

# Transhumanism

---

*With more humanity than a human being*

Does one imagine small steps towards Transhumanism with a self-evaluated limit as to how extensively or significantly one undergoes the transformation? Surely, many give it no thought, but many of these, still, had the opportunity to envision their submission to technocracy. It was implicit through school in the sense of perceiving that whatever is being done, particularly in medicine, is the most modern set of procedures and standards that there has ever been.

Indeed, one can take heed of the collective's power and imagine the ways in which one can be liberated in tandem with the breaching the world's boundaries.

Particularly in a school, where one's attention is formally placed on implements of the future which, at the least, enhance one's capability and, at the most, overcome the limits of reality.

## They Are All Transformation

The activists seek transformative change through:

- solidarity, redistribution, inclusion, belonging, diversity practitioners, agents and evangelists, disruption, repression, censorship, holding institutional power, or influencing institutional power. None of these solutions are a process of conceive -> risk -> create. There is always risk in creating new, but hijacking institutions allows causes some risk to be absorbed by the structure, allowing freedom to focus on the grooming without having to worry about the cost of redirecting.

## Create vs Negate

### **Solidarity**

Create: solidarity, understanding, Negate: oppression

This does a few things:

- it not only reduces the burden of cost but makes it impossible to gain an intuition for the cost.
- reducing burden from such optimal utilization of resources increases the degree to which one pursues a modality
- Given the above and a culture celebrating self-centredness

## Viral Dialectic

Back to the COVID narrative, how does dialectically-mediated praxis affect the perception and use of the COVID era/event?

### **Brainstorm**

- Historicism, achieving absolute idea through synthesizing contradictions until we are left with the idea
- Means to disregard factors

- Allowing for men of action
- Seeing the application for material and cultural equity
- Transcending original ideas about Public Health and governance
- Opportunity to allow your idea to create reality is amplified when it is insisted upon through forces, like the state, or the appearance of death
- Original Philosophy: allow for romantic and self-indulgent thought.
- Social Justice and Critical Consciousness. If we can finally get everyone to do X then we can get them to do my thing

Many have been waiting for the means to make their fantasy come true, particularly through subscription to their preferred form of collectivism. One world would be hard pressed to reveal a path to reveal a path to collectivist thinking which doesn't entail resentment regarding distribution and availability of resources for everyone's displeasure comes from the perpetuation that they are whom they would like to be or are not doing what they would like to be doing.

One might say that it is out of identification of the suffering of others, but even if we are to accept the proposition of altruism at face value, how even if we are to accept the proposition of altruism at face value, how can one identify the plight with no familiarity to its structure? The only other reasonable modality is desire for power, except perhaps if they endure some important physical circumstances.

One of the things that the activist seem to have stood strongly gravitated to is the mask. This seems to serve identity Marxists in a variety of ways. To bring about a claim of allyship is towards a calling of solidarity. The solidarity means having or rather serving something beyond oneself, but it is not distinctly the serving of any person. It is in service of the identity theory, which presupposes that the theoretical description for every identity category is more real or accurate than the claims of even a person of the category is more real or accurate than the claims of even a person of the category. This is because the system has subverted their perception. So, then, how does the mask serve? Well, we neednt have descriptors uttered by anyone - we already have theory, either wear the mask as a sign of your acceptance of collectivism, or wear it to disable your individuality, which we want suppressed anyway.

In short, if you are a collectivist, though you have ample reason to be biased towards wanting masking to be enforced, perhaps the simplest of those reasons is because it provides authority to force an action by everyone's person.

But what of the jab? Well, we could see that there was an extremely asymmetrical handling of concerns vs the promoting of it. Some might say this is due to advertising dollars, corporate ownership, partnerships between pharmaceutical companies and the media (Reuters, CNN, etc), as well as government purchasing massive quantities on faith from a very early time, but there is more to it than just that.

The human mind has a tendency to view itself as exceptional to what it expects are the states and experiences of other minds. Even if another mind is suspected as being accomplished or having achieved a more expressive result along some measurable dimension or heuristic, the mind can excuse itself for not achieving the same level of performance while still possessing greater overall advantage (even if only imagined as such), or even one advantage which carries more weight than all other factors of consideration (superordinate/superseding factor).

It does seem to me that those who don't care to see a thorough and symmetrical addressing of concerns are not so focused on understanding whether this is the expected solution all hoped for, but whether we are utilizing the opportunity to transcend. Transcend the flesh and transcend the ways in which you are

accountable to reality itself. It is very difficult to come to terms with having a body and consolidating all the complications that come along with it. Given an aspiration to solve mortality, disease, physical/cognitive inadequacy, sexual attraction, reproductive ability, gene propagation.

Many dream of constructing a neutral or enabling environment with with fictitious representations of form (avatars) and being able to address issues of sex and virility with medicine and technology (in some respects, we seem almost there, though in others, we seem to regress). Most of all, we can address the prospect of not being able to do something (FOMO/YOLO), like being capable of highly developed figure skating or simply being able to be an up-to-par model as per any cultural context.

What is the difference between those conceiving of such ends and demanding them vs the more casual supporter? We know, for example, that those with a negative disposition are more easily manipulated over the prospect of evading physical or mental discomfort, yet they are being made to perform an action which can produce discomfort and which can cause anxiety. Is that not enough to stop them?

No, the simple truth is that the threats are numerous and social exclusion is always implicit. Furthermore, there is still the question of plausible deniability. Everyone should wish to preserve and optimize its use.

So, then, we are all transhuman because of various reasons: (to be completed)

- the presence of a synthetic particle
- supplementation with the express intent of modifying a particular biological modality.

## Gaining Access to Bodies

*Gaining access to bodies as a moral virtue and intellectual right*

Holding the intellectually supported position, one is able to claim not only that one's prescriptions will support the community, but that the leanings of their detractor cause them to be prone to self-harm. At such a point, failure to participate is evidence of self-harm and community harm. The politician makes increasingly incidental observations to support their position.

Though it might not seem rigorous or intelligent, it is supposed that abortion rights and vaccine refusal are incomparable. There are multiple ways to posit dissimilarity.

### Abortions vs Injection

#### **Not Mandatory**

Vaccination is not mandatory because: a) you are not put in prison b) you are not forced physically c) in most countries, you are not fined d) you can leave your job and stop making money (it's your choice)

#### **A. Not Put In Prison**

Not put in prison, but those who make this argument would likely not make a fuss if being unvaccinated became an offense for which a conviction carried prison time

#### **B. Not Forced Physically**

Not forced physically, though it can and does happen (just not in Canada or the United States, at least among those who are in control of their faculties and not committed to an institution for care).

Even in places where it does not happen, the pressures being applied are possibly best considered as more insidious.

### **C. Not Fined In Most Countries**

Not fined, but in some it was or is, and most of those pro-vaxxers (communivaxx0rs) are fine with incurring cost among the unjabbed. One must ask why that is.

Yes, of course, the assumption is that being unjabbed is a burden on society, but many assumptions are baked into this. The evaluations for those assumptions are delegated to another party, so keep that in mind. They already know the position of that party (those doing the evaluation). They are absconding from the opportunity to think through a fascinating and pertinent problem affecting those that they even may know themselves (and might even claim to care about). They are sitting idle while a great constraint is applied to the unjabbed such as to diminish their capacity to stay alive. Why forego the important task of formulating a means of evaluation?

Why delegate this to a party whom you already know will support the idea that the unjabbed are a burden worthy of punishment? Is that process of evaluation not the only thing that makes the difference? Would you not want to prove that, before your supposed friends and loved ones are made to perish? Reasons to delegate:

- Blind faith or incompetence "Who Cares"
- Adversarial behaviour prompting reactionary response (see the following)
- Deriving some utility from the outcome. What utility?
  - Leveraging the weight of law to raise the sanctity of one's position.
  - Retaliation out of resentment
  - Enhanced capacity to view oneself as correct with less cognitive dissonance

### **D. You Can Leave Your Job**