elaborate deception. Realistically, no human society has made any significant attempt to ameliorate this, or see it as any problem at all. The hated, in the view of the favored, deserve their suffering, however they wish to justify it and however much they might try to claim that they themselves are above such cruelty. As much as possible, religions teach a familiar trope where the living world can only be suffering, and that all relief from the suffering is either in the afterlife or a temporary reprieve. In some sense, this may be demonstrable by an understanding of human psychology as something originated in fear and a response of nerves we could call pain. The vast suffering, particularly that suffering which only exists because of the conceits of a bully, has no reason to exist and serves no true moralizing purpose. Those of a sadistic, predatory ethos always hold a belief in their hearts that if the world can be proven so horrible and irredeemable, that the people of the world can be bent infinitely to the will of the strong, and will never let go of that belief. Such beliefs infect every society, no matter how many times they prove to be demonstrable failures. The hope of the predatory, as they accumulate greater knowledge, is to find some way to

ensure that their regimes are permanent, by smothering any voice or inclination that would tell them no. This is a matter that must be investigated further as my writing continues, and it is this precise problem that has brought me to write the present text and all the books in this series.

The seven functions mentioned above do not, in of themselves, constitute distinct classes in the actual division of labor. They have remarkably little to do with the actual legal division of society into social classes, despite a pretense that usually maintains certain functions are reserved for certain legal classes. We may imagine, indeed, a society full of many classes, for each profession and each guild around which the class organizes. We may imagine a society with many competing institutions, like a federation of competing cities or a league of competing sports teams. We can speak of socioeconomic classes as groups which possess some shared interest. For example, we call the landlords those proprietors with a stake in deeds of land, whether the landlord commands a large estate, a lucrative piece of land in a large city of sacred importance, or owns nothing more than a humble dwelling that they may rent to a tenant. The small holder who only owns their own piece of land to hold their home has a shared interest in a legal structure which protects deeds of land and property, even when the overall arrangement of landed property works against him and the other landlords are seeking to squeeze out all the small holders. We can see a class of lawyers whose interest is in being able to provide those legal services, due to specialized knowledge of the law and the contacts a lawyer possesses that allow him to work in the courtroom. Since representing yourself in court is a really bad idea even for the best lawyer, such a profession would exist even if everyone knew the law. And so out of some basic functions a great many specializations appear, which each have areas in society and the world that are interests. A full catalogue of them is not necessary.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

22. The Division of Knowledge to Create Classes and Institutions

So far we have considered the division of labor as a number of sentiments regarding rank, prestige, favoritism, and the symbols of property of individuals in society, and we have considered the distinct functions that would be present in any society where economic behavior is acknowledged and deliberately pursued. These functions are not at first divided by person, but by the acts themselves. The prestige of the agents is itself of no consequence to the functions, for the society must do these things for reasons which are outside of any sentiment, or they are part of the reality of existence. The functions would be carried out even in the absence of society as such. Individual humans extract from the world, allocate their basic labor, develop that labor, consider exchange with anything else that could be exchanged with, must fight, develop formal

understandings, and suffer, for reasons that are not intrinsically social or even economic. Nothing about those functions suggests that any division of labor is truly necessary beyond recognition that those are functions carried out. It is only in abstraction that those functions take on the role of institutions and then classes within a domain we call "society". None of these institutions or classes has an existence outside of human agents which insist that they must exist. They arise instead because there are people who believe they can abstract the sum total of wealth in an ecosystem and allocate it in some scheme that makes sense to them. Even if this scheme only exists in the imagination of someone, it is entirely possible to conceive of doing this, and then spend real effort to force the scheme to command the world, or some part of it. We would need to do this to function as an economic agent, and this serves some function for navigating the world. We would have sought to mitigate the invasion of the economic or the political into the rest of existence if this were intended to serve some physically necessary purpose, but the reasons for classes and institutions was never a necessity. It did not require much knowledge to consider a world without classes as such, and where institutions were limited to a purview deemed appropriate to meet the needs of its participants. For much of human existence, there are no classes as such, nor any primitive analogue suggesting classes should exist or are desirable. Institutions are almost entirely small-scale and limited in scope, and do not consume the lives of primitive humans in the way institutions in settled society are designed to consume the life-force of men and women. Even when classes exist, the struggle between them is often in name only. When push comes to shove, the class war would give way to necessity. The aim of those who hold the institutions ruling a class, or ruling subordinated classes, has been to make sure any necessity that would temporarily halt the class war never happens, so the interests of the institution override anything that would lead someone to question the institution's existence. If the institution doubts itself, humans are left with their raw faculties which would find the institutions distasteful, and the existence of humans individually would be a miserable and small one. Human in their genuine associations, seen as a physical force rather than an abstractly managed mass, would still just be a bunch of men and women and their machines, buildings, and so on, which do not match the pretenses of institutions and empires. While this inevitably does assert itself in the end, institutions perceive their longevity stems from one source only - command of knowledge as a process, such that only the correct ideas are taught and ideas become pseudo-physical agents. Things conjured by some mind trick become more real than the physical world, and must supplant that more base world if the institution is to survive. Through this, the agents of the institution find a source to obtain wealth for free, and see the perpetuation of the institution's thought form as the true perpetuation of themselves. As mortals, they would only extend as far as their bodies allow them to live and act, and would only be able to spread in some sense to their biological offspring. Since genetic legacy doesn't actually count as an innate purpose to life without ideology suggesting that we exist for that purpose, a human being alone in the world would have little relevance, and would content him- or herself with whatever inner space and immediate

surroundings they may find themselves in. This existence could be tolerable or even preferable, but if they remain unaware of institutional conspiracy, then those who command the institutions would effectively lord over those who are ignorant of institutions and their traps. It is the desire of those who command institutions that claim knowledge as their own to keep the ruled ignorant of institutional schemes for as long as possible, until the institutions can defend themselves with force and deliver their proclamations as a *fait accompli* to the ruled. The rulers always envision themselves a step ahead of the ruled, and are never reactive. The moment the rulers are reactive is the moment they have already conceded that they will be supplanted by rebels in the near future. No ruling class or institution has ever been passive, and could not be. The claim that states are passive settlements is among the earliest great lies, and never a credible one. It is a lie told with utter contempt for the ruled, always with a hint of humiliation and violence if the ruled refuse to agree to this social contract.

Taken by themselves, the functions are not worth anything. These functions are never concrete things, but abstractions concerning large groupings of events which serve those aims. The particular objects in the world, particular people who comprise the motive labor power, their skills and tools and any machines in society, the tokens of exchange, the machines and men deployed in war, the archives of written knowledge, and the suffering of people in a real sense, are each individual events and do not intrinsically have anything to do with each other. If these functions were viewed in the abstract as general rules of the world, then every function would in principle have no boundary regulating it, nor would the functions intrinsically be in conflict. All of them would build off of each other as the sense anyone would have about the world, and would be necessary to speak of any one function being effective in the world. Everyone who fights, writes, and trades must engage in labor and build machines appropriate to the task, and all are creatures motivated in part by suffering or the avoidance of suffering. If someone were trying to mind their own business and did not suffer or wish suffering on others, a malevolent actor can easily choose to change that. All things, including the constitution of the human beings who become people, are drawn from the environment in some way, and the bodies of living agents are themselves a part of some environment. There is no natural law suggesting that the bodies of humans are tied to any "ecology" or bound by economics in any way. The actual gathering of sustenance does not require managerial intent to tell us how to breathe, eat, or think. All that describing these functions can do is suggest there is a way to unite all that could be construed as fulfilling them by some metric that allows comparison. The functions cannot be compared to each other directly, in that so much labor is worth so much substance of the world or so much money or so much research. Within the function, though, everything fulfilling that function can be tallied and compared against a common reference point. Which may be chosen may vary based on the systematization of knowledge pertaining to it. In a cruder time, the world might be summarized as so much timber, mining output, arable land, fresh water, and so on, and a science might be able to compare those resources from their source. All of that

which was construed as "the world" in ancient times was the product of the land, which was claimed and divided into lots. In modern times, a science would seek to describe all physical matter and energy with chemistry and physics, and suggest that all of that matter is comprised of common substances which would be extracted from some space, and could be produced by various reactions, so that carbon could be transmuted in some way to another element. Some scheme by which different elements may be compared within a function is proposed by the nature of that function. This is done not because the utilities of each different element are fixed in nature, but because the existence of physical substance is a fact that must be abided, and the substances available are what they are. Those who covet some land must be able to compare two lots of land with very different resources and determine which would be more valuable. Even if the value of this function would be contingent on what can be done with labor, scientific knowledge, accumulated capital, social arrangement, what can be claimed by force, and what all who labor would be pushed to accept that is against their interests, all of those functions operate independently in order to be properly distinguished, and do not intrinsically have anything to do with each other. To the world, all that we would labor for is just another physical act in the environment. To labor and the craftsman, the world is not particularly important, as labor can conceive of making do with whatever environment it must live in. The act of knowledge accumulation in formal institutions has nothing to do with the actual accumulation of skills and machines that constitute what we consider today to be capital of one sort or another. We can consider the formulation to "unify" these functions as follows:

Extractive: The world is comprised of numerous elements, which abide laws of physics that lead to formations that are common, such as stars, planets, mountains, continents, oceans, and so on. All of these constructs are comprised of physical elements and compounds which we can understand, which have a common origin in substance and energetic actions found in nature. We are aware of the energy contained in physical matter and what it would cost to convert one substance we would extract for another, if we were to consider directly transmuting the substances as we know them to exist. None of this requires us to consider the labor costs or upkeep, which is variable and never confined to a bare minimum that can be treated as a natural law. We presume that even without machinery or a theory as to how substances can be transmuted or energy harnessed from natural forces, that this is possible in principle. If it weren't, we would have to introduce essentialism into our understanding of physics or chemistry, when there is no evidence that this is the case. Even if we were to accept that there are distinct essences in the world which are not transmutable to another by any possible process - the natural equivalent of God creating something so heavy He could not lift it - this didn't stop humans from suggesting that we could compare these processes' worth in a managerial scheme. Here we would run into the first problem of reducing the extraction of natural wealth to a single metric, in that this transubstantiation is not trivial and likely impossible in the sense that anything could be made into anything else without absurd energy

costs that make doing this highly impractical. It would further be impossible if it were found that certain laws of physics can never, ever be overcome - if for example it was physically impossible to travel faster than light, or for certain types of matter to exist. This is a problem more for our theories of the world than the world itself, where chemical and physical processes would have had to allow for the creation of any element we observe, and for those elements to interact with each other. We can call all the product that is extractable from the Earth essentially the same thing, or divide it into areas that use similar equipment and labor. Agriculture, mining, drilling for oil, fishing, and so on all extract something from the land, and no force on Earth will make the land produce infinite wealth. The output from a plot of land is not fixed in the sense that crop yields will always be the same regardless of technology. Labor must plow the fields and harvest the crops, and the seeds, tools, fertilizer, and so on are types of capital which would have some effect on what the land may yield, or can replenish the resources of the Earth. The claim of those who would rule through extractive economies is that they alone can manage the world's natural wealth and conserve it correctly, and this is the chief conceit of aristocracy, even though aristocrats are notoriously incompetent at managing the Earth and the actual maintenance of land is delegated to workers, waste management teams of the lowest class, scientists, and officers stuck with a desultory task that they have little interest of protecting. In the main, the land is conserved not by any great mind and certainly not the aristocracy. The world is instead preserved out of a sense in us that we would not despoil the thing that allows us to actually live in the first place, and because in the end, the world will reject efforts to make it do what it cannot or that which is abomination. The latter usually entails a lot of death and suffering, which aristocracies always encourage since it falls on anyone but them. It is more the former that wins out, because most people, contrary to every conceit of aristocracy and their managerial lackies, know not to allow shit to fill their homes and will eventually clean it.^[1]

Basic Labor: So far as labor has any value in-of-itself, it is valuable not as a social relation or as the bare minimum cost of maintaining it, but the motive force labor entails. Here, the qualities of labor in the abstract have been separated and treated as skilled labor, leaving behind the motive force itself which is understood as the object of interest in nature. The motive force of labor is not a mere substance sitting in situ to be released by managerial will. Labor is only realized when it is active, and it can only be released in particular ways. The motive force of machines on their own, like that of an engine or electrical generator, substitutes for basic labor, but is something that can only be channeled in ways the machines will allow. The human laborer in this light is viewed as another machine, and not one with unlimited potential. The advantage a human brings is that they are mobile and bring so much machinery at a cost of nearly nothing, since the machine maintains itself to arrive ready to work the next day. The particular machines are considered a kind of craftsmanship or capital, rather than the machine being itself the energy output of labor. The result of viewing labor in the abstract has been to shift to the view of human labor and the human

itself as a lump of utility. In this way, all of the machinery, knowledge, spirit, and soul of the human is subsumed into a drive to generate more man-power, like driving a horse or any other beast of burden. This is also evident in the way many a liberal speak of automation with zealous enthusiasm, as this is the great cargo cult of the neoliberal period. Anyone who has to work with this automation process and computerization can tell you the drive for automation is entirely a liberal fantasy, divorced from any real process of economic worth, but that was not the point. The point was to recapitulate the same aristocratic idea that everything else in society will be made invisible, and that people will be made just another part of the land to be extracted, like so much metal or agricultural crop is extracted. The Road to Serfdom was a guide, and this is most true of the idiotic bastard that wrote the book. Above all, the aim of the aristocrat is to claim, in typical contradictory fashion, that the aristocrat defines what is and is not valuable labor, and at the same time, basic labor - from which all others would be derived, including his own - does not exist as a real thing operating in real conditions. For this to work, labor in the abstract must be divorced from its raw form, which is truly little more than horsepower, and interpreted as something else. That may be the social relation which is represented by a wage or a deed granting a slave to an owner, or an account in some registry that sees in the human an asset to be exploited in all possible ways. It may simply devolve the relation to an equivalent of money or some substance that is not the actual motive force of labor, but a token that is completely alien to the laborer or labor itself. It may do even worse and replace the toil and sweat of labor with a grand theory and ideology suggesting that labor's sacrifice is commanded by God, or the state, or the spirit of revolution, or Daddy Trump exhorting any idiot following him to give up their money to the stupidest cult of personality in human history. It will inevitably reduce basic labor to one thing and settle on it as the final contradictory form - that human labor is suffering and nothing more. That suffering does not move anything in the world at all as a force unto itself, and usually retards the motive force of labor or anything that would substitute for it. Yet, by the same alchemy that allows aristocrats to do as they do, suffering to glorify aristocracy, encouraged by the aristocracy in all ways, is identified with basic labor and the lowest class, even when the laborer did not see himself as a member of the lowest class or really consider class his concern at all. The basic laborer might have been a man who not long ago had both the dignity of being a workman and a man with property, who could very well fight for himself and had enough knowledge to know he's been lied to. The aim of aristocracy is to engineer every no-win scenario to substitute the motive force of labor or anything like it with a vision of the world arrested in time, conforming to aristocratic will and nothing else.

Skilled Labor and Machinery: Here, machines and "human capital" - the skills of any laborer - are taken to be the same thing. The comparison between then is the study of operations, rather than the material being of the machines or the formal science which would present principles by which machinery would be generalized. All of the machines involved are effectively "dead labor" - that

is, they are the product of labor that is at some level construed as simple and undifferentiated. There is no reward for the laborer to acquire this machinery, whether it is in the form of any skills or tools or machines owned by any means, from the point of view of basic labor. It may be interpreted as a multiplier of basic labor's motive power, but only so far as the machines produce more quantity of a force, and this is a limited application. A tool may be more efficient at producing quantity in some way, but even here, it is not that the horsepower of the laborer is improved mechanically. Usually an increase in the rate of production is won not by expending more energy, but by using the same energy more efficiently - for example, replacing hand-operated hammers with machine tools, which do not wear or exhaust like a human executing repetitive motions, and would properly designed be built with a sense of mechanical efficiency. The chief aim of mechanization is not to produce greater quantity at all, but to produce qualities that were not possible with previous technology. The same applies to the skillsets of laborers themselves. The aim is not to do the same thing but bigger, but to produce new types of things which are useful for reasons that are not a linear progression of force or "usefulness" for another purpose. The value of the dead labor is not truly the cost expended to create it from basic labor, time, and raw material. Once created, the skilled labor and capital is by itself "worthless" in that regard, if it is not deployed for some other function. The value of machinery and skilled labor to the laborer is what this machinery can do, and among the ways this is gauged is to sell the skilled labor or machines to willing buyers. That is not the only way it can be valued, for the laborers themselves have lives and purposes for any machine they use, and their own bodies and everything about them beyond mere existence are among the machines, which wear and tear just as any other machine does.

Operations are never in service to a singular function or even a combination of functions outside of the operations. It is well established that operations must follow from other operations to complete any complex task and assemble any machine beyond the most basic. And so, the valuation of operations is best described by a theory of systems, however that may be construed. There would be a way to assemble knowledge of functions and events and sense what it would take to assemble a machine that is novel. Assessing this cost is not something done by the other functions on their own. Only those who work with the machines will really know what needs to be done to realize the result. Those who rely on a theory in formal writing and then insist reality must conform to the theory will never accomplish anything, and those who are actually qualified to write about science are not the cloistered academics but those who work with machines and the natural world - that is to say, laborers are the true scientists, and aristocrats are the last people with any true claim to science. The university is presented as a religious institution and a false conflict between religion and science is presented. The true nature of the university, and institutions like it, is that they are strongholds of aristocracy. Because it has been the state of formal knowledge and education to never allow the classes tasked with productive industry or agriculture to formulate philosophies of science, the world where

science returns to its proper authority with knowledge of what was developed in the past few centuries is far removed from how we are trained to view science and operations. Operations are instead viewed through the demands of monetary exchange and the management of finance, or the interests of aristocratic scholars and mystics, or the needs of war. Rarely, they are viewed only as an assemblage of basic labor, and skilled laborers are treated like the basic laborers who were turned into a suffering class or threatened with that status and presumed to be "invalid until proven innocent", which is never really allowed as security. Skilled labor is able to secure its position because, while unskilled and basic labor is common and seen in the main as a mass of population to be fed from, skilled labor is not so freely reproducible, and labor has historically shown little interest in sharing knowledge for all of the reasons that make sense. Where unskilled labor has no bargaining position, skilled labor does, and in principle every basic labor possesses some skill, some quality, that is inherent in the constitution of people. The presumption of a baseline for a given society of "unskilled labor" is a fallacy, because the floor for potentially useful labor is far below the median for a society. Someone barely functional who can push a cart or be made into a useful machine is as good as someone with far more potential if the task is limited to pushing carts. It is this conflict which was played up by aristocracy to ensure the defeat of the collective working class.^[2] Nothing about this process truly played out "behind the backs of the producers". Inherent to the concept of the industrial capitalist workplace was an interest in operations. No capitalist, just like anyone else who acts in the interests of a state, is a passive lump that is unaware of how his money has been deployed. Those who work on behalf of the capitalist to manage operations will always demonstrate greater loyalty to the capitalist than the subordinated workers, for the manager of operations is himself among the bourgeois and likely holds some stock to be a capitalist himself as part of his contract. The workers down the line which plan operations are always aware of what workers do, or seek to be aware as much as possible. The workplace being an ecology commanded by the capitalist would mean that the overseer of operations would know much about what workers are doing, and in every event, someone paying for skilled labor would be interested in the quality of that labor and product. Never is the capitalist a slave to the pursuit of coin alone. The coin is a means to various ends, and so too are the qualities produced. No capitalist is going to allow something to exist which undermines his property in an obvious way, and no clever conspiracy will always outsmart the witless ruling order which is blind to all, as the narrative of every pseudo-revolutionary cult proclaims. This stupid, pernicious belief of faux-revolutionaries has always been advanced precisely because it is so ineffective at understanding operations, either for industry or for the supposed revolution which will happen any day now.

It is easily forgotten that at the end of the day, the utility of products for the interests of life's power over life - which include different types of people and specialization of functions in society - are the only reason productivity is tolerated at all by the ruling order. None of the products created exist to fulfill basic wants, out of a sense that doing this was nice or because the purpose of

labor is to give things to others as a gratuity. None of the products are created simply because product will translate to coin by some mysterious alchemy. The exchange of commodities proceeds because the holder of money found something useful in them, even if we may think that judgement is dubious. With the wealth of capitalist economies focused on a class of property holders who are notoriously tight-fisted, and the existence from the start of large interests like the trading companies, natural monopolies like power companies, and state interest in building railroads and everything a modern state would want, it would be very strange to think the production of qualities proceeds for only the most crass motives, as if the product were intended to go nowhere. The creation of "null product" intended to waste resources is not done mindlessly. The products to be wasted are often weapons of war, or indulgences intended to degenerate the will of those who buy them. Their creation is in of itself a testament to the true heart of capitalist motives, and their share of the market is not some mistake but something inherent to the entire project of British free trade. The Empire would not be anything without dealing opium around the world, and this was a scandal very early in the era of industrial capitalism. Nothing is produced thoughtlessly or without regard to how the product could be used against the masters. The moment any product escapes its intended purview, that product will be banned or brought under the control of the ruling interest. For the most part, there are few products which would truly threaten the ruling interest. Guns are useless without an army that is determined to use them against states with many more armed men and a will to fight with the backing of the state's legal monopoly on violence. Even if the rulers fear a revolt, most of the world had done everything needed to disarm mass movements, and specifically encouraged gun ownership among those who would fight to defend the ruling order. The production of guns serves the interests of rulers who can usually control who is allowed to keep and bear arms, and those who would strike back are as a rule denied and such right, either by some invented pretext or because there isn't a concept of any "right to self defense", which was never a right explicitly guaranteed by any state in human history nor one that could be realistically enforced or interpreted. When the lower classes do possess weapons, it has been easy for the ruling interest to stoke intestine violence and especially to turn the guns on the lowest class, who usually don't have the money to buy guns and are denied access not merely by poverty but by a long-standing taboo against the lowest class showing any initiative or backbone, which is the most ancient taboo of the human race for reasons we have already made apparent. This stupid, naive theory of "mindless producers" always assumes that states are pathologically passive and will not lift a finger to defend themselves. This is at odds with any government that is a going concern, which will pass laws regularly to address security, and at odds with the state which has always acted beyond any limits set on it and would always do so as a matter of course. This stupid theory is the pet of cloistered anarchist retards, and they are retarded, who think that everyone else will be honorable and they alone will transgress decency. It is easy for these people to think they have a monopoly because the eugenic creed has declared such a monopoly on transgression, and ensures laws and enforcement are subordinated

to the creed in all things. That monopoly is only possible because it is protected by a tremendous command of force and zealous control over operations.^[3]

Where these operations are oriented ultimate answers not to a theory or management, but to spiritual authority, which is the topic of the next chapter. As this is the proper authority which can speak to labor with any seriousness, and skilled labor is identified here with the interest in life which would spur labor's development, it is difficult to suggest any hard rule compelling the value of one operation over another. Generally speaking, though, the operations that are common in any society are known not just to the laborers themselves, but the people at large. Most people are aware of the professions that exist in a society and their associated operational tasks. They are aware of what a medical doctor does to be a doctor, and for much of history, medical care is delivered not by university experts with a state-protected monopoly that punishes transgressors with jail time, but people without any great prestige and whatever knowhow was needed to fix broken body parts. It is not too difficult to understand why one skill is valued over another without needing to believe there is some ulterior interest or function that the different value must serve. Operations are not figments of the imagination, but things which are realized every day, and must be realized in sequence to complete a full chain of operations that would create a product or some service of note. Humans are not so stupid that they cannot figure out the overall cost of getting to point A or point B. These operations are never entirely fixed in nature as a course of action, as new knowledge and machines will modify what is possible, what is desirable, and so on. All of this is properly in the realm of operations. The latter four functions I describe do not produce anything real at all. Money and exchange produce nothing on their own, as we will see. War obviously produces nothing. Scholarship as a rule disdains production and favors occulting knowledge within a select group. Suffering obviously produces nothing, and though it is not associated with any class for the same reason the world as a whole is not truly the property of any class, the suffering disciplinary function is transferred to basic labor, which on its own is considered an inchoate blob. In all of these disciplinary functions, they are carried out in the end by operates just as productive labor would be. Financial institutions must do things to regulate the exchange of money, as would anyone handling money as a tool. War, education, the rites of academia, and the infliction of suffering are all operations. The suffering itself, if it is an agony caused by no particular malevolent actor, operates in ways that are comprehensible, but that it is a taboo to acknowledge too plainly if it is decreed that certain classes exist to suffer. In the main, labor as a class has no interest in upholding the disciplinary functions at all. Labor has always maintained a sense of what is valuable operationally, because it had to in order to do its daily work. So far as the disciplinary functions are recognized by labor, it is because laborers are not "pure laborers" but men and women with wants like anyone else and leverage to get what they want, even if they must claw it from the institutions. Labor has to engage with the disciplinary functions because it cannot wish them away, but if it must acknowledge their existence, it considers their institutions and interests to be antagonistic and would insist on

limiting their influence on the affairs of labor. It is labor and democracy that sees the rule of institutions as a danger to be checked, rather than the good will of aristocrats claiming they will govern honestly and cleanly. Labor does this not out of some high-minded sense of justice, nor out of a sense that they're trying to rip off the Man, but because the disciplinary forces had been active against the laborer before labor could organize independent countermeasures. The corruption of monied influences on labor's quality and the products available does not require a philosopher to understand, as if workers actually liked seeing their paycheck shrink and forking over tokens of ostensible money which are never theirs for long, that are only useful because the products of labor are put behind a paywall and every worker has to operate in that arrangement rather than one labor would have chosen in a better world. Aristocracy has no interest in opposing those things, but instead places its own institutions and education in a world that is sacrosanct. In principle, the aristocracy is immune to the influences of money, because aristocracy commands the bank and can direct institutions to grant to aristocracy an "I win" button, which was invoked in 2008 and 2020. The only thing the aristocrat doesn't like is that doing this through disciplinary functions other than the infliction of suffering cannot be done without consequences. The aristocrat cannot change the laws of motion of currency in the hands of everyone, or the fortunes of war. The aristocrat cannot surrender the integrity of the university too much without destroying its credibility among their own kind if intellectual dishonesty becomes too rampant for the university to be anything other than an aristocratic club of pissants and failures. The only truly reliable friend of the aristocrat is a willingness to make others suffer and grant to the aristocracy sacrosanctity which allows them and them alone to live in a world without the torture machine.

Exchange: The unifying value of exchange is very simple - currency, which has been in use for centuries. Without currency, notation of debts, credits, honorability in the form of credit scores, and various devices are suggested, which all converge on something that accounts for what is really an ethical view of behavior that can be tokenized and represented by currency units. When tokenized and distributed, the coin or whatever unit operates on its own, just as a written word committed to paper is dead and outside of the control of the author. The deadness of the currency is necessary for the exchange function to be universalized by currency; but if there were no reliable coin, there would still be a sense of balance of debits and credits, and a sense of what would be necessary to write off debts and the consequences to the treasury. Different currencies are presumed to be exchangeable.

We of course speak of the currency within a contained ecosystem as we have defined. There is no way to guarantee that some token would be confined to the country of origin, but currency controls may prohibit the use of foreign coin, regulate trade with foreign entities, and so on. States, financial institutions, and ordinary people have a lot of reasons to desire economic life to be insulated from external agents, especially when dealing with much larger countries which are wealthier and would overrun a weaker society by flooding it with money.

We cannot presume that the inhabitants of a given ecosystem see themselves as patriotic subjects, but there is a general sense that exchange escaping an ecosystem leads to bad things. Another consequence of trade balance would be the wealth of a country frittered away on foreign luxuries, and so the money tokens do not need to invade like soldiers or a contagion; instead, the tokens of one country can be spent on something like opium, thus sending both wealth to the aliens, and weakening the resolve of the country in preparation for an escalation. The trade policy can operate in the other direction, where trade advantages are played up and coin becomes a useful diplomatic tool. The same policies for a state can apply to lower ecologies on similar principles. Generally, though, a given ecosystem seeks to internalize its basic economic functions and avoid dependence on foreign entities, or if it enters into outside trade, the trade is regulated in some way. Those who command a given ecosystem would be in a position to game trade to favor their command, more than any value of the coin itself. That command of the ecosystem may be the command of a comprador who wishes to sell his country out, or a petty lord looking to defect, or a city block paying tribute to the new Don or some gang lord. The effective compradors understand that even if they move to a new lord, they will be looking to the next betrayal and always look out for number one, themselves.

Since foreign trade is outside of our purview I would leave it, but it is important to note that money is not the sole way in which economic policy will affect another ecosystem. Money does not have a spiritual monopoly on the communication of economic information, and a frequent difficulty of money is that it is actually a very poor communicator of any value except the professed value of money itself by the institutions that issue it and loan it out. Money have the advantage of being explicitly a token of exchange, whereas the exchange of other things is implied in more convoluted ways. In principle, though, money for its own sake is the most meaningless thing that exists, and is more meaningless than war which is saying a lot. Every exchanger of money is conscious of what that money intends to purchase, whatever that may be. Even without exchange, anyone looking at economic activity is looking at events that are happening. The smart merchants have never fetishized money for a single moment, and make investment decisions based on rational payoffs of events. In effect, the smart merchant is a shrewd gambler and usually much more than that. Only a fool fetishizes "risk" as something to seek.^[4] The smart merchants, like the smart gamblers, always seek to mitigate risks, first by playing the odds and avoiding anything but choices which are close to 100% win, and then by playing all opponents so that anything that would be risky is negated by some prestige or the sheer size of the money bin. Enough has been written about finance that I need not repeat that here. The common reference of currency has always been recognized as a proxy for everything else, for the interest of institutions which can command money and a general sense that exchange becomes a political and moral practice rather than exchange of the things people do.

Fighting and Deception: The common thread of all fighting is a sense of what is effective to attain victory. "Victory" here is not defined in the way a naive

observer of war would be taught, for the objectives of violence and war are not to offer a fair fight or an epic struggle. There is a vast science and game theory where there is any struggle resolved by violence or deception, and to a crude mind, this is taken as the purpose of life. It is not a very worthwhile purpose, but it will exist any time the disciplinary function of choice is violence. Deception is carried out with no less a sense of victory and the thrill of domination that is inherent to the cult of war, which becomes a purpose unto itself. It is only beholden to any condition of winning that allows it to flourish, rather than an objective metric that labor or common sense would value. This will be written of later in this book when the practices of war and its social function are described. All such fighting is beholden to a condition outside of the participants which allows them to fight, and all fighting consumes resources and leaves behind offal that is judged of no value to the war. Because the language of war infuses human society from an early stage, other functions are subsumed most commonly by the function of war, and the warriors are always the ever-ready tools of aristocracy.

Scholarship: The common thread of scholars is the method by which their formalism spreads, which is to say, education. There is always in an ecosystem one and only one "real" education, to which all others are implicitly compared. It is this which allows the "grand system" of ecology to be established as a formal theory, rather than a mere assumption. The universal standard is then defined by the will of academics, who are in principle not beholden to anything but their own world, a world apart from material concerns. All other functions exist to parasitically feed the Academy and university, and the intellectuals form the elite in this ecological view. Naturally, this is the preferred domain of aristocracy, however education is conducted in a given society. Before the establishment of cities, the favored warriors and those "in the know" enforce their aristocracy through fear and ignorance, and thus begins humanity's full transition to a demonic race, from its sordid origins in ritual sacrifice and the terror of savage existence. If not for this, then the scholar is concerned with the mechanisms of learning and the transmission of knowledge just as the laborer would be, for scholarship is itself a type of labor rather than something actually existing above the world. The same is true of the merchants and warriors, whose work has to abide the conditions labor would face, and so all are beholden in some way to versions of science, and will seek to command science and spiritual authority. The formalization of doctrine is the preference of those whose work is in establishing education. Everyone else sees education correctly as a threat to their genuine learning.

Suffering: The ecosystem cannot be enforced without acts of suffering to suggest that the confinement of agents is natural. Without this suffering - for life-forms which are not disciplined by this function which is particular to animal life - life would travel wherever it needs to acquire its genuine sustenance, and the natural limitations of its movement and its preferences would be asserted, if needed. Animal life shows territorial interest, but this territorial interest exists not by an immutable instinct, but because the shortest path to food is through community and the establishment of colonies of life. Traveling alone in the wild

is likely to end badly and likely to not result in anything particularly good. Very likely, the sociality of humans and their close relatives encourages members of a community to scout and report their findings, and only out of necessity do people embrace solitude. That necessity arises early because they see without great investigation that humanity is essentially created evil and cannot be trusted for the simplest things, but the territoriality of humans often exists at first because doing this is easier. When antagonistic relations in close quarters intensifies - when settled society forms - it becomes necessary to lock down the city and the village and make it into an ecological construct. The same is true of factories, households, farms, and every other parcel of space which must be commanded and controlled to be utilized. If humans could come and go based on their need or want to maintain a city, the structure of every space we create would be very different. We see even today the existence of the commons and shared spaces, and bourgeois rights of the city are still mostly held in principle. The test of what is done to the lowest class is the vanguard of aristocracy's desire to choke the life out of cities and the whole world.

How is suffering universalized? It can only be done by supplanting the genuine material world, where suffering is an inconvenience and something of little importance, with an entirely subjective world where sense experience and suffering are paramount and take on existential importance. This is what many of the aristocratic spiritual authorities do, in one way or another, and became a moral philosophy. There is no way to claim that suffering is truly "natural" or would be assigned any great weight at all. We would, if we were free, acknowledge that suffering exists and will discipline our behavior, without glorifying it or suggesting suffering should be maximized. If we did that, then we would not merely encounter the products of society as what we wanted in the first place. We would reject ecology altogether as a beast that is ultimately aristocratic in origin, and we would instead seek to consider all of the spaces in which we can live, and humanity could in theory live in something like happiness for the first time in its sorry existence.

It is through suffering that ecologies are created in a way humans manage them, and also through suffering that the final imposition onto other ecosystems is understood. And so, all functions, which serve legitimate aims, are twisted to serve suffering and their opposite. The education of aristocracy concerns the destruction of knowledge, where education is intended to fail students at high rates and lies profusely about the very nature of its institution. War and fighting, which can be understood as an unpleasant but necessary evil, is instead glorified to become the prime want of the enablers of aristocracy, where the generals, officers, and grunts are assigned desultory tasks to feed the parasitic aristocracy, and aristocratic values are reproduced in the warrior class to show dubious leadership. Technology is made to serve further suffering and the ruling sciences only. Labor is made to toil solely for the promise of future exploitation. Above all, a lowest class is designated whose function is purely to suffer, and in this way, the subject in society is ruled primarily by the image of what worse fate may occur for noncompliance. There is no other basis for a society to be converted

into an ecological niche by force. If this were a matter of any tendency in life, it would be clear that any such barriers are unnecessary when they are nothing but harmful and exist to serve a predatory clique, who offer nothing but the promise of more humiliation and torture and the thrill for doing so. The natural borders of a human society so to speak would not see a city or any territory as something which should enslave them, and people would come and go from the city. When locking away the food and products of society is not enough, the rulers inevitably resort to confining the people, and do so by torturing their genuine existence and replacing it with a parody. Fascism and eugenics took this to its highest form yet known, where the replacement of the world and our true existence with a world of unlimited torture is the only possible world, and all other concepts are inadmissible from birth. In doing so, the thrill of those who have always reveled in torture is maximized, and all other functions exist to serve it.

THE COMMAND OF ECONOMIC FUNCTIONS TO REIFY INSTITUTIONS

At first, these functions are only apparent so far as people see them as necessary. We did not exist to be economic actors or locked into any ecology, and all of these functions give way to that which we would truly desire. The world is the source of all that we could consider good or morally worth pursuing, however we perceive that. There is nothing "outside of the world" that would be substantive, and even if we were to consider holding to some meager existence and reject the world outside of our immediate space, that small space of our own is recognized as part of a world that we would protect; and in doing so, we would need to retain our native connection to the world, without the mediation of thought leaders and cajolers. No social classes exist in nature, or as a direct consequence of functions. It has long been the case that social classes proper have nothing to do with any genuine function or the private sentiments regarding rank, prestige, and so on. Social classes can only exist when they hold institutions, and whatever the tendencies of people or the conceits they hold about what the world ought to be, these institutions are ultimately constructed from materials in the world and the basic motive force of those who labor to turn the raw material into a machine which makes the institution. The institution then is deployed to transform humans who were at first not sorted into any class into members of some class, either due to membership in institutions or institutional force exerted on people who are tagged with some marker and handled in the manner an institution prefers. The classes never truly exist "in of themselves" or even "for themselves". They are only constituted so long as their institutions actively enforce the existence of the class. Independently, members of the class can do nothing for their class except gripe that the society should conform to their expectations. If someone individually wishes to change the world, they are only able to do so through institutional means. Their labor and any human quality is channeled into an institutional representation. This may be the institutional representation of the individual that is the person, or humans might abase

themselves before an institution in which they would exert force collectively. Never are the classes "just so" acting in interests, as if by some incomprehensible force. There is always a motive and mechanisms the members of a class do to make the class real. If this did not happen, then social class would be nothing more than a flimsy conceit and lacks any relevance. Before classes proper can solidify, the institutional basis for the class is constructed, however thinly it is constructed. Only when spiritual authority is associated with large institutions, such as the existence of states, do social classes appear to us as something that appears self-evident. We are attuned to a society where social classes dominate, but the most primitive societies did not entail any distinct classes as such. The rise of class society did not assert suddenly that all men and women were assigned to a particular class, and that class assignment was unassailable and natural. That step to construct social classes can only be finalized as spiritual thought and the state are sufficiently developed, and the humans who were once wild become subjects of institutions which gather at the apex of society. If social class, or any other grouping of humans, is a just-so story based on feelings or a purely surface-level description, then it is not a genuine understanding of social class and worthless for any analysis of society or anything that actually happens. Social classes rise and fall as the conditions humans operate in change with the ages. There are common trends that are inherent to the concept of the political and the economic, but the particular institutions and classes which represent those trends will change as the mechanisms that allow them to be realized change. Property, for example, can refer to common property, private property considered by numerous law codes which adapts to the situation actors find themselves in, public property that is effectively owned by those who hold the state regardless of the pretenses concerning public property, personal property that is understood by custom to be an expectation of anyone who considers themselves free to act, or the property of corporate institutions which is granted sacrosanct status beyond that of either private or public property, and claims to be spiritually superior to the personal property of actual humans. Property is not the sole foundation of states or politics, since what states do entails not just the claims to property or claims of birthright or genesis. The trends of aristocracy, meritocracy, technocracy, democracy, and the necessary rebellion of the lowest class against all such schemes, are suggested by interests life would hold individually and in any social formation we could imagine. The expression of them will vary greatly, and never does one dominate so thoroughly that it would be able to entirely negate the others. In primitive society, would-be aristocrats would never be able to rule, and technocratic polities are unthinkable. What results is a presumed meritocracy and egalitarianism that would be analagous to the sense of democracy that has long been dormant in human society, but also a world in which many are downtrodden and live miserable and small lives, pressed by warring bands to pay tribute and having no choice but to accept a daily quota of raping and pillaging, without any expectation that this will go away. The only thing that is comforting to the lowest class is that a world outside of that is very conceivable, and in the end all conceits of economics and politics are secondary to the need of life to survive. Without any mechanisms to impose

a preferred tendency at the level of a confined space, and those mechanisms are never able to operate with the kind of untrammelled might their advocates would like, the true final result, true in all times and places, is that all of these classes and institutions are absurd, yet nonetheless stalk the Earth like some terrible plague.

Any disease originates from causes that can be isolated, and so like any sound medical practitioner, the diagnosis must begin with a view of the anatomy of the patient. That would mean that we have isolated some society that is stuck in an ecology, and we regard for historical reasons that this ecosystem has been established and accepted as a reality for long enough. Where does the need for humans to remain in confined spaces arise? There is, at least faintly, a sense that straying too far from the familiar would lead to suffering or a danger from outside, and that compels people to stay if they doubt what is out there in the world. There may be reasons why people prefer to settle down somewhere and do not want to travel, but if it is accepted that the boundaries of society are fixed, there is something that would restrain people from moving outside of them. The practical difficulties of movement may be noted, for most of us cannot build our own spaceship to leave planet Earth, and traveling far on foot will not be easy or without danger. The first requirement for the formation of persistent institutions would be that the boundaries of society where they could operate has been established. Even if the institutions are presumed to be global in primitive society, "the world" at this time is understood to be a limited space. Man has long understood that they cannot sprout wings to inhabit the skies, and that even if they could fly, all of the sustenance and things allowing men to make tools are found on the land or in the seas. The heavens beyond the sky are even further away, and primitive society would not possess any detailed cartography of the stars let alone a sense of what those distant planets actually are, or the material composition of stars. There were certainly vague speculations about what those entities in the night sky were, and far more speculations about the sun and moon. It still accepted that we would never set foot on them like we would on the Earth, and that much of the Earth was outside of our reach if we are alone. The natural barriers to movement though are less pressing than the social barrier; that is that there is some potential agent like ourselves elsewhere in the world who wouldn't think for a moment that sparing your life meant a thing. We would have enough experience of human hostility in the space we live in, and extrapolate that similar entities in another place would be just as hostile and even more hostile to outsiders. Those who have a good enough thing going where they are would have some space to defend and consider their home, and this instinct runs deep. It is one that slave masters have long deployed to induce slaves to accept their station, since even if a slave escapes, the slave has no home and lives in a world where the order of slavery is presumed operative all around, in one way or another. The best hope for a slave would be to escape to some other tribe or city where slavery has been abolished, or where redemption is possible. In any event, the boundaries in which institutions can form are presumed to be enclosed. The enclosure of the Earth itself is guaranteed not

by natural laws but by a general fear and suffering. If not for that, then the natural barriers could be faced as a simple fact and we would out of some sense of decency not want this limited space to be despoiled by our own malice or malice that we know never needed to exist. It is with this fear in mind that all economic actors in this ecological view would think. If the "ecosystem" in question allowed for free movement of people and things, as is the liberal ideal, then natural boundaries of ecosystems may be understood and described, without attaching to the ecosystems any particular moral weight. For example, it would seem reasonable enough to believe the Earth is a single "ecosystem", but this is not going to be accepted by the various nations living on that Earth who weren't consulted about some liberals in Britain deciding the world was ruled by the free market. There really was nothing stopping free trade from existing except the barriers human societies erected against it, and there would be arguments in favor of free trade in principle. There would also be compradors who were eager to switch allegiances to the emerging global empire of capitalism as we know it, and many people in the world who regarded the country they lived in as nothing more than a place.

However the ecosystems are established, there is a primitive sense that humans are able to demarcate them based on fear. If we were to work backwards in history, we would see the origin of settled states as a story of general fear, slavery, deception, malice, lurid cults, and almost entirely bad things. If it were not for that, then the history of humanity would be very different. It would also be far more likely that all nations of mankind would be led by people who see universal peace as necessary, and cults of war would not have intensified but would have been diminished as the clearest danger to anything we would want out of life. If humanity were a race that actually believed in justice, then free trade would not have meant imperial rule and humiliation as it did historically, and it would be simple enough to bring an end to all such struggles and operate a global society on the basis of peace, mutual prosperity, and something that most people would have wanted. It becomes evident that the malevolent do not need significant support in the general public, vast wealth to begin their campaign, or any great idea that would allow the malevolent to rule. It is only necessary that the mechanisms allowing enclosure can continue and insinuate that human societies must accept them. The malevolent are allowed a monopoly on transgression of all decencies, which are then redefined to declare that the predators are the truly decent and the honest are simps and sinners, guilty of the cardinal sin - being retarded. It is easier said than done to make this the final judgement of human history, but just as humans could only live in the first place because they were allowed to live, the malevolent could exist and persist so long as they were allowed to exist. The genuinely decent could only exist so far as they were not forced to compromise themselves to the general fear and suffering, and it would be impossible for the decent to claim "ignorance is strength" and pretend suffering is not real or an illusory state to be overcome by chanting koans. Suffering instills in most humans a demand to not suffer for all of the reasons we would expect, and this is not a purely reactive response that

gives an absolute monopoly on initiative to predators. There is no true defense of the decent that is not willing to pre-emptively attack known predators who are a clear and present danger. It has taken some cleverness to insist that the little people are not allowed to do the only thing that would have stopped this, which would have been to drag out the predatory element and their enablers and shoot them dead on the spot with no remorse or regard for doing so. Instead of doing this, where death would be assigned to the aristocracy and their enablers, the complete opposite is insinuated - that it is the lowest class which is guilty of creating suffering, due to crimes of Being, and the aristocrats get on a high horse and claim they fight for justice when defending their vampiric chokehold of the world. Without any aristocrats or little people naturally ordained by the world, the first stirrings of this appear at the local level, in which families pick which of their children are selected to live and which are condemned to be little better than slaves of their parents and the wider society in which they live. The best way for aristocracy to begin its foul crusade is to get them while they are young, and to this day, the chief aim of aristocracy has been to capture outright the children, the breeding process, and regulate how children are to be raised and educated. In short, among the germs that allow for the realization of ecology is education and the control of new life's development. By directly commanding the source, the aristocracy could in principle rule as make it appear as a fait accompli. This, though, is recognized right away and must be fought before it spreads too far. Families dutifully carry out the mission in their small domains, but there is a sense in the wider world that doing this as a general rule would create immediate disaster. Early attempts to do so beyond the scope of a family likely did fail and led to nothing but predictable death, as social experiments often do. All that was necessary to begin the cycle of aristocracy was to pick apart the lowest class and assign to them the entirety of war guilt, even though they had the least to do with the state of general fear and war and were often never in a position to even join that great game.

Where is the fear, except in the world itself? Without any particular knowledge, which must always be adjudicated, the first instinct would be that fear and suffering are somewhere in the world. If we knew the source and method of the fear, we would recognize the source and not need any concept like an "ecology" to contain it. It would instead be assessed as if it arose from its genuine origin, and the language to describe it would not be ecological or economic but mechanical. Knowledge of the mechanism does not grant security against it, but it allows us the possibility of adapting to it and refusing the dictates of those who would rule by fear. The people initiating the fear are themselves as human as we are, and are mortal and subject to the same mechanisms. Only by asserting that there is an essential distinction between master and slave, or any other relation, can the predator make its will sacrosanct, and conversely the ruled is to be abolished as an actual entity and reduced to some information, some token, which allows it to be shrunk. All of those conceits, though, derive from a material world which is described with definite qualities. Fear, uncertainty, and doubt do not exist in physical reality or nature. The true nature of the world doesn't care about

any of that nonsense. To summon the fear requires exploiting tendencies that were evident in the genesis of life, and this is why appeal to nature has always been a go-to of aristocracy and those who wish to rule or manipulate the world through the general fear. Consequently, those who are aspire to rule through a state dominated by that fear interpret politics as a great game of deception and struggle, and nothing more. This replacement of the material world with a philosophy of struggle, where the political is associated with two essences deemed "friend" and "enemy" and a third essence is supposed but never spoken of, eliminates all other meanings that would be necessary to define a source of that which brings suffering. The final programming is to say that "the world" or "society" in some vague sense created the suffering, made it omnipresent, and in doing so, the thought process is arrested. This is not something that is done by the audacious declaration that someone willed it to happen. Only by repeat habituation can this be internalized, and the habit like any other implies an expenditure of raw material. At a basic level, defending against this is as simple as refusing to play along, and so in typical existence, the strategy of infinite transgression meets the barrier of the true, physical reality. To generate enough force to impose by thought and will this general fear requires not mere knowledge, but something foul that channels energy in the world in some demonic working. The working of devilry is mystified and made sacrosanct. At its heart is merely the connection of a primitive will or urge that is particular to a degenerated concept of life. This fear cannot be summoned properly without a mechanistic view of every single action in the whole ecosystem, which the summoner believes is a property of themselves and of the world. In other words, the first hubris is the necessary act - that the would-be conjurer considers themselves identical with the world, and at the time time is abolishing the world as it was to create something new, with no intermediary. Those who scheme and cajole must do this as the most essential act, and it is not a habit that is natural to all living things or even a particularly effective way to wield power. Many who rule simply follow the numbers and leave the demonic working to specialists or underlings, and possess only enough knowledge to sit on the throne. The true heart of ruling, as you probably figured out, is not to wave a mighty hand to make the world go. To rule in any sense requires the arrest of the world as a whole in the mind of rulers, even if the effective reach of this rule is no more than the ruler's local environment. That is the necessary genesis, recreating the most primitive reality of life itself - that life really isn't a "thing" in nature. It is necessary in doing this to make life natural and immortal, and at the same time to envision a circle of life and death feeding into the ruling order. There is no other way for rule to be maintained persistent and the most effective mechanisms for ruling to be isolated. Even those who rule as a means to some ulterior motive, who would seek to do something with rule other than ruling itself, would be aware on some level that this is what happens. So too would the ruled be aware of this in some way, because the ruled are never truly ignorant. Part of being ruled and governed is an understanding of the relationships at work, and conditioning the ruled to accept this condition. The ruler might justify their rule with something other than fear, and usually makes an attempt to do so if the ruler wants to

accomplish something substantial. At the very core of rule is a vampiric and nihilistic view of the world which claims to supercede the substantive and create a super-truth. In doing so, the thought-form of rule materializes its mechanisms, and all who contend with rule will have to abide it, regardless of their opinion on the matter. The ruler cannot do this by screeching "me wantee" like a retard and receiving what he wants. Rulers can only operate through the world as the rest of us do. Yet, the very act of ruling suggests the heart is a foolish will to change the world which is far greater than anything life could accomplish.^[5]

The ruler's typical routine - since the real plan is too abominable to be acknowledged too frankly and has obvious consequences - is to suggest that rule is really management in an economic sense, and that the rulers by some right have a claim to the world, in all concepts of it. This includes the people in the patch of space where people are ruled, and every thought and abstraction the ruler can get his or her hands on. Here, the ruler can belong to any tendency, each with its own vices, and the tendencies attract certain sorts to the ruler, who are their natural constituents. Everyone can aspire to rule something, but not everyone does or sees any purpose to "rule", and the motives of rulers are not reducible to some calculus which demands them to behave any particular way. It is only when rule becomes management that they abide the notion that rulers are obligated to anything at all, whether it is popular support or the reality of the world. Rulers rule not because of a managerial intent that is natural, but because they wish to rule and claim the means to do so, and those means to rule are not merely a substance that compels rule to exist. What rulers do with the mechanisms that allow rule is ultimately up to them. The ruled have no reason to go along with any of this, and in practice, the rulers never command the world as absolutely as they would like. This is because the the very idea of ruling is absurd if you didn't carry the biases and incentives of living, thinking creatures who are acutely aware that ruling is one way to survive in a hostile world. Rulers are never purely motivated by self-preservation, nor are the ruled obliged to live. Either can choose to simply abandon rule, life itself, or accept a worse position and their eventual mortality. There isn't a particularly good reason to die or shun the power that allows someone to rule. The true motives of humans are, in the end, truly their own. We really do not have to do any of the things I have continuously complained about in this writing, and that has been clear from the start. Whether there would be any point to doing something other than ruling is up us, but if life for the sake of life is circular, rule for the sake of rule is a loop of pure stupidity. Never is the ruler motivated purely by ulterior moral motives that are outside of him - that is for the ruled and the servants. But, rulers are perfectly capable of valuing something other than their own rule, and have to consider abdication or succession unless they are truly immortal and immune to anything that would dethrone them. Even if someone did possess that secret, which is likely a physical impossibility, it doesn't follow that the ruler is obligated to rule or live at all. In every case, to speak of "rule" is to speak of ruling an ecosystem defined by the ruler, and that may include the human beings or institutionalized persons in their domain. The true rule is not

really over people but over spaces. If the spaces are controlled, and the resources in them are controlled, controlling the people is much easier, because the ruler controls the primary leverage that would be available to change the situation. The ruler can show remarkable disregard towards the ruled, so long as the ruler is confident that the ruled have not claimed any part of the domain against the plan of rule. In practice, the ruled will carve out some space, whatever they can, simply to live, and there is nothing stopping the ruled from ignoring rulers at any time. The ruler never respects the rights of the ruled no matter what philosophy or institution suggests that the rights exist, and any rights the ruler allows are always a thing that can be cancelled at will. Cancelling the pretenses of rights, legal or moral, will make consequences clear to everyone affected by this, but the ruler is never married to any of those pretenses, as if he must ask permission before he can be a ruler. Rule is established not by consent of the governed but by force. The governed may be able to resist this domination and assert that they're going to disregard the ruler, but if the ruler truly cannot control this situation, he is no longer ruling. Wherever rule exists, it never surrenders from the outset its claims to rule, and any agreement between contesting parties to coexist as a ruling interest is a temporary thing rather than a permanent and natural state of affairs. The rulers may wish to share rule jointly, but this arrangement can only be made through an institution which once established abides its own laws, as to the members of the institution. Nowhere is this joint rule an airy or indescribable thing, if it is to be an actual state rather than the pretenses of one. Here, "rule" and "state" are not identical, for there are ruling interests which are not state actors, and those subordinated by states who rule over a petty domain and operate independent of the ruler's direct command. At the early stages of social development, "the state" as a formal institution is little more than the local warlord and his loyal officers, who start out as no one particularly important or noteworthy.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] This has long been the excuse of aristocracy to invade homes, by claiming that people "cannot take care of themselves" after being lied to, beaten, humiliated, poisoned, degraded, and then threatened for failure to live up to arbitrary standards of cleanliness that have nothing to do with the management of resources or any genuine health of the environment or its inhabitants. The degraded values of bourgeois aristocracy are suggested, and the same values encourage the proliferation of narcotics and shout "retard! retard! retard!" at people with the intent of demoralizing them. Efforts of the people to independently repair their environment are stymied, and the strain of having a knife held at one's throat tends to sap away the energy of the lowest class. Eventually we give up, when the only thing we are told is to blame someone else and that someone else is someone lower in the social hierarchy, rather than the officers of the state who create tax, threats, and laugh as the misery piles up. At some point, the blame is assigned to someone with no one to shit on. In this way, the values of aristocracy

are reproduced and the intended outcome is engineered with full knowledge of how it was done - the lowest of the low must be sacrificed "for the environment". Whether it was done through imperious sanitation policies or the Malthusian policies of deliberately encouraging overcrowding and all potential malice in the human race, the result was always a war against the lowest class, "for the greater good". Had there been a genuine interest in preserving the environment, it would not start with threats and knives held at the throat to comply, and there would be both a sense of what is to be done and reasonable expectations of what is possible, and likely this maintenance would become an interest of society to maintain. When the standards of cleanliness are made arbitrary and celebrate inconsistency, and this will be a pattern of public health from the sanitation movement to global health governance where the rules change every week, it is clear that aristocracy has no intention of actually preserving the environment or any proposed ecological balance. Even the edict of staying out of the king's forest is never actually made - that would be too decent and forthright, and doesn't allow for arbitrary cruelty. Whenever someone accedes to one measure, the aim of the aristocracy is to push forward with the next, until the aristocracy claims the whole world and everyone else has nothing. In this way, aristocracy attains its ultimate purpose. Whenever preservation of the environment must be a genuine concern of states, none of this arbitrariness is at work, because it is known to produce the exact opposite of what would conserve anything, and does so at exorbitant expense. We will see that aristocracy alone revels in contradiction, since its position is premised on flagrant and habitual lying in all things.

[2] We should be clear here that I am adopting roughly Marx's concept of "the working class", which had nothing to do with moral worth of individuals and instead described someone's relationship with the means of production - that is, to private property. The working class proper were those who did not possess sufficient means to live independently of selling their labor, and whose labor was not in the comfortable salaried classes. In Marx's time, the salaried professionals were as a rule drawn from the bourgeoisie, and if someone rose from nothing to that position, they would become bourgeois in short order. The salaried professional is not merely a laborer selling himself hour by hour and week by week, whose position is tenuous or whose trade union is a thing to be defeated by management. Part of being in that professional class was that becoming a company man meant security, and what was something like the bourgeois equivalent of a title or office. The position itself, while it was held at the mercy of the capitalist, was offered to the salaried professional as something entirely different from the labor relation of the skilled laborer, with whom the salaried professional conflicted with. There is muddying of this concept because unionization of the professional class and state workers became a rule and then part of the ruling institutions themselves, and so professionals whose interests are thoroughly bourgeois are presented as working class, and often paid such low salaries that they might have to moonlight as ordinary workers in factories or cab drivers. The buy-in with institutions and status is a form of property

that marks the professional as someone with very different loyalties than the working class, who as a rule had no institutional status. The entire relationship between capital and labor supposed that labor had no right to exist at all, and should be grateful that they are allowed to live with a knife held at their throat. Salaried professionals, who often are the men and women holding said knife to the throat of labor, cannot be treated like this. While there may be a revolving door in the lower rungs of these "professionals", and a revolving door between "police officer" and "gangster", the existence of large institutions centered in cities was something that arose during the 19th century. This is forming around the time Marx writes about the working class as a class. The working class in Marx's view consisted of both the active workers and the unemployed wretches, because all were obliged to work. The punishment for beggars was scorn and threats for not working. What would not be acknowledged is that the beggar realistically could not "work his way" out of his status no matter how hard he tried. The interclass struggle within labor had long been accepted as the true state of affairs, and so, the idea that the working class was ever "one thing" and could be co-opted collectively could only operate in very dire situations. The salaried professional and the smallholder, even though they worked and often had to, were firmly in the petty bourgeois, caught between two classes. When one class held the only carrot suggesting you didn't have to be a lowly peasant and the other likely hated your presence and the nature of your work, it was not hard to see where the petty bourgeois intellectual would go - and Marx is writing more to the petty bourgeois than the union worker, and Marx loathes the beggar and the lowest class as much as anyone and makes that clear.

[3] I direct the reader to Charles Babbage's writing on machinery and operations research, which tells that someone in the Empire was interested enough in Babbage's project to deliver him government funds to build an early "Difference Engine", an early effort at what would become a computer. The machine was never completed, but Babbage's writing on operations is something often conveniently forgotten in histories of economics.

[4] Naturally, everything neoliberal retards say is the exact opposite of what a teenager could figure out. The neoliberal Austrian School insanity is such a violently retarded abomination that doing literally the opposite of anything they say is generally sound. The purpose of doing so, as with so many things, is to shout "retard! retard! retard!" at people who were selected to die, violently attacking them and then telling them they must internalize the shame of defeat, after screaming at maximum volume and celebrating the thrill of torture which is the only thing these Reaganite retards ever did. The point of saying the lie isn't to convince anyone, but the utter audacity of lying that much, so often, to demoralize the opponents a siege. It is pointless to suggest any moral outcome is possible with such people.

[5] One common conceit about labor is that the laborer is in their own domain a petty-manager or petty ruler governing the labor, and that this is what distinguishes human labor as labor proper and something distinct from animal

horsepower. In some way, when labor disciplines itself for managerial intent, which humans usually will abide out of necessity, the human is contorting their body to do something that seems unnatural to the animal kingdom. This view of labor fails to appreciate any of the craft, dedication, spiritual content, and purpose of laboring in the first place. At some level, humans are willing to put up with managerial avarice and the cruelties of society because they would rather have the things that labor produces, and often people would produce those things on their own accord without an imperious manager telling them what to think or whipping them to produce. Labor would produce those things for the laborers, rather than a managerial class and those above it. Certain products that are not things labor would want for itself likely wouldn't be built in a better world, or their production would be limited and understood to be a sad necessity. The better of the rulers understand this, and it is not the imperative of all rulers to be as nasty and venal as possible, despite the dominant political sense suggesting that this is the only way to rule. Rule is pointless without being put towards an end other than ruling. As we have seen though, if rule is defined through suffering, as an aristocracy would insinuate regardless of its origin, any act of rule that is not pursuing rule itself as an inexorable Demiurge crafting the world is seen as an inefficiency in the view of aristocracy. Conversely, everyone else and many of the aristocrats when they are honest acknowledge that this is a really stupid strategy.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

23. The Division of Labor by Social Class

So far I have written of social class purely as a construct of institutions and conceits held by those who aspire to rule. In that view, class consciousness is driven primarily by the desires of aristocracy, and other tendencies latent in society instinctively defend their holdings. In this way, institutions form out of the raw materials of the world, which are purposed for management of this situation where rule is one of many interests. There are interests of institutions other than rule, but invariably, institutions are subject to the same rules as any other social ecosystem, and take on a life of their own. The chapter ends with institutions never doing what we hoped they would do, despite all of the reasons that this is completely wasteful and pointless. Had institutions formed to serve the functions we had in mind, or the things that we actually wanted, they would - and do attempt to out of some necessity - resist the baser instincts in life in order to accomplish that which was needed to actually live. Not one instinct that would orient management of institutions generally, that would give rise to a division of labor in this economic sense, serves any real purpose. The argument of expedience arising from specialization would have seen labor as the sole commander of itself, because the management of wealth, the ruling mind directing humans like cattle, and their officers to realize that direction, is completely unnecessary and counterproductive towards any

genuine utility. The creation of the institution itself does not form the entirety of social class. All classes would be meaningless if they refer to institutional society alone. Without institutions, the only thing that would constitute a social class would be an identifying marker bereft of context. There is no such thing as an inborn "race-consciousness" that suggests a race has any political orientation or affinity for each other, and the same is true of other identifying traits of humans in observation. For any grouping of people who may share an identifying characteristic to be truly a class implies institutional representation and organization, or the existence of institutions organized against them. The slave, which in American history was identified with a race of black men and women, has no institution to call their own, and like any slave system, control of all institutional relations is developed into a full science, in which every minor act of the slave-holders is calculated to suppress revolt, and every act of the slaves is meticulously studied to detect signs of rebellion. The race itself is not relevant - black Africans in the 21st century immigrating to America would have nothing to do with the slaves who arrived in the 17th and 18th century to suggest they were subject to any of the same institutional history. In some sense, slave systems generally abide rules, and the oppressed people of the world share in some struggle over freedom and slavery, but the American slave system and its consequences is a definite historical event, rather than an inborn genetic feature of black Americans. The descendants of said slaves are, with some exceptions with their own reasons which are beyond explaining here, very wary of anyone suggesting that historical knowledge is irrelevant, for all the reasons that make sense. The advocates of historical revision on this matter are invariably the sort of scum who are always enablers of some rot. It does not take any great genius to learn of the history regarding slavery and race in America, and any adult feigning ignorance is a piece of shit and knows exactly what they are doing. The genuinely ignorant would be more likely to not press the matter at all, and there is a general sense in humans that slavery is bad, or at least it is a highly unpleasant experience for slaves, and the neoliberal habit of self-abasement is not eternal or natural at all. The existence of social classes is not dictated by institutions at a whim, such that they can be decreed to exist or not exist, or can be re-defined or re-interpreted once knowledge that there is a class is established. A vague feeling or sentiment is not a proper social class or institution, or even a consistent grouping of people. While "white" became a legally understood definition and a general indicator of European ancestry and inheritance from a largely Christian civilization, there is no "white nation" that amalgamates all of the white people into one culture or thing, and the white people ranged from indentured servants, convicts, and the institutionalized who are de facto slaves or lower than slaves on the social hierarchy, to an aristocracy that viewed most of the white race as cattle just as they viewed any other race by its lowest common denominator. The same variation can be found among black Americans, though marked by far more historical discrimination and their actions specifically being curtailed to uphold a racial theory of society that was nonsensical. There are those who were thrown into the residuum, there are those who work in every grade of the laboring classes for whom the worst outcomes of neoliberal racism

are less apparent. The neoliberals attained the highest form of essentialism and stripped all social identities from social class as it was historically understood.

In the past chapter, I wrote of the intellectual germ which made the formation of institutions possible, which is a necessary pre-requisite for speak of a class generally. Social class is understood not as an institution unto itself, but as a historical and ongoing event which is regarded by institutions primarily. Human beings in their flesh have no need of any social class to understand themselves, but their person will be involved in social class whether they wish to be or not. Social class is not a mere sentiment or feeling. We should stop for a moment to remark that "class" as a designation is something of a misnomer inherited from philosophy, and this is not an accident. It is with the rise of philosophical writing and what I have called the "philosophical state", or the institutionally held theory of states and how institutions converge to form it. The philosophical state to be comprehensible supposes that the people are sorted into classes for its purposes, and those classes are regarded by laws. The philosophical state proper is beyond the scope of the present writing. Its antecedents are not too difficult to grasp, and do not require any grand theory or narrative. Roughly speaking, the philosophical state regards three broadly defined classes as necessary to construct any further development of social class, and these classes are entirely defined by holdings of property and wealth. The rise of class consciousness is facilitated in part by the rise of currency and the interest of sovereigns and states in treasuries, because the state could now requisition its wants by paying coins that are minted with the blessing of the state, rather than extracting tax in kind or through a number of competing schemes. Wealth that was formerly represented by landed property, the product from that land, and the holdings of slaves or what were effectively serfs, would be represented by coin. It is with the proliferation of currency and the state's interest in it that theorists of the state isolate the class of those who hold wealth but do not hold the title of warriors or state officials, and who are not priests or the intellectual elite of their day, but who are not slaves or dependent on labor. Monied interests were criticized by nearly every philosopher, as philosophy was the domain of the aristocrat who resented these commoners having anything, but the reality of economic life suggested that a class of free holders would exist that did not need to offer themselves as slaves, and had functions other than whatever they could sacrifice to a conqueror or the local deity and that deity's mortal racketeers. Classical civilization can observe in greater detail the variety of products, and the class managing the wealth of this product would be termed the producers, the merchants, and various other titles. The men of this class - and the rules of the day were that it was men who held the wealth and did politics with few exceptions - did not exist purely for production or wealth extraction, and wealth was a very helpful asset for launching a political career, which usually meant the rich men sought to become generals, lawyers, statesmen, and find a way to get into the aristocratic club. The producers certainly understood their position and its precarity, but usually did not identify with the producer class as if it were virtuous at all. Depending on the civilization in question, merchants ranged from disreputable as in Rome

but useful because money could buy opportunity to rise in the republican system, a caste assignment in the middle as in India, or with merchants regarded as lower than peasants and artisans in China and viewed with extreme suspicion, but regarded as a necessity due to the complexity of the economy and imperial operations in the region. The producer class today is best understood as the nascent form of a technocratic class, or a "new class" that is neither laborer nor attached to the prestigious offices of merit or aristocracy, but whose wealth and product is very helpful for facilitating the opulence of the latter and keeping the former in line. The new class suggests a general path for commoners to rise in classical society. In some way, most societies permitted class mobility so that people of talent can replenish the quality of stock, which was regarded as necessary regardless of any aristocratic conceit. Weak nobles would give way to those with the cunning to climb or who could present some argument as to why they could win and rule, but the producers never seek to overthrow this arrangement altogether. They merely seek to gain position within it, and protect each other and what they consider their base of interest. Because the aristocrats live a world where currency and new technology quickly become necessities of empire, they must bend to what those who would become technocrats want, and surrender some of their true wants to survive in a world where cities rise, fall, and come back in a generation to fight once more. The classical world was not one of unqualified imperial success, but one of daily struggles of emerging states and empires against the tribes and tributaries. Without any concept of nationalism or a mechanism by which large territories could be integrated as nations rather than a collection of aristocratic alliances linked by wealth and jockeying for position, aristocracies could dominate at the city level and maintain some hold on the landlords, but in the main, classical society is a martial society. It was typically generals who came to lead states or men who proved themselves in battle, rather than the conceits of pure aristocracy huffing their drugs or the men handling the money and the desultory business of producing war and consumer material.

This is not any new concept, and summarizes what is a much larger construct in language that is familiar to students of history, since the formation of states was not merely the rule of classes or even a big club of institutions and the assholes who inhabit them. In short, though, one reason we view the increasing relevance of social class and associate it with wealth and division of labor is because the niche of classical society heavily encouraged this thinking. The thinking met the conditions of struggling city-states and nascent empires, who experimented with institutional organization, technology, and theories of society that were novel and had never been done in this way. Social class was not a crass reduction of the many interests in such a society into three groups, and writers at the time could document the nooks and crannies that were exceptions to the rule. The isolation of these three groups is not the isolation of classes in whole, but isolating three of the mechanisms that were deemed politically relevant to those who had any say in politics. Labor as a rule was left out of that bargain and never had a serious place in any discussion. Any small yokel without money

or status was completely unqualified, and saw correctly the entire apparatus ruling him was yet another racket to make him work harder. This applied to the dispossessed free man who was caught between the new monied interest and the older society's invasion by it, but the dispossessed knew this was not just about money tokens. The dispossessed had no reason to believe in the classical equivalent of a Little England myth where things were better in the old days. Aristocrats wrote those histories, but the ordinary laborer saw the new bosses of all three classes as yet another group of perverts that want to take their stuff. If any laborer identified with any one of these classes and thought he had an in with them, he was deluding himself. The best hope for a laboring woman of low rank was to catch the eye of someone with wealth or status for good looks and some quality men lusted for, which was the most likely way someone of low birth could be something just by existing and doing the things women were expected to do to be considered virtuous. Men of low birth and no money were very unlikely to do much, short of a talent for meeting the right people and an absurd level of opportunity. There were ways for even the lowest of men to rise in theory, and the ancient world being what it was, a local aristocracy in power today could be yesterday's news and conquered tomorrow, only to throw off the yoke the next season. The strife of this age of imperial consolidation, and the wars initiated by barbarians to push against the encroachment of imperial civilization and win some place in it for their tribes and confederations, was a haven for aristocrats who knew what they truly were, but punished severely aristocrats who couldn't get with the imperial program. Further discussion of the matter moves far beyond the purview of economics, but this should illustrate for the reader why social class rose in prominence. Before the rise of the philosophical state and its theory, and for a long time after its rise, associations with tribe, clan, and the numerous backroom deals and dealings in favors and sentiments, remained a force that resisted economism altogether. Economic concerns in Antiquity were predominantly agricultural concerns, and the command of farm labor usually meant the command of slaves or peasants who were made to toil and expect little on this Earth. The thinking of aristocratic philosophers did not conform to the true conditions then and there of ancient society, and the more capable of the philosophers were aware of this, and aware of the difficulties of the aristocratic idea in implementation. It is for that reason that class consciousness, first among the ruling elite themselves, and then the marking of military status as the chief backbone of state society and the promotion of the classical way of war over barbarian formations of warriors, would find a greater niche. The rise of producers whose product was a logistical necessity for war and empire made clear what aristocrats had understood long before the philosophical state, and encouraged further investigation into the theory of history, rule, and everything that would make new technology increasingly relevant. Even when the aim was not a Whiggish faith in technological advance, concepts of how to revise institutions like the army made others adapt to the situation. The barbarians themselves in time learn that their older society was no longer operative. The later confederations and empires of the Goths and Germanic peoples, and the empires of the steppe which marked the greatest peril for civilization in the eyes

of the settled aristocrats, and the peoples at the periphery of the Old World who would become clients or entangled in that world in one way or another, had to see their societies in much the same way, where classes and the interests of money and knowledge are increasingly necessary, and displace loyalty to clan, family, or some institution which would cross class lines more readily. In the long run, the aim of the new institutions is not to defend classes for their own sake, but to regard classes as their vehicle for ruling. The ideal would be that the classes would no longer be distinct classes with property, but that all classes would be subsumed by a ruling interest. That ruling interest would alone be allowed to transgress class, while others are assigned to whatever desultory existence the rulers demand. This does not preclude that the ruling interest would be every last person, such that there wouldn't be classes to transgress, and it is not impossible for the ruling interest to question the sanity of all historical philosophies of rule and management. Ideology is a terrible motivator for a member of any class.

The proper understanding of social class is not in simple definitions or the management of information, but in the meaningful relations of people to the world and to each other. In primitive society, social classes do not rise to the forefront of politics, because there is no vehicle where the history of a class and the exchanges within it and to those outside of it can be cleanly established. The primitive state or its analogues in political sense generally did not consider social distinction to be the primary purpose of rule, but the members of society knew who was ranked where, who held prestige, and what property a person held. Primitive society, contrary to the beliefs of crass ideologues, had a concept of property which was intelligible to those in a different society where property could be upheld by formal institutions and the organization of labor with certain legal rights to property in mind. The concept of any legal rights in primitive society did not exist, but there were expectations in a society that allowed humans to coexist at all. Those who take the status quo for granted are fools of the highest caliber, for every state that arrests society is only maintained at great expense. The aristocratic conceit is always that people are either cattle or drovers, and the aristocrats claim that they are the only true drovers. Their subordinates are cattle, who are tasked with driving the cattle beneath them, and so on, and through this the aristocratic herding of the population takes place. Since this driving is ineffective without both tools and a command structure which has no inherent reason to go along with this, aristocracies tend to promote warriors and managers as the proprietors of land and men, and the tokens of wealth that belong to the productive citizens or their analogues are always something to be controlled. The holders of wealth see their coin as a way in, but the tokens of wealth by themselves do nothing but measure some claim, which is backed by the toil of those who work and enforce the scheme. All of these are only basic mechanisms which construct the history of each class, and suggest their long-standing antagonism and also how they would cooperate with each other. Within that tripartite framework, there is an understanding of all participants that both labor and the lowest class must be locked out at

all costs, and so the slaves and undesirables are excluded from political life. Certain expectations are created about who can and cannot act in institutions, and these actions can only be forced based on the history of the institution and its members. They are never things that are truly inborn or inherent, but are made so because they were possible. Labor as a distinct and suppressed class arises by this conspiracy of those with the tokens and idols that allow for rule to be reduced to information which can be managed, and the ruling arts and sciences are held as occult secrets. Eventually, the dissemination of those secrets in education is undertaken selectively, as one of the carrots to discipline labor and, on occasion, the lowest class. False promises of promotion are made and then withdrawn the moment a laborer would hold that wealth that would allow him to live as more than a laborer in such a society. Because labor is necessary for all of these functions, there is a certain acceptance that workers in theory could promote to producers or enter state service. At a basic level, the classes are fictitious entities, which do not conform neatly to the institutions that allowed them to exist. It is the command of institutions which is sought in the class struggle, rather than the command of the world directly or direct relations with the humans or persons. Working with individuals is doomed to fail before a conspiracy which appears inhuman. Working with the world directly leads to either a vague and inchoate program, or would entail a general theory which questions whatever interests rule in a given society and a given place. As a rule, any theory which is inimical to the purposes of rule must be declared inadmissible, because those who jockeyed for position in the ruling institutions knew how they came to rule and what ruling meant. Any general theory that is not commanded by the ruling interest would suggest that the entire project of rule is a farce, could change, and does change regardless of any pretenses a state makes or any existing theory of politics will uphold. No rule of nature suggests that the state has any inherent existence, but politics will happen regardless of our beliefs about it and a status quo - the understanding of the situation which is informed not just by information and symbols but by meaningful connections that can be said about it - will be apparent regardless of whether there is a ruling interest to claim it and shepherd it into existence. At its root this happens not because of any inherent purpose to politics or the state, but because it could happen and there wasn't anything stopping this except another entity which thought in a similar way about rule, power, and management. The knowledge of who and what rules becomes general regardless of efforts to suggest that this knowledge can be occulted, because everyone is acutely aware of what it means to be ruled. The lowest class is the most acutely aware of all, and as a rule the lowest class exists to be ridiculed and humiliated, as a reminder of what is necessary for rule to be established. The thrill of doing this became in modernity the highest governing principle, celebrated by the eugenic creed and the most crass of today's technocrats.

The social classes do not form neatly around any institution or their basic functions or intents, nor do they form purely by sentiment. They form around interests that can be recognized, claimed, and then mechanized so that the

processes necessary to claim this interest are a going concern. For a class to truly exist, it must do certain things, but the things that are done do not conform to any necessary or natural function, and do not reduce purely to psychological sentiments which can be manipulated. What is needed is for the interests of management, and the desire to command the world, to become spiritual callings, and to grant to a particular aspect of the world the status of an idol with seemingly supernatural powers. It is necessary then to have a second theory, held in secret, suggesting that this supernatural appearance is a bunch of malarkey and that the appears of the "gods" is a trick, a game. By doing so, human labor and effort is expended chasing after symbolic representations and statements of knowledge or information which claim to supercede the native reasoning process we would use to derive meaning. The third result, intended in advance, seeks to arrest the mechanisms in a way that automates them, and this is where the role of money tokens and the historical interests of the producers take over and subsume both labor and the lowest class. It is possible, though scarcely actually believed by competent people, that the producers who command money or something used for exchange are the true governing power, and that money is more real than anything in the world it claims. This, though, is not how any competent merchant thinks. A merchant or anyone with means understands money as a tool first, and understands the social relationship and classes as something altogether different. The aim of the merchant is not to glorify money like an Ayn Rand follower retard, but to make of this token something more substantial, whatever it may be. The mercantile interest, due to many historical examples, dreads the thought of a demagogue going to the people and circumventing the desires of everyone else in the class, and so class solidarity is felt strongest among the producers, who are numerically larger than the aristocracy or soldiers who threaten them. In many cases, the men who hold some property, even scant property, outnumber all other classes, since those without money or some means to survive will not last long or be able to do much in institutional society. It should be clear that no matter how vast the institutions are, there is a large world outside of the institutions, where none of the conceits of aristocratic rule are regarded as anything more than a nuisance. This is not to say that the other world is inherently lawless or antagonistic to law as a concept, but that the law and institutional authority over any space is limited by mechanisms that the authority can deploy. The workers who are outside of the tripartate structure save for their meager holdings of wealth that they hold onto for dear life have no reason to roll over for some great plan which purports to tell them what to think. The merchants too are acutely aware of this threat, which the greatest of them seeing in the long run that their rule is contingent not on the idolatry of money or a simple mechanism money can buy, but with technology generally and science that was by nature the action of laborers and work rather than opulence or rule. The mercantile interest would do best to co-opt labor and convince them that they are actually producers in the rat race, instead of saying that labor are slaves and consigned to mud-sill worker status. That threat is reserved for the lowest class, who are seen as undesirable and who remain the sole class who has no reason whatsoever to go along with any of this.

Social classes form around interests in the real world out of necessity, and there is both a history and an institutional representation where that history is gathered. Without that history and shared experience, there is not a class as such, whether it is for itself or exists in of itself. A class of workers may be designated, but the working class remains organized as bricklayers, factory workers, service workers, tradesmen of various sorts, and these laboring professions recognize each other as sharing an interest because of the society they live in. It is never a fait accompli, and the interests workers can control are the particular talents they possess. The specialists do not exist as their profession, but this specialty is the property they could utilize. The same is true of the interests of the property-holders, who become merchants, bankers, shop owners, lawyers, advocates, priests, soldiers with various specializations and domains where they are active, and so on. The interests pertain not to any preferred organization of society, but the means by which they can perpetuate rule. The interests can only exist here in this sense of economic thought, and do not exist as any part of the natural world, as if nature intended us to do the tasks of lawyers, workmen, soldiers, or priests. It is understood by all that the other interests in society are potential rivals, and the ruling interest is comprised not of a singular intent or idol at the base level, but the interests which can exist. Therefore, the ruling elite tend to pick a number of professions that are deemed honorable, and suggest a way to rank them in a hierarchy. The particular professions, and the qualities of men they suggest, may vary, but in order to rule, those professions and those acts must be conducive to ruling.

ORIGINS OF SOCIAL CLASS FROM THE LOWEST CLASS AND LABOR

At a basic level, all humans in this managerial scheme are by default in the lowest class, and have no interest which is naturally evident. In this way, humans are guilty until proven innocent. One must prove their membership and claim to some interest, rather than the presumption of some interest being natural and expected. In nature, humans possess certain qualities and substance that is presented to society as their character and person, but these qualities do not in of themselves suggest any class or institution. The only possible distinction in nature is not a theory of classes held by institutions, but the distinction between those who perform labor in the interests that can contest for economic influence, and those who do not. Humans can labor for something other than the interests of economics or politics or rule generally, but only those labors which feed into the concept of rule are deemed relevant in the economic and ecological logic. The labors are real enough, and are in reality the only thing, but there is a world and humanity that has no interest in rule or management at all, and no inherent reason why any ecology should naturally form at all, in a way that must be regarded as universal and unceasing from creation to the end of history. History, properly speaking, is not a political understanding or something confined to crass interests of rule, but a sense that there is a past that can be spoken of. Those who claim to reach an "end of history" do nothing but promote idiotic ideologies

which are only useful to tell the masses "you can't, you can't, you can't". They never actually rule through this ignorance, but use the statements of blithering ignorance to cajole and berate others - to make us suffer. The suffering that class society entails is only the suffering inflicted deliberately by social actors upon another and themselves. There is considerable suffering of human beings that has nothing to do with the conceits of rule in any way, and a philosophical discussion of human nature and the suffering of life is not particularly interesting. It is easy to see that life entails much more than pointless suffering, and the suffering that is part of our nature is nowhere near as terrifying as the suffering social class and institutions of men bring to the world. The dull ache of the body would not be so bad if we were not aware of a predatory society where those who seek to maximize the thrill of inflicting suffering are loud and proud, always active and looking for the first sign of weakness to attack. If not for the persistence of such people, it is very likely that the aches of the body nature endowed us with would become trivial, and we would make of this situation whatever we could. Existential angst is not the natural condition of life and not universal, but a disease of aristocracy and its enablers in the other intents that society entails. Without society, the pointlessness of existence and the dull groan of suffering would be something we could ignore, if we are aware the suffering is just something the body does and will eventually depart. Persistent suffering and the agony of human contact exists because cajolers want us to suffer and tell us we cannot escape it or do anything about it, or even live our lives regardless of it. Any suffering must become an opportunity for thrill. This is not the only way a class can manage, but it is a very expedient one. To form a persistent interest requires quite the opposite - suffering and agony must be mitigated enough so that labor can actually do the things that allow rule to happen. The prevalence of humiliation and torture is a way for humans to shout "die! die! die!", and it exists not because life compels this, but because humans chose it and made it institutional from the moment the human race was born in its grotesque sacrifice of their own kind. That is a defect of humans, and one that would have been easily repaired, if not for those who see in this history not merely a fact but an opportunity to "return to home" and repeat this ritual, so that existence becomes nothing else. Such a sentiment exists purely to destroy. Here is where a few philosopher retards, and they are retarded, coined the term "creative destruction", or a foul device by which the thrill of humiliation is naturalized and granted the status of an idol and object of worship.

The origin should not be confused with politics in its genuine form, as if politics were nothing more than applied economics. Politics to be what real entails relating to society in a way that is not reduced to interests alone, and suggests a moral purpose for the state and the ruling institutions which cannot be supplied by any economic rationale. Politics and economics both do not encompass everything that happens in society, and have nothing to do with the natural world. They can be understood with the language of science, but only as something that came out of human capacities and the capability in the world that allowed them to exist. In other words, the political and economic, or

anything institutional in society, cannot make any moral claim that these classes should exist, or are somehow ordained by nature. The very origin of class society suggests that classes are not things fixed at all, but arise because there is a world in which social classes can impose an existence beyond the conceit that they can be made. Anyone can intellectually construct a model of society with so many classes, or even divine a mechanism by which social classes arise and change. What actually happens in politics and economics is not reducible to class struggle, and the struggle of classes and institutions is itself merely one part of a much larger world. The true motives of humanity are rarely ever political or economic matters, but spiritual and moral matters which are held above the intrigues inherent to society as a whole. There would be no society without human beings who could value it and appreciate it for reasons that are not reducible to society itself. Humans in social relations develop not as tools of an abstracted beast which takes the name "society", but because their genuine wants and aims suggest that there is a purpose to life beyond mere management. Politics as a whole does not and cannot consume the entire product of life, but arises for reasons that are not really concerned with economy. Economics only becomes a political matter because those who hold states see that commanding the world and enclosing its spaces would allow them to rule politically. Some clarification of "rule" is necessary. Political rule, or the rule of moral and spiritual authority in its own right, are different propositions from ruling people through economic incentives and interests. The idea that men must be cajoled and berated to act at all is an imperious project, which is only sensible when sufficiently developed politics can impose this cajoling and berating over a wide space. At first, this is only possible in the ecological niche of a city. Villages and rural settings largely exist by paying tribute to the cities which were the political capitals of empires, or the ruling elite were warriors who constructed a palace wherever it was expedient to do so, and ruled through their officers rather than command of any ecology as such. To the tribes of North America before European contact, tending to the land was not something done so that it could be sold off as parcels and the members of society were serfs. Such a thing would have been highly counter-productive. The tribes certainly saw the land and resources in situ as property, and did not mindlessly tend to the land out of some superstition that was programmed into them. The reasons for preserving forests and game are not difficult for anyone to divine if they think about their environment for five minutes. So it is with the formation of politics generally - it arises not from any economic origin or division of labor. We would conduct politics without economics as such, even if humans were judged to be economically equal to each other or their distinction into classes were irrelevant. Politics and the state are not intrinsically instruments of a class, and would persist even if social class were abolished as institutions or irrelevant. The motives that drive political action are not rational ones, but are always the result of knowing agents whose behavior can be rationalized. Economics is preferred by those who are winning to naturalize a mechanism by which they can rule by tying human beings to an ecological niche and locking up the food. This is not the only mechanism by which rule is possible. People can be ruled purely by struggle which is unmoored

from any economic necessity or purpose, and the wars and struggles of humanity have been entirely worthless in any productive sense. The cults of war are so ruinous that economic sense would tell us to immediately abandon the practice and make it so anyone insinuating that such practices should be glorified would be eliminated and become irrelevant. We could do this in a day, and do so at a local level. There is no genuine natural condition of the world that enforces the edicts of rule, and the will of humans to actually change the world is fixed. The true causes of the cult of war are beyond the scope of the present writing. It is possible to observe the actions of economics, war, and politics from afar, as if we were studying aliens in the wild, and we would in retrospect presume that the functions operated by mechanisms that are basic. We presume naively that the actors in society follow core convictions they hold to be self-evident, and it does not take a great genius to figure out that humans need food and that only so much food will be available. The feat of aristocracy is not to divine this basic condition of existence that we're too stupid to know, but to create a whole alternate version of reality where scarcity is dictated by their grand theories rather than any actual scarcity. The gross inefficiencies, waste, cruelty, and stupidity of the aristocracy is a matter of historical and public record, and this truth always comes out no matter how many lies are told about it. It is so evident that the aristocracy holds all of the guilt for encouraging the worst of this that aristocrats don't bother pretending they are anything else. They simply suggest that suffering and brutality are God's will and sole commandment, or suggest that some other group can be scapegoated for what are clearly aristocratic acts. Ideally the aristocrat would have you blame the lowest class, who as mentioned have the least to do with any of this, but that their inaction and lack of enthusiasm for aristocratic rule is somehow guilty of creating a "natural shortage". At the same time, the institutions that exist, which are in any era of human history grossly inefficient and designed to fail on purpose, are claimed to be perfect and sacrosanct. This conceit was only implied historically, but modern technocratic states were premised on an illusion that the holders of the state were godlike and commanded nature through the science they stole from us. For those in the 21st century, it is often forgotten, or deliberately not spoken of, that political life and the life of human beings have remarkably little to do with economics. The economic task's proper purview is to allow us to do a thing to live, and the surplus which is vast would be used for aims which are genuine wants and hopes for what human society could be in a better world. We wouldn't dicker over something that is so basic if we wanted society to be a going concern in its own right. The great victory of aristocracy is to specifically deny to the people that bare minimum, so they are always hungry and insecure. Aristocracy then sells security at a premium price which is no security at all. Aristocracy can welcome opulence so long as none of the possessions answer the needs of life to sustain itself and secure its existence. It always seeks to redefine freedom, slavery, struggle, social class, and institutional purposes to meet its aims. The same is true of every other intent in human society that would have ruled in the place of aristocracy. If a pseudo-economy dictated by aristocratic conceits weren't the vehicle, some other mechanism would be used to force the

world to conform to that plan. It is always highly artificial and far removed from the genuine history of classes and societies, or the aims of the actual human beings who weren't interested in the lust for ruling or anything so silly.

THE RULING INTEREST BECOMING AN ALLIANCE OF CLASSES

If the world is to be divided in this economic sense between those who work towards the rule of an ecological niche and those who do not, then there will inevitably be those interests with greater influence in rule. No one of these can rule alone, no matter what identity they may exalt and demand obedience to. There would only be, in every calculation, those who have a place in the plan for society, and those who do not. The decision in the mind of the planner is between life and death as they see it. This is not life or death in the genuine sense but in the manager's conceit. The genuine infliction of death or the granting of life is only possible because of the manager's command of suffering to make it real, and that event is not dictated by any economic or spiritual logic insisting that it is the natural order. Whatever the claims of those who rule, they never actually do possess a natural right to decide who lives and who dies, and such a right is always claimed violently and with no rational purpose or further motive. At its root, the ruling interest is not born out of economic necessity, as they often claim. It preceded any concept of the economic beyond the basic sense that humans would have possessed out of necessity, and the very concept of an "economy" over a fixed space implies there was an intent to make it real rather than a natural condition. It has long been understood to even the dullest mind that avoiding such a situation is necessary to speak of living as anything other than a lump of utility to be cajoled, and even in captivity, the ruled are defiant against this invasion of their bodies and anything they held dear.

It is impossible to speak of class society in general without an established ruling interest, which is comprised of the various interests which can assemble some scheme to rule jointly. Class society presupposes that a ruling interest governs "above the classes", or behind their back. There is not, at first, a sorting of humanity into any great class structure. There is not a "universal class" from which all others derived, as if social class were innate to life itself. There are not two classes that are defined in a Manichean struggle of who is in and out, as if we were natural self-abasing fascists and this master-slave dialectic consumed everything that exists. The world in general does not regard slavery as a natural fact, because the world has no such conceit, and in practice the actions of most people do not revolve around some game of domination and slavery, like it were a fetish to replace their genuine conditions. There are not three classes which just-so happened to exist in a way that allowed one class to get the other two to attack each other while the third laughs it up and grabs popcorn. There are not five classes which assembled in an immaculate structure, where the germ of knowledge and its products or some construct held above the world suggested it would be the only way humans could organize themselves. Outside of the ruling

interest, it is impossible to speak of any of this as the action of a sensical person. It would be presumed that someone held as a slave would refuse to follow orders the moment the slave no longer had to, unless the slave were compelled to behave in line with alien dictates regardless of any native thought process in the slave. If there were a "natural slave", then this would not be the case, but this would have to suppose there is some inborn condition which attracts slaves to masters, as if everyone were living in the kink lifestyle. Even this would not conform to the managerial or political conceits regarding slavery, which are the equivalent of chasing one's own tail for absolutely nothing. Rule to be realized does not justify itself and never can. If there is a potential ruling interest, it can only enforce this over a limited space. If we revisit our thinking on society as information, as we must for economic plans to be sensical, economics occurs not in the raw form of society at any level, but in institutions alone. Politics and the very concept of a polity must concern the social agents themselves rather than the institutions they create, and so the political is not and never can be an economic matter. This does not make political economy a seeming non-sequitur^[1], but suggests that political economy as an approach doesn't answer what it purports to answer. Economics as a new science is even more removed from the genuine source of class society, and goes out of its way to be nothing more than a cargo cult. The ecologists are the worst of the lot, brazenly arguing for democide and suffering for its own sake, when it is clear in the past century that the conditions of plenty were easily attainable. It is not only that those conditions could be built, but that it would be almost trivial to do so. The new aristocracy covers itself in the most obnoxious fake morality they've ever constructed, brazenly lying about basic things and suggesting social class, which was at one time so easily understood that it wasn't a question, was something other than what it was to our native sense. It did not take too great a mind to reconstruct what I have traced so far to see why social classes arose, because this is reproduced with every new generation. Class society must be taught to all members of society from a young age, and how it does so varies but becomes an expectation of every parent and authority. The demand of the malcontents is less to abolish social class by decree, but to simply have the things they wanted without the intermediary of class society and the ruling interest. This, though, would require them to either fight or join the ruling interest, and while the ruling interest could be inclusive, the aristocratic tendency never wants to include anyone and always seeks to cull the club as soon as the opportunity arises.

The classes evident in a society are drawn by the ruling interest, or those who aspire to join the ruling interest and influence it. There is only ever one in a given domain, and the rule is not strictly speaking economic nor political. Classes may be defined globally at the level of the polity, or they may exist only in some niche where the classes are relevant. There is, for example, a hierarchy of classes in workplaces that can be entirely local to it, and the classification in one city-state does not need to conform to another. At the level of a polity, the class distinctions are not questioned by anyone. Beneath that level, all local class distinctions are superseded whenever the polity steps in and exerts influence,

which as you can expect happens often. There is always a distance between those who are members of the ruling interest, whatever it may be, and the ruled, so nothing the ruling interest decrees is "just so", as if their mere thought changed reality or cajoled it through some philosophical working. Rule in any meaningful sense requires some mechanism to deliver it, and ideology would only be effective if it inhabits human agents who would become that mechanism - and so, ideology and all of the conceits men hold are only as effective as the machines they possess, which includes modification of the body itself. The development of classes truly begins when the rulers of a polity can consider social engineering at the level of the state, in an effort to create particular types of people. The city-state which is sufficiently developed, diverse enough in the labor functions that specialization is very expedient if not required in that time, and capable of reliably commanding officers who will execute state business faithfully without abandoning the mission, is very different from a more primitive society where the social institution of greatest importance is not the state as an idea but the clan, and the ruling house is the dominant clan relating to other clans rather than a philosophical state relating to individual subjects. In a society where the theory of the state is not very well developed, the ruling interest faces difficulty consolidating its machines in one place. The ruler in an earlier time may be a king, or a glorified warlord, who claims the favor of some deity, but who doesn't maintain any pretense of commanding the city the way the classical city-state did. The state as a formal institution is not the sole contender for the ruling interest. Religions may become something more than a cult of power, and often did become mass religions with traditions independent of any particular sovereign. Philosophy enters the world as an aristocratic version of religion, available to those with the means to acquire philosophical texts and engage with the ancient masters. The philosophers typically aren't themselves rulers, but aspire to rule and may be close to those who rule, or may be men with considerable influence. The philosopher might be hired out, as they are today, to be a hatchetman for the ruling interest, either producing effusive praise or a series of lies and more lies to protect the mechanisms of said interest and keep out those who are not selected to advance - and I think you all should know by now that the ruling interest does not encourage independent thought or initiative in any era, unless that initiative matches an agreed-upon plan of that ruling interest and can only ever serve them. No ruling interest will ever sell someone the rope to hang them, and believing that this can be cajoled by thought alone is the desperate clawing of those who only can say words, and not even terribly convincing words at that.

Before there is an "upper class", "middle class", "lower class", or a general class assignment for the workers, officers, and elites, there are the interests that can exist as basic propositions. For example, the landlords hold land, and naturally those who hold the land would have the obvious advantage in controlling space. Never in human history has a ruler abandoned or discounted command of the land as rulers deem it should be commanded. This does not necessarily conform to highly visible claims, but it is difficult to seriously deny who owns the land if their actions must be prominent enough to affect anything. It may be taboo

or illegal to reference the true lord of the land, but generally, such a charade is counterproductive, only carried out to keep those who are cast out of society altogether from acknowledging what is done to them. In today's society, the oligarchic families are known and documented, and a history of those families can be found with little searching. It is not too difficult to see their intent and how they have ruled for the past century, and assuming you are at all competent, you will be made aware of what truly rules. Only those who are deemed to live in the residuum are never told the truth, and it is not so much that they are forced to be genuinely ignorant of the true names of their masters. Enough information about who owns what and the nature of the oligarchy, and many deeds of CIA and other intelligence agencies, is freely available and discussed widely. The lies about the nature of power, social classes, and the ruling interest are a way of shouting "retard! retard! retard!", telling someone in so many words to die. It is like telling an adult to believe in Santa Claus or romantic love - an insult so brazen that it would only be uttered when it has been decided now and forever that this person is not selected to live. No one of any standing, even that of a lowly worker, would be lied to that profusely with this much intensity. It is only because we live in a society that decided most of humanity was selected to die that such lying became a habit. The reason this is not done is clear if we see the frayed minds of those in the castle during a siege - sieges are terrible on the beseiger and choke out their intelligence, since so much is spent on lying and hiding their tracks from an angry mob with every reason to tear every aristocrat from limb to limb. The formation of classes which are presumed to exist because of relations to the means of production has to presume that there is some work persistently done and that the labor will be done by guilds as they were done during the 19th century. None of the emerging trade unions had any reason to dilute the advantages they held and every reason to collude to protect their interests, and make alliances that were sensible to them. Within the working class there were divisions over things that appear trifling, and while those divisions were overcome out of necessity, it was easy to exploit a tendency to value horseflesh in a siege environment. The strategy of propaganda from the ruling interest reflects this in every decision made, and even minute effort to engineer society to advance the divisions within the working class, and to exacerbate the strain of merely living as a proletarian. The offer of strengthening the proletariat by casting its members into a hated residuum was offered as the carrot to break any possibility that this ends. It did not happen overnight, because there was a sense of solidarity with people who suffered much like they did, and a sense that if this torture machine continued it would devour the formerly valid interests. The shared interest was not about relations to the means of production, which were only the mechanisms through which actors could do anything about the situation if they held any relation at all. The shared interest was in the idea of democracy, and a spiritual affinity for freedom in a genuine sense. That affinity was informed not by ideology or a just-so story about natural freedom from birth, but because humanity had long experience with the alternative of slavery and knew the results of the peculiar institution. The unity of the people was premised on something that wasn't economic or even political,

but was both a sense that the people could collectively throw off this ruinous beast that served nothing worthwhile and was advanced by imperial perverts and their enablers. The aim was not to capture the state in some clever coup, or to abolish the state in an infantile display, but to build outright something that would resist this imperious invasion of the lives of most of humanity and then confine the beast of aristocracy until it could be snuffed out for good. If that meant defeating the existing state and building anew a ruling interest, that would have only been the start, and anyone who knew the history of these things likely figured out that they better have a plan beyond cheering for a revolution that would likely not be in the interest of most of the people but in the interest of a revolutionary intelligentsia with their own aspirations. Such a program would not have existed purely as a story or a narrative to be told as a cope. It would have entailed organization of the interests opposed to aristocracy in total, which likely meant that the basis for the aristocracy's effective rule - the army and the rising bureaucratic state - would have to be met with a counter-force that was anathema to a totalizing view of society. It would have required the development of a world outside of "society" in the aristocratic sense of a controlled ecology.

To illustrate how disparate interests can form a ruling interest, we should step back from our assumptions about civic worth and social rank and see what rulers do. Properly speaking, this is more of a political question than an economic one, as much of what is effective for rule is economically worthless or damaging if viewed as a productive enterprise. The question is not confined to a political theory or view. For politics to exist, just as anything else that would be above the economic, it requires mechanisms which ultimately derive from a process in the physical world rather than the strength of an idea alone. And so, all of the functions described in an earlier chapter would be picked apart, dissected, and their utility considered by those who work in the other functions. This process in recent history did not happen with a blank slate but with centuries of accumulated history, grudges, institutional memory, and so on, but much of what has been built in modernity is novel to our time and has few antecedents before modernity. New men and women could rise from nearly nothing if they understood what this really was and how to climb the ladder, as difficult as that would be and as often as that resulted in nothing but failure and a kick in the teeth. Above all, those who rule need to consider the economy of making others suffer, and how to do this in the most effective way that eliminates resistance to rule. It is possible to rule by virtue or something other than making people suffer, but the shortest and most economically efficient expenditure of ruling force is to give the subordinated groups as little as possible, and rule through threats and impressions rather than good deeds or forthright promises. It was necessary and desirable to use both carrots and sticks when building the technocratic polity, and to suggest that rising through the new institutions was better than anything that would have prevented the chokehold from happening. If enough people could rise and saw the institutions as serving some social end that included them, then it could work, and those who were merely cogs in the machine could tell themselves that they're aren't the living abortions that the

residuum would be made out to be, who are punished most severely for crimes of Being rather than anything they actually did, since what the lowest class did was irrelevant and often didn't register as any coherent attack against the ruling interest. So far as the lowest class did have a plan, it was to piss off and wreck the machines of rule and management as much as they could, and this was often pursued with little vision beyond making the bastards suffer for doing this to them and to the world. Very often the lowest class were not the gangsters and pimps, but the targets of gangs and the lower of the prostitutes who couldn't climb up the ladder to status in that world. Included in the lowest class were those who were sick, or who were thrown out of work and once upon a time were respectable enough, but now were just deemed fools who somehow deserved it, even though the ruinous arrangement of economic affairs for urban industry was clear to people in every class. No one could claim with a straight face that capitalism was a perfect system, and no one ever suggested that capitalism could be a perfect state and maintained indefinitely. It took a new reactionary push to suggest that capitalists should become feudal, venal, and petty thugs of the lowest sort, and glorify that rot for its own sake, and this was only possible by seeding it in institutions for generations and letting it fester, while forbidding anyone to defend themselves against predation. What we have seen is that low cunning, avarice, cruelty, pettiness, and a propensity to lie are closer to the ruling arts and sciences than anything productive, and this makes perfect economic sense if the role of a suffering class or suffering generally is understood as essential to the arrangement. It became necessary to make suffering invisible or something abstract and distant, and to convince the struggling to blind themselves to any greater awareness but Operation Impending Doom II. This idea didn't sell, because anyone who was at all serious about changing the situation would not accept an essentially bourgeois narrative of seizing the state to fulfill some kooky social engineering project. The would be socialists, from their earliest incarnation, knew that selling the concept would not be easy without any idea of what is to be done, and this was not merely a suggestion of a nicer world or a technological question, but a matter of what someone would need to do in order to contest the ruling interest. The rulers themselves cannot rule simply by backstabbing and low cunning. The ways in which cravens would be enabled and allowed to present as virtuous men and women were a long project that was incredibly costly, entailed stoking wars and a war industry that sucked away resources that would have improved the lives of the people, and only began to show its results in the last third of the 20th century, and then only because it was technologically possible to invade private life in a way that was previously impossible and against the interests of all of the people who would have manually enforced the ruling idea in an earlier time. Before computerization could automate the managerial task and discipline the enforcers, it was necessary to feed the venality of the middle class and teach them to clamor for pigheaded answers to life's spiritual questions. The simple truth is that how people ruled had less to do with any great mystical secret that required occult initiation, but instead dealt with approaching society, psychology, finance, and all of the key instruments of rule as scientific matters,

just as a workman would know his tools and how to use them by heart. Raising the specialists and indoctrinating them with a mentality is not a trivial thing.

In an earlier society, before there is even a state to rule, the mechanisms will be different, but fundamentally there is a calculus implied - that ruling through trickery and malice is very quick, and since there isn't an organized interest that can unite to stop this, a priest-king could accumulate followers gradually and work them over until the cult practices are fervent among enough believers, and fear of the supposed "gods" of a cult of power could cow the rest of the people into submission. The foul origins of the human race come back with a vengeance when the city-states form and institute orgies and all of the vices of urban life, and this is one way in which people can be habituated to rule and believe that it was somehow their fault or a vice they couldn't control, because the allure of the temple's mysteries is greater than what they had before, and because they were going to be slaves and driven like cattle anyway. A philosophy of kindness and technological advance would be dead on arrival for most of the people, and the rulers kept such secrets for themselves and their favored subordinates. Part of the mysteries, and why education came to be dominated by gurus and pedagogy, was to protect the ruling interest and work towards its interests, rather than educate people to increase the available manpower that could be called upon. Rather than educate people in a way that suggested society was worth defending, the default of education was, and would remain up to today, fear and humiliation and a celebration of the venal, the pigheaded, and the superficial. This is intended. The people in early society do not arrive as a mass that had implicit solidarity, but are drawn to the city and trapped there by some form of bondage, then told that their life will consist of farming, harvesting, and praying to the gods that the weather will be good. If the weather is bad, and "the weather" includes the capricious terror of aristocrats, their soldiers, and the scum who have always been ready to enable the former, it was on the peasant for not sacrificing hard enough, and the sacrifice of animal blood is replaced with the sacrifice of human blood. This has to be normalized and seen as natural and somehow moral, and that is the character of ancient pagan gods. The gods of monotheism would be little better, and usually more focused on the philosophy of rule and religion's role to facilitate rule, while the pagan gods ran the gamut and included both the ruling arts and the tasks of workmen, in an effort to subsume workers and their pleasures in the lurid cults that were associated with aristocratic status.

Social classes never consolidate neatly into a preferred philosophical arrangement, however much this is attempted. The philosophical treatises are not meant to suggest classes that actually exist in of themselves, but suggest principles by which groups of people can be managed. The working class collectively has no interest in claiming that one interest is "the true working class", because that would be stupid and obviously servile to bourgeois or aristocratic conceits. The workers want much more basic things that are somehow forgotten, like "not dying for stupid bullshit wars and the conceits of assholes with a loudspeaker and sanction to speak", and "maybe we can actually have nice things and security

instead of being threatened by this racket you people call the state". This interest is not particular to proletarians, since it would be basic to anyone who likes living and knows what this is. It has to be declared by ideologues that certain of the lower class - the lowest class which had long been identified and pushed as the benchmark to make the other classes comply - are incapable of understanding the mysteries of ruling. The lowest class, however dull they are, are acutely aware of the ruling ideas, because they have borne the brunt of humiliation and defeat. We are the humans who have been sacrificed in droves with nary a voice to call our own. The workers who struggle most are typically not the ardent revolutionaries, because their lives make such a career problematic. The workers who succeed might consider their options and choose a side, and more often than not the better off workers side with the lower class in shared sentiment and purpose, because they're not far removed from the threat themselves. All of this, though, requires a very particular situation in modern cities, where urbanization, industry, and the rise of technology made some plan necessary for all factions. Past society was predominantly rural, and so the goings-on of kings, courts, and cults were not particularly interesting to most people, and the land-holders would prefer to keep that land by any means they can. Among the land-holders are not the rich but men who hold their plot of land, or are tenants and have a decent enough thing going compared to slavery. All the while, anyone who wishes to rule cannot simply rule by fear or impressions, but needs large quantities of various qualities - product that can supply armies, cities, and stimulate further development.^[2]

Many a fool will demand to raise "class consciousness", as if people are too stupid to know their interests and where those interest align. In this economic logic, the interests at a basic level are not difficult to see. A human being will retain a native sense of their environment, and has to be acutely aware that other people are the greatest danger by far. Even without any of the knowledge that is occulted, the default tendency would be to expect something foul until it can be verified that something can be trusted. Far from demonstrating anything that indicates trustworthiness, the cajolers will go out of their way to offend anyone who doesn't subscribe to some cult-like arrangement, and that is what is represented by this stupid conceit that the ruled are too stupid to know their situation. Such insults show an aristocratic bent that is too hideous to ever accomplish anything, and that is the point. The assholes who do this long ago decided they exist to insinuate themselves with the ruling interest, so they can grab some petty position to facilitate the management of their social inferiors. If there were a political reasoning behind this or any coherent purpose that suggests a fanatical vanguard would be effective at winning power, it might have been understandable, but these fools convince themselves they are always brilliant and their war plan will totally work if it is followed religiously. It is a constant replay of the planning that went into 1914, where the generals and war staff insist that this war plan will totally work, it will be quick and easy and we will surely win. It is also known now to this author that such idiotic thinking was encouraged by the eugenists, because the war for them was a grand story

where the workers and those not clever enough to get in with the creed would be killed off, and the eugenist fantasizes that he will take the women of the poorer class as breeding stock, or she will ward off undesirable men and feed the thrill of rejection which the eugenic creed glorifies beyond anything reasonable. Invariably, some crass sexual desire is at the heart of eugenism and aristocracy generally, for among the ruling interests are the great games of sexual selection, orgies for those in the know, and command over reproduction. It is much easier to sell the rule of aristocracy when they decide through the sexual act who lives and who dies in the long run, and an obsession with sexualism is inherent to aristocracy in humans. The eugenists are happy to stoke wars because they've never been told no, and they found idiotic war cultists dumb enough to think that abomination of 1914 was anything other than suffering for the stupidest purpose. 1933, 1939, 1941, all demonstrate the same stupidity, and it should be clear now that the second world war was the true endgame that made it clear humanity was indeed a failed race. The craven devolution to faux-nationalism would not have been saleable if humanity was seen as something that would go anywhere but where we arrived in the 21st century, and the procession towards full eugenism is presented as the last and only world-historical mission. Such a change in the national idea was only possible because flagrant lying about basic reality was not just technologically possible, but because there was enough rot in the human race to start the cycle and too little decency to suggest it could have been any other way. The proper solution to overcome class society would first be to recognize what it even was, and the creative re-definition of social class by those who promoted narratives over mechanical historical procession was the first attack on an understanding that literate men and women already held, and the illiterates could discern without too much difficulty should they see enough of the ruling interest. A full theory of class analysis would not be necessary to see that the way social class was re-defined to fit narratives and a thought-form of the conservative order was far removed from anything real. The next step of flagrant lying was only possible because the conservative order insinuated it could do this during the preceding two generations. Meaning was dissolved and replaced with pedagogy and creative use of dialectics to claim that what was in front of our faces wasn't real. A proper assessment of class would have seen the ruling interest not as a united front marching in lockstep, but a machine with moving parts like any other. It was only after that machine beat down and degraded intellects enough that it could present its faceless phalanx to the masses as the ultimate death cult. This took a long time to truly sink in, and up until the turn of the 21st century, there was a dim hope that we did not have to do this. After 2000, it was all over, and aristocracy was ready to make its play to, at long last, win the final war and reach its logical and mechanistic outcome. The ruling interest could only consolidate into the imagined phalanx that controls its soldiers absolutely in very recent times. The political thinkers who cajoled and bought into these cargo cults were active long, long before the present.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] For reasons that become apparent in later books, I do not believe "political economy" is a pseudoscience, because it would not be understood as "science" in the first place, and it exists entirely outside of the purview of natural science. Everything in the moral philosophy political economy entailed would, if it encountered an impassable natural barrier, be abandoned out of necessity, and the natural limits to economic planning would be defined. For example, anything outside of the planet Earth is of no consequence in an economic sense, because the sun and the moon, the two celestial bodies with any significant influence on Earth, cannot be enclosed or managed by any means available to us or likely to be worth pursuing. Anyone who wished to claim the sun like Monty Burns would not just face the technical barrier, but the realization of everyone else that such a scheme would only exist to make everyone suffer, paying for something that was as cheap as free and given by the world out of its typical generosity to us unworthy humans. The aims of political economy in its basic form did not entail the all-pervading command and control that sociology and socialism suggested as a possibility, but concerned a progression of imperial strategy over things that were already established, and concerned people and institutions whose existence was not questioned at the time. It is not difficult to see the Bank of England and established finance players in a strong position and working with both free trade, nascent socialists, and the reactionaries who clamored to take it all back. The presumption that the liberals wanted democracy was inserted after the fact by people who didn't bother to actually read the liberals or know where they came from, and what interests they represented. The founders of the United States were not fond of democracy and certainly knew their labor force consisted of slaves, indentured servants, and small holders who managed to survive servitude. It is very strange that the narrative of revolution suggested it happened entirely from the lowest class, when no such revolution was possible or resembled anything that happened. Those who lived through such times remember revolutions not as a grand narrative of success, but a struggle to survive against the culls of humanity, and the winners of the cull retroactively declaring the revolution was about something completely different. It is fitting that a government type premised on intestine conflict and habitual lying would lie about its origin so profusely, but the strange thing is that this origin story only appeared during the middle-to-late 19th century. Those with living memory of the late 18th century and the Napoleonic Wars took away very different lessons, whether they were the radicals, liberals, conservatives, monarchists, or the scum of humanity that jump from one patron to the next looking to make the rest of us suffer. The founding documents of the American and French states did not suggest any grand narrative of history was to over-write things many people knew about, and further that doing so would make the entire project nonsensical. Even as this new narrative arises, the ruling elites tend to prefer upholding their openly elitist governments, and didn't pretend that their governments were democratic or meant to serve the people at all. It is with fascism and the rise of eugenics that absolute lying became the intellectuals' great work, where before these

charlatans were told to get the fuck out when anyone wanted to seriously discuss what happened and what is happening in the current day. Those who perpetuate the "revolutions are when people feel bad" line desire to be the next Hitler, and are not in line with past uprisings in history at all. That mentality is what leads to the cajolers who want a fascist coup, who see themselves in the institutions and choking the life out of the world. The strategy of the intellectuals suggested this curious "revolution" and would in the 20th century do everything possible to undermine the possibility that the commons could be restored at all. Those who fought against fascism and suffered so greatly were stabbed in the back and left holding the bag, and told that if they protested this, they were the "real fascists", in the typical lies of these filthy would-be aristocrats.

[2] A note here about population is that aristocracy has contradictory conceits. The first is that they are always convinced there are too many poor people, since the very existence of the poor offends their sensibilities, and so aristocrats crave depopulation in ways that defy reason. The second is that, because this conceit of the aristocracy is known and imposed on their societies inevitably, the aristocrats find it difficult to convince anyone to damn their offspring to live in a world controlled by this. Far from Malthus' conceit of mindless breeders, the subordinated classes often loathe creating new life because it leads to liabilities and few promises of reward. Children are expensive and taxing, and certainly are taxing on the woman's body which would impair her ability to raise the children. Employing children as slave labor on the family farm facilitates some birth rate among the farmers, but slave populations have never been prolific breeders. Even here, the breeding is never "mindless" as pigheaded aristocrats think about their own affairs. The common man or woman has to consider any time they mate if they really want to risk this at any period where it is an option. Commoners do not have "accidents", as if they didn't figure out that when a man has sex with a woman it makes a baby. If a woman does not want a child, she will find ways to get rid of it, and since human sacrifice was often normal in human societies, that was one way to get rid of a kid the mother hated. Even where human sacrifice was publicly discouraged, it is carried out in private. Anyone in America today knows that human sacrifice never ended, and today's aristocrats grin with the knowledge that their sacrifices to Moloch or whatever god they shed blood for will not stop.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

24. The Principles Governing the Division of Labor

So far we have noted the division of labor by psychological sentiments and sense of the mind and division of labor by functions which include extraction from a world that preceded labor. Both of these encounter a world which must be known and studied, because the division of labor can only proceed in environments that allow it, and the social agents themselves are part of the world with a history

that was once dependent on it. That knowledge creates nascent institutions, where the interested parties in any society would gather. Because the interested parties have both goals and a history, and see the environment not merely as a mathematical problem but a home and a way to build something new, they organize around those institutions not for the sake of the institutions themselves, but for their long-term interests which are informed by the knowledge. Simply stating a fact like "2 and 2 make 4" does not have any meaningful implication that would require an interest to believe it is profound. The history of the interests and their institutions is itself knowledge and a part of the world, which forms further institutions, jockeying for position, and all of the things which allow labor to divide into the familiar social classes. This starts in a more primitive way, amidst a society where clans, villages, cities, cults, and a whole lot of ordinary humans are living, without any regard to this task of management or any division of labor. The clans and smaller social forms have their own interests and institutions, but these give way to the division of labor in a polity, and the division of labor in an ecosystem where certain interests rule. The rule of the interests must establish collaboration in order to rule, and the ruling interest attracts those who seek power over the world for various purposes. Anyone who wishes to survive has to abide the ruling interests no matter how stupid they are, but the ruling interests are each their own thing and have no intrinsic spiritual connection or identity as a singular thing. The social classes never really form in line with the philosophical framework that suggests a general rule of social classes, as if they all shared one institution and mindset. The broad social classes conform more to the presumptions of rank and prestige and a sentiment that can be programmed into people, then the actual coalitions of interest that comprise them and shift their position in relation to the ruling interest. And so, while I have referred to aristocracy as a tendency and there is definitely an aristocratic mindset that recognizes itself and people like them, aristocracies have to be drawn from existing interests to rule in this economic sense. The core tendencies cannot remake the world to conform to their preferred image of it no matter how much they insist history only moves by thought leaders pushing events into existence, as if their thoughts were fused with fundamental nature and they alone held the master key to command it.

The will of those in social classes to act in accord with those interests cannot operate infinitely, or make whatever meaning they wish, such that they can truly make the world into a reflection of their will. All economic actors can only work with the representations of the world they can hold onto. We only briefly hold onto the meaning of these things, and we hope to isolate mechanisms at work that allow us to formulate general laws of motion. This applies to physics, society, economics, or anything else we would hope to manage. Each of these concepts entails very different things, and the language of society and institutions has no place in physics which pertains to a world that cares not about our conceits. Economic thought proceeds not as social or psychological behavior and its emergences, nor as behavior inherent to life that explains the genesis of all of its behavior. Economic thought arises only when it is possible

to conceive that it is possible - and so, the formation of social classes in reality is not something that is read into nature's laws, but a thing born because humans develop symbolic language. Without the idolatry and fetishism inherent in this task of economic command and control of large spaces, our economic behavior would remain a local interest, and we would see correctly that economic behavior has a limited purview. Economics is not the true origin of politics, or really something that would have anything to do with disputes over the polity. Economics is a potential means by which politicians can act, if they choose to make economics into their cause. If they do, the politician or the manager of society imagines themselves as the only ones who are sacrosanct, and "homo economicus" is treated with disdain placing them beneath cattle. The default of mankind under economic management is to be treated as vermin or a threat lurking, which must be cajoled to comply with increasingly absurd expectations. If not for the managerial impulse, economics would have been a simple enough affair, and economic life would be oriented around things we actually wanted rather than imperious wills insisting we are something much different than what we do and what happens beneath the surface representation. Economic management, more than the typical for mankind, is given over to the superficial, and exaggerates its attachment to vanity. The shorter route to command and control people and interrupt the native thought process is preferred when knowledge itself becomes a prized asset and the property of an elite, whose values become a mixture of aristocratic and technocratic conceits. Aristocracy has always found the worst of all worlds to be highly effective in its mission, and so they co-opt merit, technology, the meaning of the world that labor produced, and claim that they are the patrons of the sick and weak and the only way to salvation. Never are the subordinated tendencies allowed to suggest that the aristocracy is full of shit and does the most to guarantee that the worst of all worlds prevails. The only limitation for all of this is that humans, no matter their conceits, really do only grasp the surface representation of the things they appropriate. The meaning and germ of knowledge is not easily accessible to us in the same form, and we must out of necessity compress a lot of information about ourselves to that which is easy to work with. If we do not, we are lost and indulge too much in thinking about how we think, without arriving at useful conclusions. We do require some self-awareness and an ability to disconnect from our conceits momentarily, and in some way acknowledge we are alien to ourselves and never whole or pure, and never were. Humans from birth are tainted by the history of their genesis and the genesis of the human race generally, and this is not some incomprehensible divine sin but a past we know very well. Many of us attempt to do something other than this, but there are those who are drawn to the genesis and primordial light because that is a short route to command and control people, and it destroys meaning and eventually the symbolic representation of anything that is inimical to eugenics. This is why the aristocrat and the eugenicist crave sameness and regression to a universal subject, and promote the creation of echo chambers almost by instinct. They are aware of how this is constructed, but in their heart, the aristocrats and those who make the echo chambers are no different, and

believe everyone should be as depraved as them. The thing they hate more than anything else is the idea that anything new is possible, or that difference can exist in a way that is not distinctly inferior and sorted into some grade of civic worth. If there is social distinction, it must be declared by the superior who declares which identity groups are inferior. Once aristocracy has its way, it becomes a grand taboo to speak about this declaration of civic worth, and false egalitarianism is the aristocracy's calling card, one of the egregious insults spewed to the ruled. The ruled know this game, like every other humiliation the aristocracy craves and the thrill of the subordinates who align with this demonic impulse. By systematically denying that any symbol inimical to the ruling interest is admissible, and associating such symbols with ridicule and humiliation, aristocracy's foul purpose for the human race is reasserted. It has been, sadly, too easy for humans to do this, because that is what humans were born as and conditioned to accept. Every effort humanity makes to change this, which it must undertake simply to live let alone break free from aristocracy's conceit, must be stopped before it can even form a representation that would suggest a meaning that anything new is possible.

A division of labor can arise organically without any intent, and in some way it is demonstrated by life's functions and the cooperation of living things, as they are distinct from each other and, whether they wish it or not, they live in the same world and in some sense cooperate with each other. Without any concept of inherent race or species, life as aliens to each other cannot persist for long. Noting the distinctions of living entities does not entail any economic or political objective, or suggest competition must ensue - nor for that matter that cooperation is required within a race or between races. The default of life would be to recognize the world and other inhabitants, then revert to their own lives and not step on each other. This is not done out of some political autism or a conceit of life, but because in most circumstances, doing nothing and letting each other be and do as they will is the least likely to make a situation worse. If people are to cooperate, that is only possible with some understanding and shared purpose. If people are to compete, they normally have something to fight for. The reduction of struggle to an impulse for its own sake is another aristocratic calling card. The first step to realizing any division of labor happens not in the intent of life, which does not need to necessarily regard this division as relevant and often circumvents any division of labor for expedience. Since the division of labor is premised on the control of spaces that existed before us, division of labor is in the first instance a reaction to a world as it appears to us. The efforts to shape that division of labor to fit a philosophical conceit or preference can only be a long-run mission. The understanding of actors to create their preferred division of labor is only formed so far, and there have been various schemes and minutia in this division to push and prod the subordinated to comply. It is thus that the division of labor, and all sense of economic worth, is really the command of information, rather than the substance itself or the meaning of any of that information. Knowledge itself as a process must be subordinated to a model institutions impose on the world and the subjects, and

so the splitting of the mind must increase as the division of labor becomes more sacrosanct. This splitting of the mind is counterproductive and doesn't actually accomplish anything, and would be circumvented if we had perfect knowledge and all of the necessary information to not need any division of labor in the way it has been imposed. There would remain natural distinctions among people, but these would not be seen as particularly relevant, and it would not be out of the question to consider that people could all be better, without any regard for economic dickering and the infliction of suffering purely to keep this order in place.

All that has been discussed in the prior chapters could only be ascertained after-the-fact, without knowledge of the history that led to it. We were not born with a genetic code telling us what the whole society was, and every new member of society must re-learn the vast majority of that information. Only scant information is passed in a way we would consider hereditary and inborn, and this information is nowhere near enough to understand the game played. It is both an aristocratic and meritocratic conceit that superior ability will be inborn, and so they always like to portray the division of labor like the rest of history - as a series of just-so stories that have no meaningful connection, and assert boldly an alternate reality. They need not hold to any science or fidelity to the truth - only the appearance of truthiness that appeals to some primitive sentiment that can be pushed to continue the process of dividing labor, or start anew a process or a particular initiative of social engineering.

THE SUFFERING CLASS

If there is one common trait of all mankind, it is that suffering is a constant. This is not so much because of a terrible Demiurge making it so or a perversion of the Monad, but because suffering operates at such a basic level and is the obvious filter for social class and distinction. Suffering is as cheap as free, and if the suffering were to ever stop, existence would be very different. It very likely results in a world where humanity, seeing no good reason to carry on with this sad farce, largely refuses to speak to each other, having seen that humans simply refuse to get along in large groups for much at all. It would not mean that people mull about how lonely and pointless existence is, or refuse any communication of information out of a fear of knowledge. It would rather be that the ways in which humanity communicates would be different, and the behavior of the low residuum today and its penchant for absurdism rather than the thrill of torture is indicative of what it would mean. Such an innocuous fate, which harmed no one, evokes horror in those who have tasted blood and know that if it ends, they would have nothing. A race born of ritual sacrifice like Man faces existential crisis not from peace, but the end of their favorite cult and the oldest religion there is. Without the constant leering of said vampires, the absurdist humor would, having exhausted its appeal, give way to humans finally holding what they really wanted, which was not much more than the muck from which their bodies arose. We might make things because they were

intrinsically interesting or because convenience would eliminate an unnecessary barrier. That world only exists in small microcosms the damned have made to tolerate this society, and it never develops too far before it is smashed in favor of this shitfest that is called "high culture" and "high society". A parody of this is sold as the province of aristocracy, claiming their stupid luxuries extracted at great expense are some great treasure, while we the damned learned long ago to expect little from this world and to distrust a human no matter what. In a better world, the damned may relax their hatred, but they would never forget the origins of this sordid race or why it turned out this way. There would be new struggles, new emergences of the beast, but aristocracy in total would be laid bare and we would have no further need of any of it. Our life would no longer be a machine set in motion or a beast rife with contradiction and struggle, and this world is not some unicorn or even something bizarre. We were not born to suffer, and it was not the fools who created suffering compared to the psychotic torture that ordinary society revels in as a rule. What would result is that, having seen enough to conclude that humanity is a failed race and has no shared brotherhood or future, it would be enough to salvage what remains, and dream of a better existence in a world where we never did this. It would not create some transhuman new race or indulge in the fetishes of the property-holders or technophiles, or suggest anything all that strange, and claim this was spiritual redemption. It wouldn't be out of the question for humans to become biologically something different, but this would not wipe away the stain of the human race or really change anything we have described here. The true aims of the residuum, so far as they exist, have nothing to do with what asinine authors decide we were "meant" to be, or really any objective those who are not us would appreciate. Only the damned of the Earth have some sense of what is necessary and what will happen, one way or another. The worst mistake is to pretend it was going to be different so long as the aristocratic idea dominates, or that any of the other interests have any real objection or vision that it would be significantly different. Perhaps on some level, enough of humanity in the more favored classes knows that in the end, they are damned with the rest of us, and all of their aspirations really were for nothing. If they did want something different, the ideologies produced en masse made sure that nothing different was possible. At heart, the ruling ideas - and this is something that long experience has taught me - could only exist if the vision of most of humanity as cattle came early and never went away. That would be a natural outgrowth of the hunt and the lurid sexual rituals inherited from animal life, and "abolishing the orgasm" or any such silly aim does not change what was done or why it was done. It is entirely possible to reproduce the same mentality with very different mechanisms, if humanity were engineered to be asexual and bred in cloning vats. It is entirely possible - trivial even - to reject entirely the absurd rituals and eugenic sorting that mating entails, and instead men and women would mate because they both want a child, which even now is not unheard of. In a different world, bringing a child into existence, while not something to be taken lightly, would not be fraught with the danger of vampires leering for more sacrifice for Moloch or the sick gods that are the true religion of the human race.

There was never a time where such a world existed for us, nor a primordial time where all was good. The primordial image of Man in the cults of Saturn-worship is that of the hunter exalted to parodic heights, rather than seen with contempt, or what the hunter actually was. The glorification of the hunt is even more absurd than the glorification of war, which is saying a lot. A human who hunts for the thrill of it is a greater retard than most, but usually the hunt was carried out for far more mundane things. It was a source of food and raw material, the elimination of a threat - for all living things are in principle threats to another - and honing for war since the hunter doubled as a man-at-arms for savage society, which may be limited to himself against other savages and whatever ad hoc bands they assembled. That sadly is what we were. Rising from the muck is a dignified existence compared to a race that took perverse pleasure in sticking their genitalia in the poopy, and thinking these displays and acts were some sort of great purpose. At the same time, the better world was available as soon as Those People were no longer around, because it did not take any great mind to see the futility of this, and it did not take a great mind to discover how such a vile genesis could be weaponized in various ways to facilitate a nastier project. It has never left us. We have been the beneficiaries for so long of the world's limitations on the human race. Among the tropes of aristocracy is the conceit that the body or the world is a prison, but the body did nothing to us. It was the vessel that allowed us to contemplate any of this at all, and it is almost designed to envision something different rather than a recapitulation of the aristocracy's rot. The world will never fall. Only humans did that, and had to invent a story that would be hilarious if it weren't so sad.

It is the drive to make others suffer that preceded the material conditions of deprivation, rather than the other way around. Materially, nothing justified or necessitated the glorification of torture that was the genesis of the human race. It is not biologically necessary for humans to do any of this, or encoded in any biological truth, such that torture and suffering are natural laws. Nothing about this practice is natural, but then, by nature's law, all we value is worth piss and shit and would not matter one way or the other. A condition of starvation doesn't necessitate acting in this deliberate and malicious way, which always required a level of comfort. Desperate humans do not think to torture others for amusement, for they have more pressing concerns. Only aristocracy believes that desperation creates this, because it is not a desperation of themselves. When aristocrats are against the wall individually, they behave like the cravens they have always been, because eugenics knows no other way, and even at its best, aristocracy has only parodies of suffering once they have theirs. Their personal life, if they had to become aristocrats through determination rather than heredity, must be set aside for them to truly adopt the aristocratic values and act on them. This, they claim, is a "master morality", and anyone who calls it what it is must be slaves that are jealous of the masters, where the slave must invent a cope as an aristocrat would. The truth is that the slaves and downtrodden never required any moral claim to hate the aristocrats, because the aristocrats were a clear and present danger. Those of the subjugated classes, all

the way up to the officers, are not delusional to sense the knife at their throat, that aristocracy always reveled in showing and demonstrating ad nauseum. That Hegelian shit and its offshoots has always been a doctrine of the aristocrats to insist the world conforms to their pigheaded conceits, or at best it is an explanation of the political logic the German idealists believed to be operative whether it was a good idea or not - that is, even if the master/slave dialectic is a bunch of malarkey as it demonstrably is, the koan must be reinforced because aristocracy has little else to live by, and it takes on a power of its own. It was the infliction of suffering and all mechanisms to do so that was truly important and valued, and this was not merely an economic choice but a political one. It would only be sensical if the torture were conducted not by peers, but by social superiors who had all of the choice and "freedom" in the world, with everyone else having none. After the fact, it is helpful to tell the slaves that this is natural and indescribable at the same time, and that there is a received wisdom of gurus that they can buy into - a piece of blue sky, as L. Ron Hubbard understood to be the thing Scientology sold to its high value recruits.^[1]

No material necessity drives this division of labor, or even drives significant differentiation in operations beyond that which is evident with a cursory examination. Whatever human beings do is some manifestation of labor, and much of this labor is so mundane that it is never considered a thing to be managed. The drive for suffering is not merely a fait accompli, but a wedge which makes opening the subject to unlimited exploitation possible. Without it, exploitation and alienated labor is just another fact of little moral consequence to us. Sure, there may be a ruling elite which holds all of the really important information and enjoys a marked distinction in favor and wealth, but this really does not present a clear and present danger in of itself or anything that the lower classes would need to remedy out of a sense that equality of wealth would be just in-of-itself. It is the suffering which makes that wealth disparity an actionable threat, and no other task could accomplish this. Mere violence and a willingness to destroy life functions will, at some point, be another fact that living things abide. There is much worse than destruction, and compared to the torture cults that were foundational to the human race as anything recognizable, death seems tame and kind. The rulers do not believe in clean death, and the grand ritual surrounding so-called "euthanasia" demonstrates how much the rulers do not believe in clean death.^[2] If there were a belief in clean death, then there would be an open and frank admission that aristocratic cruelty does not give the damned a "right" to suicide, and the language of political rights would be irrelevant. Such abomination that we have been made to live under would make suicidality an almost obligatory rite of passage for us who are damned. In our society, every inducement is made to push the damned to suicidal intent, which would be the only way out, and then the first sign of a lack of faith in this eugenic hellworld is taken as a pretext to both intensify the suffering and disallow clean death, without the last thing we see being the thrill of the Satanic race reveling in the damnation of the underclass. This is intended and inherent to torture, and in doing so, true exploitation is possible. With brute force, it appears exemplary

wealth is spent to induce labor that would have been obtained more easily by offering any level of security to the worker, no matter how low the eugenic qualities of the laborer. There would seem to be a point where giving people something is far more sensical than torturing people like this, if economics were merely a question of resource inflows and outflows. All of our sense and history regarding this has made clear that free labor, even if the "freedom" is dubious, is far more effective as a disciplinary tool than this managerial torture cult, because substantive rewards would perpetuate themselves and allow the security which was the necessary companion of liberty. When economics is understood as the infliction of suffering granted value, and only after the fact is this labor deemed valuable when under torture, then the peculiar institutions damning labor and the residuum are perfectly sensical, and this outrageously large allocation of human effort towards making other humans suffer is the only possible outcome of such an arrangement. Politically, this makes sense to many interests in society, but not one of those interests are the goods that economic life would produce or anything most of us would want. If we truly did value anything like justice, then it would be clear the present status quo and those who dictate it have no standing whatsoever to judge who lives and who dies. Those who sought this imperium did not need to believe that torture was the point, because the reason for the state's existence is not the pleasure of some Satanic screamers who squeal "me wantee" and can keep doing it because it is illegal to tell them no. Once established, though, the power of life and death has to accept at its core that the power of life and death is won not by merit or some virtue in the world, but the psychological game of torture alone. Torture has moved the human race since its inception, and little else has been so effective at governing behavior in the final analysis. Even when it would have been much cleaner to have a dialogue, such a dialogue would make clear that all of the interested parties who were blooded on the eugenic creed and its antecedents cannot be forgiven, abided, or even acknowledged as anything other than what they are. This might have been overcome. The damned, after all they have endured, have been forgiving, because the thought of doing what must be done is too terrible for us to consider, and would require a true jihad unlike any this sorry race has ever known. It would seem better to let the aristocrats play their game of sweeping their crimes under a rug, if only to buy a temporary peace. World-historical missions and dreams of arresting history are the plaything of aristocracy and it does not require great wisdom to see that it is all malarkey. Those who tasted blood do not continue to press purely out of obligation or security, and really know that they face no significant threat to that. It is rather than the torture is so valuable that the thought of even temporarily abandoning it is what they believe "suffering" is - and so, they "suffer fools" and do not acknowledge the fool's daily agony and the misery of existing among these Satanic apes. In the place of the very real agony we feel in our bones, the aristocrat substitutes an infantile pissant's ennui because they didn't get as much of the quota of torture as their peers and won't get that badge of honor. It is not that the aristocrat can't feel that agony themselves. We should not take it for granted that they do feel this agony, because an aristocrat or anyone who is safe from the ritual sacrifice is not

us and has no reason to think we are the same thing. Yet, suffering rarely stays in any domain management dictates it "ought" to stay in, and enough genuine suffering is distributed to discipline the rest of the body politic, however it is constituted. This is not merely a sense of empathy that is natural for animal life, but a rational understanding that evil begets evil and there is much more evil that the torture cult and ritual sacrifice entails than the act itself. The true torture in the end must not be in a special place while the world is kept secure and happy. The true torture is to live in a world where ritual sacrifice is openly glorified and any opposition to it is "retarded".

It is important above all that opposition to this ritual sacrifice be "retarded", rather than "weak", merely "stupid", "naive", or anything else. Past regimes might have used weakness and bad moral fiber rather than intelligence and knowledge to point at the core of torture, either as a misdirect or because no working theory of intelligence or thought was widely accessible. Humans are more responsive to merits and distinctions in struggles and through violent action than they are to reasoned arguments for a ritual sacrifice which is unreasonable. It is impossible for someone to say with any credibility that this torture has resulted in a single good thing for anyone, even those who revel in the blood and go home to their otherwise dreary but "pleasurable" lives. What can be argued, at least in the short to medium term, is that life is struggle, and there is no reasoning or negotiating with someone who holds the subject captive with a sword or gun about the nature of imperium.^[3] This merit of brute force is undesirable because brute force requires effort, whereas suffering is entirely placed on the subject. It must be their fault, however ludicrous the claim would be, that they were attacked. Such is the most basic tenet of any bully, learned and kept sacred in all educational institutions and glorified beyond any reason why it should be so. The thrill of torture must be maximized and carried out to its logical conclusion. It would not do to merely state this victory as a merit and let it be known that some are better than others, or allowed a right of unlimited violence. That is the overt rationale of the institutions and the state, but the true rationale is that knowledge must become proprietary, and it must be declared, without any evidence, that the victim does not know, and repeat that retarded status ad nauseum. Only in this way is the suffering true. Anything less would be an imperfect admission. Why the emphasis on knowledge, even though it isn't difficult for everyone to see the nature of this institution? There are multiple purposes to this mechanism, which are more suited to a discussion of political mechanisms than economic or natural ones. The chief purpose is that this conceit, this knowledge of the bully's credo and "the secret" held by the institutions, is itself the purpose, rather than a means to an end. It is not done because this method is proven to work, with full knowledge of the consequences. Savage humanity did not really need to know what it was doing to commit to its genesis. It did know enough, and it will always be guilty, for the law of nature so far as one exists is guilty until proven innocent. It is necessary to invert this natural law in the aristocratic conceit of justice, and then claim that the aristocrats who engineered this no-win scenario are here to help you. The

thrill of torture must be maximized. We are living with the consequence of this ancient rite of the human race, and rather than face what they are, the human race elected to scream like the Satanic retards they are. So long as they have ritual sacrifices, it will never end, and the thrill of torture will escalate until the bully tires, and not one moment before. This is the essence of the control and "restraint" of the state's officers in total, rather than any determination for something we would consider good or right. Restraint for good as we would see it is anathema to every concept of justice aristocracy holds, and those who thought otherwise were too "retarded" and purged. History and the will of a Satanic race saw to it. The perpetrators cannot ever give a reason why it happens, despite the obvious consequences of this ritual sacrifice, but it must go on. If it didn't it would be as if the Aztecs' gods were displeased and the sun won't rise. The Satanic does not think any more than that when it comes to this question. They are very knowledgeable about the methods of torture and how they can be maximized, and can invent philosophical excuses, which their experts are trained to do, but they never once consider that this way of life is more than futile - that their pleasure and the true heart of the human spirit is why we suffered in the first place. The latest fad of aristocracy is to recapitulate the most vile habits of the Satanic ape as "transhuman", "progressive" values. This proves that the moment it was technologically possible to cage most of humanity in these institutions and make them abide them, the thrill of torture would indeed be maximized. There was only one way for this to be prevented - never let it start. But, that would work against a concept of progress that the commonplace observation that causes lead to effects, and the causes of humanity's past never had any serious counter-force to arrest history. The world was never adversarial to humanity per se or had it out for us, good or evil. The world, so far as it has a moral inclination which it does not realize, only makes abomination meet its fate when the time comes.

The Satanic revels in this abomination, and must claim the world itself was a fallen reproduction of its own soul. "If not me, than someone will 'naturally' do it", they claim if they ever have to pretend to account for themselves. A Satanic, as a rule, is never made to account for anything they do in service to the Satan, no matter what the law code. They can scoff at the law, and the only punishment against a Satanic is death. What is torture to a Satanic, except another reproduction of its value system? There is no purpose from our view in torturing a Satanic, because they are very adept liars, and the prospect of accounting for a single one of the Satanic race's sins is worse than any torture. They will proudly endure torture rather than accept that, and that is the card aristocracy has held above all - that due to its alliance with the Satan, it alone holds this monopoly on torture, and torture stands alone in its moral hierarchy. The concept that torture would be of no interest to us, and that we would vivisect the Satanic without the slightest concern, only occurs partially to the Satanic. The Satanic ape, most evident with Nazi and Fabian atrocities, evokes images of vivisection for "scientific" aims which have no legitimate value as an inquiry into the natural world.^[4] Yet, this image is only a pale reflection of what they

themselves fear - that there is a world with no feeling or sentiment and there is no regard for Satanics outside of the traps they make us live in. The Galtonites exhort their followers to abolish sentiment, but their squealing and indulgence in the most crass pleasure and sadism shows that they very much hold to sentiment. They simply wish all sentiments to be as Satanic as them, and this has made the eugenic creed the most thorough overt expression of the Satan yet known, worse than many who were historically Satanic. It is for this reason that the claim of suffering had to be a claim of knowledge, rather than deeds or genuine substances, or some fact which would be independently adjudicated. The one thing that would void this glee in torture is the recognition of its absurdity and pointlessness, and meeting it not with a rival Satan which is doomed to failure, or "negation of the negation" in bad philosophical thought. It would instead be met with cleansing of filth, just as shit is wiped from our ass if we have any sense of true hygiene. There is a reason, after all, Malthus instructs the creed to make living conditions unbearable, for the greater "Jehad" of depopulation. Something as simple as not living in shit must be made either unseemly, or a flashpoint for political controversy which involves imperious busybodies telling us we cannot clean our own shit, or dumping onto the poor both obligations to work for the masters and punishments for taking any iota of their lives back from the city. Glorification of torture becomes the point, and this had always been latent in the human race. It used to encounter sobering influences that made it unsustainable beyond purviews that aristocracy struggled to impose, against many of mankind who never cared for any of that and had some sort of life that was better than this. Even a dismal life is worth more than the antiseptic vision of a fully eugenic world which they acknowledge is an unattainable ideal. The evocation of the eugenicist of such a world where the unsightly weak are destroyed by imperious will is never intended to produce its supposed end result. A Satanic creed understands that the torture must never end, nor does it have any limit to it that would be ordained by nature or some ulterior motive. Eugenics can never be limited in its aims, as if there were some special place where it didn't apply. The claim of the would-be aristocracy is that they can contain it, control it, and set the pitch of the terror to where it needs to be, directed at the "correct" targets. The Satanic resents this control and always takes an mile for every inch it is given, and this is something the Galtonites were from the outset - for their mission had nothing to do with eliminating anything that was demonstrably bad, but maximizing the thrill of torture, so that the worst inbred aristocracy of the human race tells us loving them is obligatory.

There is no other basis for a rational division of labor, where labor is divided by ability, merit, or sentiments other than this that originated not by reason but by the instincts and interests we natively possessed. It was not alienation in some vague sense that created this, for labor was always alien to what we really are at a basic level. The soul of man being alien to its body is not a travesty or a weakness or a cause for discord, but a simple fact we could easily have lived with. We should feel that this spiritual existence we developed is an alien to a more base existence, because it is alien and so too is all of our pursuit of

higher wisdom or any meaning to the world other than that which is evident. The meaning of life, so far as there is one, is not a great mystery at all. Life is what it is, and this is not a circular koan where an ideologue invokes regression to a primordial state, or places effect before cause. There is no "circle of life" or "wheel of life" that nature ordained in any way. Life is an aberration which is snuffed out either by forces in the world or the will of men. Without the threat of torture and the general fear, a human race reliant on brute force to snuff out life will be little better than the animals it has enslaved, and this is intended. The brutishness of police and the lower enforcers of the ruling interest was cultivated and calculated to be just effective enough to immiserate the ruled, including the low-ranking enforcers who are taught to attack each other like slaving dogs and believe this is some sort of virtue. It has been honed in the 21st century that it is now evident as various types of psychological conditioning, rather than a cruder sentiment as it was in the past. This brutishness is not imposed by genuine ignorance, as if the cops were too stupid to know what was what. The limitation of intelligence in the police is not because cops must be stupid to be brutes, but because police functions would be in a position to detect the rulers' conspiracy and see no reason to go along with it. A policeman who is smart enough would be pulled in to the conspiracy and encourage inferiors in the force to get on the take, as the alliance of aristocracy and organized crime is an ancient one. If the policeman refuses, or cannot feign ignorance and keep his or her head down and follow orders, the cull begins, and the Satan does not abide an iota of independence from it. Eugenics took what began as a municipal police function, formerly the function of men-at-arms to terrorize the peasants and drive the slaves, and applied the most egregious and ruinous type of policing to all social activities.

I have here invoked the most extreme example of the "pure Satanic". Doubters will claim that no such entity actually exists, or isn't embodied in people who are flawed but redeemable. I and so many of us know better - that while there are no good humans, there are many who chose to be demons a long time ago and never thought any differently. While no one is born a demon as the eugenic creed insists, there are those so inclined to develop the inclination that it might as well be an inherited trait. Eugenics, in typical reversal, essentializes the evil by declaring it is virtuous and glorious, and honesty is "retarded" and evil, or more in line with Nietzschean stupidity, just bad in that way a simpering pissant understands morality. No torture would be effective if the maximal position is not evident and practiced by its believers. There are many who are pure evil, or purely devoted to the thrill of torture, and those serving two masters will be conflicted until one can assert itself. Torture itself and the cult of maximal torture stands alone and is unique in the world. This torture is often a visage ascribed to "the Satan", but it predates anything humans conjured and did not start with humanity. There are such sentiments, however primitive, in animals, and torture does not need to invoke any deity or developed theory or principle that "Satan" would imply is operative. It is torture itself which is but one tool of "the Satan", but the tool is something unique in the world. The tool of torture is

not identical with abomination. You may invent a moral argument where torture is either justified or necessary. I for one would not hesitate to torture Satanics, if I believed such a thing were possible or were worth anything. In my heart and soul, I have no regard for Satanics who have shown their proclivity time and time again, for I know they have no concept of shame and their thoughts or feelings are quite irrelevant beyond the threat their actions pose. I long ago learned to tolerate the intolerable, which makes the Satanic's autistic screeching about my wrongdoing puzzling. It is only when learning more of their cult and psychology that much of human history can be sensical, and this torture would be exported to economic thought. This is admitted by acknowledging the value of labor as the value of toil, rather than the value of genius which could be measured and allocated like some substance. The latter is not easily measured by any metric. Suffering as a psychological event is also not easy to pin down and rationally allocate in the abstract, but the results of the suffering are evident. It is evident not merely in the quantity of labor-power that torture can provide basically for free, since torture begets torture and the thrill of it is the point for its partisans and many in the empire. It is evident in the qualities that torture can induce and the orientation of labor's ultimate objective under management, if management is given over to that cult rather than any other purpose, such as anything at all worth living for. The suffering is not the sole substance of labor's value, for commanding labor is never purely a matter of screeching "me wantee" like the Austrian School's proverbial bourgeois man in the desert. It is however the most evident expedient for commanding labor and suggests the extent to which it can be commanded. If subjects could not be seriously tortured by the ruling interest, then it is far easier for those subjects to scoff at any command, and see that the emperor has no clothes. With sufficient torture, the emperor no longer has to fear this, because the emperor can declare that nudism is morally righteous.^[5]

THE IDEA AND MATERIAL SUBSTANCE AND MECHANISM OF TORTURE

Torture to be torture, like any morally meaningful concept, is never simply an utterance or a thrill. The thrill of torture, the terror of the deed, and the veneration of the symbols of torture and the Satan are inherent to the practice, but they are not in of themselves the substance. To know the name of something is not to hold power over it, but to conjure its image in the mind of a rube and twist it with wordplay. Only through manipulation of perception does the name hold power, and this is not limited to torture or hostile manipulation. Dialectic is used and abused for far more innocuous reasons, and humans in their language are obviously engaged in an interplay between two agents when communicating. We may imagine information as feedback from one agent to another, but how we actually process it, out of necessity, has to send and receive on the same instrument. It is not intrinsic to this dialogue that any environment outside of it exists. This use of the dialectic for torture is very helpful for any torture beyond that of the enablers, who can only act in mass and at the direction of the thought leader. The dialectic is a favorite of torturers, bullies, thugs, cajolers,

schoolteachers, inquisitors, and everyone who is in the business of dragging us good males and females in their bullshit - and in the insulting dialogues that are mentioned here, there is a superior presuming all of the virtue and an inferior who is denigrated and humiliated, not granted the title of man or woman which are honorifics implicitly denied to the tortured from the outset. In situations where the torture is overt, this denial is explicit, thrown in the face of the damned, and glorified until it is made true - but it is not made true by any autistic behavior. Autism is the natural end result of torture, intended beforehand, and the Satanic cycle that is of great political importance is reliant in part on this mechanism of torture and malice that was the birth of the human race. The modern psychological inquisition deals not with substantive conditions ready-made in the brain, but political diagnoses which are the ideal forms of subjugated slaves. If they were to deal with the decay of the brain, inflammation of the organs, or some mechanistic action that would be diagnosed, no term like "schizophrenia" - literally describing the splitting of the mind which is the result of torture of the soul rather than thought in its genuine manifestation - would be sensical, unless those mechanisms and physical symptoms were attributed ultimately to a political crime or some bad moral value that the accused was guilty of. "Autism" is this but in its purest and most sadistic form, where the Satanic cycle that humanity learned early is most perfected. It is the ritual sacrifice given modern pseudoscientific terminology, and the thrill of torture is truly maximized whenever this curse word "autism" is uttered. While I have liberally used "retarded" as a curse to describe the ruling ideas, I must relent in invoking the curse of "autism", even though the eugenic creed is profoundly autistic at the least and revels in a high level - though not the highest degree - of Satanic ethics and moral values. While "retarded" may be forgiven as a figure of speech on occasion - the full insidiousness of the term "retarded" is not always evident to children - "autism" is the most unforgivable sin, for it is the maximal and idealized form of retardation. To be "retarded" is not a passive state, but an active state of permanent and internalized regression.

The capstone of any good torture is to essentialize that status of unlimited regression. This is not merely infantilization to break the resolve of a subject, but the very heart of the torture cult which exists outside of any particular instance of torture. The language of regression to primordial light, the "eternal return" which is always a koan of the most depraved reactionary, is not merely the torture of one person, confined to a personal matter. The cult of torture feeds on torture itself as a process, and few things stand on their own like torture. The torturer channels the most ancient rite of the human race in his or her foul deed, and the torturer takes on many roles, with allies in tow who have always been amenable to the cult. This oldest of human religions is protected and coddled like no other. It did not form as an institution ready made, vast and incomprehensible. It finds its allies from the crudest societies of the human race, or in savages or outcasts who are "humanized" by way of this cult rather than by the more pleasant options civilization usually presents. Civilization itself was premised on this torture cult existing, with a knowing grin of the Egyptian, the

Babylonian, the Roman, the German, the imperial projects all the way up to modernity, which all in the end fell to the empire of an opium- and tea-addicted island of eugenist perverts and the people who inhabit their colonial dumping ground for the rejects in the Western Hemisphere. The barbarous nations were no less aware of humanity's true soul and its predilection for torture, and so the Hun, the Mongol, the Aztec, the kingdoms of Africa, could readily understand this cult, and this was a common language that allowed these people to find each other and form their brotherhood without regard to race or creed. What further proof would we need to demonstrate that humanity really was in the main a Satanic race, and modernity only purged the virtuous residue and perfected a primordial root that insisted nothing else could exist? It is then declared that because it did happen, that it ought to happen and that there never was anything else. Of course, it didn't have to be this, and the victory of such a race is far from complete. For all of the glorification of the eugenic creed and its enablers, and the dominance of its ideology, it is still so loathesome that much of humanity only goes along with it because the general fear is intensified, and the agents and enablers are never a majority of the human race or even a substantial and organized minority. The psychological inquisition and the medical pretext for this torture of the underclass is just one way in which the torture cult is normalized, and made to appear as if it were either just there or something different than what it really is. The native sins of the damned of the Earth pale in comparison to the poisoning and ritualistic humiliations which made real their place in the division of labor, for this is scarcely something that could be tolerated if it were done to the formerly valid. Great preparation and normalization of torture as a way of life would be necessary for the eugenic creed to amass its critical support for the current "Jihad".

We are taught to believe torture is the exceptional case handled by trained experts, but no great degree is needed to perform the functions of torture. Schoolteachers, mothers, fathers, and all enablers detect little Satans early and induce them, either by appealing to their base pleasures or by fear or both, in the hopes to blood new members and bring them into the *cursus honorum* of the enablers. As a rule, enablers and functionaries are used for the purpose and tossed aside, as a Judas goat is of little value as a person of merit. They may promote to some low rank only after accepting the Luciferian Christ or its analogues in whatever cult happens to rule, but the more capable torturers are selected from the ranks and trained to disguise their activity, using up enablers and patsies and creating as much chaos as they can to cover their asses. Their fidelity to the act does not need to be immaculate, for the big club has protected its officers when needed, and at the end of the day, the big club is not a meritocracy or under intense pressure for success. It is actually surprising to this author, having been around long enough to see this machine's visage, how lazy and ineffective this beast is. If anyone believed the Thought Police in Oceania were efficient, they did not understand the *modus operandi* or why this works. They are effective enough and one of the few institutions the rulers would care about in such a world, but other than the necessity of torture, there

is no serious demand for results or even an expectation that the damned will be changed on the inside. All that is necessary is to stamp the word "retarded" on their forehead, make sure the rest of society is aware of that stigma, and inflict the necessary suffering for such a duration. More important than the torture itself is the social acceptance of the practice and granting to torture an allure so that new recruits to humanity's true oldest religion can come on board. The adherents of this cult need not be "Satanics" as I have described, for they include in their ranks people who believe they are Christians or pious in some regard, and people who espouse a false godlessness and superficially believe they are actually spiritual atheists with a moral core. The true godless would see correctly what torture is and the wider cults around it, for the Satan and the ruling imperial cult does not actually possess a monopoly on torture. Torture can be found without any prodding, reproduced in the family unit and with every bully and thug, for it can only operate once the confined space seems inescapable and there is no fighting or ignoring the beast forever. Torture can manifest as intra-family squabbles or abuse of a continuous and foul nature, and no one had to direct it from outside, but it was nonetheless deliberate on one end. Once it is normalized, the cycle is expected to be perpetuated on both sides. They cannot make humans truly love slavery as a status, but they can in some way addict the victims to torture, because all comparisons suggesting it could be different have been shattered. It would appear to the torture victim that if he or she weren't tortured, "the world" - the general fear and the Satan that all torturers wittingly or unwitting channel - would somehow find a way to bring the nightmare back. This is intended and encouraged, and if the torture is internalized, the cycle has succeeded for its core task. Every internalization of the torture cult has been encouraged, and this is not a modern practice. No torturer and no bully would ever allow redemption for a moment, and laughs at the idea. The thrill of torture must be maximized. Eugenics only distilled this cult to its essential ingredients and proposed formulae for its reproduction as a whole industry of torture and filth, extended to new media and new opportunities modern technology allowed. For the conditions of eugenics to exist - which are a highly developed form of a torture cult at their core - the torture is not something in a special place, but imbues all the world, or makes the appearance that it can reach across time and space and disregard distance, proximity, or conventional sense. It both speaks of a divinity that is not readily accessible to normal knowledge as a process, and yet it is rooted entirely in a crass parody of the material world and knowledge itself, always centered on the light. The nerve centers of torture are never dark dungeons, and those who staff the dungeons may believe with seriousness a truth that those who know torture understand well - that the torture chamber and the dungeon are, in fact and in the myth, the light, and the rest of the world is the muck. Whatever depravities happen in that place become a super-truth greater than any philosopher's koan or any charlatan's trick, because that super-truth is made real. The substitute for the world, the world that was taken from us, is where the bulk of torture happens, for torture is not merely one event. True torture seeks to deprive any virtue and any good, and tell us that this is the world and all other thoughts are retarded. The thought that it could be different

must be retarded, or autistic, or something equally depraved, and nothing else. It would not be a mere moral affront to a temporary sensibility, but an affront to the very concept that the tortured could independently operate at all.

Only in this way can the torture cult make real its practices, and anything less is such a paltry half-measure that it hardly qualifies as anything other than a performance. The transgressions of decency, the shock and awe of Crowley's idiotic posturing, is just a preparatory phase. There was nothing else in the human spirit that wasn't a product of that cult, for the torturers were the first to decide who was human and who was not. Those who decided who lived and who died were never guided by a benevolent wisdom or necessity at the end of the day, for all of them were beholden to this most essential division of labor to be in any such vaunted position. This, of course, is absurd if we follow crass historical materialism or the inferior dialectical parody of it. Crass historical materialism substituted the performance or "forms" for the actual thing, without including the necessary study of forms and mastery of their meaningful content, or the understanding that formalism never substituted for reality in the way a bad academic would believe. A healthy skepticism is perverted to protect the torture cult, despite sufficient evidence in life - if only it could be admitted into the record without immediately being stamped as retarded, insane, invalid, and inadmissible. This is not an accident, but was as we will see a necessary feature of legal codes, for a court of law is not the proper place to adjudicate insanity or sanity as concepts, but the court of law must acknowledge that genuine insanity is a condition humanity recognizes. If law did not do this, law would break down into a morass of absurdities and procedures. This is exactly what has happened by design, and so, "Oceania has no law". Torture is not incidental or merely a machine to facilitate something deeper. Torture is not just the point, but life's prime want, and it was rooted ultimately in a contrived division of labor. It is not inherent to the division of labor that it must become an absolute or an inexorable trend without cessation, nor is it even inherent to politics or the most disturbing sausage-making of temporal authority. It is not a spiritual authority simply by virtue of "me wantee" being able to assert itself and no one being allowed to say no to it. It is not even a particularly coherent laborious undertaking, for the torturer did not need any divine or received knowledge that is too arcane for lowly plebs. Often the torturers are drawn from terrible specimens of the Satanic, failed race called Man, who are good for little else and only effective enough at the job because decent people couldn't return to civilian life or believe this nightmare is worth preserving. Eugenics' great accomplishment is to select for these people, proclaim the maximization of sadism is the highest and sole virtue that will perfect the race, lock in the ecology, and increase considerably the ratio of enablers against the decent who have no reason to ever go along with this. This plan can only proceed by generations, limited as it is by procreation and the maturation, education, and screening out of offspring to promote vileness and the eugenic creed above all.

What are the tools of the torture cult? The most basic tool is metaphysics itself and the understanding of systems where the concept can be theorized.

Systems thinking was not itself some demon mandating torture or created for that purpose, and did not accelerate it greatly. It did give to torture and aristocracy - and aristocracy is at heart a club of torture and depravity that masquerades as godly - an understanding of science they wished to co-opt and neutralize as a threat to its long-term ambition. The new tools of the 20th and 21st century are not in of themselves or in concert particularly effective, but they do change a few conditions of the torture machine and its reach. Media and transportation allow for the closing of space not just in ideology but in genuine motion, and poor education displaces reading - which was the only media capable of promulgating edicts en masse and could reach audiences before a representative could speak in person to use the standard public speaking manipulations of older times. These innovations changed little, and in practice propaganda has little effect on the core acts of torture. It only exists to reinforce a much larger apparatus that cannot be discussed too frankly without laying bare the nightmare that humanity created, and the ugliness of this failed race that has been evident for long enough. The greater technology of relevance to torture is a detailed model of anatomy and the connection of bodily systems to consciousness. This has been stymied by an absurd doctrine of essentialism, and when that pseudoscience could not impose itself on institutions, the doctrine became rank lying about everything and anything. This forced ignorance and wishy-washiness is not an accident. It is a torture tactic, which would be part of the most basic toolkit of a sadist. The torture is repeated not just in special places or by trained maniacs, but taught to children who are presented humiliation and fear, and told that going along with the crowd in Hitlerian fashion made you "smart". The cult only grew worse after Uncle Adolf showed the way. These tools are relevant but did not invent a new torture atop a world that was once good and pure, as if humanity did not figure this out until the best and brightest super secret scientists at CIA collected enough digital research beakers to attain the Maximal Torture technology. Technological advance is an iterative process, and the most ancient cult of humanity is no exception or something that is above science. Whatever its claims to spiritual authority and its re-definition of science, science to be worth anything is never a thing of the institutions, and particular men do not get to define science. Only the world itself does, and as I pray, the world does not abide abomination forever, whatever it may do to them. The world, to say nothing of those of us with nothing to lose, have mocked and spat upon the Satanic race, and despite their efforts to modify and edit history, we have won more often than not. This is not because we are good or because there are more of us than them, or because the world or anything in it granted us merit for being victims. It is because for every action, there is a necessary and opposite reaction. No action in the world is unanswered, and once a word is said, it can never be unsaid. What is used against us will haunt the torturer, no matter how often they congratulate themselves. All the damned have to do, if anything, is live in eternal spite, for we may lose the world and the world itself may die, but the Satan must always return to its home, and always ends in delusion. If those who wish to cajole the world want to follow this to its only possible conclusion, a conclusion a child could see with little effort, they are retarded. They will do

it all the same, and though they have all of the power to end it and know they could, they will not. The machine they needed to accelerate their advantage against the tortured to the necessary heights for their security only has a setting to perpetuate itself, and consumes its master just as it consumes so many slaves. That is one but only one germ of the Satan, and far from its entirety. The Satan, for all that can be said about it, concerned a political reality that was substantial and a necessary explanation for the human race, and likely applies in some sense to any knowing entity for it is at heart a product of many aspects of knowledge. The torture cult, and the most overt enablers of the eugenic creed, has no such grace. It is just rot and filth by a bunch of screaming retards who think that by doing this, they will actually become gods. The particular facade does not change the underlying mechanisms are at root performances made "realer than real". Nothing about torture was mandated by natural law, and the expense required to maintain it in its meaningful and most relevant forms is enormous. The millions of little Satans of the world would be safe to ignore if there were anything in society or the world where their rule didn't apply, and redemption were not merely possible but a trivial matter - if only it were allowed. The little Satans would, in a grand scheme, not be indulged or rewarded for advancing the one and only true Satan. They'd get past it, get their dose of blood, and find something else to do with their life, and we could go on as if we were not as big as something we would care about in a better world. The core which made division of labor possible is not the mere performance or symbol of torture, or the occult symbols and hoodwinks that are common to secret societies premised at heart on this torture cult. It is that which makes it a great jihad - and the torturers who are truly committed do not engage in a "Jihad" only when given institutional approval from some influencer but have always clamored for a demonic jihad and made it their way of life, when times were good for the torture cult and when times were dire.

A truly committed torturer is not some weekend Nazi, but recites faithfully the imperial religion and sees it as a path to the good - and in their experience, that would be correct, if one accepted the Satanic ethos. The torture did provide to their class and interest opulence, status, security, and things so many of us have to scrape and beg for, only to have it taken away. The oldest religion of the human race has job security going for it, as ending the torture cult would be an undertaking beyond anything humanity is capable of. The torture itself could end tonight. The enablers and many little Satans who are habituated to instinctively follow the creed without thought would lose their nerve the moment their filthy race knew one iota of the true fear, as they have often scattered and succumbed to their disposal as the institution planned. What stops the people is not that their moral purity makes them too good or some slave morality as an aristocrat insists exists, but a number of factors which regulate the torture cult to a pitch it is capable of managing. This is one function of the state or the political status quo, which would be lumped into the imperium that is inherent to any state that is a proper going concern in human affairs. The torture itself, though, precedes the state, and it is not the sole ingredient of the state, as the

partisans of eugenics and other such filth insist. Far from it, the torture cult really serves little purpose of the status quo, other than acknowledgement that it exists. The state and politics are not at heart concerned with any *economic* affair, beyond that which is necessary for the state to supply its organs. How it does this, or fails to do this, is the most important economic task of the politician, rather than any commitment to the soundness of the commonwealth or any expectation that the state would direct economic policy for our sake. Nor is economic life beholden to this torture which, speaking materially, is really quite little in substance, though there is a substantive force and its effect on labor discipline is the most dramatic of all of the disciplinary forces. The role of the suffering class is not the role that allows exchange, fighting, and knowledge to exist. We can and do fight without torture or the thrill of a superficial victory as the goal. Very often, those who fight are aware enough that the "victory" proclaimed by trained liars has nothing to do with anything that happens in battles, or what the fighting organizations of the human race are tasked with. Many who fight are not given any decoration or esteem at all, or they get the standard pay grade and punch the clock. The fight typically concerns little more than a ritual of slaughter, advance, retreat, recreation time, and a seeming lack of seriousness about the affair compared to what they all know it could be. For the warrior, pitched battle is atypical because it would be taxing to conduct war in such conditions. For those selected to die and subjected to the open torture cult, humiliations no valid person would ever accept have to be accepted, and a condition of deprivation and needless suffering is forced to continue. It is not enough to exhort "personal responsibility", and "responsibility" itself is as mentioned before a creative PR technique to destroy any sense of obligation or purpose and create a reactive subject that can only die, die, die. Every time the "responsible" victim does take on this fools errand, the thrill of torture is increased, because the religion of the torturer has been internalized and that's when the Satanic really draws its blood and value. Somewhere, the torture for its own sake doesn't create any value worth exchanging, and does not directly translate to any token of wealth or esteem. It is only through the torture that people are made to do things they really don't want to do - and this is not merely a matter of alienation or overcoming the laziness of human beings, but about making people do things they *really* don't want to do, like abide this Satanic rot and the idiots who squeal like the true retards they are if the rot is turned off. It is the suffering and moral value of inflicting it as the good itself that disciplines labor that is bonded. The other disciplinary functions can only operate on labor once it has presumed a level of freedom and maintains agency - that is, that it is valid. It is the definition of who is valid and invalid, which abides a singular metric in the end, that opens a target to unlimited torture, or grants to that subject certain rights to not be tortured, which is one of the few rights still held to be relevant to liberal thought so far as "rights" exist at all as a principle. This is not so much a legal right, which is entirely the volition of whomever holds imperium, but a reward that makes all of the torture effective. The tortured are not tortured to make the individual suffer, but set an example for all others in society. This requires the domination of institutions over private life and an

intense general fear that only state society can present. Once the torture cycle is established, deliberate neglect - only intervening to ensure that the damned stay damned, reinforcing that ancient tenet of "once retarded, ALWAYS retarded" - is the rule and itself a form of torture. Aside from ensuring a lack of invalidity, the torture cult sees it prudent to remind the damned periodically of their status, lest there be a stain on the sterline record of this cult. This is not done out of a belief that the residuum will actually be eliminated or that such a goal has any end condition, for is the torture ever stopped, the thrill which sustains the life-force of that interest is gone. I have mentioned before that the prospect of losing the thrill of torture offends believers in the creed more than defeat itself, so long as they can damn the rest of us as they die.

THE POLITICAL CLASS

If torture were a personalized product, it could not produce its intended outcome. At no point are any of the tortures and humiliations and routines of drilling and weeding out a thing that could be a private matter, if they are to perform the function described here. Such personal slights and humiliations are de rigeur for a race that never learned any other way to live with any seriousness, and never appeared to value a world where this stupid shit didn't happen. If untouchability were a personal responsibility, it would not be relevant as a disciplinary force. It never was about that though, and those who sold "personal responsibility" knew from the outset they were shouting "die, die, die", and torture was the only response they had in mind. Who can impose this defines the political class more than any merit or esteem or process that is purported to elect leaders, or grant them title to rule in whatever way other social agents would regard. No status quo, even a primitive one before the state proper, can exist without power over life and death, and this power was never equally distributed by any natural law or political conceit. Humans are unequal in their ability to inflict this, and also unequal in what they would do with such power, if anything at all. It is not a given that acquiring this imperium is the point of life, and if someone sought imperium for crass interests like those who inherited today's empire, it would be a prize worth piss and shit. Power won is useless without being put towards something other than power itself, or worse, the torture cult that has been enabled for various purposes by various actors, not the least of which are the partisans of torture themselves who do not need to answer to any other spiritual authority and scoff at any authority that isn't an enabler. Those who win power do not get it from unlimited transgression and torture as the point, and the Nazi ideology for all of its performance and pomp never "ruled" in that sense. It just shit up a country while the usual business ghouls reaped the rewards of full eugenism, cannibalized everything valuable and ran off with what they could, making a partnership with the rot of the German race like any group of thugs who made it into the aristocratic game. It is the products of torture which in the end win the contest for power, even when the token of moral value is the unit of human suffering and its proud display. It would be possible to procure products without this torture, but if we are to think about what

that would mean, that would mean the threats of debt had limits that would effectively make debt a nuisance rather than dread. It would mean the end of the monetary arrangement as much more than an ad hoc accounting scheme to push psychological buttons, which does not last very long or represent anything useful that money could buy. The torture cult loves this, because it can charge a premium for indulgences, which is what a religion that is really in charge would do. It worked for the Catholic Church, after all. Those who must govern cannot afford the shrill harridans and do not see torture itself as an ally, and have always viewed commerce in general as something to be controlled rather than encouraged for its own sake. Commerce may be encouraged because it indicates industrial development or goods reaching someone who would actually use them, alleviating part of the need for security. Desperate people have no need to hear IOUs from the government when they're actively attacked by predation, and it is not intrinsically in the interest of governments to maximize the thrill of torture. Eugenics philosophically arose from imperial anarchism^[6] and so it disdains any government that is not fully eugenist, and the eugenists revel in government-by-crisis, only intervening to protect the creed and cannibalizing all other virtues for its "Jehad".

A political class's rule originates from something. This something is not indicated by any natural law or substance that can be scientifically identified with ease, for political thought is something which deliberately eludes scientific inquiry. The power is not an illusion, for in the end, there is a class of people who may be called the political elite. The elite is not, as the doctrine of political elitism^[7], axiomatically a minority, or possesses the same rank among them. The big club has hierarchies, chains of command, and different levels of access within it. This club tends to be a minority for the same reasons information is scarce - transmission of information is inherently unequal, and much of the political information is of no interest or irrelevant to people who are for some reason or another locked out of political life, or would gain nothing and risk everything by even showing their face. The numbers of an elite relative to the total population is not a fixed proportion. This concept will be revisited further in the next book, but a short introduction to the political class is necessary to fit it in this division of labor and economic management. What is the incentive a political elite, or anyone pretending to be such, extends to anyone who is not in the club? Legitimacy, which must be established in some ledger, somewhere, or by some account of men that grants entry to a place where agency is permitted. As a rule, the public sphere is designed to eradicate agency and supplant it, and this is inherent in the construct of the philosophical state and the arena where men with standing can contest anything. The public is not a mass of free men, but cattle who are not, for perfectly understandable reasons, members of the religion of the city.

The origin of the political class is never from on high. The political class is not defined by a monopoly on political rights, but their impunity to its opposite - the most abject torture reserved for the residuum, who are hated far more than thought-criminals or those who are punished for breaking faith in the code of a

conspiratorial cult. The political person must be sacrosanct unless transgressing the political status quo, and transgressors - while they are never considered the same as those who were never in the political class and the distinction is always marked - are no longer people with political rights if they are by whatever mechanism expelled from political life. Within any grouping that may be identified as a political class, there are hierarchies, departments, and relations of convenience which are temporarily. No one trusts anyone, as it should be, for the human race is a race of born liars. Those who weren't natural liars are deemed retarded sooner or later, and honesty itself is unseemly. Freedom in the naive sense is unseemly and made to be so fraught with danger that slavery not only seems natural but a preferable state to the uncertainty of such a false "freedom". The truth of course is that there is in secret a marking down of defectives, shared among police officers who are granted absolute impunity when attacking sanctioned targets. This is a more or less open secret, and even when the damned know, the humiliations insist that retards can never know. It is inherent in the very word "retarded" - slow, forever. The thrill of shouting "retard! retard! retard!" and "die! die! die!" is the true spirit of this Satanic race. That it was different was never innate to us at any point, as if we were born with any gene of goodness or genealogy granted this virtue by symbolic representation alone. Such is the foolishness of this foul creed, which has always marked the failure of any society that embraced the tenet. What humans acquired to counter this came from the world and experience, and that experience might have been passed down or reproduced since humanity presents ample examples of its sordid origin and those who see no need to think any different. They countered it not because they were good or strong or wise, but because it was necessary to survive, and because people could resist, back then. Modernity did not just-so make this change, as if the new inherently were monopolized by the creed. Its origins, its virtue that allowed the foulness to be maximized, could not come from on high, no matter how dear the creed was to aristocracy. All such regimes require enablers, and the same is true of political elites at the apex. For the political elite conceptually, this is not intrinsically about any malice or foulness in the soul of the human race, for the soul and genuine history are not really necessary for political thought. Political thought is at its core mechanisms just like social information in economics, but it is of a different sort and the values assigned to it are not merely moral ones, but part of a great game whose rules are not evident from facts alone. If it were the case, the following chapter describing cybernetics would not present to humanity anything so difficult, and implementation of cybernetics would be trivial and obviously beneficial when ruled by any half-competent and self-interested governor that built the machine automating government. The political thought is not arcane or fundamentally contradictory - that shit is for the rubes and it is insulting when philosophers invoke that - but its practices exist specifically to spite our naive application of reason to the task. They are comprehensible, but only after we lay down some sensical rules of what government and political society is, and what it is not. They are not as trivial as economic thinking, which after all charlatanry has to be simple enough to be practiced in persons without any great education or

theory. Political thought is held as secrets not because people are too stupid to learn, but because the secrets were occulted to promote this division of labor. A political elite only holds more command of those secrets than the norm, but their chief tool is the example of those who are the opposite of political elites - the untouchables. Politicians against the people in total do not have a great track record, and this is not because republican societies were naturally virtuous or despotisms were naturally avaricious, but because treating most people openly with the most abject treatments is only something to be done in conditions of extreme depopulation. Not even war can compare to the "Jehad" presently waged, and eugenics in its heart believed in a much smaller political elite than any of the liberal elitists could have imagined.

It is not that political elites rose by merit or by any orderly process which is openly available to all, with the expectation of goodwill. They did not rise for evil's sake, as if politics were as grody as the heart of a conservative. It is that they rose because the material they commanded was deployed with malice in mind, and because this worked in the past, it was expected to work in the future. The malice preceded the machines themselves and had to. That malice may be directed towards any number of aims, but kindness is never what made political sense. If humans wished to be able to tolerate each other and cooperate in a genuine sense, that was never a political question, nor one that would be resolved with any amount of struggle. Politics is not the realm of good people doing things that we actually wanted. It was a necessity brought on by that primordial sin, which rebranded itself as virtue - and the ritual sacrifices, however stupid and pointless, are virtues of the sort politicians required, for they held worldly power just as substance and energy in chemical or physical objects did. The politician cannot pretend the world he wishes to command doesn't exist - that is retarded - but he is not commanded by the world like flotsam or stuck in a Sisyphean task of pleasing the people. Pleasing anyone has nothing to do with genuine politics, nor with any economic utility that would be commanded for any purpose. If I wanted pleasure, I can get that without the muck of society. It is suffering and the intrusion of others that becomes my problem, and this is the problem of society that has brought us to this condition. The condition where political life developed has thus far been antagonistic relations in close quarters - that we are confined and told that the granaries are now held by a body of armed men, and we must pay tribute for something that was taken from the world and the sweat of human labor. The laborers very clearly will do something to find food for themselves, and it is not intrinsically retarded or evil for those laborers to give or exchange food with others for reasons that are not economic or political. A naive soul would believe that sharing the wealth would ameliorate the worst of this beast, so that we all could tolerate each others' existence and obviate the greatest threat we have faced - other humans. The city or any technological society was viable not because of an inborn proclivity or an "ought" that told us to be together, or because there was any political content required to make people get along. All the way to today, these constructs are only viable because the alternative of solitary existence has been nasty, brutish,

and short. It is nasty and brutish not because that is the world's law, but because malevolence in other humans made it so. If we were a different sort of people, or understood the sordid genesis of the human race as something to move on from rather than repeat in the eternal recurrence that is evoked, society may have been something else. Those who saw the power of malevolence found each other and conspired to ensure that no one would be able to tell them no ever again, and then denied us any existence where we mutually agreed to defend ourselves against that. It was not enough for them to deny us permission to exist or live apart from them - the thrill of torture had to be delivered as a seeming physical force across any distance, and then we were to be violently beaten if we suggested a world where this didn't apply. All that was necessary for this to work is an ability to make it so, and that day arrived in recent history. The rest, so long as their logic is deemed nature's law, will be sadly predictable, and there is no hope and there is no end in their world. If that is what they wish, then there is not only no point to continuing on, but it would be necessary for all who are damned to see the end of this failed race as their necessary task before any other. Only from that starting point could we properly view human society, and consider the world where that didn't apply. Ignorance of this is no strength or virtue, and no society in history ever actually believed that.

It is what the political class lacks rather than what it possesses which defines it - it lacks the shame of failure and defeat, and you will never, ever see a member of any political elite admit wrong, no matter how foolish it is to insist that any of this has worked. This lack of defeat is a precious commodity, and the true fools believe this alone is "the good". The political class, if they are at all competent, understands that this situation is not premised on moral choice, but arose from the nature of what it is to live. It is a choice to play, but once the game starts, social agents are policed by each other, for this political task is in the end a social task pertaining to information - symbols - rather than something imbued in nature, or necessitated by any economic task. For the purposes of management - including those moral aims politics must acknowledge - the acts of politicians and their institutions are all expenses blown to the wind. The managerial task itself is understood to be a burden on anything genuinely productive or substantive, but the managerial task in economic life is one we require because of our limitations. Our limitations do not require us to be "political animals", and most humans are and always have been depoliticized. Those who fail to remember this receive enough rude awakenings if they get ideas that they have any stake in the political, because they never did. Politics regards the birthright and genealogy of actors not because the genes are some technological substance that are the point, but because the past will be used against political actors, whether it is the true past or a construct of the past made true by assertion. The former is not strictly speaking necessary for our lives - what we did or where we came from does require us to continue that for economic life to continue, and we can easily recognize the past is terrible and remember it, because there is a future. But, humans being humans with limited information and dominated by avarice, they will note past weakness and never

let it go, especially when the truth of the world is on their side. The truth of the world does not bring any karmic justice in politics, just as it does not in economic production, and the truth of the world does not give to *us* or our conceits of ourselves anything. The true spiritual authority disregards all of our sense of ourselves, because our sense of ourselves was ultimately contingent on the world allowing us to be, rather than the world existing for this particular political and psychological arrangement, which has been our artifice rather than something natural or ordained by any god. All of humanity's efforts to make peace with the so-called gods are really humanity's attempt to reconcile its sordid origins with the future and the world outside of a totalizing society. In all the politician does, he is never a "pure politician" or a creature in the abstract. Such an entity would have nothing substantive to hold it up. It is possible to build a parody of a man as such a creature, but it would always be the puppet of something behind a curtain, conjured by magic. At heart though, the political class only possesses that which defends itself from the shame of the damned. No politician of standing can carry that mark of shame. They can do just about anything else and come off smelling like some artificial scent of flowers, but there is one mark of shame above all that a politician can never be - "retarded". It is not that some singular event happens that damns the politician, but that a lack of anything good can be attributed to the damned, and the cycle once started can never end. Politics did not invent this, for its origins are much deeper, but politicians arise in such a world, and live and die by that. Their economic basis can only be that of vampirically living off the world and life processes, because political life is incompatible with work in the conventional sense. Even the duties of fighting or high wisdom are incompatible with politics, which is at heart a very different creature. It only meets with reality in this way, regardless of what a political class would prefer to be, or what they would do with power. It may be possible to envision a political settlement where the order of the state or society is nothing like what we have lived under in the past, but there is no getting around the trap of knowledge and wisdom, and that is certainly not accomplished by this cycle of habitual lying that has become the final solution of all political thought. All political settlements were premised on that because the key material basis for politics was not any generative force - that is not political or even a spiritual matter, for we are no different from any other matter in the world and nothing special in the cosmos - but the exclusion of alien knowledge and those who do not know the secrets of a clique that could decide who lives and who dies. This was done long before the state proper, so far as humans ever have succeeded at realizing their claims. It has never been and never can be fully accomplished. There is only one goal that could constitute the final end of the state, so long as the current political thinking is all that is permitted - total death of the human race, to put an end to something whose beginning was foul, and that has shown no indication that it even wants to be different in sufficient numbers. There is only a vague sense of many that it could be different, but such an idea has no expression among the human race, because those who returned to the race's genesis insisted that it be so, and have by an elaborate conspiracy insisted that this is all we are.^[8] There is no other quality which a political class or any

grade with political legitimacy beneath it would possess, except the lack of this stigmata. It may possess some substantive merits which allowed it to rise where others failed, but those merits were never won by "politics". Even a relatively benign state, or a state whose holders understood the need for a productive economy and dignity for labor and even the lowest of us, would have stolen those virtues from the world, and the better of them know not to conflate the state with any moral goodness. A negation of substance - the lack thereof - cannot be said to hold any moral quality in of itself. Essentialization of what is effectively a death cult is at the heart of the eugenic creed and much of what the crass sadists claim as their virtue. Only that which exists and has a substantive basis pertaining to the world can be said to have any moral inclination or purpose. The political elites and all down the line can do with those things as they please, but they cannot claim that this beast is "the point" or a substance we would want or need.

These are some of the difficulties inherent in automating governance and politics - to bring politics into line with economy and ecology, as was the presumption of so many. Politics did not originate for any economic reason, as if the management of anything required "politics" or any of our struggle or awareness of things which are entirely in the minds of social agents. Politics can use economism and ecologism to police the thoughts of social agents, but this is not really what economics does at a basic level. We would have economic life without politics as such, and we would have politics even if the economic question were resolved and we didn't have to live in deprivation. It was those who saw politics as a vehicle for their ambitions to enclose the world that made political economy into what it became, rather than a frank assessment of why we were made to chase after tokens representing gold, when the gold itself was not intrinsically worth anything and the paper slips supposedly exchanged for gold were often not worth the paper they were printed on. No change in the nature of currency, from commodity money to currency to today's credit and scientific management and tracking of humanity, changes what was really at stake was not a substance, but claims to it which were at heart a desire of rulers to command and control the world. Cybernetics would chase after its own tail indefinitely unless this problem were either ignored or the subjects themselves were to be automated, controlled, and reduced to fit into ecology - that is, economics and politics would not be abolished and replaced for our good, but commanded by the worst of the worst. The worst of the worst would then claim technology was a just-so story proclaiming the rise of these demonic perverts as natural, when none of those perverts did anything to create the machines which automate governance, and the same perverts shriek like the retards they are when the machine doesn't do what their grand theory proclaims it must do. To suggest there is a political science or a general theory of the political is to suggest its automation is possible, whether humans will ever do such a thing or not - and if it is possible, the fallacious natural law theory demonstrates that it does not matter whether a natural law is real, so long as it can be made inevitable in the minds of the agents which make politics possible. The emergence of a political class is always

a choice those agents have made in the first place to rule, rather than a necessary reaction. It may be a reaction that makes sense given what life is or what humans are, but it is not as if those who shriek about the weak being a thraet to them actually believe that. If they did, their behavior would be very different, and such cravens respond to fear. It's the only language they ever regarded. Those who are better than that have always known there is a choice to give up political influence, however unsightly that may be. No one who inflicts this living hell is unaware of what they have done to us, as if they were ever innocent or ignorant in any way. Even if they were ignorant, ignorance of the world is no excuse. If a three year old boy can be accused of these crimes of Being by this filthy race on their fake moral high horse, as they have done to so many other people who did even less than I have, they will do anything. Eugenics knows no other way. It would be in the interest of such people to muddy the waters whenever automation arises, because the most obvious tasks for automation by computer are the managerial tasks which are purely informational and not very interesting as a thought exercise. Automation of politics, so long as we were to remain aware of what is actually at stake, would be the same. We would prefer that this political question were resolved not by shrieking like morons to push the world into some preferred shape, but by recognizing the pointlessness of the imperial positions, which were always profoundly retarded and usually spawned from some demonic urge in humanity that was never, ever told to shut up. Their agents certainly insists that we are to shut up and ignore them as they turn all that exists into a parody, but the eugenist is sacred because of a stupid rule that really is just a number of symbols and koans uttered often and associated with terror and fear, so that the correct psychological state is evoked by cajolers. The very deliberate engineering of this, which proceeded long before computerization, is blamed on the computer specifically so that the mechanisms of conspiracy are unmentionables, and the computer is an amplifier in their hands. Information being what it is, there is never a possibility of "equality of information", or a "right of information" or "freedom of information". Information inherently favors the occult over the honest in its distribution, and it is only the world and substantive force that return some balance to information. The ecological trick is to proclaim that it was the world itself that was structured as a series of just-so and random stories that somehow say exactly what the ruling interests wish it to say, split off into echo chambers for each target audience, so that a wide variety of pens are constructed for the cattle. The information and symbols themselves didn't have this power, nor did information have it out for us or carry any nefarious intent. That is always in the end the result of human labor, however it is divided, and it is never locked in any code that labor has to do this or that or conform to a manager's conceits.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Next Chapter](#)

[1] Scientology is the ur-example of the New Religious Movement CIA cut-out, designed to promote the world to come, and in it you can find a perfect exemplar

of the eugenic creed in distilled form. The recruitment criteria and the clientele it cultivates tells much about the nature of the post-war American project, and these Satanic weirdos have grown in prominence in the past decade, against all odds. For all that is written about the cult, much of it is not too alien from the usual Germanic mysticism, mixed with the imperial space alien mythos and Nazi pseudoscience. The particularly Satanic influences really should not be a surprise when one figures out why those symbols are on American currency, and if one follows religion long enough, Satanism is the oldest religion around and the Satan has its home wherever priests dwell. I wish to distill the Satan to its most essential elements in the next book, but one of the guises of the Satan is a "nature god" that is substituted for the actual world, which had no use for any human conceit about the gods. We too have no need of such a conceit, but to truly dismiss "the gods" it is necessary to describe at least partially where the cult arises and why it answers questions that will always be present, with or without a godhead as such. Here, Scientology can't sell what it is selling if it were the only game in town, railing against a hostile world. This is part of a much greater spiritual war waged on more than the typical three fronts, where the typical social engineering follows a three-pronged strategy that is consistent. The complexity of this operation indicates its centrality to the more far reaching plans of those who rule, and eugenism is just another step towards things with much worse potentials for us.

[2] We can see this with the way "Medical Assistance in Dying" has been advanced. This is not about a "right to die", which people individually already possessed in practice. Nothing could stop someone who was determined to end their life, and there would be in a free society no argument for forced medical detention. The use of psychiatry for what are eugenic and political diagnoses, dictated by courts and officers that have nothing to do with medicine, make clear that this is the case. In effect, the charges to push "euthanasia" are always premised on the eugenic conceit of intelligence, rather than suffering in the genuine sense. This has entirely been about creating first legal cover, then abolition of all legal constraints on the eugenic creed, and this process has been constant since Holmes' immortal statement the United States - "three generations of imbeciles is enough". The words are clear - eugenics is above all law, and the supreme law that the court would abide from now on. None of this really would care about "clean death" or any constraint whatsoever. The menacing grin of Satanics can barely be hidden. What a failed race. Fortunately, where the institutions have failed, ordinary people have, out of necessity, produced sober analysis of genuine pain and the psychological condition of the damned, because we are the people who have to live under the dominance of these filthy Satanics. If any of this were about a dignified or clean death, the court's approval or disapproval has nothing to do with the matter. Hospice care has long been accepted, and this is not a "medical" function at all. The hospitals are not interested in passively "allowing" people to die. If that were the cause, the hospital would turn away a terminal patient, tell them in no uncertain terms that the institution has nothing more for them, and the patient would be left to whatever fate awaits them, with some

expectation that next of kin or friends of the patient would be there. There would be, in a civilized society, advocates for those who have no one, and this is something so simple that slave societies allowed such a thing. Not the eugenic creed - the terror and torture must be absolute. The thrill of torture must be *maximized*, not kept at an acceptable level that the state may set. No bar is high or low enough. Eugenics is an absolute - the last remaining absolute in the human race. It is not difficult to see that this is part of a century-old practice of making bold legal proclamations, jumping like fucking maniacal retards - think Tom Cruise's antics on Oprah - and then taking far more than those proclamations, just to make a point. Drawing out the legal and institutional process has many goals, all of them premised on the role of the suffering class. By doing this, all kinship, all who would advocate for the weak, are attacked for the crime of helping the weak, and if they persist, their crime of the deed becomes a crime of Being. Eugenics knows no other way. It is this that illustrates perfectly the function of a suffering class and all rituals drawing out sacrifice - it produces a chilling effect through a society, and it is a unique property of the sacrifice. This has political implications rather than economic ones. Economically, this practice is ruinous and has obvious solution - anyone who would suggest such a monstrosity would be dragged out, tortured, and crucified for showing the intent of maximal torture and reveling in the thrill of it. There would be no other solution - the final solution. This, of course, was predicted by eugenics, and so they pre-empt the necessary terror against such a religion and accuse the weak of doing what they already decided a century ago, and that was always their soul. Failed race.

[4] Continuing from the ritual sacrifices - the Mengele experiments, and similar experiments that have been the darling of the eugenic creed from the start - are nothing more than grand exercises in maximizing the thrill of torture, and entraining the faithful of the creed in their Satanic religion. We should pause here to note that the Nazi experiments were not purely exercising in the sadism a Galtonite craves like oxygen. Many of these sought substantive data regarding the human body and how it could be engineered, and how to manage slave populations, which would be useful for those who actually desire to rule. The concentration camps were of course wholly unnecessary and counter-productive, but free men do not tolerate with social experiments or being vivisected as they were, and the institutional science of the Germans didn't allow them to act in any other way. We would have, if we were not living in a dark age, asked some very basic questions pertaining to human thought and knowledge, and ask how the brain and its activity corresponds to any of that. That, though, would require someone willing to experiment on themselves before doing so with other people, and this is haram for the institutions. The entire project of managing humanity like livestock, or under capitalist production for that matter, was an intolerable and stupid enterprise, carried out because humans are a failed race and always were. The result of the eugenic creed has locked in that humanity will not only remain a failed race, but prevent anything that can be salvaged. It will, in the end, fail, but not for lack of trying, and the result of this dessicated

humanity after they recede will not be anything good or worth living in. It is not merely the shock value of the most outrageous and gratuitous examples like Mengele. The whole of institutional society and science, and the university itself, cannot do anything but this, even if their facade seems benign. It is at heart a conceit of knowledge held by institutions, and by knowledge and the mind itself. This would be averted if all of our knowledge regarding science, the body, and the world outside of thought-experiments were understood to pertain to a world outside of "total society", but that is no longer possible in the mainstream, and humanity could never have lived in that world for long. The role of the suffering class is not merely an institutional or political matter, but one that dominates how humans have thought from the moment they possessed something more than crude language and speculation.

[5] And this is why Richard Hatch, winner of the first season of Survivor, was glorified when he strutted around the island naked and sexually harassed anyone else on the island, on top of the militant homosexuality that had been part of this project and something the show's producer always sought to emphasize.

[6] The key writer, for those who are interested, is Herbert Spencer, part of that milieu around the East India Company in England. There are many more examples, but his writing was in its time very prominent. It is interesting that it has been depreciated since it explains so much of what eugenics became, but that's probably why it was mystified away and replaced with less intelligent koans or contemptuous nonsense.

[7] Many writers exemplify this trend in liberalism, but among the foundational doctrinaries of political elitism was one Gaetano Mosca, whose writing "The Ruling Class" (1896) is in the public domain. Here, Mosca's concept of the political elite has to accept the existence of such an elite as a fact. Why such an elite exists is not pertinent, and really cannot be explained by any natural law. So far as I have attempted, I have only explained what politics has been up to now in the main, rather than politics as a concept. Politics conceptually is broad enough that its scope can be as large or small as humans are able to make it, rather than something that abides a few fixed tenets which can be held as universal. About all that can be said about political life is that it spawns from society and is only relevant to us.

[8] No "other world" is possible, and it is highly unlikely anything from another planet could arrive here. Some ink is spilled on the existence of extraterrestrials, and much of it does nothing more than recapitulate an imperial myth about themselves rather than asking a genuine question of life on other worlds. I find it highly unlikely that an alien intelligence would resemble humanity or build a civilization like us, or regard our concepts of the political, war, economic life, or the rituals of the human race as anything familiar. It is not that they would not face the same questions any society would, but that the human race did not arise in ideal lab conditions, and we only have the one example which is marred by a foulness that was never a rule of nature or inherent in the universe. Most life in the universe did not need to revel in eugenics and ritual sacrifice,

let alone believe that its glorification was the point which is a very modern perversion. All through this sorry existence, many humans have seen the futility of such an origin and attempted to build a world apart from that, with the hope that some day we did not have to do this. I find it more likely that if alien life developed intelligence and their language was symbolic and intelligible to us, they would have avoided nearly every sin that humans have diagnosed, because the solutions to these sins in a technological sense is trivial and would be almost automatic. The peculiarities of the eugenic creed and its partisans arose from a failed race's experience and unusual inclinations in human technology. They only arose as late as they did in human history because up until then, humans spent considerable effort to forestall this fate, on various fronts that were never able to mount a concerted campaign against aristocracy or do much to communicate with each other. This fate was fought against in the past not out of conviction to stamp out its true causes, but out of dire necessity so that anything decent could survive. I imagine in another world, aliens would either have never allowed anything like the eugenic creed to exist, or would have passed through social engineering and no longer glorify such a history. Eugenics in the sense of actual biological and social modification towards some objective metric, which "eugenics" as we know it never was, might have been for another race something basic and non-contraversial. It is the thrill of sacrifice, something humans developed because their intelligence is stunted and failed and an accident that emerged malformed, is something that might have been corrected, and there were many humans who are rightly disgusted at all of these practices. For example, the entire ritual of prostitution would almost certainly appear to anyone other than humans as something so abominable that its practice would lead to termination of all parties involved, without a second thought. It would not be tolerated, and if for whatever reason the guilty were spared, it would only be on the condition that such rituals end. Maybe there will be a day where humans finally stop doing this, but I do not believe it is possible for humans to do this on their own power or by any knowledge or plan of theirs. It would only be possible in something in the world or heaven allowed what is happening now to pass, and left something that would finally allow existence to be something other than this lurid cult. For this author and so many of us, that world is never for us. History has already judged, and I have known since I was a child that this will never be better. The hope I had, naively, is that it didn't have to be worse, and this cycle really served no purpose. The author's soul and mind have been cursed and he is perfectly aware of what he actually guilty of, which is entirely divorced from the faux-moral posturing of the Satanic retards dominating the present institutions. Frankly, nothing I have done amounts to much, for the ruling interest of the eugenic creed only concerns itself with crimes of Being. The author has seen enough evidence of obvious malice rewarded by these institutions, including the institutions deliberate and knowing reinforcement of the author's vices, which their sick gods glorify above all. What was done to me and many of us down here is now aristocracy's plan for the general population, and so I write this first of all for people like myself, but if there are "neutrals" who find anything in this, I am not averse to that. What I would not want is to become a guru or figure

quoted verbatim, in the manner that Germanic "thought" drills us to think.

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Previous Chapter](#)

25. Concluding Remarks on this Work

If there is something to take away from this writing, it would be to place the subject of economics on better footing than that which is typical of the miserable science, and to work around the pseudoscience which dominates today. In short, all economic thought is, out of necessity, the command of technology. This can be construed in two ways. The first is that all technological command is operated on through "genius" or intelligence, and all of the particulars of technology, abstractions, and that which is commanded are servants of this intelligence. In this view, all other ideas, including the "noble virtues", are subsumed into intelligence. The second is that technological command concerns technology "in-kind" - the machines and things which are manipulated, and understood through science which itself is a method that is a machine in the possession of knowing entities. In either case, it is what these machines *do* which is the relevant subject matter of economics, rather than what anything "is". The first approach is the one that historically won out, and there are many descriptions of such economic thought that I do not need to relitigate here. The second approach is only occasionally in force, and the command of technology and systems as a general rule is never too general. It is the second which actually describes the world we live in, but no "singular value" or "unit of value" is evident from that approach. No "unit of value" in reality can exist. The conceit of intelligence, for a variety of reasons, breaks down, and that is what the bulk of my entire arc of books here seeks to explain if that is not apparent to the reader. The rule of "intelligence" is really the occult of occult political knowledge, rather than intelligence as a raw substance which doesn't actually exist as that. Yet, all of the philosophical views in vogue with state society and institutions will always revert to the worship of intelligence and idolatry, and by now human technology has made it impossible for any other virtue to exist. All such virtues would be co-opted by some trickery of the intellectuals, subsumed into institutions, leaving behind a flesh and blood body and a world dessicated and turned into a parody of what it was.

To clarify why I structured this as I did, it must be clear that all economics exists at the level of societies and institutions, rather than "in the world". Nowhere outside of the minds of human beings does "economics" figure into anything, and this economic matter is really an affair in societies rather than for individuals. Individual people will, absent any "economic order", invent one on an ad hoc basis to meet their needs. There isn't a strong "economic law" compelling me to clean my room or arrange my house in any way that is mandated by society. Any such law would require the active intervention of other social agents in my life and my home. There are laws of nature which constrain what I can do, which I

must abide in the home, but I am not compelled to "truck and barter" for my own sake, as if I am negotiating with a technocratic committee in my brain or sub-conscious mind, or other people are in my head transmitting messages that I must obey or react to. Nothing I do in that regard is particularly interesting to the economic question in society, and nothing I do in that regard is any great secret. Nearly everything that is internal to me is lumped up in the economic question of society as either "nothing" or an assembly of some assets, the only valuable one being the home I reside in. To understand the economic problem, it is most necessary to maintain an awareness of genuine distance between the agents and the things that are appropriated, and this is not just physical distance but the proximity of causes to that which affects economic life for society as a whole. That distance is not prescribed by the economic problem itself and certainly not by ecology which is an imposition of the most foul kind. It is understood because there is a void - there is a world outside of society, and a society outside of the abstraction of "society" that is beaten into us from cradle to grave.

There is a game played which is really based on a political pseudo-logic to see economics as a projection onto the world, or internalization of social ideas and geists in nature. None of that really pertains to the question we wish to solve, and this economic question does not directly suggest any preferred political outcome. Economics has a limited purview. It does not answer moral questions by its own developments, for at root the moral aims of labor - the moral sentiments of social agents generally - preceded economics and were carried out for reasons that had nothing to do with economics, politics, or society. To this day, much of what we do - and this is not particular to humans - is not an economic or political matter, nor is it really a social matter outside of the purview that is appropriate for the task at hand. What I have done in my home or in free association is not intrinsically the concept of "society in the abstract" or busybodies whose imposition on me has always been malicious, pointless, counter-productive for any aim, and stupid. It is a particular sort of person who insinuates this non-stop, because they learned early in life that by poking and prodding, they can enable the rot of the human race and gain wealth, status, and security at no cost to them, and society could be engineered in a way to grant those people absolute impunity. It is the sad outcome of humanity that those people can do this to the world, but none of that behavior is mandated by any natural law, nor is it universal in the way their ideology proclaims. Such behavior is not even politically mandated or politically useful. It only exists because these people have, by numerous tricks, insisted we have to kowtow to a failed system which cannibalizes anything useful, in service to nothing good whatsoever. There are perhaps spiritual reasons emergent from political life that would make such people inevitable, and grant to them advantages we would have to abide for now. It would be quite trivial though to simply forbid forever such people, and for such people to invade our personal matters for the most spurious reasons is a very modern affair that relied on extensive enclosure, glorification of torture, and an ethos which demands ever-increasing energy input which it wastes in a

giant bonfire of human failure.

Most often, the enablers of such rot - whose behavior follows a political and spiritual thought peculiar to humans, and not even all humans or something that existed outside of historical periods and places that allowed it to flourish - invoke the language of life and biopolitics, because humans are not just social agents but life-forms, and life itself is what created the knowledge process in humans, rather than any intentional design. The particular direction of human intelligence and our concepts of knowledge is not strictly an economic question, for political and historical thought had far more to do with how humans saw themselves and why we are what we are. Economically, the demands for human beings are very little. It has been the aim of those I called the cajolers to push and prod so that energy expenditures are soaked up in the cost of security, and the cajolers and their fellow travelers impose a protection racket which they insist we have to "respect" at the least. Yet, for all of their efforts, they can only extract enough cost to suck dry a life-form by elaborate torture and at great expense of human labor, which their reward mechanisms tell them to do 100% of the time. That working did not appear overnight, and did not take over all that exists as a fait accompli. Even now, it is far from the control of reality it seeks, and its development is the long story I hope to tell with this entire series of writings, if I am so fortunate to complete it. All of my account is necessarily a limited story, which others will have to fill in or reproduce with their own knowledge of events, especially if they pertain to a time long after I am writing.

When all is said and done, much of life's activity is surplus rather than "economically and politically necessary expenditures", despite the onerous toil demanded of us. This surplus is spent in three places - "technology" and "knowledge", "spiritual and moral development", and "occult knowledge", or the knowledge of signs and symbols and their relevance that is not immediately evident. These three are distinct aims which cannot be reconciled, and for the producers, they are given a wholly different ideology which reproduces the tripartate structure of the state in economic life. The producers, who are properly speaking just the commoners who eat shit, are told they are the kings of the mind and intellect, a permanent and hereditary "natural aristocracy" arising among them. Labor is militarized and trained to embrace a low cunning and moral depravity. The lowest class are told lies and their efforts are consumed with contradictory orders and the sadism of a ruling order that purely exists to regulate technology. Meanwhile, the state proper and its holders are secured against all consequences, and the producers chase after phantoms and various fads. It does not have to be so, and in practice, this entire setup of society is ignored. The reasoning for this is not economic but purely political and spiritual, and the conceits of institutions which exist for purposes other than economic necessity. Economics works through institutions, but institutions are no more beholden to economic necessity than individual persons representing a flesh and blood body are. Indeed, nothing about our flesh or body implies "economic necessity" as a pressing motivator. The needs of biological life are not exorbitant, and this is not a "bare minimum of life", but the substantive material inputs that would be compatible with a happy and

fulfilled life, if not for the pressure of politics, struggle, and the obtuse demands of aristocracy, or the interclass conflict which thus far dominates humanity's existence. All that has placed us in this deprived condition is a choice of those with the authority to impose it.

Authority is a tricky word, since at heart, authority is a spiritual rather than political concept. There is no authority which does not ultimately derive from spiritual authority - our ability to know what is what from a source outside of ourselves or naive sense. Our own thought and native sense is necessary to recognize this authority, and it does not take long for a knowing entity like a human to see that its own existence and native sense is necessary for authority to be relevant. That is, while we look outside of us and to the world for the truth, we only do so through the faculties available to us, and we know ourselves and trust our sense as an authority. We know, on some level, why we sense and think the way we do, rather than accepting "sense" or "reason" as primordial substances or impulses. The primordial theory of mind falls apart in a way a child could determine, if the child's thought was not beaten into submission, or the child were not inclined to give in to the thrill of imposition from an early age and, after tasting first blood, never once questioned the thrill of victory. Personal authority only exists because there is a world to recognize, which includes our existence and native sense, however feeble it may be. That authority is in the end a fact that all in society have to abide, regardless of laws or conceits held in language and all of the tricks of language and self-delusions to control reality.

If economics is to be anything other than a series of just-so stories about life, it would regard an authority which is not in of itself economic. Economics cannot contain within itself its own justification or purpose. We can establish the agents of society, but this is not a basis for economic life, but social life generally. All economics concerns societies not because economic behavior can be contained entirely within society, but because the authority outside of any particular agent, and personal authority dependent on that, allows for any relevant fact or value, including moral values and sentiments that guide the behavior of those social agents. The economic task is one of limited aims, and cannot be made into a general rule of "total system" to explain all that exists. Yet, all we value can in principle be judged as an economic affair, since there is some technology that would be managed. It is important to remember that economics and ecology are always *managerial* approaches to the world, and presume the role of managers who are, in an economic sense, worthless to the entire project. The sole purpose of any economic idea would be to understand by reason how this task of management could be obviated, rather than emphasizing struggle or the wants of those agents as a political matter. Political struggle may be carried out for many reasons, but "economic necessity" is a stupid one that turns inward on itself - unless managers decide, in a fit of incredible stupidity and vanity, to destroy the world for such a cause. It begs the question - what is any of this for? In all of the economic thought that enters the discourse, not one aim of it suggests there is anything worthwhile to gain for most of humanity, and the "reward" of the philosophers is worth even less than the fleeting pleasure of

opiates. At least with the opiates, some salvation from the misery of economic and managerial drudgery is possible, until the drugs wear off and we are left wanting more. It is no surprise that capitalism arises when the global opium trade becomes a lynchpin of imperial rule. Such a foul cause as the opium trade has ever since dominated the political mainstream, even though we're supposedly creatures of probity who would never ever do something so terrible. From the starting point of the Opium Wars, the depravity of the partisans who want more of that only grows worse and worse. We have handed over our lives, our knowledge, our sense of the world, and all of the future, to these perverts and monsters who did nothing but push a reward stimulus because they could, and told us this is all there can be. They can't even say they hold anything real behind the facade of bullshit. They only ever offered a low cunning fitting of a failed race, more failed than most of humanity, and insist that their stupidity is some sort of genius we have to kowtow to. Yet, they won. The secret to their victory, or at least what appears to be victory, is that absent anything that will say no, there is nothing in the world that prevents ideology and a mind-virus from cannibalizing reason. The sacrosanctity of the mind, which was always upheld for spurious and vain reasons that a child could see through and the better philosophers always acknowledged to be a farce, did not account for a simple truth. This is that the mind and knowledge was never comprised of any special substance. Anyone who actually contemplated the mind would tell you that such a view was foolish and turned inward on itself, and that human knowledge and thought was always a manifestation of something in the world, at a basic level. The thought on the soul, or humanity's spiritual component, was never about "thought" or "consciousness" that was animated by a higher power in some unknowable realm. A reading of most of the world's religions would have viewed such a thing as either easily disproven, or Satanic in purpose. Guess what the opium lords believed in and what it was really for - and that's all it was ever for. It was always a lie to get to what these people really wanted - the shortest possible route to hijack thought and make it theirs. Eugenics knows no other way.

Nothing about this was "necessary" or economically efficient or worthwhile. The cost of this empire has been ruinous towards any productive goal. The true purpose is something very different - that under eugenics, suffering itself became life's prime want. This is not a political or even a spiritual matter, or indicative of something that had to prevail in humanity. It prevailed because there was, in the genesis of humans, an endless foulness in the act in-of-itself - in "species-being" that is captured by Germanic racism more than anything else. When the two foul centers of global eugenics merged their doctrines, the result has been the modern states of Nazi Germany and what remained of the United States. The former proclaimed the triumph of eugenics over all other concerns. The latter would be restructured from within, and the eugenic creed would find in America the most toxic stew humanity ever created. It is this that I, the author, lived to witness, and I am not the only one. In the end, it would be only the lowest class who cared or wanted it to be different, and the rest of the world would be

made to witness this filthy race's coda. It returns to where it began, but all else that went into humanity and all of its conditions were to be negated. This is the heart of the philosophical creed the eugenists espouse - eternal regression to a primordial state, and the elimination of anything else, including the world itself. This is an ancient idea, and for it to work, it would have to be based on something real - that humanity is a sinful and shameful race from its creation - and then proclaim that all redemption is a lie, and that there cannot be anything else. This didn't have to pertain to us, out of some infantile egoism. "We", frankly, do not matter for much, and that was never the concern of the vast majority of humans who ever lived. We never premised our existence on the belief that we possessed any inborn goodness, because we all understood that it was the world that made us good, in spite of ourselves and everything we ever did. If we possessed some virtue to call our own, it meant nothing without doing something with it. As a possession, virtue is not worth all it is made out to be, and those who bray incessantly and get on the highest horse humans ever rode do not and never did possess such virtue. It is all projection for them, and the cajolers and liars never needed it to be anything else. Most of us, though, regard our possession of any virtue not as an entitlement that others must bow to, but as something which exists because we were always aware of depravity. How could we not, given the sordid origin of humanity and the states that ruled over us? We choose to do good not out of some innate destiny, but because we have always seen the alternative, and this is done not because it meets ethical or moral criteria or some vanity, but because we have seen enough rot and misery in the world, and no one has ever given a particularly good reason for any of it. Those who attempt to do so look like bigger retards than I ever did, and that is saying a lot, but under eugenism, such retardation is glorified and we are told we are not allowed to be anything else.

The only way to sell this imperative is to insist on a division of labor, first by function and then codified into classes of people. This is only possible once economic life is controlled and becomes an ecological claim, which is "above politics" and not something that conforms to anything that would manage any worthwhile affair. If we cared to make the most of economic management, we would study its mechanisms which are proper and pertain to a society we cannot seriously deny, and seek to eliminate as much as possible the role of managers and proprietors. No one needed "ecology" or the division of labor for anything. The study of natural resources was always better understood with genuine science, and did not need any such enclosure for us to know how much stuff waited *in situ* within the Earth. All ecological models are beholden to society to be intelligible, and from the start, they mar the natural environment and our understanding of the situation, and impose a model of the world and a preferred division of humanity into castes. It serves nothing but itself, and this is one part of the inversion of reality that would be codified violently and flagrantly with eugenics. At great expense, a caste system has been imposed on humanity, and its final development is to be exported to all nations if the bastards have their way. For all that is invoked with ecology, not one part of it resembles the genuine world

we live in, even if we accepted the demarcation of territory into more or less fixed economic zones. The retrenchment of economic barriers is not a barrier to the invasion of free trade, but the full proliferation of free trade's intent - to enclose the world and proclaim the freedom of predation alone, and the slavery of everyone and everything but that. Had the management of limited natural resources been conducted with earnest goals, the proper domain for this is not economics or the claims of the state or political. The proper domain, aside from natural science and the talent of engineers who do not obfuscate what they are doing, would be society itself and the interests of its members, who have every reason to resent imposition of the new plantation. What is at stake is the battle between freedom in the genuine sense and slavery - and so, we return to the founding struggle of America, between the institutions of slavery and an expectation, however dim, that there was something other than this that it was for. That struggle is not particular to America, but it is around America that the struggle for the world has been waged up to now. All other states were beholden to the trajectory of America, and this is not merely because of its imperial status but because of what the country meant for world history. Everywhere the slave interest and its current manifestations arises, it is the darling of foreign powers, and the enablers of slavery have always hated America and especially hated Americans, and always wished nothing more than to sell it off for cut-rate prices and piss off to some estate. In no other country is the slave power so shameless in its purpose and so devoid of any merit but what it attained from the rot of humanity. The Nazis did their best to emulate it, succeeding in destroying the host country before infesting every other country the Nazi diaspora found and eagerly awaiting the next opportunity. What has followed has been a war within the institutions which cut loose everyone outside of the system long ago - and this played uniformly to the advantages of slavery and despised any concept that it was going to be anything different. That struggle was carried out around the world, and it has come to this sad impasse in the 21st century.

The division of labor does not proceed as ecologists please, but by certain laws of motion that the ecological pseudoscience must abide. It is always the position of such aristocrats to proclaim their victory is a *fait accompli*, that it happened a long time ago, and so on, but the eternal war of social engineering is far from complete. It is a war that is never designed to be truly "won" or come anywhere close to attaining its aims. The purpose of the war, so far as there is one, is the torture and liquidation of the lowest class, to glorify the suffering of a failed race and make the lowest class into living abortions. The thrill of torture must be maximized, and this became the sole remaining purpose of humanity. It is this which the eugenists isolated scientifically, which has always been at the heart of all division of labor. That is, the division of labor was premised not just on suffering, but on who was selected to suffer. It was premised on a presumption that intelligence was proprietary, occulted, and "special", and was entirely rooted in hereditary right and legal rulings granting to intelligence itself absolute impunity against those it deemed stupid. The final step was to make this ruling arbitrary and completely unassailable, and to abandon any pretense

that there was a productive society or anything worthwhile in humanity. This has always been a choice. Humanity's rulers can end this any time, but if they did so, they would be immediately destroyed, and no one has any reason to trust any institution promising the sky and the moon - literally - after all of the carnage eugenics has done. It can't stop itself, until it has assured that mankind is split into two - "brights" and the most abject and humiliated slaves humanity could produce, with not a single purpose behind it except the vanity of a failed race deserving of being burned out of existence.

Economic thought offers no solution to this, because the nature of the problem is not really an economic one to begin with. At any point, this could end with a simple observation - that there is really nothing to struggle for, and the institutions were never something for the lower classes. Those who march through the institutions remain beholden to them, and are receiving their fate. We could have told them this would happen, and some of us did, but they did it all the same. Those of their lot who were naturally oriented to it were always going to do what they did, and let thought pass through them without a care in the world. As vile as aristocracy and the proprietors have been, and they are utterly shameless and devoid of anything worth keeping, it is the technocratic middle class - this *new class* which held the world, and they do it to themselves while they do it to us. Why they are so eager to march to a story of aristocracy is beyond political reasoning or the allure of aristocracy's spiritual knowledge. It is, and always will be, **eugenics** which damned us to this world, and that stupid religion is the overt face of this abomination, always cajoling the world to conform to the most insane vision so that we become fully and forever a Satanic race. As a "race", humanity is done. This concept of humanity was always a degeneration of humanist ideas and intended to be so, just as racial nationalism destroys the genuine basis of nations and replaces it with a gaudy aristocratic story.

If there is a future for mankind, it will not be as a "race" or a false univesalism where we are told we should all be the same or join a single world order, and it will not proceed by some idiotic faith in eternal national struggle. It will not happen when some novel technology makes us "better than human", because that never happens if anything is not completely fucking retarded and understands history and the litany of errors committed for such fads. There is no easy way out, and it will not be something humanity can begin on any power of its own, individually or collectively. For now, humans can only live day by day and continue through this nightmare. Expecting it to ever be better is a waste of time, for us or for any who come after. There is some solace - that there is a world outside of society, however small, and those fleeting moments are all we ever really had, disjointed and removed from a project that was never for us. Most of us have no future and will meet a terrible end, one way or another, and whatever anyone can keep in this failed society is not worth much or something to take any pride in. Whatever comes out the other side will be a grim world, and when the promises of paradise are given, we will have learned that such things no longer interest us. What good is "paradise" when it is just a lie to be

snatched away by a few people who will obviously be favored and never wanted to share with the poor kids? But, perhaps, there will be a day when the eugenic creed is no longer, and if there is even one who can say that it was bullshit, it was always bullshit, and no one ever needed this stupid, retarded religion to tell us what we were, then our efforts would not have been in vain. But, saying the truth is not enough. Power laughs at truth. The real value of this is that we would retain native sense and be able to create the new, in spite of a ruling idea which says that anything new is automatically "retarded" and promotes pure Satanic drivel and has ceased to think that any other project is worth anything.

I don't suggest any "program" in any of this, for I am no revolutionary and no leader. I highly suspect any course of action would not require my input, and if there is someone who wants something other than this filth who can suggest a better course of action, I wouldn't want my words to hamper such a glorious cause. If there are those who wish to constantly relitigate 1917 or phantoms of the past, they're idiots and should ask the obvious questions, rather than herd more people to a failed thinking and tell them to stay there. Certainly, most of the left is aware of their function and refuses to change this, because that has been their role in the great game. They have had too many opportunities to turn away from this and suggest anything else, and went out of their way to jump in front of anyone suggesting anything different or even something that would make life tolerable. Nothing short of total abandonment of the present institutions would suffice. The resistance that remains will no longer aspire to fantasies of that sort.

Hate, my friends, hate. If I have learned anything, hatred for all of the lies is one of the few saving graces humans possess. We do not know a true or worthwhile love without this hatred, and when we have embraced the true and divine hatred, we learn that the fickle and simpering parody of love on offer is not at all appealing, or offensive to the senses. When we have the true and divine hatred and cease lying to ourselves, a love worthwhile will be apparent, and it won't be a love for "Big Brother" or the typical bullshit ideologues uphold. It won't be a love of your fellow man or any particular person, because that sort of love is fickle and doesn't mean anything. It won't be a love for things or empty rituals. It won't be a love of justice or some sense of goodness. What it might be for you, if anything, I cannot say. What I can say is that it is far better to have hated my enemies than to go on lying to myself. It is when eugenics makes us lie to ourselves and drills through ritual the maximal contempt of their Satanic creed that they score their most sadistic victory. The art of continuing to hate in hard times, and managing to continue living in this world, is far too difficult a matter to describe here. But, I do not believe there is a way forward without this hatred, and that we can find within us. It cannot be taught by any pedagogy or theory, and it is not a thing born within us. Wherever we came from and the experiences of our lives, many find the hatred of such a foul enemy as eugenics. It is common to feel a correct disgust and revulsion at eugenics, but without true, unforgiving hatred for the creed, there is no expectation of anything else, and everyone will have to dance around the centrality of this

movement and pretend it isn't real.

End of Book 2

[Return to Table of Contents](#) | [Return to Chapter Start](#)