

Becoming Sustainable Man

Asserting constantly that the goal of the whole climate consciousness is to help the vulnerable. I suppose that a clear catastrophe hasn't yet been realized and though most of the greatly committed climate activists would like nothing more than for a "biological" incentive to be imposed on the entire populace, until such time comes that an unequivocal circumstance of climate change derived threat comes about, the next thing is to either connect second order effects or to claim that it is merely decency and consideration for the have-nots. This gets sticky, as the have-nots often take vocational opportunities which, at least at the immediate scale, are assumed to be made available to those lacking an associate's degree or higher. Why them? Because there is no intellect necessary - at least not from the perspective of the climate activist (are we yet prepared to term them Climate Marxists?)

Those Poor Fools (They don't even know)

The blue collar working class and below are that most vulnerable span of society, yet they are mostly unaware of the looming threat. The aspects of society which seem just at a superficial level to be functioning are not doing them any real favours, as it is setting them up to incur unexpected catastrophe. Their happiness is incomplete, and is mostly associated with a dulling of their senses, as they'd otherwise hear the world screaming to act immediately. They busy themselves within the contraptions which accelerate the crisis and once it hits it will be too late for them, as they are clearly on the wrong side of history. We look for ways of reaching them as our muppets showcase dialogue about the dimwitted challenge before us. Can they ever even grasp the knowledge necessary to take the challenge head-on?

We have insights, as a blessing of our own standpoint, and for those who haven't the correct standpoint? We must stop them from having the wrong thought before it manifests. They haven't the means of defending their minds from false suggestion. Their minds are already littered with all that is false, and it causes them to be a threat to our children and the unfortunates (and, of course, our Great King).

By acting on their behalf, we adjust their environment without them even knowing, and this permits a heightening of their sensibilities, potentiating an awakened consciousness which can lead to the pinnacle of existence - perfect harmony with my conception of family and conception of self.

The Social State

Some like to grovel over distinctions. Socialism is not Communism, yet I think I fail to understand or even trust the implied definitions.

They try to make the distinction on the basis of Communism being an Authoritarian state which lies about being able to lead its citizens to a society where everything is owned by the public, or even a society where everyone does whatever they like while enjoying the best any society has to offer (from each according to..).

Socialism, on the other hand, is showing attention to social matters. It is simply tending to an issue that would otherwise occur at a faster rate. But what is that matter? Well, any number of phenomena can and will be enumerated. Disease, they will say, because some are too poor to have driven to a vaccine clinic. Crime, because the homeless have nothing better to do. But the tool of socialism is always the same -> rounding. We can't have any lumps or bumps unbecoming of a civilized person of our kind.

But what really is Socialism? Caring for more than most? Is it Marx's conception of social man, who naturally does work and brings about more social man? What would Hegel have imagined? He would have envisioned the sort of men that would feel so inclined as to participate in a German Folk Religion, and who had the mind to utilize or induce a process of speculation. By looking in and reflecting dialectically, one could come to realize one as the absolute idea. The eternal idea, aware of itself. This is not far off from what all other belief systems do and demand. Christian Science uses a logical process to reason man's reflection of God. Chris Langan's CTMU uses logical induction to describe reality as something composed as a self-identifying event for the purpose of identifying and that is there was no purpose, it would be impossible to occur. If everything has meaning implied by its own existence then, at the very least, it could all be aware of that one meta-fact -> bringing awareness to an absolute.

In a sense, we demand reflection much as our nervous systems recognize the potential for our having been observed and, even just acknowledged. But the reflection does something more because if I demand it of you, I am criticizing the incomplete structure of your expression of being, both observed and as it exists through your own perceptual frame. You are, at that moment, the inadequate experience and that questions not only your existence, but existence as a whole. That may be a path, or the path to evil.

We should dwell on that, for we all understand the nature of recognizing injustice, and some might even claim that justice is deducible as per the lines defined by the state, but even such cases suggest the continued implication through indirection that there even is a concept of justice worthy of being addressed, and that it is not, at its most generic level, something entirely arbitrary. Even if its evaluation might have arbitrary behaviours associated with it as a realized process.

So what then could any 2 agree about its structure (Justice)? About the component or perception of it which is not arbitrary? Unnecessary suffering is not enough, as that appears to occur in neutral circumstances, but even that comes to be considered evil erroneously. Evil, because if there is no obvious reason for it, then why should it ever need to have occurred - begging the question as to whether neutral existence is itself evil, but it is still not enough (and, furthermore, one can come to champion the demand that all should seek to rectify the latent portions of structure producing the suffering, lest they be, at the very least, a neutral part of the neutral structure producing suffering). Naturally having come to cause unnecessary suffering and are thus evil out of inaction - or their participation in evil is voluntary, making them actively evil. These interpretations can never distinguish themselves from the potential for their adoption and use to itself fall under the same standard. Be at least just as evil.

Structurally-Determined Evil

The notion that the single most consequentially valenced factor worthy of sociological or psychological consideration is itself a demand to negate existence. It proposes that what has been brought into being can be so accurately evaluated that it's sufficient to give more credence to the structural description of a being rather than the claims from and independent observations of that being.

There are paths towards transforming the determined structure, but it leaves no room to interpret some current frame as oriented to truth and expressing that which is not logically supposed as per the structure. This demands that the other perception that lays outside of or expresses itself incongruous to the predominant superstructure take up the cause of transforming it. Since this can only be perceived as antithetical and hostile by the superstructure, it is no surprise that such ventures are met with hostility, but what can be a real surprise is that, as science, psychology, social science and engineering advance themselves, the capacity for the superstructure to instantiate and refine programs and procedures

proclaiming to be critical of the superstructure increases. Furthermore, it such programs cannot be expected to be instantiated for the express purpose of subverting and undermining interest and action-potential which would otherwise critique the structure, but may very well be borne of modes of thought which are themselves intended to critique the structure; that these operations are managed through the structure, however, and that they are executed through assignment and deputization of individual persons whose sense of survival and actualization are now intertwined with the project while it itself is supported by the very structure it purports to critique, yields an environment of interoperating systems of logic and infrastructure whose conformed interfaces and innovated transactions are prone to complexity, contradiction, and, quite simply, cognitive biasing.

It is for this reason that true criticism will be identified with decreased latency and increased weight of condemnation as the systems through which relevant infrastructure is made available advance themselves.

In time, though the original aspiration to allow for some degree of foul play by the underprivileged as a means of balancing odds with corporate greed sporting incalculably immense resources comes to normalize breach of principles within a system where the capacity for each entity to optimize exploitation of such a breach is at least unknown, and quite reasonable most favourable to thoes who are already most calibrated with such a system's implements.

After all the standards are eroded or injected with exceptional and covert additions to the advantage of the same greedy entities, there remains only one mode of pursuit in order to restore hope of emancipation: proficient and faithful commitment to universal standards.

We must heal process and tend to it.

Good Promises

What promise can possibly interest you more than the promise if being? That you are is not contingent on any other recognition and is no crime or moral burden. You can simply be and make observation and become action. The chemicals and particles might seem to suggest that you are not what you perceive, or that what you are is not being but reacting, and that this calls into question the very basis for understanding ourselves as being sentient beings, but this becomes a choice for each of us; how could you take that away from all of mankind? You wager against them all for what? A false promise of less fear? The promise that all will agree that you have suffered too much? And now, have you no fear? Have you less suffering? Have you a clear mind?

Transcendent Man

Transcedent man is new man. The process of becomign is declared by its very existence and, if everyone became this, we would all be liberaed. Sexuality is made both glorified and rejected. We seek to have the pleasure by virtue of demonstrating that we are refusing the oppression which demands that our biological realities are used to serve another. Interstingly, it is not assumed that in having developed an interest in sexual deviancy or sexual or reproductive dysfunction, that we might be serving another interest or entity's needs.

The only oppression, in this case, is an expectation that you would continue the genomic propagation of your family tree. Parent and partner is oppressor because they have any expectation of normalcy. An expectation that your family could be hidden in the sense that they lie beyond biological limitations. The

expectation is that you must remain on a path of normal life where the expected outcomes are just that - the end result is something that has precedence - and this is oppression.

The subjective means of committing all others to the process of liberation is not just limited to a few domains. It appears to be tied into the human experience, and so this would help to understand why considering certain speech as forbidden would be the norm, rather than the exception. In climate science, for example, you have professors who remark how their own students are penalized with anxiety, which prevents them from performing their scholarly duties at the expected pace, but there is no contemplating whether this is brought about by subjective conception of the threat level - understanding (the degree of) the material consequence and anticipated rate of impact in a measured and balanced way which takes into account some of the egregious predictions which had failed to come to pass. That some predictions line up is a consolation, but the fact that some of the most, or all of the most, stress-inducing of predictions have been shown to have not come to pass. This is a simple test in that it is obvious we needn't belabour ourselves with consistency. The contradictions are part of a dialectical process, and if we have a historicists's view of the world, then we need only invite contradictions to embed themselves within a process which moves forward inspite of the currently instantiated observable representation.